

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

VOL. II. No. 22.

Telephone: DRYdock 1516

NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, December 28, 1929

PRICE 5 CENTS

MARION KILLERS FREED

Naval Conclave Sure to Crash

The London Naval Conference which is to open next month in the British House of Lords has already encountered such huge obstacles that there is every assurance that the conference will collapse without any agreement being reached. The essence of the obstacles lies in the demands of each of the five powers involved—United States, Great Britain, Japan, France and Italy—for the strengthening of its own naval power at the expense of its most immediate rival.

The preliminary conversations held between the Japanese delegation and American representatives in Washington already gave promise of the hopelessness and hypocrisy of all the solemn "disarmament" pledges of the various imperialist robbers. Japan attempted to get the consent and support of the American imperialists for the maintenance of its submarine strength and an increase in the ratio for cruisers to 70 percent of the strength of any other power. Thus far, the U. S. has refused to agree to the Japanese proposals.

France Wants Submarines

Following right upon the heels of the Japanese demands, comes a wrench thrown into the conference spokes by the bitter rivalry of France and Italy. The French have announced that their demands are not and cannot be based upon any proportions with other countries. Their intention is to build irrespective of the strength of other powers and to base their land and naval armaments exclusively upon their own imperialist needs. Since they have a long coastline facing England on the one side, and Mediterranean interests competed for by Italy, their demand is based essentially upon the maintenance of a big submarine fleet, and parity with no one else in any other military or naval field.

In the meantime, to keep the pot of dissension boiling, the Italians have again come forward to press their demand for parity with France. Mussolini does not "deny" the right of France to build "according to her needs", only he insists upon Italy's right to build to the point of parity with France.

Thieves Cannot Agree

Despite the big fuss made about the "great hopes entertained for the cause of peace at the conference," it is being reluctantly acknowledged that the conference will find it impossible to do anything but disagree. The French, according to information given out by their Foreign Office, will not find it possible to arrive at a solution "which will suit both countries (i. e., France and Italy) and also be acceptable to the other participants in the London meeting" (New York Times, 12-22-1929). To corroborate this significant declaration, comes the statement from Washington, evidently inspired by the State Department, that "so delicate are the prospects that American officials do not care to discuss them publicly prior to the London conference."

The numerous forecasts of the conference made by the imperialists themselves, today at any rate, belie their previous proclamations of its success. The imperialist powers have no more intention of disarming than they have of turning power over to the working class. The London conference was called for the purpose of disarming "the other fellow," but it appears that all "the other fellows" refuse to disarm! The collapse of the conference will only add to the enlightenment of those workers who gave a penny of confidence to the diplomatic hi-jackers and their suave assurances.

Acquit Deputies Who Murdered Six Strikers

BULLETIN

After being out for 22 hours, the jury returned with the verdict of Not Guilty in the case of the eight deputy sheriffs who slew six textile strikers in Marion, N. C., on October 2nd. The decision of the court occasioned no particular surprise, particularly following upon the convictions in the Gastonia cases and of the workers in Marion. In the Gastonia and Marion workers' cases, the class character of the courts was adequately demonstrated. Despite the fact that in both trials there was no proof presented that the

BURNSVILLE, N. C., (F.P.)—The "hand of God" was called in to help the eight Marion deputy sheriffs tried for the murder of six striking mill workers early in the morning of Oct. 2, in closing appeals to the jury in this mountain village.

That was the only way defense attorneys could explain how the deputies, said to be battling in self defense, slaughtered six pickets while escaping themselves unscathed, save for a scratch on one deputy's nose.

The tiny courtroom was crowded to suffocation as union attorneys asked that the slayers, half of them mill-paid, pay the price for their reckless fusillades into the ranks of gassed, fleeing strikers. To Char-

les Hutchins, Burnsville attorney retained by the United Textile Workers, the Marion mill struggle was a class fight between the rich and the poor, "with the poor men shot in the back to protect the rich men's mill." Jim Owens, mill bossman, was deputized the morning of the massacre "because he was the arch enemy of the union in Marion", he said.

A star witness in rebuttal for the union was W. L. Hicklin, Asheville reporter, whose original testimony that he saw deputies shooting strikers in the back was a sensation of the trial. On the stand again, he testified that Sheriff Adkins shouted to his gunmen: "For God's sake, men, stop! Don't kill any more!"

THE MOONEY FRAME-UP

Governor Passes Buck Again

SAN FRANCISCO—Gov. C. C. Young, in referring action on the Mooney case to the state pardon board, has caused a "ghastly delay", Editor Fremont Older of the San Francisco Call-Bulletin told a Federated Press correspondent Dec. 18. Older has written Gov. Young charging him with deliberately delaying Mooney's freedom by his latest act. It will take the pardon board until April to study the case, when the two labor men will have passed their 14th year in prison.

"What is there to 'study'?", asked Older, "that would take more than 2 day's time? I cannot help feeling that delay was your motive in passing the case to the board. Then there could easily be more delays stretching on beyond the troublesome month of August, 1930."

Φ

THE REAL "RISKS IN INDUSTRY"

More Mine Deaths in W. Va.

CHARLESTON, W. Va.—More deaths from mine accidents occurred in the first 11 months of 1929 in West Virginia than in the same period the year before, according to the state department of mines. The killings to Dec. 1 were 447 against 436. Most of the deaths were due to falls of roof and coal and to haulage accidents. This means that the companies are economizing at the expense of the workers' lives and that they are greedily speeding up the hauling apparatus. Fatal gas explosions were fewer.

Just as in former years, the state department keeps on begging the mine owners to please put in adequate ventilation and to rock-dust the mines to prevent explosions; to inspect thoroughly and intelligently; to use only permissible (safe) blasting powder and to have foremen instruct the miners in safety methods.

Φ

NEW ORLEANS.—Cases against Victor Aronson and William J. Davids, organizers for the Marine Workers League, have been dismissed. They were arrested recently during an anti-red hysteria.

Miners of Illinois Fought Big Odds

By Arne Swaback

Despite the splendid fighting ability displayed, the Illinois miners strike is practically over, broken up by the brute force of jailings, soldiers and machine guns mobilized by the bosses' government on the command of the coal operators and their fellow capitalists. Acting in complete unison with them were their lickspittles who keep themselves in control of the United Mine Workers Union. The breakup was made so much easier because of the isolated basis of this strike, confined to a few localities, and by the utter lack of preparations.

Was Strike a Mistake?

To many workers the question will occur: Was this strike a mistake? To which we must say: No—a thousand times No. For the Illinois miners—which is also true for the working class in general—there is no other way out of the miserable conditions imposed upon them by the coal operators and the misleaders jointly, except through struggle. The miners struck for a chance to live. They fought courageously. Their leaders showed no fear in this fight. The experiences gained should mean one big step forward. They should be the basis to build on for the future. But it can become so only provided the many great lessons are taken advantage of.

First it showed clearer than ever before the readiness of the government with all its forces of coercion and suppression to come to the rescue of those who own and control the means of production and to be pitted against the workers when they fight for their vital needs. One more illuminating example of the fact that the government is owned and controlled by the capitalists and function in their interests only.

The miners, even those who did not participate in this strike, are not the least in doubt that their conditions must be improved in order to make living possible. They have now seen once more, in the most glaring manner, that those officials of the old union, who by fair means or foul, constantly have themselves reelected, act directly against any such possibility of improvements and do all in their power to defeat it.

The National Miners Union has proven itself as the only miners' organization which will fight for their needs regardless of obstacles in the way. There will now be increased attacks upon it from the reactionaries. The operators will long remember the serious scare they received, and hasten more completely to affirm and uphold the wage cut, speed-up contract they have concluded with their faithful servants who keep themselves in office in the U.M. W. A. Blacklisting will likely be put into effect against the most active strikers in order to drive additional miners from the field and get rid of the militants. The miners will be told, often in terms of the right to a job, to return to the old union and its "leadership". But it would be the greatest mistake to rely in the least upon them. They have proved themselves too definitely the tools of the operators and the defenders of the capitalist system to ever seriously contemplate any fights for the interests of the rank and file.

A Communist Scare Coming

There will be plenty of forces busy endeavoring to turn sentiment against the National Miners Union. But it should be remembered that it always takes a bitter struggle, and sometimes temporary defeats, to build a real working class organization

Continued on Page 2

Unemployment Grows with Business Decline

By HARVEY O'CONNOR

NEW YORK, (F.P.)—The spectre of unemployment is assuming material form in New York as the Christmas holiday buying season comes to an end with trade reported at low levels and workers more apprehensive than in years concerning job prospects after Jan. 1.

Heavy Business Decline

Business leaders, whistling on the front pages of the daily press to keep up their courage and instill the Christmas buying spirit into consumers, sing another tune in their own press. *Annalist*, financial weekly of the New York Times, announces that the decrease in November business activity was the greatest for any one month in the past 46 years. The decline for the one month was 8.1%. The index figure, in which 1925 is represented by 100, was 95.4 at the end of the November as compared with 108.8, the peak in May.

The *Annalist* figure by no means tells the whole story, as it represented business conditions three weeks ago. Since then New York department stores have been wringing their hands in anguish as shoppers flock through their aisles but fail to buy any but low-priced articles. Hundreds of saleswomen for the higher-priced products have been laid off during the Christmas season.

Dr. Leo Wolman of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers told Federated Press that production in the men's clothing industry, an important factor in New York industry, is 7.5% under 1928. The spring season, which gets under way in October in good years, is barely under way now.

In the women's garment industry unemployment is even worse. Many employers devoted more time to stock gambling than to business before the crash. Now they are being forced to the wall. The long skirt has also caused demoralization. Women are refusing to buy dresses in the new style in expected quantities and the entire trade is in confusion. All told, needle workers are experiencing a bad season.

The Illinois Miners' Battle

Continued from Page 1

From the Lewis-Fishwick-Farrington machines, jointly with the coal operators, will be launched an increased campaign against Communism and against Communist leadership in the union. In any event for a worker to fall victim to such a campaign, to accept it, is to strengthen the hold that crooks and fakers gain upon the unions.

Communist leadership of the union means leadership by the most advanced working class section, the one which is most responsive to the true interests of the rank and file. That is always correct. But it must be established on the broadest possible basis with the constant active collaboration of all honest Left wing and progressive elements. Particularly must it be based on correct policies and that is not yet the case in the National Miners Union.

The strike and what preceded it, is the best illustration of this contention. The lack of thorough strike preparations and concentration on outstanding strike issues failed to bring out the most decisive section in the southern part of the field. The campaign of artificial issues raised against Watt, the national president ending in his arbitrary removal, initiated by the Party leadership, almost split off and certainly discouraged the whole Staunton section. The representatives from that sub-district at the last N. M. U. Belleville district convention saw in that campaign only the worst features of machine rule. They objected, but to no avail, and thus it became a campaign against them. Hence this section, which had been among the best supporters and the best fighters before, this time practically failed to respond.

Foster on Strike Strategy!

On the question of preparation for strikes of unorganized workers (which is the case in this instance) Wm. Z. Foster says in his pamphlet "Strike Strategy":

"Less and less can the strike strategist depend upon the spontaneity of the masses to bring them into revolt against their exploiters, more and more he has to figure on substantial preliminary organization, conceived planfully and carried through almost like military strategy. Within the past fifteen years American employers have become very able and skillful in checking spontaneous mass revolts amongst their workers. To this end they have developed a whole arsenal of weapons which may be summed up under the general heads of concessions, of duplicity and terrorism".

And further: "In impending strikes of unorganized workers, conservative labor leaders habitually overestimate the importance of organization and underestimate the spontaneity of the workers. They smother the fighting spirit of the workers by a dry-as-dust campaign for excessive organization. On the other hand, a common tendency of left wing leaders is to underestimate the necessity for a certain degree of preliminary organization and to depend too much on the spontaneity of the workers. The result is abortive strikes. The history of the I. W. W. is full of such mistakes." (My Emphasis.—A. S.)

This is as true now as when it was written, and it is precisely the policy which was not followed by the Communist Party

leadership in the Illinois miners strike. For the miners it becomes essential to fight to correct such mistakes.

Fishwick's "Progressivism"

The immediate result of the break-up of this strike will be a strengthening of the Lewis-Fishwick-Farrington control of the situation. That, however, can only be a temporary setback, because of the role played by this gentry itself. The Fishwick-Farrington combination in its present fight for the spoils with the Lewis machine is cunningly taking on a somewhat "progressive" veneer, hoping thereby to fool the miners into support for them. They have received favorable publicity by the Socialist Party, which since its New York election "victory" has become more ready to align itself with the capitalists and their hangers-on. The leading Musteites have already publicly cast their lot with this combination thereby showing that their coming into being was decidedly a reflection of growing working class dissatisfaction even within the conservative unions, these self-styled progressive leaders are already beginning to merge with the reactionary bureaucrats.

To the Left wing this can mean only one thing and that is, simultaneously with the building of the National Miners Union, to organize Left wing sentiment within the old union so much more energetically. Taking advantage of this latest exposure of the strike-breaking activities of the Fishwick-Farrington combination a genuine Left wing and progressive movement should be built of all favorable elements within the U. M. W. of A., where is still has a mass organization. All opportunities should be utilized to more effectively propagate united struggle of all rank and file miners for their interests, and thus help prepare for the next open battle.

Persistent organization work of building the National Miners Union and preparation for future strikes is now particularly necessary, not merely sporadically in certain sections but as far as available forces and conditions permit on a national scale. But above all correct policies are essential as a guide to correct action.

Φ

A COMMUNITY CHEST DRIVE

Hi-jacking Labor in Texas

HOUSTON, Tex.—R. E. Kennedy, former employe of the Lone Star Creamery Co. of Houston, refused to join the company's 100% club to donate a dollar to the Community Chest. The company fired him, took the dollar out of his wage anyway, and refused to give it back to Kennedy. Two days after being discharged he went to the office with his pistol, aimed it at an official of the company. Thoroughly frightened he gave up the stolen dollar.

The company had Kennedy arrested, charged with assault to murder, robbery with firearms and carrying a pistol. The case was carried to the grand jury where the charges were no-billed.

Nearly all the big industries around Houston resort to these methods to fill the community chest. Workers are afraid not to donate for fear of losing their jobs.

The McAlester Mine Disaster

Few more tragic stories will have been told in the entire year of 1929 than that of the mine explosion at North McAlester, Okla., and its aftermath. Lives of 59 coal diggers were snuffed out when the spark of a coal cutting machine ignited a gas pocket. For the 59, the troubles of existence in a low-wage, non-union industry are over, but for the dependents there is added to the loss of their breadwinners the desolation of a future shrouded in destitution.

Oklahoma's workmen's compensation law makes no provision whatsoever for the widows and orphans of men killed in industry. They are expected to go into court, hiring lawyers to prove negligence by the company. How negligence can be proved when nearly every man in the mine was killed is something the Oklahoma legislators probably never thought of.

The coal diggers were for the most part Negroes and Mexicans, reports a Federated Press correspondent who passed through the field last autumn. Thirty five of the victims were Mexicans. The union is only a memory in Oklahoma and wages have been cut to the level of the bankrupt farmers, whose 1929 crop was a complete failure.

Φ

POOR SCABS!

Coal Co. Raises Rent

BROUGHTON, Pa., (F.P.)—Scab miners get it coming and going from the Pittsburgh Terminal Coal Co. which went nonunion three years ago. Rent of the company houses in Broughton has been jumped \$2 a month. Miners now pay \$10 or \$12 a month for company shacks of four rooms without running water and unfurnished. The rent used to be \$8 or \$10. Streets are unpaved but there is electric light. The scale has been trimmed as follows:

Day labor which used to get \$7.50 a day under union conditions now gets \$4.25 and around the mine on top as low as \$3.50 a day. Miners paid by the ton have been cut from 77c a ton to 55c. Pick miners get 77 a ton instead of the union scale of \$1.11.

"And there's been another cut besides." a staunch union miner now forced to work under scab scales tells Federated Press. "We ain't got no checkweighman anymore. I can figure from my own loading experience for 20 years that the company is cheating us from 10 to 20% on the weights. They stick us for deadwork (removing slate, etc.) also. They got us every way."

Φ

MORE HOOVER PROSPERITY

Southern Sawmills Shut Down

By Jack Mette

COLLETON, S. C.—The first thing that I heard when a dropped off the jerk-water passenger train in this little lumber camp village of the Colleton Cypress Lumber Co., a subsidiary of the great Ritter interests, was that they were cutting off men.

"We have been told by the boss that we might as well check out and hunt us another job," one of the mill employes explained. "The Ritters own eight or ten big saw mills in this part of South Carolina and they say that all of them will close on the first part of December and that more than 400 families will be thrown out of employment and that's not counting the unmarried men. They say that they might reopen in April or May and then again they may not, but that they would advise us to hunt other employment."

Φ

INDUSTRIAL ACCIDENTS MOUNT

ALBANY—Although the advent of winter usually brings a decrease in the number of fatal industrial accidents, November showed a total of 174 deaths, the New York state labor department reports. The 63 deaths in construction work were responsible for the increase, being the largest for any month of 1929. Falls from scaffolds and ladders killed six. Falling bricks and planks killed seven and cave-in of excavations killed three.

Five workers were killed by exposure to gas fumes and other poisonous sub-

stances; one man drank poison by mistake; the metal in some way ran past the stopper and set fire to his clothing. A painter cleaning with steel wool caused spontaneous combustion; electric shocks caused the death of three; a fireman's assistant was cleaning out the ashpit when the blowoff pipe in the boiler blew out, enveloping him in flames and steam; a gasoline lantern exploded in a sleeping car and in the resulting fire a laborer was burned to a crisp.

Did y' renew your sub?

Many of our readers have already received notice of the expiration of their subscription to The Militant. In order to avoid missing an issue of the paper, particularly now that it is published every week, it is advisable to send in your renewal immediately. As an additional offer, all those sending in a new subscription, or a renewal of an old sub, will receive free a copy of "The Draft Program of the Communist International: A Criticism of Fundamentals" by Leon Trotsky. This masterful work, which was sent to the Sixth Congress of the Comintern for the consideration of the delegates, was deliberately suppressed by the Stalinist machine, taken out of the country by one of the delegates, and published for the first time in the United States. The booklet makes an excellent combination with a yearly subscription to the weekly Militant.

The Militant has already been greeted with very favorable comment in all sections of the radical labor movement. It is striving to become the outstanding revolutionary labor paper in the country. The frenzied enmity it has already aroused in the ranks of the official Communist Party is an indication that it is doing the work of enlightenment and clarification which is its aim. Every worker can help this work tremendously by putting a firm foundation under the paper in the form of a wide-spread mailing list. If you are already a subscriber, there are other workers of your acquaintance who would appreciate getting the paper. Help us by getting their subscriptions or else send in the money for their subs yourself.

The annual subscription to the Militant (52 issues) is two dollars (\$2.00). This sum also includes the free copy of the Trotsky booklet.

THE MILITANT
25 Third Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

I am enclosing two dollars (\$2.00) for one year's subscription to the Militant and a copy of the Draft Program of the Comintern by Trotsky.

NAME

ADDRESS

City State

NEW YEAR'S EVE ★ REVEL ★

ENTERTAINMENT and DANCE

on

Tuesday, December 31, 1929

8 p. m.

at the

MILITANT HALL

25 Third Ave., (near 8th St.)

JOIN WITH THE RED REVELERS

ALL WORKERS WELCOME

Auspices: New York Branch, Communist League of America

Naval Conference Farce

Japanese Delegation Visit Indicates the «Disarmament» Prospects

Mr. Henry Stimson, representing the United States delegation, and Mr. Reijiro Wakatsuki, representing the Japanese delegation, have just enacted another scene in Washington from that merry farce which has had a successful run eleven years since the end of the world war, playing before distinguished diplomatic audiences in Washington, London, Paris, Genoa, Geneva, and other noted international points. It is the comedy called "Disarmament", and the next scene will open in London on January 21, with King George of England himself in the role of curtain-raiser.

"Disarmament": A Farce

That some of the actors have a tragic role to play does not change the character of the piece. It was conceived as a farce and must remain a farce, replete with all sorts of sleight-of-hand tricks, hypnotism acts, the old army game, and if there are no bedroom scenes, there is plenty going on all the time behind the scene itself. The main role is played by the United States as the gay villain, with all the other actors, France, Italy, England and Japan playing the injured, foiled heroes who cannot hope to win. That the entire chorus sings loudly in various keys of their intention to disarm, should not deceive the many million-headed audience, because it is nothing but a part of the play which the actors themselves do not take very seriously.

When MacDonald arrived in the United States a few weeks ago, his meetings with Hoover were generally acclaimed by the capitalist press of both countries as the inauguration of a new epoch, not only in Anglo-Saxon relations, but also for the ideal of peace and disarmament itself. It was widely announced that with these conversations as a beginning, the London Naval Conference would begin (as all those that preceded it began!) to take step leading to the disarmament of all the great powers, or at the very least the limitation of armaments, so that the sublime spirit of the Kellogg Pact—the abolition of war as an instrument of national policy—might become a reality on earth. The pacifists of every color and shade went into a veritable epileptic frenzy of joy, and praises were showered down upon the modest heads of MacDonald and Hoover as the enlightened statesmen of the century.

Fascinating as all these opium dreams may seem, they are, alas, only opium dreams intended to confuse and confound the minds of the workers. As the conflict between the various imperialist powers becomes keener, and the prospects of a war to decide their antagonism begins to assume more concrete form, it is necessary so to befuddle the workers that their resistance to imperialist war is weakened or muddled with pacifist fantasies. The meeting of the Japanese and American delegations in Washington is but one of the numerous indications of the hypocritical and impossible cry for disarmament, when it is uttered by those whose economic life depends upon increased armaments.

Japan's Demands

On November 25, 1929, the Japanese cabinet approved the proposals of its naval department on the demands to be presented by its delegation to the London conference. Japan demanded nothing less than a ratio of 70% in the 10,000 ton-8 inch gun cruisers of the strongest powers (i. e., Britain and the U. S.), an equal ratio in light cruisers and destroyers; and would stand against the abolition of a single submarine. Japan demanded parity with the largest powers on the basis of 80,000 tons. So far as capital ships and aircraft carriers are concerned—fields where Japan's greatest naval interests do not lie, and where she is not particularly strong—it generously offered to advocate tonnage and gun calibre reductions.

The idea of reducing on capital ships was not distasteful to Washington. But the proposal for parity with itself and England in submarines, and a 10-10-7 ratio in 8 inch cruisers, an advance by Japan over the 5-5-3 ratio of the Washington conference, was immediately frowned upon. It was pointed out that at the tri-partite conference in 1927, Japan had announced its submarine needs to be in the neighborhood of 70,000 tons.

The visit of the Japanese delegation, preliminary to the London meeting, was an attempt to secure the support of the United States for Tokio's demands. The high-minded idealists became fish-market hagglers. The Japanese intimated, unofficially,

that they would not be sticklers on an absolute 70% ratio in cruisers if they would only be supported in their submarine demands, their proposal to reduce the gun calibre on capital ships to 14 inches and to extend a vessel's life to 25 years.

To these proposals, the American experts countered by pointing out that the British have abandoned work on the Singapore base, which is supposed to cut down the defense needs of Japan. But the latter reminded the U. S. that while Singapore might possibly affect battleship ratios, since it is the only dry dock between Malta and Pearl Harbor capable of taking a dreadnaught, it has no bearing on 10,000 ton ships (cruisers) for which there are numerous harbors available. And besides it is not England that Japan fears primarily. The Tokio correspondent of the New York Times (12-20-1929) unwittingly unmasks all the diplomatic pretensions about the "coming epoch of pacific world relations" and indicates where Japan's real concern lies:

Whom Japan Fears

"To put it crudely (Ahem!), Japan is not afraid of England, because the British navy has to cover such a large area and England could not assemble a fleet in the Pacific large enough to defeat Japan. If a state of war unfortunately (What a convenient and diplomatic word is "if!") existed between Japan and America, America could concentrate virtually all her fighting ships in the Pacific and give her Pacific trade to neutral ships, leaving her with a 40 percent superiority on cruisers."

In other words, all the pious declarations of the diplomats of the various imperialist powers, their signature to the Kellogg Pact made with hand on heart pledging themselves never to resort to war again are all dissolved before the realities of imperialist rivalry. The French as well as the English, the Japanese as well as the Americans, understand what should be clear to every worker: The various "disarmament" conferences are not held for the purpose of disarming—a utopian deceptive plan under capitalism—but for the purpose of jockeying for better positions in the face of the inevitably oncoming war.

All of them swear by the hour that they haven't the slightest intention or idea of another war, but, they add, "IF a war SHOULD come", then it is "obviously" necessary to take measures for "proper" national "defense".

It is needless to say that the efforts of the American imperialists to force a reduction of armaments—in proportion to its own—by England, France, Italy and Japan will succeed only in part. That has already been shown by the results of the conversations with the Japanese delegation at Washington. The United States delegation declined to "discuss detailed figures"—in other words to give Japan any concrete assurances of support in advance of the London conference itself. When the associated pirates get together in the House of Lords next month, the United States will take its position without being embarrassed by any previous binding pledges, promises or agreements. It will be in an easier position to dictate terms. It will stand in the center of the conference, manipulating this way and that, playing off the naval "needs" and interests of one power against another, making concessions here in order to gain a point there, squeezing England with the aid of France or France with the aid of Japan, or Italy with the aid of some other combination of buccaneers.

That it will not have smooth sailing is already evident. The conference itself will only heighten the contrast between the "pacific" pledges of the Kellogg Pact and the cold brutality of ruthless naval competition.

The British Viewpoint

The attitude of the British is becoming more clearly defined. The psalm-singing champions of open diplomacy in the labor government, through the First Lord of the Admiralty Alexander, have already announced that none of the conference participants is "prepared to view favorably a scheme for a substantial reduction of battleship strength immediately or at a defined future date." So much for battleship "disarmament." So far as cruisers are concerned, there is little more hope in that field. The well-informed correspondent of the New York World (12-20-1929). John L. Balderston, cables from London: "That Britain will meet this situation (the growing doubts as to the chances of reaching a five-power cruiser agreement) by cutting

down her cruisers program as outlined in the Hoover-MacDonald negotiations, is extremely unlikely and no illusions on this score should be entertained at Washington. There is the strongest authority for this statement."

Indeed, Balderston's inspired warning is borne out by the significant article of Hector C. Bywater, British authority who is close to the "Big Navy" end of the British stick. He points out that the American battlefleet of 18 capital ships is the only completely oil burning fleet in the world. It is the only one in which every pre-Jutland unit has been or is being extensively reconstructed and modernized. It mounts 192 heavy turret guns as against 166 corresponding guns in the British fleet. Its cruiser fleet comprises 23 ships of post-war design as against 15 British post-war design ships. In heavy calibre ordinance, from an 8-inch to a 16-inch, the American navy has a margin of 45 guns over England. In submarine tonnage, there is virtually the same superiority. There are 124 American submarines, armed with 516 torpedo tubes, as against 63 British boats with 383 tubes. Of submarines for long-distance cruising, America has 62, the British Empire 47. The ratio in air power for naval use is now: United States, 10; Great Britain, 1.7.

The French Become Pious!

These articles do not bear favorable augur for the "success" of the conference, particularly since the continental press continues to point out that the United States plans even greater expenditures for military and naval purposes. Even the semi-official Parisian Temps is in a position to comment with consummate Tartuffian hypocrisy, on Hoover's speech "explaining" the increased military and naval "needs" of the U. S.: "These figures merit attention, for it is only necessary to regard what the Americans consider an indispensable minimum for their security to appreciate at full value the spontaneous sacrifices (!) which France has made. And yet there are people in the world (just imagine!) who, even now, are seeking to resurrect the legend that French militarism and imperialism is the last obstacle to disarmament and the consolidation of peace."

Great fellows, these diplomats! They are a real sign of the progress of our civilization. In the old days, when they frankly sailed under the Jolly Roger and made each other walk the plank, they didn't make fools of themselves or anyone else with pretenses about their noble, lofty intentions and aspirations. Nowadays, they gather in very solemn conclave seeking to scuttle each others ships with the utmost of courtesy and soul-stirring oratory. The Jolly Roger has been struck. The pirates now sail the seven seas under the Christian pennant of brotherly love, the limitation of armaments and "peace."

On Hooliganism -- (Today and Yesterday

"In desperation at our growing strength among the Party membership and the left-wing workers and in a frantic attempt to cover up the disastrous effect of the 'new course' in the Party and in the mass organizations, the Party wreckers have advanced to a new stage in the 'enlightenment campaign' they have resorted to the hooligan and gangster methods well known to the trade union bureaucrats and sharply condemned by all honest workers. . .

"Armed with clubs, blackjacks and knives they succeeded in inflicting serious injuries upon D. Benjamin (formerly: Assistant Director of the Workers School) and upon B. Ralph. These comrades had to receive immediate hospital treatment. . .

"In Hartford, Conn., a group broke into a private house and attacked a meeting of over 20 comrades, most of them non-Party workers. . .

"These methods are acts of desperation. . . they help to convince Party comrades and non-Party workers that the Party 'leadership' is absolutely unable to answer any of our political contentions and therefore attempts to find refuge in the worst methods borrowed from the A. F. of L. bureaucracy." Etc., etc., etc.—**Revolutionary Age**, December 15, 1929.

So, my dear Lovestone, your chickens have come home to roost! Your lamentations and protestations, however, are a bit too late and more than a bit stomach-turning. Permit us to correct one or two little "typographical" errors in your statement quoted above:

The Stalinists did not borrow these hooligan and gangster methods from the

Auto Wage Cuts

Pontiac Workers Seriously Affected

PONTIAC, Mich.—Thousands are out of work in this auto town, and 2,000 families are "living on the city", with winter just well started. "It's hell," is the way one worker in the big General Motors plant put it, "and I hate to think what it will be before spring."

The few workers who have been put back to work following widespread layoffs in auto and body factories are experiencing speed-up, slack time, and cut in wage rates.

Can't Make Room and Board

"I went back to work last Friday at 60 cents an hour—a 30 cent cut on my day rate," a body plant worker told Federated Press. "I got in 24 hours on last pay day. That is \$5.40 short of what it cost me for room and board. I went to work this morning and they sent me home and told me come back tomorrow. Half the crew works tomorrow and half Friday, so I'll be off again Friday, and that will be all for this week. I'll be lucky to make room and board here this winter."

This worker is more fortunate than many, for he is single and without dependents. That he is allowed to work at all he attributes only to his being an "old timer" who has worked for one company six or seven years.

How the lineup looks to a married man may be gathered from an unemployed worker's letter, published in the correspondence columns of the Pontiac Daily Press. "It is not an enviable situation to have one's little children calling for food and be unable to satisfy their hunger," says this writer. "It is not an encouraging outlook to walk the streets day after day, from factory to factory, or even to seek a sewer digging job until one is tempted to end it all—as many do—because he cannot furnish food, clothes, etc., for a family of youngsters. Isn't something radically wrong when millions of people must suffer because they have created too much of this world's goods,—when men starve while farmers cannot sell food at a price to prevent them from going bankrupt?"

Fifty Percent Wage Cuts

Another worker testified that wage cuts on piece work in his plant averaged 50%. "A man who was putting out 20 jobs a day last year will have to put out 45 jobs today to make the same wage," he said. Overtime, which helped out the meager earnings of auto workers last season, will be conspicuously absent this year, the auto workers prophesy. Thirty thousand 1929 Pontiac cars are said to be stored in factories, distributors' and dealers' warehouses around this section, and it is the general opinion that the 1930 model will not be put on the market until most of the are sold.

A. F. of L. bureaucracy alone. They learned them from a master closer at home: from YOU. You were the leader of the Party who directed the gangster and hooligan attacks upon the "Trotskyists" you expelled. You and your poor friend D. Benjamin were the ones who sent knife and blackjack squads down from the district office of the Party in Union Square, New York, to gang up on our comrades for selling the Militant on the streets. You and Benjamin and Levich and Weinstein and Stachel and all the rest of them sent your knife and club men down to our public meetings to break them up at all cost. You and you, precious friends, those of today as well those of yesterday—were the ones who "broke into a private house", with jimmy in one hand and blackjack in the other, and stole private documents so as to "expose" us in the Party press. You protest that the Daily Worker "lies" (we do not know which of you to believe) on your calling police to protect you; but the Daily Worker only copies the infamous calumny on the same subject that you published about our group. If these methods of the Stalinists are acts of desperation, what were your methods against us? If they show the Stalinists "absolutely unable to answer any of our political contentions", what did they show when you applied them to us so recently?

Don't assume such an injured look of piety, Lovestone. Your own infamies of yesterday are too fresh in everyone's mind to inspire a ha'pennyworth of confidence or faith. You are deserving of neither. But we do owe you a charlatans crown. we do owe you a charlatan's crown.

The Defense of the Soviet Union and the Opposition

Continued from Last Issue

At one time, the Red Army entered Menshevik Georgia in order to help the Georgian workers overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie, something for which the Second International cannot forgive us to this day. Georgia is populated by Georgians, the Red Army was composed mainly of Russian soldiers. On which side does Louzon stand in this old conflict?

And the march on Warsaw in the summer of 1920? Louzon perhaps knows that I was an opponent of this campaign. But my objections had a purely practical character. I feared that the tolling masses of Poland would not rise in time (the tempo of war is as a rule swifter than the tempo of revolution) and was of the opinion that it would be dangerous for us to move too far away from our base. Events confirmed the correctness of this foresight: the march on Warsaw was a mistake. But it was a tactical, and in no sense a principle mistake. Under more favorable circumstances it would have been our duty to help the Polish (as well as every other) revolution with an armed hand. It was, however, precisely then that Lloyd George, Bonar Law and others accused us for the first time of Red Imperialism. This accusation was then taken over by the social democracy, and from there it was imperceptibly transmitted to the ultra-Leftists.

Against revolutionary "intervention", Louzon quite inopportunistically raises the old and uncontested principle: "The liberation of the working class can only be the task of the workers themselves." On a national scale? Only in the frame-work of a single country? Should workers of one country help the strikers of another? Send arms to the rebels? Send their army, in case there is one, to help the rebels? Or for the purpose of preparing an uprising, just as strikers send their brigades to pull the workers out of factories that have remained behind?

Why Doesn't Louzon Decide to Go the Whole Way?

Louzon stands upon the national-democratic viewpoint, but he does not remain entirely true even to that. If it is true that the Chinese government is fighting for its national liberation against Soviet Imperialism, then the duty of every revolutionary does not consist in administering philosophical enlightenment to Stalin, but to help Chiang Kai-Shek actively. From Louzon's attitude, if it is to be taken seriously, arises the direct duty to help fight for China's right to national self-determination against the heritage of Czarism, if possible with arms in hand. That is as clear as day. Louzon refers and rightly, to the fact that the Soviet government helped Kemal against the imperialists. Quite right: against imperialism even the hangman Chiang Kai-Shek must be aided. But here the brave Louzon remains standing irresolutely. He feels in some way or another that the conclusion following from his position would sound something like this: Workers of the world, help the Chinese government defend its independence in struggle against the assaults of the Soviet state. Why does Louzon remain standing half-way along the road? Because this only consistent conclusion would have converted our ultra-Left formalists into agents of imperialism and into political accomplices of those Russian White Guardists who are today fighting for the "liberation" of China with arms in hand. This inconsistency is a credit to the political feelings of the ultra-Leftists, but not their logic.

Are Socialist "Concessions" Admissible?

At this point, comrade Urbahns and his closest colleagues in the national committee of the Leninbund enter into the dispute. In this, as in most of the other questions, they strive to adopt an intermediate position. They print an article by the Korsch disciple, H. P., an article by Louzon, an article by Paz, an article replete with errors by the Belgian comrades, a Marxist article by Landau and one by me. Then the editors finally come forward with an eclectic philosophy which borrows two-thirds from Louzon and Korsch and one-third from the Russian Opposition. Figuratively it says: "We are not in one hundred percent agreement with Trotsky." Basing himself essentially upon Louzon, Urbahns however, does not limit himself to geography and ethnography. But his attempt to add

the class viewpoint, that is, to supplement Louzon by Marx, yields truly unhappy results.

Let us examine the program article of the *Fahne des Kommunismus*, (the theoretical organ of the Leninbund).

"The railway represents, even now, a Chinese concession to a foreign power, a concession which, viewed from the Chinese side (!) is different only in degree (!!) from the other concessions that are held by imperialist powers." ("On the Russo-Chinese Conflict", No. 31).

Here we still have before us the purest Louzon. Urbahns teaches the German revolutionists to estimate the facts from the "Chinese side". But it is from the proletarian side that they must be estimated. The question is not exhausted by national frontiers.

In the first place it is sheerest absurdity that a proletarian state should, generally speaking, not have any enterprises ("concessions") in other countries. The question of the formation of industrial enterprises by a workers' state in backward countries is a question not only of economic, but also of revolutionary strategy. If Soviet Russia has rarely followed this path, it has not been for reasons of principle but as a result of technical weaknesses. Advanced, that is, highly industrial socialist countries like England, Germany and France would be interested in every instance to build railroads, to erect technical works, grain elevators, etc., in the backward countries, the former colonies. Naturally, they would do this neither by means of violence nor of generous gifts. They would have to receive certain colonial products in exchange. The character of these socialist enterprises, their direction, their conditions of labor would have to be such as would raise the economy and culture of the backward countries with the aid of capital, technique and experience of the richer proletarian states, to the mutual advantage of both countries. That is no imperialism, no exploitation, no subjugation, but rather the contrary, it is the socialist transformation of world economy. There is no other road at all.

If in England, for example, the dictatorship of the proletariat were to be set up, it could on no condition present the Indian bourgeoisie with the present English concessions. That would be the most stupid policy, for it would enormously strengthen the power of the Indian capitalists and feudalists allied with them over the Indian proletariat and peasantry and hold up the development of the socialist revolution in India for a long time. No, the workers' state will be compelled, while it proclaims the complete freedom of the colonies, to liberate the concessions from all national privileges, from the command of the one side and the degradation of the other. Without letting go of the concessions, the workers' state would at the same time be compelled to transform them into a means not only for the economic rise of India but also for the future socialist construction. It is self-understood that such a policy, which would be necessary also in the interests of the consolidation of socialist England, could be carried out only hand in hand with the vanguard of the Indian proletariat and would also have to bring visible advantages to the Indian peasant.

Let us endeavor, together with Urbahns, to consider the question from the "Indian side". The result will be that the socialist "concessions" would be far worse for the Indian bourgeoisie than the capitalist, if only because they would have to cease mercilessly the profits of the bourgeoisie in the interest of the Indian workers and peasants. Conversely, the socialist concessions will be a powerful point of support for the workers and peasants, a socialist fortress, so to speak, where the forces for the preparation of the revolution could be gathered. Naturally, the Indian proletariat, as soon as it came into power, would receive these concessions. The relations of the Indian proletariat to the English workers' state will be regulated not by the recollections of bourgeois property but by higher principles of the international division of labor and socialist solidarity.

There are, consequently, no simply Indian or simply "Chinese" sides. There is only the side of Chiang Kai-Shek. There is the side of the advanced Chinese workers.

There are innumerable intermediate stages of the petty bourgeoisie. When Urbahns tries to consider the matter from the "Chinese side", he is really looking through the glasses of the Chinese petty bourgeoisie who does not know what position to

By L. D. Trotsky

adopt in a difficult situation and on what side to fight.

Mistakes in Principle in Estimating the Chinese and Russian Revolutions

Up to this point, Urbahns really only repeats Louzon. But then he "deepens" him. If the editorial article of the *F. d. K.* is cleared of its reservations, equivocations and loopholes in general, it can be resolved into the following formula: since the national revolution has triumphed in China, and the counter-revolution has triumphed (or almost triumphed, or must triumph) in Russia, then... what? A clear answer is not given by the article. Its eclectic philosophy serves much more to dodge a clear answer.

I think it is necessary to make the following preliminary assertions before a further presentation:

1. Comrade Urbahns* falsely comprehends the character of the Russian revolution and its present stage. He falsely construes the meaning of Thermidor.

2. Comrade Urbahns misunderstands the class mechanics of the Chinese revolution and its present situation.

3. From his false social evaluations, he draws correspondingly false and extremely dangerous political conclusions.

4. The fact that he (like Louzon and the other ultra-Leftists) does not carry his conclusions to the end, only shows a lack of consistency, but in no way diminishes the danger of his false position.

I am compelled here to quote a larger excerpt from the *Fahne des Kommunismus*. The editorial article endeavors to explain the conditions that created the "national liberation movement" in China.

"...a national liberation movement that bore a revolutionary character, had a distinct point against the imperialists, and in which the Chinese proletariat represented its class interests (!!!) This revolution came to a standstill in the bourgeois revolution, brought the military power of Chiang Kai-Shek to the top, bloodily suppressed the Chinese proletarian revolution, the revolutionary peasant uprisings which infringed on private property, and brought the Chinese bourgeoisie closer to the aid of the bourgeois revolution. One of these aims is national unification... The concessions of the imperialists are a painful thorn in the side of the China that is being unified. Their elimination is sought from the imperialist powers through negotiations, from Soviet Russia, which is considered an essentially weaker opponent, by means of military attacks. Therewith (!) it is also decisive for the Chinese military government that the Russian concession is a more dangerous factor from the class standpoint than the concessions of the capitalist 'hostile brothers'. This conflict should have been foreseen by all, for there could not be a peaceful co-existence of the Chinese and Russian interests in China of the bourgeois revolution. Such a collaboration could have been guaranteed only by a victorious Chinese revolution. Even if it had only ended with a workers' and peasants' China..."

I can hardly recall ever having encountered such confusion of thought in a few dozen lines. At any rate, not often. To unravel each line a page would be needed. I will endeavor to do it in the shortest form, leaving the secondary contradictions out of consideration.

In the first half of the quotation, it speaks of the imperialist concessions, among them also the Chinese Eastern Railway, being a thorn in the side of the national independence of China. The Soviet republic is here brought into one denomination with the other capitalist states. In the second half of the quotation, it is said: therewith it is decisive (!) that the Russian concession, from the class standpoint, appears still (!) more dangerous. Then there finally follows from these two mutually exclusive declarations the synthesis: the Chinese and the Russian interests are in general irreconcilable. In what sense and why? From the first half of the quotation it follows: Russian Imperialism is incompatible with Chinese national unity. From the second

*I speak here, and further on also, of comrade Urbahns only for brevity's sake. I mean the majority of the national committee of the Leninbund and the editors of its organs. Indeed, one can frequently find the expression in *Volkswille*: "The national committee of the Leninbund and comrade Urbahns."

half of the quotation it follows: the interests of workers' Russia and bourgeois China are incompatible. Which of these two mutually exclusive declarations does Urbahns choose? He does not choose, he unites them. In what manner? By the little word "therewith" (in German: *dabei*). Five letters and the problem is solved.

The irreconcilability of the interests of the Soviet republic and bourgeois China, says Urbahns, could have been foreseen by anyone. Good. Consequently, it is not a matter of the railway and not of the treaty of 1924? The irreconcilability in the relations between present-day China and the Soviet republic only reflects the irreconcilability of the internal contradictions in China itself. Were Urbahns to say that the Chinese bourgeoisie, supported by bayonets, hates the Soviet republic because of the fact alone that its existence forms the source of revolutionary unrest in China, that would be correct. To that would still have to be added that the Chinese bourgeoisie designates its fear of its own oppressed masses as fear of Soviet imperialism.

Urbahns says that the bourgeois revolution triumphed in China. That is the standpoint of the international social-democracy. In China, it was not the bourgeois revolution but the bourgeois counter-revolution that triumphed. That is by no means the same thing. Urbahns speaks of the suppression of the workers and peasants as of some internal detail of the bourgeois revolution. He even goes so far as to assert that the Chinese workers represented their interests in the national revolution, that is, in the Kuo Min Tang, where the Comintern drove them with sticks. That is the Stalinist, i. e., the social democratic standpoint. The bourgeois revolution was accomplished in 1911, in so far as it could at all be realized in China as an independent stage. But it was accomplished only for the purpose of showing that a bourgeois revolution, even if only somewhat completed, is impossible in China, that is to say, that the national unification of China, its liberation from imperialism and its democratic reformation (the agrarian problem!) is inconceivable under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The second Chinese revolution (1925-27) showed during its whole course what had been clear previously to the Marxists: The real solution of the tasks of the bourgeois revolution in China is only possible through the dictatorship of the proletariat, basing itself upon the alliance of the workers with the peasants, and which is directed against the alliance of the native bourgeoisie with imperialism. Such a revolution, however, cannot remain standing at the bourgeois stage. It is transformed into a permanent revolution, that is, it becomes a link of the international socialist revolution and shares its fate. For this reason, the bourgeois counter-revolution, which obtained its victory with the help of Stalin-Bucharin, mercilessly suppressed the movement of the popular masses and erected, not a democratic, but a military-fascist domination.

The Question of the Permanent Revolution in China

In the first half of the excerpt quoted from comrade Urbahns' paper, it says that the bourgeois revolution triumphed in China. In the second half, it declares that the collaboration of China with Soviet Russia would be conceivable only in case of a "victorious Chinese revolution". What does this mean? According to Urbahns, it was the bourgeois revolution that triumphed in China. That is just why it strives to pluck the imperialist thorn from its side. Then of what other revolution is Urbahns speaking? Of the proletarian? No. "Even if it had only ended with a workers and peasants of China." What does the *if* mean? It means precisely that it is not a question of the proletarian revolution. And at the same time not of the bourgeois? Then which one? After Bucharin and Radek, Urbahns therefore foresees neither a bourgeois nor a proletarian, but some kind of a special workers and peasants dictatorship in China. One must speak out more openly, courageously, definitely, without hiding behind the little word "even". It is precisely out of this philosophy of the non-bourgeois and non-proletarian dictatorship that the Sta'in-Bucharin course of the Kuo Min Tang grew. It is precisely over this point that Radek and Smilga stumbled. Stalin, Bucharin, Zinoviev, and after them Radek and Smilga also, believe that between world imperialism on the one side and the workers' state on the other, a petty bourgeois revolutionary dictatorship is possible in China. In spite of the experience with the Russian

Throughout the World of Labor

Christmas for the German Workers

In spite of the sloppy, smeary weather, Christmas is coming. St. Nicholas' ruddy face beams out of holly-trimmed store windows; and papers encourage gift-buying. Every day it rains, and soft winds suggest spring rather than winter.

It will be a sad Christmas for millions in Germany this year. With one blow Krupp laid off 1,100 men only a week ago. The Phoenix Steel Corp. follows this "rational" example, knocking off a few hundred more. Some plants of the Edell Stahlwerk in Bochum have been shut down. Other industries report hard conditions.

It is estimated that unemployment this winter will reach nearly 3,000,000 in Germany—a much larger figure than last winter's.

The mines are enjoying their usual spurt of winter activity, with slight depressions noted due to the unusually clement weather. Building is practically at a standstill, and textiles work only a few hours weekly, with the exception of a slight hump in the curve of the silk demand, which keeps silk mills humming on a reasonable schedule.

But millions of people will depend on

Kerenskiade and the Chinese Kuo Min Tang, the Right as well as the Left, Urbahns shyly hums the melody struck up by Radek in the question on which the fate of the whole East depends. It is not for nothing that Urbahns prints the extremely superficial and banal articles of Radek's on the question of the permanent revolution, while maintaining silence on his own position on this question*.

It is not a matter now of repeating disfigured quotations from the year 1905 on the permanent revolution. The Zinoviev, Maslovs and others have been sufficiently engaged in these forgeries. It is a matter of the strategic line for the whole East and for a whole epoch. It must be clearly established whether a special democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants is possible and how it would differ from the dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang on the one side and the dictatorship of the proletariat on the other. This brings forward the question: Can the peasantry have an independent policy in the revolution—Independent from the bourgeoisie and from the proletariat? Marxism, enriched by the revolution in Russia and in China, answers: no, no, no. The peasantry marches under the leadership of its upper section and the petty bourgeois intellectuals, with the bourgeoisie; then arises a Social-Revolutionary movement, a Kerenskiade or the Kuo Min Tang. Or else it marches, led by its lower sections, the semi-proletarian and proletarian elements of the village, with the industrial proletariat. Then it is the road of Bolshevism, of the October revolution (that is, the permanent revolution). It is on this question—precisely on this one—that Stalin and Bucharin twisted the neck of the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese Revolution. Zinoviev, Radek, Smilga and Preobrazhensky wavered between Stalinism and Marxism, and this wavering brought them to shameful capitulation. For the countries of the East, this question forms the line of demarcation between Menshevism and Bolshevism.

*By the way: Radek's article contains a monstrous bit of gossip that in Alma Alta I held back the exposures on the negotiations of Bucharin with Kamenev out of a desire to form a bloc with the Right. Where does this come from? From Yaroslavsky's snuff box? Or from Menzhinsky's (head of the G.P.U.) notebooks? It is hardly likely that Radek himself invented it. Comrade Urbahns, however, has so much room that he can print not only novels of Sinclair but even the gossip of Yaroslavsky-Radek. Had comrade Urbahns loyally applied to me for information, I would have explained to him that I received the news of the negotiations between Bucharin and Kamenev simultaneously with the report on the ambiguous declarations of Urbahns on a bloc with Brandler. I answered this with an article on the absolute inadmissibility of unprincipled blocs between the Left and Right Oppositions. This article was published a few months ago by Brandler and only then reprinted in Volkswille.

Continued

unemployment stipends for their Christmas joys. Three times weekly the unemployed of each city must personally register at the town office. Once each week they draw their money. This is usually based on their last wage rate, but the average is around 17-19 marks (\$4.25-\$4.75 weekly).

The army of the unemployed is subject to draft. Street cleaning, and other public work is done by men recruited from the jobless ranks, who are compelled to accept the jobs offered them, at wages arbitrarily fixed, and frequently below the wages usually paid for such work. The penalty of refusal is loss of the weekly insurance income.

The unemployed are very dissatisfied with this "drafting". Many are men of learned trades, unaccustomed to crude work in raw weather. But they have no choice.

Newspapers chant the coming of Christmas, and kids may be seen pressing their faces against store windows laden with toys. But for millions of men this will be a lean Christmas, and the New Year's bells will hardly suggest to them the coming of greater blessings next year. For with every year the situation grows worse.

ED FALKOWSKI

Krefeld, Rhineland.

Native Resentment in South Africa

While General Smuts was pronouncing a homily at Oxford on the policy to be followed in South Africa towards the natives, and acted the good apostle, Reuter communicated to the press a dispatch from Durban saying that a large force of police accompanied by an armed detachment with machine guns and tear gas bombs had invaded the district inhabited by the natives on the pretext of arresting natives who refuse to pay personal tax. Six thousand natives were questioned and finally six hundred of them were placed under arrest. Tried forthwith by special tribunals, they were condemned to pay the tax or undergo a month of imprisonment.

This police and judiciary mobilization underlines in an impressive manner the uneasiness prevalent at the moment among the South African natives, an uneasiness provoked by the government's policy of repression and violence.

British loyalists of Natal and violent republican Afrikaners of Transvaal who formerly carried on a rabid struggle amongst themselves, always find themselves in accord when it is a matter of exploiting and brutalizing the natives. The minister of justice, Pirow, an Afrikaner, is the principal instigator of this policy of repression; it is he who directed the armed attack upon the native district, composed of huts. This great performance of the police had as its avowed aim to facilitate the vote on a draft law depriving the natives of the electoral franchise.

Mr. Pirow has been obliged to justify his coup de force. He has made a declaration in which, from the beginning to end, he accuses the Communist International and expatiates at length on a meeting of natives held at Johannesburg, November 10.

This meeting, organized by the native section of the Communist Party, had gathered about 1,500 in the audience and was concluded by the arraignment of the minister of justice, deservedly made responsible for the measures taken against the natives and those with which they knew themselves to be threatened. The "judge" decided that the effigy of the minister be burned while the "jury" cried: "Burn the swine! Burn the oppressor! Burn this tool of British imperialism!" Previously, many speakers had accused General Herzog of "seeking a refuge under the wing of British imperialism".

The liberal journals show some uneasiness on the subject of the brutal and exceptional measures of the government. They recognize that the situation is serious, seeing that there are 40,000 natives in the huts of Durban, subject to a lively excitement. But they fear that the way of force will only succeed in aggravating the situation. It is possible that Communist "agitators" sent by the Communist International are to be found among the natives, but their propaganda would be in vain if there did not exist a profound discontent. From which they conclude that a wise policy of appeasing the natives by according them adroitly contrived satisfactions would be more effective than ministerial declam-

ations against the Communist International.

The mining problem has taken on an unforeseen development. The Miners' Federation, at the suggestion of A. J. Cook, who has become a very reasonable man after having declared himself "an humble disciple of Lenin", has decided to content itself with the government project whose essential provision is to change the working day from eight hours to seven and a half. The decision was carried by a majority, the representatives of the two mining districts: Yorkshire and Forest of Dean, remaining irreconcilable. The government project, in actuality, brings absolutely nothing to the miners in the districts where the working day is now seven and a half hours, and Yorkshire is one of those.

Immediately after the vote of acceptance, the president of the Federation, Herbert Smith, who has been the leader of the Yorkshire miners for years, tendered his resignation. He has been replaced by T. Richards.

Discontentment is always lively in the ranks of the Independent Labour Party towards the policy of the government, and especially on the subject of the proposed modifications of unemployment insurance, which are in actuality very far from that which the Laborite candidates promised during the elections. On one point, they even worsen the existing stipulations, Maxton, the chairman of the I.L.P. is leading the discontented, but is cast off by his own troops. He had prepared an amendment and received thirty-three signatures. A meeting was held in the House of Commons which was very lively and lasted more than two and a half hours. All the speaker deplored the insufficiency of the government project but it was nevertheless decided, finally, by 41 votes against 14, to vote for it. The "rebels" of the I.L.P. against the directing Laborite clique never go very far. They hang fire along the road: Additional vexations must not be created for the comrade ministers.

London, November 25, 1929

—S. B.

Tardieu's Attack on Humanite

The Tardieu government has just proceeded to a new attack against the central organ of the French Communist Party, *Humanite*. The latter was many million francs in debt to the *Banque Ouvriers et Paysans* (Workers and Peasants Bank). Through the medium of the legal administrators placed in the B. O. P. by the government, it demands that *Humanite* immediately turn over about 2,600,000 francs. It is a means of putting *Humanite* into bankruptcy and makes it possible for anyone who wants it to buy it back. The thousands of workers of the Parisian region who read *Humanite* are aroused against this governmental attack.

Humanite calls itself "the journal of the working class." If this means that it is the journal that the revolutionary workers read, it is true. There is none other that appears daily. If this means that it is a journal that defends the working class properly, we say No.

Humanite carries on a policy that is almost never correct and which we denounce and will continue to denounce each time it is practised. On most of the national and international problems, its position, which is the one the executive of the International imposes upon it, is wrong. It is constantly deceiving the working class. It serves as a means of superficial agitation, but by no means of propaganda. Nevertheless, it occupies itself with the interests of the workers. In spite of its continual errors, its circulation is considerable. Every revolutionary worker, even he who already understands the constant and gross errors of *Humanite*, reads it. That is what must be taken into account. Tardieu knows it well, and that is why, after having done so much to exhaust and mangle the Party, he directly assaults *Humanite*. But the workers will not permit him to do it. They will show that they want to defend *Humanite*.

But we will not hide from them the responsibility of the Party and *Humanite* in the crisis that torments them today. How could *Humanite* have a deficit of many millions in the B. O. P. without its readers being informed of it? Why does the government undertake its maneuver against *Humanite* today, that is, at the moment

when the Party is weakened, when the masses follow the Party with difficulty, and when a certain passivity prevails among the workers? It is because *Humanite* and the Party consider the opinions of their supporters only when it is necessary to ask them for their pennies! Because the only work that the Party asks of its members today is to collect money for it to replace that which is frittered away in functionaries, publications, and so on, without any control whatsoever! In a word, this state of affairs is the result of the whole internal policy of the Party for the past number of years.

To the comrades who contribute their mite for the defense of *Humanite*, we say: Comrades, that is not enough! It is not enough to give money for saving a journal whose whole false policy drives it under the blows of Tardieu and Co! What is needed is a thorough house-cleaning: men, methods and policies. In defending *Humanite* against the government, in defending against the bourgeoisie a journal to which the workers have given so much of their support and their strength, it is necessary to assume the obligation of defending it against those who are leading it to its doom by running it without control, by having it carry out a wrong policy, which does not educate the proletarians, which sows falsehoods in the working class.

For *Humanite*, Yes! But for a Communist *Humanite*, relieved of the whole apparatus that distorts it, *Humanite* must be the Communist journal which really guides the workers, instead of flinging them into a blind alley and making them commit mistakes. Tardieu will not dare to touch a Communist *Humanite*.

Today is not the first time the governmental attack against *Humanite* has been made. But, after each alarm, those who supported it went to sleep again, they left the bad leaders at the head of their journal, they did not organize the control from below, they did not demand the rendering of the necessary accounts. A few fine words and all was done.

In defending *Humanite* today, every worker must say to himself that once the alarm is over, a new administration must be demanded in *Humanite*, a new policy, honest information. The Communist Opposition must be helped to conduct its fight against the bureaucratized cadres of the party, against their methods, against its policy of compromise, against its actions which do not do what they should to rally the working masses but, on the contrary, frequently discourage and demoralize them.

Humanite does not cease saying that Tardieu is striking because the awakened working masses are threatening bourgeois power. That is wrong. *Humanite* should know, on the contrary, that if the working class had not been previously weakened, Tardieu would not dare to attack it so impudently.

The Communist Opposition calls the workers to strengthen their activity by a correct proletarian policy, devoid of bluff, but vigorous and exact. Then the workers will be able to recreate a *Humanite* which will really be their journal, and which will lead them successfully in the struggle.

For a genuine Communist Press! That is what the workers want. From *Humanite*, they demand, together with the Opposition, a new policy. That is the only condition that can render their aid effective for the future of the revolutionary movement.

—VERITE

Paris, November 29, 1929.

The BULLETIN of the Russian Opposition

The Latest number just received contains articles by L. D. Trotsky, Christalnikov, R. Kovsky, V. Kossior, M. Okudjava, N. Muralov, F. Dingelstaedt, and others.

INVALUABLE FOR A KNOWLEDGE OF THE RUSSIAN SITUATION

25c each 18c in bundles

Order From THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

The Theory at the Root of Lovestoneism

The organized appearance throughout the Communist International of Right wing groups—separate from their former Centrist allies—took place after the Sixth Congress of the International in 1928. Since that time there has been the distinct, organized formation of the Brandler group in Germany, the Jilek-Hais group in Czecho-Slovakia, the Kilboom group in Sweden, the Hueber group in Alsace-Lorraine, Right wing groups in France and Austria, and their replica in the United States the Lovestone-Gitlow-Wolfe group. There is only one "principle" that "unites" all these factions; national autonomy, opposition to international revolutionary action coordinated and directed by an international leadership, non-interference in each other's affairs.

We do not interfere in the Russian Party struggle, says Brandler, and we don't want the Russians to tell us what to do, either. Quite right, my dear fellow, says Jilek, if you will only keep out of my parliamentary dickerings in Czecho-Slovakia, I shall not say a word about your conduct in the Saxon Landtag. Entirely correct, interposes Lovestone, if you, comrade Hais, will keep hands off my opportunist and adventurist policy in the American needle trades, I will overlook your reformist conduct in the Czecho-Slovakian red unions. As for myself, says Hueber, if I am just permitted to remain the Left wing of the Alsatian Catholic-Autonomists without any criticism from you fellows, I shall swear by internationalism and keep a discreet tongue about my good comrade Kilboom's combinations with the Swedish social democrats. Let us, finally declares Kilboom, form our international opposition. Three cheers for unfalsified Leninism! shouts Schlamm.

The "internationalism" of the Right wing is of that buttery kind which retains its freshness so long as it is kept on the ice of mutual respect for national opportunism. But it melts into a sickly yellow in the heat of international revolutionary struggle. It can develop only at the expense of the Communist movement.

What is at the root of this disintegrating development in the ranks of Communism?

Spurious vs. Real Internationalism

We have emphasized numerous times that we have nothing in common with that spurious, artificial "internationalism" of the Zinoviev-Stalin-Bucharin type, which stifles all independent thought and healthy development in the various parties of the Comintern, reduces the national leaderships to the rank of subsidized agents of the dominant faction in the Russian party, and transforms the tribune of the international Congresses, plenums and sessions of the presidium into dreary circuses for political infants and rubber-stamping idiots. We have never understood by internationalism that poisonous atmosphere developed by Zinoviev and Co., to serve the needs of the struggle against "Trotskyism". It only replaced confident, firm and competent political direction with mechanical measures, wire-pulling and cablegram leadership. It is precisely in this atmosphere that the Lovestones flourished for years like a stinking weed in a swamp.

We have been and remain, however, convinced partisans of the genuine internationalism that was the foundation stone of the Communist International. It was this feature that so largely distinguished the Communist movement from the social democratic. In the Second International of the days before the war, the representatives of the various national parties would come together and agree that internationalism was a very good thing and highly desirable, but it did not follow—Messrs. Hillquit, Scheidemann, Thomas, Turati and Co. agreed—that these international gatherings shall establish the policies of the individual parties or shall presume to "dictate" in any other way. The "happy" results that followed this "noble independence of action and thought" are quite well known. The monument to it is the socialist betrayal of the workers during the war. Each party of social patriots betrayed its respective working class on a free, independent, "national" scale. . . .

The Communist International, born in the struggle against national reformism and patriotism, took an opposite path from the outset. Its relentless antagonism to national prejudices was not a weakness but a strong point, as was demonstrated by the growth of its influence, prestige, as well as its numbers in the first five years of its existence.

A Nationalist Theory

It was in the second five years of its

existence, following upon the defeat of the German revolution in 1923, that the Comintern began to march under a new banner: the theory of socialism in one country. It was a theory proclaimed and adapted for a period of back-sliding into national limitedness. It arose out of a disbelief in the teachings of Lenin on the revolutionary nature of the epoch, out of an awesome respect for the length of stabilization in capitalist Europe after 1924. Losing faith in the revolutionary support of the European working class, the "leaders" chosen for Russia in this period, of whom Stalin was the perfect type, developed the theory that Russia, backward and surrounded by world imperialism as it was, could establish socialism by itself, without the state aid of the European workers. That this "theory" flew in the face of all that Marx, Engels, Lenin and every other revolutionary teacher had ever said, did not dissuade these neo-national Communists in the least.

But theories are not harmless things to be played with. Out of this pernicious theory of "socialism in one country" came the destructive policy of Stalin-Bucharin-Martinov in the Chinese revolution, a policy which made of the Communist Party a ladder for the rise to power of the Chiang Kai-Sheks. Out of this theory came the policy pursued in England where the Comintern jilted the British working class and the Communists in order to become the anxious and willing servant of the General Council of the Trade Unions.

Out of this theory came the course that the Russian Communist Party steered towards the Kulak and away from the proletarian core of the country. In 1926, Stalin announced that "nine-tenths of socialism" already existed in Russia! Bucharin deceived the workers with his "brilliant" theories that the "kulak was growing into socialism", and Stalin nodded his head in assent. The most modest objection to these reactionary, chloroforming ideas was met with violent attacks by the Stalin-Bucharin regime and finally with the exile and imprisonment of the Opposition. It is quite as it should be that the most prominent "theoretician" of socialism in one country, Bucharin, finally ended up as the outspoken leader of the Right wing, with his opposition to industrialization, his protection of the "economically powerful peasant" (the mellifluous name the Right wing gives to the counter-revolutionary Kulak), etc., etc.

Trotsky's Warning

This anti-Marxist theory still remains the guiding, dominant line for the Russian Party and the International, the vade mecum of Stalin as well as Bucharin. The organized splitting-off of the Right wing internationally shows that the fatal results of the theory have not yet come to an end. Comrade Trotsky raised a warning cry, made his predictions of these results, years ago. As late as a year and a half ago, in his letter to the Sixth Congress of the International, he wrote with remarkable foresight:

"If it is at all possible to realize socialism in one country, then one can believe in that theory not only AFTER the conquest of power but also 'prior' to it. If socialism can be realized within the national boundaries of backward Russia, then there is the more reason to believe that it can be realized in advanced Germany. Tomorrow the leaders of the Communist Party of Germany will surely bring forward this theory. The Draft Program empowers them to do so. The day after tomorrow the French Party will have its turn. That will be the beginning of the downfall of the Comintern along the lines of social patriotism. The Communist Party of any capitalist country which will have become imbued with the idea that its particular country possesses all the 'necessary and sufficient' prerequisites for the independent construction of a 'complete socialist society' will in substance in no respect differ from the revolutionary social democrats who also began not with Noske but who definitely stumbled on August 4, 1914, on this very same question." (The Draft Program of the Communist International, p. 74, American edition).

Sauce for Stalin is Sauce for Brandler

Less than a year after its utterance, the warning has been essentially realized. If Stalin and Bucharin can build socialism in Russia alone, without the state aid of the workers in other countries, why cannot Brandler and Thalheimer build a "Communist" party in Germany alone, which has "fraternal" relations with other "revolutionary" parties, but wants no "rigid international centralization" for itself or for its

"friends" in other countries? For Brandler, this is quite logical. If Stalin and Bucharin can build socialism within national borders—and those of a backward, agricultural country, at that—why cannot Lovestone and Wolfe build a "Communist" Party within national borders, strengthen it, "arouse the masses" to revolution, and then "build socialism in the United States alone"? Surely, the magnificent industrial and financial structure of the United States, for which Lovestone has such an overwhelming admiration!, offers

What Now?

By the Editors of the Bulletin of the Russian Opposition

Numerous Oppositionists have rallied, as is known, to the "Declaration" of Rakovsky, Kossior and Okudjava. This "Declaration" brings no change in the fundamental line of the Opposition. On the contrary, its sense is a confirmation of this line at a new stage. The declaration rejects the tactic that the Stalinists have so perfidiously and with so much insistence attributed to the Opposition: the armed struggle for power against the C. P. S. U. The "Declaration" reiterates that the Opposition remains entirely on the path of internal reforms and that, as before, it is quite ready to pursue its work within the framework of a single party. This state of mind is dictated to it by its unshakable conviction that, under the conditions of party democracy, the Opposition, by normal methods, will gain the proletarian kernel of the party to its cause. But, it will be said, you yourself admit that this is possible only with a real party democracy. The complete absence of democracy constitutes the principal characteristic of Stalin's regime. Under these conditions, does not the declaration become a fiction?

No, the "Declaration" is not a fiction but a new public examination of the party regime. Is this regime capable or not, in spite of the lessons received, of remedying, be it only in part, the enormous evils it has caused the party and the revolution? Is it today capable or not of showing some initiative in putting an end to the dangers that only a blind man can fail to see? Is it capable or not—after the experience of the last years, the swinging from one side to the other, the severest losses, as well as the relentless decline in authority suffered by the party leadership,—is the apparatus of Stalin capable or not of taking a serious step toward Leninist methods of party life and leadership?

The Intentions of the Declaration

The declaration of the Opposition puts this question once more on a new plane. The extremely reserved tone of this document, the absence of indications of the pernicious character of the Centrist policy from the international point of view, as well as the remarks on the evolution of the Centrists towards the Left in various questions, all this was indicated without doubt by the intention to make it easier for the apparatus to take the first steps towards a healthier party regime. Furthermore, this tone should again demonstrate to the party that the Opposition puts essence above form, and the interests of the revolution above personal and group ambitions. It is ready to occupy the most modest place in the party. But it is willing to occupy it only by remaining what it is, not only by retaining all its points of view which, in the course of events, have received such a striking confirmation, but also by defending its right to internal struggle in order that its points of view may become those of the party. That is the significance of the declaration of August 22.

Now we have a reply to this declaration, an unofficial but quite authentic reply in the form of an article by Yaroslavsky. With us it is a matter of a very great and very important question, that of the future of the C. P. S. U. and the revolution. Everyone will understand that for this reason we would have preferred to disregard a dishonest article and its impudent author. But Yaroslavsky is now the guardian of the party apparatus. His article is the document of a responsible person. By this fact, it is impossible not to dwell upon it.

The article of Yaroslavsky represents the "Declaration" of the Opposition as an attempt to deceive the party. By this evaluation, as we shall demonstrate further on Yaroslavsky not only gives a crushing criticism of Stalin's regime but confirms the correctness of the tactic of the "Declaration".

at least as good a basis on which to erect a socialist society as agricultural Russia. For Lovestone too, this is quite logical.

Only these "logical conclusions" have a fundamentally wrong premise, the theory of socialism in one country. Grant the correctness of that theory and Brandler, Lovestone, Hais and Hueber are also correct. But grant the correctness of the same theory and you have the essential theoretical justification for the social democrats of Germany and France on August 4, 1914. Social nationalism—not Communism: That is the positive outcome of the philosophy of national socialism, that caricature of revolutionary internationalism for which Stalin and Bucharin alone—not Marx or Lenin—are entitled to full credit.

The Bolshevik Opposition and the C. P. S. U.

In what and how does the declaration deceive the party? Yaroslavsky does not make a political reply to this, but a policeman's reply. It is by tearing quotations out of a confiscated letter from a deported Oppositionist, and by grossly cheating that he constructs his "accusation". The political significance of our "Declaration" does not exist for him. Nevertheless its significance is obvious to those who deceive the party and those who utilize this deception.

When Radek declares in his conversations and private letters that the platform of the Opposition was brilliantly justified, then officially disavows this platform as being allegedly false, Radek is deliberately deceiving the party. Yaroslavsky is perfectly informed on matters for he lives only upon confiscations of letters of the Opposition. But Yaroslavsky is not only the protector of the party but also the insipid hoaxer of Radek, so far as the ideological hoaxing of the party is concerned.

When they were part of the Opposition, Zinoviev, Kamenev, etc., recounted in detail how they, in company with Stalin, Yaroslavsky, etc., had invented the myth of "Trotskyism" in order to struggle against Trotsky. Now these people abjure Trotskyism at the demand of Yaroslavsky: are they not buying their return to the party at the price of a deception?

A Regime of Systematic Deception

When, at the Sixth Congress and afterward in August, 1928, Stalin publicly affirmed that there existed no differences in the Central Committee and that rumors of a struggle between the Centrists and the Right was invented by the Trotskyists, Stalin deceived the party in order to transform the ideological struggle against the Right into organizational machinations, and to prevent the party from understanding that Stalin quoted only a few scraps and morsels from the platform of the Opposition. The number of these examples could be multiplied without end, for a regime of Centrist unsteadiness and bureaucratic violence is necessarily only a regime of systematic deception of the party.

But in what does the deception on the part of the Opposition lie. It says only that which is, it does not disavow its opinions out loud in order to preach them in an undertone. It does not attribute to itself the mistakes committed in reality by the Central Committee. Without shamming, without changing its path, without camouflage it has once again knocked on the door of the party. To the question of the doorman: Who's there, it replies: "The Bolshevik-Leninists (Opposition)." To the question: Do you renounce your opinions? it replies: "No, we consider them absolutely correct."—"Then what do you want?"—"We want," replies the Opposition, "to fight with the party against the class enemies and to fight in the party for our opinions with the methods of persuasion of a normal party."

Where is the deception? Where is the shadow of a deception?

And what can the shabby swindles and quotations from a personal letter change in this clear and direct dialogue?

But the candor with which the Opposition demands its readmission into the party does not appear at all accidental to the guardian of the apparatus who sees in it an attempt to deceive it. Do not the Oppositionists know—this is the private but quite obvious idea of Yaroslavsky—that he can let in only people who have broken legs, bent spinal column, and who declare that white is black? By what right do people who have kept their political spine intact dare to knock on the door and disturb the repose of the doorman? Obviously to deceive the party!

Concluded in Next Issue

STALIN

The «Second Lenin's» 50th Year

"Every social epoch," said Marx, invoking the words of Helvetius, "demands its great men; when they do not exist, it invents them." Well, Stalin is the great man "invented" by the period of the reaction against October.

—L. D. TROTSKY

The entire Stalinist press, obedient to the wishes of its master, is now engaged in publishing columns of praise for Joseph Stalin on his fiftieth anniversary. He is hailed as a "second Lenin"! His "bolshhevik" past is lavishly described. His "great" contributions to the Communist Party and the October Revolution are recounted in detail. His alleged sagacity, his theoretical profundity, his practical ability, his fine personal qualities are invented or exaggerated and spread from Moscow to New York and back again. In order that the militants may see through the false glamor with which Stalin has had himself surrounded, and know the real Stalin, we will briefly note some of the high spots—few as they were—in his career in the revolutionary movement. We condense them from a brilliant study by comrade Trotsky.

One of Stalin's first appearances in the Russian Party was in 1911. At that time Lenin had formed a bloc with Plechanov for the struggle against the liquidators and conciliators. Stalin's theoretical contribution to this struggle was a gesture of contempt. He called it a "foreign tempest in a glass of water." In his letter of January 24, 1911, published in a Tiflis Party paper in 1925, he continued: "In gener-

"From the age of 19, Stalin was set like steel to 100 percent Bolshevism, from which he never deviated a hair's breadth."

—Comrade Walter Duranty, in the New York Times anniversary article on Stalin, 12-22-1929.

al, the workers are beginning to look upon the foreign groups (i. e., upon the group around Lenin) with disdain; let them get into a rage to their heart's content; we, however, think that he who really has the interests of the movement at heart, works—the rest (i. e., the struggle against liquidationism!) passes on."

Semi-Social Patriotism

During the whole time of the preparation of the revolutionary forces, Stalin, of course, played the minor role to which his nationally-minded "talents" were fitted. In the period after the Kerensky revolution which overthrew the czar, Stalin adopted a semi-social patriotic viewpoint and wrote articles in Pravda—while Lenin was still in Switzerland—for the "defense of the fatherland," that is, for the bourgeois government of Kerensky. In fact, his viewpoint was that the Bolsheviks should unite with Tseretelli, the outspoken social patriot. In the minutes of the May 1917 Bolshevik Party conference, one can read:

"Order of business: Tseretelli's proposal for unity.

"Stalin: We must accept. We must define our proposals to realize unity. A unification is possible on the basis of Zimmerwald-Kienthal. . . Differences should neither be anticipated nor warned against. Without differences there is no Party life (so!). Once inside the Party we will liquidate the little differences."

In the uprising of the Bolsheviks themselves, on November 7, Stalin played no particularly prominent role. But for that he has been attempting for years to minimize if not entirely eliminate the dominant role played by comrade Trotsky. Unfortunately for all his later "discoveries," he had written in Pravda on November 6, 1918: "All the practical work of organizing the insurrection took place under the immediate direction of Trotsky, chairman of the Petrograd Soviet. It may be said with certainty that with regard to the rapid passing of the garrison to the side of the Soviet and the organization of the work of the revolutionary war committee, the Party owes it primarily and above all to comrade Trotsky."

Conflicts with Lenin

The first six years of the Russian revolution passed by without Stalin's name being heard of outside a narrow circle of Russian Party workers. And this, not because of any modesty on his part, but merely because of his lack of interest in

international affairs and his complete alienation from all work in the Comintern. And inside the Russian republic itself, his role was a highly colorless one. Where he did attempt to come forth with some "original" idea of his own, it was invariably in conflict with Lenin's viewpoint and earned the latter's immediate condemnation.

So it was with the differences on the national question, in connection with the Georgian Soviet republic. So far did Stalin go from Lenin's standpoint, and so brutally did he conduct himself towards the Georgian comrades, that Lenin was obliged to address a series of letters to Kamenev, Trotsky, Mdivani, Macharadze and others urging them to take up the fight for him at the Party session against Stalin. Lenin de-

"Lenin trusted Stalin beyond any other, save perhaps Dzerzhinsky."

—Comrade Walter Duranty, in the New York Times anniversary article on Stalin, 12-22-1929.

nounced Stalin for his "veritably Russian nationalism," informed Trotsky that he "could not rely upon his impartiality," and that he was "revolted by the brutality of Ordjonikidze and the tolerance of Stalin and Dzerzhinsky." The hundred percent defenders of Stalin's modernized version of "Leninism" have never published Lenin's letters on the national question; on the contrary, their circulation in Russia is a "counter-revolutionary" offense.

Lenin's Bomb Against Stalin

From statements made by Lenin's private secretary and by his wife, it has since become established that "Lenin was preparing a bomb against Stalin" at the Thirteenth Party Congress. In his article on bureaucracy, Lenin directed his attacks essentially against Stalin. And finally, according to the statement made by Zinoviev in July 1926, Lenin sent a letter to Stalin in which he announced "the rupture of all comradely relations" with the latter.

Were this not sufficient to stamp this "faithful disciple of Lenin," there is the deadly characterization made of him in Lenin's Testament. In clear and unmistakable language, Lenin takes the measure of Stalin and proposes that the Party rid itself of him! In this letter, now known as his "Testament," he writes:

"Comrade Stalin, having become general secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution. On the other hand, comrade Trotsky, as was proved by his struggle against the Central Committee in connection with the question of the People's Commissariat of Ways of Communication, is distinguished not only by his exceptional abilities—personally he is, to be sure, the most able man in the present Central Committee; but also by his too far-reaching self-confidence and a disposition to be attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs. . . .

"Stalin is too rude, and this fault, entirely supportable in relations among us Communists, becomes insupportable in the office of general secretary. Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and ap-

How Many Times Can a Dead «ism» Die?

After having been assured for the three thousandth time by the Daily Worker and its associated assurers that Trotskyism was dead and disintegrated, we turned, purely by accident, to the current number of the *Inprecorr*, No. 64, which contains a report on the internal situation in the Russian Communist Party by one of the leading Stalinists, S. Kossior (not to be confused with the Oppositionist Kossior). He informs us:

"In connection with our growing differences of opinion with the Right Bucharin group (they disappeared since then!—Ed.), we must also take into account the small 'Left' group existing among the youth. I refer to the actions of comrades Schatzkin and Sten and their followers. Great difficulties and changes in our life are always accompanied by great vacillations in our ranks. And if we are able to observe the actions of the Right opposition, on the other hand, it is a matter of course that there also are with us representatives of Trotskyist tendencies.

"It is not by chance that the Party has to fight on two fronts: against the Right and against the Left, against the Trotsky-

ists and all sorts of Trotskyist and semi-Trotskyist tendencies. . . . It is here a question of minor errors which, however, in their further development can lead to a break with the Party and to a going over into Trotskyist paths."

But why in the name of common sense, or any other kind of sense, should the Russian Party carry on a fight against Trotskyism? Why should it tilt at non-existing windmills? Why should it throw stones at a mirage? Haven't we been told that Trotskyism is dead? that it has disintegrated completely? that it is finally liquidated? In our own dull way, we can even understand the necessity of a fight against the Right front. But why a fight on two fronts? Is there a Trotskyist danger? But we thought it was all over and done with. Stalin is playing us a shabby trick. Either he has been fibbing all the while (which is practically incredible. . . .) or else he is disturbing a political graveyard by playing the ghoul. And we think that even a Stalinist ought to have some regard for the "dead!"

☐

Read and Subscribe to the Militant

BROWDER

The New Defender of Stalinism

Since the taking over of the Party apparatus by "Win the War" Foster and his new bureaucrats, the job of defending Stalinism (by hook and crook) has fallen, as everyone knows, to Earl Browder. To those who know Browder this is very amusing. Browder's chief claim to distinction, as already been pointed out in the *Militant*, rests mainly on his frequent mistakes and his passionate love for liberal bourgeois sociology. But, apparently at least, Browder is sitting on top of the world. He has realized his secret ambition.

The Party's Don Quixote

True enough, the victory is a bit hollow. Patch it as you will, its artificial character shows through. No one, not even Earl's brother, Bill, who was always too ready to admit that Earl was a genius, is convinced of its genuineness. All the "merciless logic" of Earl Browder and his mania for lumping things together cannot hide the fact that Browder and the other latter-day saints were lifted into power on the wings of circumstance, by grace of the Stalin regime. To tell the plain truth, if you examine the facts at all, Browder's new glory bears a striking resemblance to that of the other great knight-errant, Don Quixote. However, Browder, if somewhat uncomfortable, for the moment seems content with his new job.

When I read the puny drivel of Browder's in the *Daily Worker*, I am reminded of Browder as I knew him before the war. His evolution is a strange one. He always had a distaste for plain workers. He did not like to have what he considered rough-neck elements coming into meetings where he was present. They occasionally wore overalls to meetings and their trousers were seldom properly pressed. Moreover, and this was the worst crime of all, they were unfamiliar with the works of Emily Post.

He tolerated them at meetings as a sort of necessary evil. He limited himself to indirect scoldings for the rough-necks, much to the discomfiture of Earl, did not hesitate to reply in kind. But after the meetings, in little tea rooms among his close friends, he would take little underhanded digs at them for their uncouthness, their unstylish clothing and their neglect of Emily Post. He lumped society into groups—the well-behaved fellows and great unwashed.

It is something of a changed Browder who today, in his safe retreat behind the columns of the *Daily Worker*, clumsily and apishly hurls brickbats at the Communist Opposition. He does not dare to sally forth on the platform with even the humblest Opposition supporter to defend his drivel. He is content to confine himself to the columns of the *Daily Worker* and sneak around occasionally and browbeat (with all the arguments of popery) some Opposition supporters and threaten them with all the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition. But he does not dare to disclose even to his closest friends how badly he was beaten, how the floor was mopped with his arguments by comrade Shorty Buehler in Kansas City.

As a sample of his ability as an observer, I am reminded of the time just before the Coolidge election when he came to Kansas City and predicted that the democrat would win by an overwhelming majority. Even a school-boy could see that it was the other way around. We party members generously refrained from laugh in his presence. We concluded that, all, perhaps he was doing the best he could. But after he left we all had a good giggle.

Fifteen Well-Spent Years

It took him fifteen years of in reading of Lester Ward and other bourgeois sociologists to discover what workers knew instinctively almost the day it came into the movement: that the and progressive leaders would betray workers in a crisis. He seemed to be lying under the impression that they would be won over to the party in great droves.

This is the new defender of the regime. It is one of the (slightly humorous) tragedies of Stalinism. The unfortunate readers of the *Daily Worker* have to hope for in the way of enlightenment from the pen of Earl Browder. They have to turn to the columns of where Browder's many past liberal his more recent ones have been exposed. We are sure that his brand of liberal bourgeois pseudo-sociology will be thoroughly exposed by the in the future.

—MIL.

Mass Speaks at Open Forum in Detroit

DETROIT—At the Workers Open Forum held on Wednesday, Dec. 11th, Barney Mass of the Communist League, spoke on the crisis in the Communist International. Dozen members of the Young Communist League put in their appearance, evidently with the intention of disrupting the meeting.

Fellow-worker Erwin, the chairman of the forum, apprehensive of the official Communist party's tactics, was prepared for an intrusion. After Mass had exposed the vicious theory of socialism in one country as being the crux of the effort to renege Marxism, and responsible for the catastrophic happenings in the International, more courageous League member yelled: "It's a lie." This apparently was to be the signal for a systematic drive to heckle and break up the meeting.

Erwin however, instantly left the platform and emphatically impressed the young Communists that no interruption would be tolerated and if they had any questions or opinions to express they would be afforded ample time at the appropriate moment. The League members after looking over some of the fellow workers and discerning their determination to suppress anarchy in a quick manner, decided to leave in an atmosphere of noise to dignify their retreat. The effective escort of some of the fellow workers interfered with this and a few remained behind to listen attentively to the remarks of the speaker. The thing was successful and an interesting discussion followed.

Mass is to speak at an Open Forum Sunday, Jan. 5th, at 333 Grand River, at 3:30

INGRATITUDE

We read in one of the Daily Worker's columns: "The New York Times (a favorite authority with Trotsky's American disciples on the Militant) reports 'that Trotsky owns some property in Berlin, and the case may eventually be heard here.'" (December 17, 1929.)

We are sure that there is some mistake here, which we will generously attribute to the linotype operator who sets the Daily Worker. The Times is not OUR favorite authority. It is the principal authority of the Daily Worker. Where does the Daily Worker get its daily Russian news from? From the correspondence of comrade Walter Duranty, Moscow representative of the Times! Who tips the Daily Worker off on what the new "line" is on this or that question? Good old comrade Duranty! Who puts the Daily Worker wise on what Stalin wants to say about Trotsky or the Trotskyists or about Bucharin and the Bucharinists? Most honored and respected comrade Duranty! Who saves Stalin the trouble of sending cablegrams to the Daily Worker about the latest zig-zag in policy? The New York Times cable service and its most esteemed, most faithful and most "boishevized" Moscow correspondent, comrade Duranty! What paper is the Daily Worker's favorite, guaranteed authority on Russian events? The Moscow dispatches of what paper does it copy word for word without the courage or courtesy of acknowledging their source? The New York Times!

So don't jump on the Times so eagerly, comrades of the Daily Worker. Don't bite the hand that's feeding you news.

LOVESTONE'S USEFUL WORK

The political feature writer of the Jewish Daily Forward, Zivion (Dr. B. Hoffman), former member of the Workers Party and leader of its Jewish section who returned to the yellow trough, writes about his old friend Lovestone as follows: "Well, I know what will come out of Lovestone's work, but I must admit that he is really doing good work. He has never yet done such useful work for the working class as today." (12-18-1929.)

Water is not the only thing that rises to its own level!

MORONS WANTED—NOT WORKERS!

NEW ORLEANS—"We need morons in New Orleans," Dr. R. N. Bond told vocational workers meeting in New Orleans, "to do the operation of various types of machinery where girls with the men of a 6-year-old were more efficient college graduates."

CHRISTMAS FOR LABOR

By Grace Hutchins

NEW YORK. (F.P.)—Once more at this Christmas time, a fraction of New York's poverty stands revealed on the country's stage, produced for the eighteenth time a benefit performance called The Hundred Neediest Cases. Well-to-do benefactors satisfy themselves by paying \$300,000 or more for the showing of how the other half lives in the world's richest city.

A Publicity Stunt

Workers and their families, caught by unemployment, old age, illness or death of the wage earner in a country that provides no social insurance, are paraded before footlights of publicity. They are made to display their private lives, their entire economic situation. But the publicity lasts only three weeks. The curtain falls; the rich forget the play, and behind the scenes, hidden away in dingy tenements, the workers live out reality.

That the "cases" displayed are only a small fraction of those on the lists is emphasized by all the nine charity organizations participating. One of the societies told Federated Press that it carried 2,800 cases at present. Another said it was carrying 2,500, and "more are coming for help every day." Of course no such organization says anything about the countless underpaid workers who are not yet at the despairing point of seeking private charity.

Starvation Conditions

Dick B., a pressman by trade, was out of work for weeks, with a family of nine to feed. He had been existing, with his wife and seven young children, on a diet of dry cereal for breakfast and watery soup flavored with potatoes for midday and evening meals. Mrs. B. is too starved to attempt soon the support of the family. (Unemployment.)

A shoe worker had tuberculosis. The men who had worked 12 years beside him in the same shoe factory pitied him and when exhaustion forced him to go home early they finished his work for him. In spite of their help his wages began to decrease. Now he is in a tuberculosis hospital. His seven children are undernourished, dangerously so. (Illness.)

Alone at 61, she makes flowers. Her husband died. She has never worked outside; and there is very little she can do now, because an accident many years ago left her right arm and hand hanging helpless by her side. She makes artificial flowers, slowly, with her good left hand, and asks, gently, for the first time in her life, for help. (Death of the wage earner.)

Too Hungry To Move

Too old to work even at 50 is the latest dictum of personnel managers. Minnie L. is not much more than 50. For 10 years the \$15 a week that she earned in good weeks behind a department store counter supported her and her 82-year old mother. Because she was so often hungry that it made her feel sick, she could not move around and wait on people fast and she looked older than her age. So, when business gets slack, she is the first to be laid off. (Old age.)

Labor organizers, analyzing these appeals for the neediest, find they dramatize the four great hazards of a worker's life and the lack of social insurance against these hazards, unemployment, old age, illness and death. A very few of the stories are those of children left abandoned or orphaned—for whom a capitalist state feels no responsibility. All the rest are victims of a society which uses up a worker's body but makes no social provision for the hazards of his life.

Louisiana Standard Oil Signs Wage Contract with Itself

MEMPHIS, Tenn. (F.P.)—The Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana, representative in this section of the pious young Rockefeller, has gone through the motions of signing a collective agreement, covering employes in the Tennessee-Arkansas district. But no shouting and pounding of tables were reported as issuing from the conference room where the agreement was signed. The workers were "represented" by a committee from among their own number "by secret ballot." The management tried to kid itself that this was a kind of collective bargaining, but the men suspect that the company was bargaining with itself.

The company announced that it would allow a week's vacation with pay to every wage earner having a year's service, and two weeks with pay to those having two year's service.

Piously the company let be known the fact that it will not discriminate against employes who join unions. But let them try to get other workers into unions, and—well, just let them.

The "joint conference" broke up after a banquet at which a good time was had by all.

CHAIN GANG FOR JOBLESS

CHARLESTON, S. C.—Unemployment in this city means the chain gang for the jobless worker or an order to leave town and seek employment elsewhere. Police headquarters have been swamped by jobless workers arrested for vagrancy and as disorderly persons. "This is a very unfor-

tunate situation", stated the chief of police "but there is not enough work here for those who live here."

The city jail not being able to "accommodate" all those arrested, many are released with a warning to leave town and seek employment elsewhere.

WHERE SACCO AND VANZETTI WERE MURDERED

BOSTON—Sanctimonious Boston, which suppresses advanced books and plays while encouraging low burlesque shows, follows Chicago in the extent of municipal corruption, states Walter W. Liggett in Plain Talk. Bootlegging nets \$60,000,000 a year, he charges, and prostitution flourishes to a degree, unknown in other eastern cities. Responsibility is laid at the door of the governor, who appoints Boston's police commissioner, and of the Boston politicians.

The article has been denounced indignantly in the Boston Herald and other newspapers, although privately Bostonians concede the truth of the indictment.

CLEVELAND.—Vice Pres. George M. Graham of Willys-Overland predicts that 1930 will see fewer motor cars produced and sold with prices higher.

The prize of the month for the coinage of new third period words, goes to Max Bedacht for his contribution in the current number of the Communist. He writes (page 680): "The sloganization of the political issues," etc., etc. Any comrade capable of contriving a word like that without turning a hair is evidently the logical candidate for the Party secretaryship.

In German

In English

In Jewish

THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA BY L. D. TROTSKY

After reading this book by Leon Trotsky, now available in three languages, the reader will have a clear picture of the viewpoint of the Russian Opposition and the origin of the present state of affairs in the Soviet Republic. This volume includes a detailed exposure of the campaign of misrepresentation and falsehood conducted against the Russian Opposition and its leader, Trotsky.

TWO DOLLARS A COPY

Order from
THE MILITANT

Greetings to Weekly Militant

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Comrades:

This is the first opportunity I have had to tell you how pleased I was with the first issue of the Weekly Militant. I read it from beginning to end without stopping. It is certainly a relief after the many years of bombastic editing of the Daily Worker. Although I am comparatively young in years, I am still not a tenderfoot in the movement. In my time I have seen many papers started and I think I can speak with some authority when I say that never in America was there a paper started devoted to the struggles of the working class that had a better claim to the support of the workers.

Compared to the Daily Worker, the Militant is like day to night. Free from bombast, every article is truthful and to the point. Every word is a challenge to bureaucratism, every line burns with the ceaseless flame of working class determination. Side by side with the splendid theoretical articles by our leaders are the articles from our worker correspondents, reports from the battle front which will grow more numerous as the Militant gains in circulation. And the circulation will grow, let no one be mistaken about that; for we are on the correct line and the road, if difficult is clear ahead.

While every one must push forward with new courage and keep pushing from day to day, it is good to realize that we have taken an important step at this particular time for every day the Daily Worker grows more unreliable and more useless to the working class. That some who should know better continue to go along with it is to be expected, I suppose, for bureaucratism inevitably attracts to it the moral cowards, the weak-kneed, the spineless, the lick-spittles, the lackeys and the job-holders.

Although as a plain worker I have never been given to throwing bouquets, I feel that I must compliment you all on the splendid job you are doing in editing our paper, the Weekly Militant, under the most difficult of circumstances. Keep up the good work. Rest assured we will do ours.

Fraternally yours,
—JOHN MIHELIC

Where to Buy The Militant

LOS ANGELES, Calif.: Belmont News Co., 101 East 5th St.; Western News Stand, Box 604, Arcade Station.

SAN FRANCISCO, Calif.: McDonald's Book Shop, 65 Sixth Street

WASHINGTON, D. C. Gale's Book Shop, 805 Tenth St. N. W.

CHICAGO, ILL.: Cheshinsky's Book Store, 2720 W. Division St.; Horsley's Book Store, 1623 W. Madison St.; and on various newsstands.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.: Joe Angelo, 431 No. Wesley St.

BOSTON, MASS.: Shapiro's Book Store, 7 Beach St., near Washington.

ROXBURY, MASS.: Goldberg's Store, 536 Warren St.

DETROIT, MICH.: Aidas Book Shop, 1713-24th St.; and on various newsstands.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.: Engelson News Co., 234-2nd Ave. So.

KANSAS CITY, MO.: Buehler's Book Store, 220 West 12th St.

ST. LOUIS, MO.: Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Ave.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.: On various newsstands.

SEATTLE, WASH.: Raymer's Old Book Store, 905 Third Ave.

CALGARY, ALTA., CANADA: Boston News Co., 109-8th Ave. West

TORONTO, ONT., CANADA: On various newsstands.

NEW YORK, N. Y.: On various newsstands in New York and Brooklyn; Biederman Bookstore, 2d Ave and 12th St.; Rand Bookstore, 7 East 15th St.; The Militant, 25 Third Ave.

In addition to the stores listed above. The Militant also can be obtained through members and Branches of Communist League of America.

Workingmen and women who wish to get in touch with Branches of the Communist League of America (Opposition) or to obtain The Militant are requested to write THE MILITANT, 25 THIRD AVENUE, Room 4, New York, N. Y.