

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Vol. III No. 2.

Telephone: DRYdock 1656. NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, January 11, 1930

PRICE 5 CENTS

KARL LIEBKNECHT DAY

A.F. of L. Opens Up in the South

As we go to press (Monday) the American Federation of Labor opens its long proclaimed conference in Charlotte, N. C., "to map out a plan for organizing the wage earners of the South". It is composed exclusively of A. F. of L. officials, coming largely from the United Textile Workers and its affiliated groups.

The whole record of the leaders of the A. F. of L., from William Green to Thomas McMahon, president of the U. T. W., is a living refutation of the statement that they will organize the Southern workers for a genuine struggle against their Bourbon masters. One need go no further than the textile field to evaluate the "work" that the fat boys of the A. F. of L. will do in the South.

Remember Passaic!

About two years ago, the A. F. of L. leaders entered the Passaic strike, after the Left wing had led one of the most spirited struggles in American history, took over the union created by the Communists and the Left wing, offered the workers up to the bosses on a silver platter, and then strangled what was left of the union. In the New Bedford strike, the leaders of the A. F. of L. organized the skilled workers, kept them separated from the unskilled who formed the mass of textile operatives, and then worked their fingers to the bone in order to break the strike.

In the more recent Elizabethton, Tennessee, strike, the sellout by the U. T. W. leaders was so raw that many of the workers struck over again spontaneously, in spite of the lid that had been put on the union by the imported bureaucrats. The same story can be told in Marion and elsewhere.

What is most significant of the A.F. of L.'s entry into the South at the present time is that it only comes after the work accomplished by the Left wing particularly in the Gastonia strike. As the press announces, without an attempt at concealment, the A. F. of L. is going into the South in order to wipe out the Left wing and its union, the N. T. W. This is precisely the aim the bosses have set themselves. The latter understand their William Green very well. While he is not needed by them in ordinary peaceful times he comes in very handy when the problem arises of fighting the militant Left wing and its union. It is clear from the whole situation in the South today that: 1. The bosses will use the services of the A. F. of L. to displace the Left wing union or to ward off the danger of the Left wing; when the Left wing menace is removed for the time being, the bosses know how easy it is to handle the accommodating Greens. 2. The bosses will fight against the A. F. of L.'s mildest attempt at unionization in those places where it is not needed to head off into harmless channels an existing or impending struggle.

The coming of Green and McMahon to the South is not "a step forward" for them, but a sinister move against the Left wing, and therefore against the textile workers. The blunders made by the Left wing, under the direction of the present leadership of the Communist Party, will only facilitate Green's work. Instead of intensifying its activity in the South, the Left wing has had its most capable and experienced people withdrawn until only a skeleton of the forces required is left there. Besides this, the Left wing still persists in its policy of self-satisfied isolation and sensational ultra-Leftism. Its present course only doubles and trebles the difficulties with which it is confronted by the latest A. F. of L. move in the South.

KARL LIEBKNECHT



At the Martyr's Grave-side

By Karl Radek

With your tears you have bathed his dead body, whose wounds cry to the heavens against the socialist betrayers; with the red banner of the proletarian world revolution you have covered him and placed him in your hearts so that he may rest there forever. Millions of you know no more of him than that, in the black night, illuminated only by the flash of cannon, he broke out of the trenches with a small force to fight for peace; that cast into prison by the mighty, he stoically endured every torment and hardly liberated from his chains raised anew the banner of struggle and fell with it in his hands, fell on the threshold of a new life.

But I want every proletarian to know about Liebknecht, to love him, not only as the blood-bedecked symbol of a martyr, but as he was in life, with his faults and merits, not as a "puzzled-out book" but as a man with his "contradiction". The man Liebknecht should be our great model, a model for our youth who should learn to fight, a model for our women who should not let themselves be oppressed by life, a model for our weather-beaten men who are haunted by doubts. The time has not yet come to proceed to a detailed biography of Karl Liebknecht. In his house of mourning the soldiers of the German counter-revolution still rule, and as I write these words, an inspection of the papers he left behind is impossible, yes, myself illegally in hiding, I cannot even gather the printed documents. But I believe that I see at a glance his rich life in its peculiarity and I want to describe it here.

At Liebknecht's Cradle

...Songs of heroes were sung at Liebknecht's cradle... The first impressions that the boy received were the persecutions of the Socialist Law. The German bourgeoisie and the Hohenzollerns sought to stifle the first socialist stirrings of the German proletariat. For him who spread the criminal teaching: "the putrid belly shall not waste what diligent hands have earned", who aroused the poor and disfranchised, there was no peaceful working place; he had to wander, persecuted, from place to place nowhere secure from police spies.

Wilhelm Liebknecht remained at his post and did not suspend the struggle for socialism even when it was again necessary to show by suffering that we live for the liberation of humanity. Karl may often have asked himself as a child what the strange men were ferretting for in the house of his father, why people came into the house secretly at night, whispering quietly like thieves: good people they must have been, for warmly welcomed by his parents, they would stroke his little black head. Thus he grew up in the years of persecution as the son of the soldier of the revolution. To be a soldier, a warrior of the revolution, that was the gift conferred upon him in his cradle.

The Socialist Law fell. The growing, strengthening capitalism simultaneously also strengthened the working class numerically, and with the growth of the working class, the German social democracy grew in spite of all the persecution. There began the "new course", the endeavor to win the working class through social concessions, and although it apparently retreated immediately to a new sharp course, yet the spirit of the epoch was such that, while strengthening capitalism accorded the

Continued on Page 3

Velvet Words Conceal U. S. Arms Growth

By SCOTT NEARING

Velvet words, hiding the growing claws of naval and military power: thus might be summarized the position of the American Empire during recent years. Coolidge followed this policy. Hoover has adopted it. Both have talked persuasively about peace. Both have been preparing the country for war.

Recently the London Economist published a detailed report on the 1929 cost of war to the various nations. The United States leads the list with 4,553 million gold francs. Great Britain, second on the list, spends only 2,800 million gold francs on war. If, to the figures of Great Britain are added the figures of arms expenditures for the remainder of the British Empire, the result shows the American Empire and the British Empire together are spending more than two-fifths the total for the entire world.

Military costs are greater in the United States than they are in any other single country. These costs, with some modification for the increase in the cost of living show very clearly the direction in which the country is moving.

As lately as 1926 United States expenditures on the army and navy totalled only \$580 million. They were \$685 million in 1929, and the 1932 budget calls for \$891 million.

Even clearer, as indices of military preparations, are the figures showing the actual fighting machine of the United

States.

Begin with the army. Up to the time of the Spanish-American war the United States army numbered about 27,000 regulars and 113,000 members of the national guard, or a total of some 140,000. In 1910 the total strength of the regular army was 80,000 and the national guard, 120,000, making a total of 200,000.

In 1927, the regular army numbered 133,000 and the national guard 181,000. In addition to these two branches of the army, however, there were 110,000 in the officers' reserve. These, with some incidental figures, make the total army strength of 1927, 430,000, or more than twice the figure for 1910, and more than three times the figure for the period immediately preceding the Spanish-American war.

There were 276 vessels in the United States navy in 1906, having a total displacement of 693,000 tons. For 1927 the number of vessels was 734—nearly three times the figure for 1906. The tonnage had more than trebled—2,225,000 tons.

Whatever Hoover, or any of his subordinates may say, the fact remains that the American Empire is spending more for military purposes than any other nation in the world, and that these expenditures, and the military machine which they are building up, are growing rapidly, year after year.

(Prepared for Federated Press by the Labor Research Assn.)

1930 to Be «Lean Tough» Year

NEW YORK-(FP)—Nineteen-thirty will be a "lean hard, tough" year according to *Business Week*, published by McGraw Hill, which also sponsors the leading industrial and trade magazines. Intense competition, with disaster for weaker firms, is foretold. Workers can interpret for themselves the meaning of this competition in speed-up, low wages and unemployment.

Economists, statisticians, and the glorified soothsayers employed to shed prestige on big corporations have been filling the business press with their usual prognostications. Usually these oracles stress the inherent "soundness of business", namely people must eat and live and therefore will not cease all buying. Sec. of the Treasury Mellon typifies their viewpoint when he says that "I see nothing in the present situation that is either menacing or warrants pessimism. During the winter months there may be some slackness or unemployment, but hardly more than is usual at this season of the year." In this jaunty manner does the great Pittsburgh magnate toss off the plight of millions of wretched workers.

What About the Workers?

In the deluge of words published concerning the industrial depression whose beginning was seen last summer, hardly any consideration is given the workers who bear the brunt of hard times. Statisticians bend their brains to the task of estimating whether profits will decline 15% or 25% in 1930, but no attention is paid to workers' income and hardly any more as to whether he is to have a chance to make a living.

Construction and automobiles are considered the leading forces in depression and recovery. The auto slump that started last fall continues unabated, and the industry looks to the production of 1,000,000 fewer cars in 1930. That means a smaller demand for steel, textiles, electrical equipment and all the products that go into auto building. In construction no marked recovery is expected.

Profits Rise

Workers' attention is called to the prospect that many employers will attempt to justify wage cuts with stories of falling profits. But the net income available for dividends for 1929 is estimated at \$3,500,000,000 for 550 leading industrial firms. This is an increase of 17.6% over the previous year.

Poverty Spreads in St. Louis

ST. LOUIS-(FP)—With more than 1,000 workers' families applying for charity during the first 17 days of the month, December, 1929, has seen destitution establish new records in this city unequalled during the history of organized charity.

These facts are revealed by the official journal of the St. Louis Provident Assn. family case work agency, which says that "district superintendents report unemployment the major cause of the flood of applications".

Joblessness shows the greatest increase says the report, in foundries, shoe factories, paper box factories, automobile assembly plants and construction companies. Workers over 40 years old are hardest hit. The survey takes account only of able-bodied unemployed.

Thirty-one cents of every dollar spent for relief during December, the report estimates, will go to families where unemployment is responsible for the need. This is the largest proportion of relief chargeable to any one cause. When it is considered that a family case work agency must also care for families where the wage-earner is dead, incapacitated, too old to work, non-supporting, or where earnings are insufficient for the family's support, the seriousness of the situation is apparent.

N. C. WANTS ANTI-LABOR LAW, TOO

NEW YORK—Condemnation of three Ohio workers to long terms in the penitentiary for anti-militarist agitation has suggested to the *Gastonia, N. C. Gazette* and the *Charlotte, N. C. Observer* the desirability of such a law in North Carolina to curb the union agitators.

Export Industries Will Be Hit Heavily

WASHINGTON-(FP)—Information received at the U. S. Department of Commerce and at the Chamber of Commerce of the United States shows that the coming six months will witness nationwide unemployment in the industries which supply the foreign export trade. Due to the severe business depression in South America and Cuba, caused by a drop of 35 to 55 percent in prices of coffee and sugar, and due to the steady drift of many European countries

toward hard times, American export trade faces the worse crisis since the war. Millions of American wage workers may suffer between now and July, from the collapse of foreign buying.

The Department of Commerce expert on Latin America, writing in the *Commerce Reports* for January 6, predicts serious political unrest in Brazil, Colombia and other countries of South America as a result of the present business disaster.

Pullman Co. Absorbs Notorious Union Foe

PITTSBURG-(FP)—Standard Car Corp., ruthless and conscienceless foe of unionism in western Pennsylvania, has been absorbed by the Pullman Co., whose own record against labor is unparalleled.

Typical of western Pennsylvania feudalism is Standard Steel Car's plant at Butler, near Pittsburgh. Fearful evidently of the results of its anti-union policy among workers, the company had one of the five state police barracks placed in Butler when the plant was built. The company donated the ground and many facilities.

A Company Town

The inevitable company town was built at Lyndora, inhabited chiefly by immigrant workers and their families. It was through streets lined by miserable company sheds that the police patrolled its force during the steel strike of 1919. Often these sheds had barn doors for the entrance of what the company considered its human cattle. On occasion the figure of the mounted cossack bent on mowing "guineas" and "wops", sent women and children fleeing through the doors into their sheds.

Across the street car tracks was the city of Butler inhabited by native born workers and bosses. Here the Mellon car company domination was more polite but just as effective. Years ago an old pioneer land owner and county judge controlled Butler, today his sons are in charge of the Republican city and county machines, and are physician and attorney for the car company.

Boy Scout Movement Anti-Strike

Standard Steel Car benignly fathers all civic affairs from the Salvation Army and the Community Chest to the Boy Scouts. The Boy Scout secretary once told the

Federated Press correspondent that car company officials hoped to decrease the possibilities of strikes through careful fostering of the Boy Scout movement in Lyndora.

Decline in the demand for steel cars led to perpetual unemployment in Butler, as the plant alone could have cared for the entire national demand in 1927. Orders were shuffled between the Butler and Hammond, Ind. plants as well as Osgood-Bradley at Worcester, Mass., involved in the latest merger.

In 1926 part of the idle car plant was made into a modern rolling mill unit of the Columbia Steel Co., unit of the American Rolling Mills Co. (Armco) which recently crushed a steel workers' strike in Middletown, Ohio.

This year the Austin Automobile Co., a British concern, took over another idle section of Standard Steel Car plant on the understanding that common labor was not to be paid above 36 cents an hour, the rate prevailing for such labor in all Butler industry.



FREE MEALS PASS OUT IN YUMA

YUMA, Ariz.—Free meals for out-of-workers who trudge through Yuma on their way from the valleys of California to the valleys of Arizona in quest of the illusive job are a thing of the past for the associated charities has had a large wood pile placed in the yard of the city hall. Applicants for charity will be obliged to split wood for one hour before they will be given the price of a meal.

Racketeer is Pal of Matty Woll

By Harvey O'Connor

NEW YORK-(FP)—Pres. Paul Vaccarelli of the Loyal Labor Legion is back on the first pages of the metropolitan press again. This time it is because of the inclusion of his name on a telephone list kept by a drug ring raided by federal authorities.

Matty Woll's Pal

Vaccarelli, alias Kelly, is best known in the labor world as the sole owner and proprietor of the Loyal Labor Legion a racket which fetes prominent labor men on Labor Day. Its performance on last Labor Day was held at a Long Island resort, where Mathew Woll, a featured guest, pinned a medal on Edward F. McGrady, of the A. F. of L. as the outstanding labor man of the year.

Vaccarelli also burst into the public prints recently in connection with charges by Maj. F. H. LaGuardia, Republican candidate for mayor of New York in the recent election, that the labor racketeer headed a gang of gunmen who terrorized Italian voters in the Bronx. His latest appearance in print is in connection with the sensational disclosures concerning City Magistrate Albert Vitale, whose connections with the New York underworld and the dope ring in particular are now under closest scrutiny by the federal government, the Bronx grand jury and the Bar Assn.

The Loyal Labor Legion was organized in war time to break strikes on the New York waterfront and assure loyalty to the government. Vaccarelli was later closely associated with Czar Brindell of the Building Trades Council, who rounded out his career in Sing Sing. Then he preyed on his fellow-countrymen, organizing them into municipal service unions, exacting tribute from them in turn for deals with Tammany Hall. One racket was the publication of a magazine for which 18,000 members of New York Laborers Union had to subscribe at \$2 a year.

Notorious Gangster

Vaccarelli was described in the *American Mercury* recently by Herbert Asbury as perhaps New York's outstanding racketeer and gangster and owner, in his heyday, of the "flashiest palace of sin in New York City." He was kicked out of the Longshoremen's Union by T. V. O'Connor then president, but later held a lucrative job in the New York District Council.

The Loyal Labor Legion's only apparent activity is social and is concentrated on the Labor Day affair, at which liquor and oratory are the "pieces de resistance". The culmination of the affair is the award of a medal to the "most outstanding labor man of the year." McGrady was rewarded last Labor Day for his efforts in "smashing the Left wing in the New York Needle trades."

12 Lynchings Known in 1929

NEW YORK-(FP)—Twelve known lynchings were reported for 1929 by the Natl. Assn. for the Advancement of Colored People. Not a single lyncher was punished during the year.

Among those lynched were four whites, including a white woman, Ella May Wiggins, Gastonia union organizer, who was shot to death on a highway in broad daylight.

One of the Negro victims, reported the N. A. A. C. P., was a 72-year-old man, who was brutally beaten, his hands severed, and then thrown into the Sewanee River to drown.

Philadelphia:

Meeting in Philadelphia

Comrade Max Shachtman will speak before the Liberal League Forum of Philadelphia, Pa. on Sunday, January 19, 1930 at 8 p. m. The subject of his talk will be: "The Crisis in the Communist Movement", Philly Class

A study class in the elements of political education has been organized in Philadelphia by the branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition). The class is under the direction of K. M. Whitten. The class is open to members and sympathizers of the Communist League.

The Militant
A Subscription to the Weekly for One Year
L. D. Trotsky
Booklet on the Program of the Comintern

Both: \$2.00

THE MILITANT is making a special offer. A one year subscription (52 issues) to the *Militant* is two dollars. A copy of L. D. Trotsky's brilliant criticism of the draft program of the Communist International (150 pages) is thirty-five cents. Under the terms of the special offer, both the yearly subscription and the booklet can be obtained for only two dollars (\$2.00). The blank is for your convenience. Fill it out, immediately and send it in.

The Militant
25 Third Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

Name

Address

City State

I am enclosing \$2.00 to cover the subscription and the book

KARL LIEBKNECHT

Murdered January 15, 1919 by the German Junkers and their Socialist Allies By **KARL RADEK**

Continued from Page 1

masses of skilled workers more enduring conditions of living, it thereby restrained them from sharp revolutionary struggle. In appearance, socialism became "red-cheeked". The party organizations grew, the trade unions bloomed. Revolutionary resolutions were adopted at branch meetings and the party conventions. But in practice the struggle was carried on only for small improvements in material conditions of the workers, not for the revolutionary overthrow. And since deeds are as decisive in the character of a party as they are in determining the character of a man, the social democracy became a party of reform and not of revolution, no matter how revolutionary were the words it employed.

Imbued with Revolutionary Traditions

Karl Liebknecht, who grew to his youth in the period of this moderation and petrification, who followed political and social events with the greatest concern, even if he had not yet then put his hand actively to politics, was in a way already insured by heredity against this bourgeoisification and mechanization of the revolutionary spirit. In the house of Wilhelm Liebknecht lived the traditions of 1848, the traditions of the revolution and the struggle for the republic.

Ten years ago it had already struck me, when I had the opportunity to become acquainted for the first time with the German party leadership, that Karl Liebknecht was the only one of the "permanent" leaders for whom republicanism was no purely theoretical creed, but a practical burning question. And, secondly, what caught one's eye was the fact of how little petrified he was in the conception that the evolution would be slow, that neither the state nor social relations would be set into motion before long. In this connection, it was for him no question at all of the theoretical weighing of forces, that would soon bring quiet, "peaceful" Europe into rebellion. The situation was not yet revolutionary, it was necessary to go to the masses in order to arouse them. And here another characteristic feature of Liebknecht comes to light. Before the war he was frequently reproached because he was very "broad" in his conceptions, that every form of activity was dear to him, even if it were not of much importance "in principle". The basis of this accusation was formed by the, for Germany, unusual animation of Liebknecht which did not allow him to give up any method of influencing the workers on the ground of some doctrinaire considerations. This also explains his intervention in the movement for withdrawal from the church. He had a good eye for new requirements, for new movements opening a road.

When he entered politics, the first signs of the imperialism that was growing stronger in Germany also, began to be marked, the strides of capital beyond the "fatherland's frontiers" for new sources of profit. The party divined the dangers of war arising from it, but only Liebknecht saw it in real life as the Moloch that stretched out its arm for millions of proletarian youth. That is how he was one of the few who hurried to the threatened youth to summon them against these dangers. The party forbade special anti-militarist agitation. It declared that the education of the proletarian youth must by itself arm them against the militaristic spirit and that the whole struggle of the proletariat against capitalism was at the same time a struggle against militarism. But Liebknecht felt the falseness of these objections "in principle". He saw that the "education" of the proletarian youth alone did not suffice, but that the youth must be stirred up specifically against militarism. He knew very well that militarism could only be smashed together with capitalism by the proletarian revolution, but he understood how important it is for the revolution to make it clear to the young proletarians forced into a uniform that their liberation from militarism could only be part of the general political struggle for freedom. The party leaders shook their heads over the special actions of this "hot-head" but the young Liebknecht stuck tenaciously to his cause. His revolutionary feelings drove him to it inexorably.

The consciousness of the threatening international danger fortified the inherited feelings of internationalism in Liebknecht. He was one of the few in Germany who

had the most ardent desire to know how things stood in the brother parties, not only in France and Russia but in any small Balkan party.

His trips to America and France, his close relations with the Russian comrades sprang from the consciousness of how immeasurably important it is to keep up international relations. And how thoroughly, how tirelessly he had himself enlightened on the complicated Russian questions during the trip to the International Congress in Copenhagen we made together with Leon Trotsky from Berlin: We know that for Liebknecht the International is no formal alliance of various parties, but it is his real fatherland as the principles of the Spartakusbund later said. The most precious political qualities of Liebknecht, even before the war, had to make him unpopular among a section of the leaders, while they created popularity for him in the working masses and in the International. He sprang too far beyond the limits of the German party not to be accused by the small minds of being ambitious. To this are still added his human qualities by which he also diverged from the prescribed type of a worthy party leader. He loved life; unrestrained and unconcerned, he clutched at it wherever it called. There was so little philistinism in this youthful Absalom, so little hypocrisy, so much of the childish joy of life, that because of them many overlooked the deep seriousness, the mildness and graciousness of his nature. I will never forget how we once came to Peer Gynt in a conversation during a walk. He knew the drama in the translation by Passarge and I told him of the gracefulness of Morgenstern's translation. He came to me and for three hours—it was already long past midnight—read Morgenstern's translation. When he came to the scene in which Peer Gynt hears the song he did not sing, the tears he did not weep, the battle he did not fight, lament in the rustling of the leaves, lament a life that was not whole, the features in Liebknecht's face tightened and he said: "That confounded half time, and in spite of it we can, and must lead a full life." Thus he was before the war, a fiery agitator, an energetic politician, a hothead, animated and jovial, a favorite of the women, a man good—as the Poles say—for fighting and drinking. In every gesture he was the son of his father, of the great leader of the people, of the great, lively man who could laugh like a child.

There came the war and its fire forged out of all these elements of the Liebknecht temperament the hero of the German working class.

The Imperialist War Comes

The war came. With the first reports the rumor reached the outside that Liebknecht together with Rosa Luxemburg, had been shot. The report over-anticipated the reality, but it showed that outside of Germany friend and foe knew from whom the struggle against the powers of war might be expected. Liebknecht was stirred by these precipitate events. On the threshold of the heroic period of his life he paid his last obligation to the party whose revolutionary power was his vanishing dream. The belief that August 4 would remain only a dismal episode caused him to maintain discipline and to abandon an open protest against the war on August 4. After a few days he saw that he had committed a great mistake. He drew closer to Rosa Luxemburg, whose strictly laid-down theoretical line was foreign to his broad, questing nature and there arose between them, in spite of all differences in their natures, a life and death alliance.

In the first weeks of the war, they seek to go to the working masses; the government prohibits public meetings. Liebknecht is determined to raise the banner of rebellion at the second voting of credits. He endeavors to arrive at a concerted action by the fourteen deputies who voted against the granting of war credits in the Reichstag fraction. They refuse. Liebknecht, whom the cravens later accused of acting only out of conceit so as to shine as the only one, fought to the last moment in order to draw with him, out of the troop of hesitant colleagues, at least two, or even one, into the path of the joint struggle. It was miserable to see how, although he employed every means of intellectual and moral suasion, he was nevertheless unable to shake a single one in a fraction of over

a hundred men, to make it clear to one of them that it was necessary to break with all putrid compromises. It showed how much, in the final analysis, the collapse of leadership was a moral problem. Liebknecht remained alone. His features hardened, a bitter line was drawn around his lips. He determined to proceed by himself, despite the dissuasions of his friends. In that hour I saw how the last doubt vanished in Liebknecht, the last softness, how the great moral power was released that did not depart from him until death: the iron determination to open the road of the reawakening of socialism even if it were necessary to parry every spear with his own breast.

Workers Stand By Liebknecht

The struggle for the mud-trampled banner of socialism was taken up entirely in the open. The entire press sought to suppress Liebknecht, in part by calumny, in part by making a bagatelle of his deed. He was to be terrorized by threats and by the suggestion that his sacrifice was futile. Yet thousands stood up for him. The declaration on his motive for his separate vote was copied and mimeographed by thousands of workers; it passed from hand to hand, aroused a feeling of responsibility and united men and women in struggle. Liebknecht became the storm center of the decisive opposition. Towards the end of December, 1914, when I arrived in Switzerland, it became clear to me to the full extent how fruitfully his deed had taken effect internationally. It was the first sign visible from afar that there were revolutionary forces in Germany. Lenin, that man devoid of all phrase, who probably measured most deeply the collapse of the International immediately understood that the decision to raise the banner of rebellion against the whole fraction was a decision that gave the signal for imperishable deeds. Liebknecht's name became one of the best beloved in the growing vanguard of the Russian proletariat, and it was no different in France, in Italy. In his *Le Feu*, Barbusse erected a monument to him as the only German, who illuminated the last point of French socialism like a star in the dark night. In October 1915, when the dispersed parts of the militant remnants of the old international gathered in Zimmerwald, and Ledebour, answering attacks from the Left, declared in the name of his partisans (later the Independents) that there was no Liebknecht fraction, Trotsky shouted out to him, amid the lively acclaim of the French and Italians: "For us there is only the fraction of Liebknecht."

When the report arrived of his arrest on Potsdamerplatz, many friends outside of Germany asked why one in his exposed position participated in the demonstration. Many saw in it a sign of a great internal agitation that must be capable of dominating a leader. What drove him to the streets was however, also consciousness of duty. Confidence in the social democratic phrase had, thanks to the betrayal of the social democracy, sunk so low that whoever wanted to form a new revolutionary power could not limit himself to intellectual general staff service behind the battle-front. Liebknecht's "recklessness" was profound wisdom and his prison martyrdom did more for the revolution than all the "cautious" endeavors of a whole party could do. The nucleus of Karl Liebknecht became a center of a radiating moral power that no measures of isolation could dam. The "I dare it!" reverberated throughout the world, stirring up imitation.

The Russian revolution broke out, the first army of imperialism mutilated, the first army of socialism began to be formed. As we sat in Brest-Litovsk around the conference table with Count Mirbach and General Hoffmann, we spoke over their heads to the prison convict and his people. The German proletariat responded to our call. The January strike broke out. None of us assumed that this was the victory, that German imperialism would yield, and in spite of it Trotsky rejected every compromise. It was necessary, despite the greatest danger, to show the German proletariat that we had confidence in it. It was necessary to show the world proletariat that German imperialism might smash us but that we make no voluntary compromises with it. Later, when we were nevertheless compelled to conclude the peace, to take the cross of Brest upon us and to retreat, we often asked ourselves uneasily: Do Liebknecht and his comrades understand our position and tactics? And Liebknecht

told me later of the torments he suffered in prison when he thought that all our sacrifices might be futile, that the German working class might not rebel in time so as to unite with us. He feared that we would go too far with our concessions, and summoned his friends from prison to act so that we would be spared the last bitter ter cup.

Fearful of the impending revolution, he was released by the government of German imperialism, which stood on the brink of bankruptcy. His first steps were to the Russian embassy. On the night of his release Bucharin let us know by telegraph that Liebknecht was in full accord with us. The joy of the Russian workers at Liebknecht's liberation cannot be expressed. Could he have come to us at that time no king was ever welcomed as Liebknecht would have been welcomed by the Russian workers.

When I came to Germany towards the end of December and could press his hands again after four years, he said calmly, without the slightest disappointment: "We are only at the beginning, the road is still long." And we agreed with Rosa Luxemburg and him that the distance to the end could only be shortened by tireless agitation, propaganda and action. Whoever saw how both of them worked from early morning to late at night, how resolutely they cut the last ties that still bound them to the world of half-heartedness by founding the Communist Party of Germany, whoever was there to see how they warned their own supporters against exaggerations in the midst of the revolutionary ecstasy, could grasp their profound confidence in the Communist movement of Germany.

Fallen in Battle

Liebknecht was not alive to see the new times. The first wave of the proletarian revolution bore him further than he wanted, tore him with it. In the storm he did not see the distance far enough. When the January uprising was suppressed and the social-patriotic government pursued him, no one dared urge upon him the thought of flight, even though it was clear that his imprisonment contained the danger of death. He wanted to fling himself against the pogrom incitement. On the day the assassin's bullet struck him, he brought up the idea of calling public meetings for the next few days. Then he fell into the hands of the executioners who wanted to strike in him and Rosa Luxemburg the German, the International revolution. He fell in the first phase of the struggle, full of confidence and the consciousness of victory. He fell as he lived; captured at the battle position. And we, who knew him intimately with his merits and weaknesses, we who understand the immeasurable loss the revolution suffered when this iron warrior was torn from its ranks, we say at his grave: "For us he will be a model of loyalty to socialism, of devotion and courage without which the revolution cannot triumph."

Liebknecht was not only inspired by a deep insight into the objective necessity of Communism but the still deeper personal yearning for the completely harmonious life that is possible only on the basis of Communism, and this yearning sprang from an infinite love and kindness a sympathy for every suffering creature, a readiness to give assistance without which socialism is a delusion. The world knows only Liebknecht the heroic warrior. Broad sections of proletarians, who applied to him as an attorney, received humane assistance from him, loved him as a man. Liebknecht's courage was the union of his love for every man and his discernment that in the period we live in, individual suffering cannot be helped without beginning the life and death struggle for socialism. He fell in the raging struggle. And thousands will follow him to the martyr's death until naked, hungering, wound-bedecked humanity will have the leisure to remember its martyrs with love. Soldier of the Revolution his father called himself. To Karl Liebknecht fell the honor of earning this title with death in the struggle. The Soviet republic has created the insignia of the "Red Star" for its most valiant son. Lay it on Liebknecht's grave, and may all of our friends know no greater honor than, through the achievement of this insignia, to approach the spirit of Karl Liebknecht who went the road that we want to tread to the end, even should each of us win the Red Star only at the bier. Berlin, January 18, 1919.

The Defense of the Soviet Union and the Opposition

Continued from Last Issue

By L. D. Trotsky

Not Centrism in General, but a Certain Kind of Centrism

The article in the organ of the Leninbund, analyzed by us, endeavors to attack our standpoint from another side. "While Centrism," the author objects, "is a current and a tendency inside the working class it differs only in degree from the other current and tendency in the working class reformism. Both serve, even if differently, the class enemy." (*Fahne des Kommunismus*, No. 31, page 246.)

This sounds very convincing. In reality, however, the Marxist truth has been transformed here into an abstraction, and consequently, into a falsehood. It is not enough to say that Centrism in general or reformism in general constitute currents with the working class. One must investigate what functions are fulfilled by a certain Centrism in a certain working class in a certain country and at a certain epoch. Truth is always concrete.

In Russia, Centrism is in power. In England, it is reformism that now governs. Both of them—Urbahns teaches us—are currents within the working class that differ only in degree (graduell); both serve, even if differently, the class enemy. Very well, let us take note of that. What tactic follows from this, for example, in case of war? Must the Communists in Russia be defeatists like the Communists in England? Or should they be partisans of national defense in both countries, not unconditionally, to be sure but with certain reservations? Defeatism and defense of the fatherland are lines of class policy and cannot be influenced by "secondary differences" between Russian Centrism and English reformism. But here, perhaps, a number of things will occur to comrade Urbahns himself and alarm him... In England, the factories, railroads, the land belong to the exploiters; the State owns colonies, that is, it is a slave-holding state; the reformists therefore consequently defend the existing bourgeois state—defend it not very skilfully nor very cleverly; the bourgeoisie regards them half distrustfully, half contemptuously keeps them under a jealous surveillance, hoots at them and is ready to run them off at any moment. But at any rate the English reformists who are in power defend the domestic and foreign interests of capital. The same holds true of course, for the German social democracy.

Now, what does Centrism in the Soviet Union defend? It defends a social order produced by the political and economic expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It defends it very badly, very unskilfully, arousing distrust and disappointment in the proletariat (which does not, unfortunately, possess the experience of the British bourgeoisie), weakens the dictatorship, helps the forces of Thermidor, but as a result of the objective situation, Stalinist Centrism nevertheless represents a proletarian and not imperialist regime. That is not, comrade Urbahns, a difference of "degree", it is a difference between two class orders. They are the two sides of the historical barricade. Whoever loses sight of this fundamental difference is lost to the revolution.

«A Kerenskyism Upside Down»

Then what is the meaning, Urbahns replies, to your own words, according to which the Stalin period is a Kerensky period upside down? Improbable as it may seem, it is nevertheless precisely out of this formula that Urbahns endeavors to draw the conclusion that the Thermidor is already an accomplished fact. In reality, it is precisely the contrary that flows quite clearly from my formula. The Kerensky period was a form of bourgeois domination in the period of the impending proletarian revolution. It was a vacillating, irresolute, uncertain form of domination, but domination of the bourgeoisie nevertheless. For the proletariat to attain power, neither more nor less than armed insurrection, than the October revolution, was required.

If Stalinism is a Kerenskyism upside down, it means that ruling Centrism, on the road to Thermidor, constitutes the last form of the domination of the proletariat weakened by internal and external contradictions, by mistakes of its leadership, by lack of its own activity. But it is nevertheless a form of proletarian domination. The centrists can be replaced only by the Bolsheviks or Thermidorians. Is any other interpretation possible?

Still I recall that one is conceivable. From my formula: "a Kerensky period upside down", the Stalinists drew the conclusion that the Opposition is preparing an armed insurrection against domination of the Centrists, just as, in days gone by, we prepared the uprising against the Kerensky. But this is an obvious knavish interpretation, not dictated by Marxism but by the needs of the G. P. U., and it has not the faintest connection with criticism. Precisely because Centrism is a Kerensky period upside down, it is the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat that needs an armed uprising for the seizure of power. Precisely because the Thermidor is not yet accomplished, the proletariat can still realize its tasks by deep-going internal reforms in the Soviet state, in the trade unions and above all in the party.

Proletarian or Bourgeois State?

It must be acknowledged that in the article on Thermidor examined by us a half-step backward is made. But this does not improve matters much. Is Soviet Russia a bourgeois state? The article answers: no. "Have we still a proletarian dictatorship in Russia?" The article again answers: no. Then what have we? A classless state? A government above classes? To this, the article replies: In Russia we have a government which "apparently mediates between the classes, but in reality represents the interests of the economically stronger class." (No. 32, page 246. My emphasis (L.T.) Without saying directly which class it considers the "stronger" the article nevertheless leaves no doubt that it refers to the bourgeoisie. But a government that apparently mediates between the classes and in reality embodies the interests of the bourgeoisie, is a bourgeois government. Instead of declaring this openly, the author has recourse to circumlocutions which do not bespeak intellectual frankness. There are no governments standing above the classes. With regard to the proletarian revolution, Thermidor marks the passage of power from the hands of the proletariat to the hands of the bourgeoisie. It can signify nothing else. If Thermidor is accomplished then Russia is a bourgeois state.

Is it true, however, that the bourgeoisie is the "economically stronger class" in the Soviet Republic? No, that is a plain absurdity. The author of the article evidently does not consider that in making this contention, he burles, not Stalin, but the October revolution. If the bourgeoisie is already economically stronger than the proletariat, if the relation of forces shifts in its favor "with gigantic strides" (mit riesenschritten), as the article contends, then it is absurd to speak of the maintenance of the proletarian dictatorship, even if it has lasted as a survival up to this day. Fortunately, however, the presentation of the Soviet bourgeoisie as the economically stronger class is nothing but a phantom.

Urbahns will reply to us that the article refers not only to the Russian but to the international bourgeoisie. That does not improve the matter at all. The international bourgeoisie is economically incomparably stronger than the Soviet state—that is incontestable. That is why the theory of socialism in one country is a vulgar, national-reformist utopia. But we pose the question quite differently. The role of the world proletariat in production and politics constitutes one of the most important factors in the relation of forces. The struggle develops on a world scale and it is in this struggle that the fate of the October Revolution is decided. Do the ultra-Leftists think this struggle is hopeless? Let them say so! The extent to which the relation of forces in the world will change depends, to a certain degree, upon us also. By declaring, openly or covertly, that present-day Soviet Russia is a bourgeois state, and refusing, entirely or three-quarters, to support it against world imperialism, the ultra-Leftists bring grist to the mill of the bourgeoisie.

What distinguishes the Soviet Republic of Stalin from that of Lenin is neither a bourgeois power nor a power above classes but the elements of dual power. The analysis of the situation was long ago presented by the Russian Opposition. By its policy, the Centrist power has given tremendous aid to the bourgeoisie to define itself and create the unofficial levers of

its power, its channels of influence. But as in every serious class struggle, the dispute is over the ownership of the means of production. Has this problem already been settled in favor of the bourgeoisie? To make such contentions, one must either have lost his head entirely or never have had one. The ultra-Leftists simply "abstract" the social-economic content of the revolution. They are absorbed with the shell and ignore the kernel. Of course, if the shell is damaged, and it is, the kernel is also threatened. The whole activity of the Opposition is imbued with this idea. But between this and closing one's eyes to the social-economic kernel of the Soviet republic, there is a deep abyss. The most important means of production that were conquered by the proletariat on November 7, 1917, still remain in the hands of the workers' state. Ultra-Leftists, this must not be forgotten!

What Would the Policy Have to Be if Thermidor Were Now Accomplished?

If Thermidor is accomplished, if the bourgeoisie is already the "economically stronger class", it means that economic development has finally been switched from the socialist to the capitalist rails. But then one must have the courage to draw the corresponding tactical conclusions.

What significance can restrictive laws against land leasing, hiring of labor, etc., have if economic development in its entirety is on the path of capitalism? These restrictions are only a petty bourgeois, reactionary utopia, an absurd hindrance to the development of productive forces. A Marxist must call things by their name and recognize the necessity of an abolition of reactionary restrictions.

What significance has the monopoly of foreign trade from the viewpoint of capitalist development? A purely reactionary one. It hampers the free influx of goods and capital and prevents Russia from becoming a part of the system of blood circulation of world economy. A Marxist must recognize the necessity of abolishing the monopoly of foreign trade.

The same can be said of the method of planned economy in general. They have the right of existence only from the standpoint of a socialist perspective.

The Russian Opposition, however, demanded and still demands more systematic restrictive measures against capitalist enrichment; it wants the maintenance and strengthening of the foreign trade monopoly and the greatest possible development of planned economy. This economic platform has a sense only in connection with the struggle against the degeneration of the party and other organizations of the proletariat. But it is enough to assume that Thermidor is accomplished for the very bases of the Opposition to become nonsense. Urbahns is silent on all this. He does not reckon for a moment with the interdependence of the essential elements of the problem. But for that he consoles himself and others by declaring that he is not in "one hundred percent" agreement with the Russian Opposition. A poor consolation!

For Proletarian or for Bourgeois Democracy?

If Urbahns and his partisans do not draw all the conclusions from the "accomplished" Thermidor, they do draw some of them. We have already read above that they believe the Russian proletariat must reconquer "all liberties". But here also, the ultra-Leftists stop irresolutely before the threshold. They do not explain what liberties are involved and in general, they touch upon the theme only in passing. Why?

In the struggle against Stalinist bureaucratism which reflects and facilitates the pressure of the enemy classes, the Russian Opposition demands democracy in the party, trade unions and the Soviets on a proletarian basis. It mercilessly exposes the execrable falsification of democracy which, under the name of "self-criticism", corrodes and decays the very bases of the revolutionary consciousness of the proletarian vanguard. But for the Opposition, the struggle for party democracy has a meaning only on the basis of a recognition of the proletarian dictatorship. It would be Don Quixoterie, not to say idiocy, to

fight for democracy in a party that is realizing the power of an enemy class. In such a case, one could speak not of a class democracy in the party and the Soviets, but of "general" (that is, bourgeois) democracy in the country—against the ruling party and its dictatorship. The Mensheviks have repeatedly accused the Opposition of "not going far enough", because it does not demand democracy in the country. But the Mensheviks and we stand on different sides of the barricade, and at the present time—in view of the Thermidorian danger—more irreconcilable and hostile than ever. We are fighting for proletarian democracy in order to protect the land of the October revolution from the "liberties" of bourgeois democracy, that is, from capitalism.

It is only from this point of view that the question of the secret ballot should be considered. This demand of the Russian Opposition has as its aim to give the proletarian nucleus the possibility of gaining prevalence first in the party and then in the trade unions, so as, with the aid of these two levers to insure its class position in the Soviets. Comrade Urbahns and a few of his closest partisans, however, sought to interpret the demand of the Opposition, which remains entirely within the framework of the dictatorship regime, as a general democratic slogan. A monstrous error! These two positions have nothing in common with each other and are mortally counter-posed.

Speaking indefinitely of "liberties" in general, Urbahns called one of these liberties by name, and it was freedom of organization. In the opinion of the ultra-Left, the Soviet proletariat must win "freedom of organization". It is incontestable that Stalinist bureaucratism holds the trade unions by the throat, now—with the zig-zag to the Left—more firmly than ever. That the trade union organizations must have the possibility to defend the interests of the workers against the growing adulterations of the regime of the dictatorship, this the Opposition long ago declared both in words and deeds. But one must take into exact account the aims and methods of struggle against the Centrist bureaucracy. It is not a question here of conquering the "freedom of organization" against a hostile class state, but of the struggle for such a regime under which the trade unions—inside the framework of the dictatorship—will enjoy the necessary freedom to improve in words and deeds, their own state. In other words, it is a matter of the "liberty" enjoyed for example, by the powerful alliances of industrialists and agrarians in their capitalist state, upon which they exert pressure with all means, and, as is known, not without success; but it is not at all a matter of "liberty" that the proletarian organizations have or strive to get in the bourgeois state. That is far from the same thing!

Freedom of organization signifies the "freedom" (we know which) to carry on the class struggle in a society whose economy is founded upon capitalist anarchy, while its politics are squeezed into the framework of so-called democracy. Socialism, on the other hand, is not only inconceivable without a planned economy in the narrow sense of the word but also without the systemizing of all social relations. One of the most important elements of socialist economy is the regulation of wages, and in general, the relations of the worker to production and the state. The role that must be played by the trade unions in this regulation we have pointed out above. But this role has nothing in common with the role of the trade unions in the bourgeois states, where the "freedom of organization" is not only a reflection but also an active element of capitalist anarchy. It is enough to recall the economic role of the strike of the English coal miners in 1926. It is not for nothing that the capitalists, together with the reformists, are now carrying on a desperate and hopeless struggle for industrial peace.

To Be continued



DETROIT-(FP)—Two women charged with accosting in the court of Judge Frank Murphy laid their condition to unemployment. One was the mother of four children; the only way in which she could get food and clothing for the little ones was to sell her body. The other was an unemployed waitress.

Throughout the World of Labor

The Split Danger in the French C. G. T. U.

The battle that took place at the last congress of the C. G. T. U.* involved an inevitable sequel. Only a few weeks have passed and already it is clear what it must end in. In the Parisian trade unions, the struggle between the *minoritaires* and *majoritaires* is intense, the latter contesting the most certain votes, demanding extraordinary conventions, and when they are defeated, sounding the call for factions—but without much success. The turmoil is complete and the restlessness lively. The struggle is taking place between the most active and earnest elements; most frequently it passes above the masses of trade unionists who stay at home discouraged. What will happen in January when union cards are renewed? How many will remain members of the C. G. T. U.?

The splits is in the air. At first it was merely talked about. Now it is beginning to enter into reality. A few isolated cases. But that is how things begin. One has never seen trade union splitters saying frankly that they want the split—except for a few ultra-Leftists who understand nothing of the trade union movement and imagine that it is easy to create new trade unions and even a new confederation. The tactic of the *majoritaires* is everywhere the same: it consists primarily in maneuvering adroitly so as to throw the responsibility for the split back upon the *minoritaires*. French experience is quite recent and it must look back upon it at the moment when history seems compelled to begin all over again.

Jouhaux never declared openly that the split was necessary and that he was going to carry it out. Quite the contrary. He did not cease repeating that it was Moscow that wanted it, even when he capped his maneuver by having the first expulsions executed. He did not precipitate the operation until the minority became so strong that the normal course of trade union democracy would have sufficed to drive him from leadership.

He had no lack of advisors—strange to the trade union movement—to push him onto the road of split. They even found that he was delaying too long and sermonized him publicly, asking whether he would foolishly allow the leadership to be taken away from him.

The leaders of the C. G. T. U. are in a similar position. Even though the votes of the confederal congress appear to leave them a wide margin and consequently permit them to wait not to press events needlessly they know well enough that this position is insecure and may change very rapidly. In the present organization, they no longer have a solid basis. They know that there are still many "panic-mongers" among those who voted for them at the congress and that as a result they run the risk of seeing their majority give away abruptly. The trade unions are not the party—something they have completely forgotten—and a leadership that practises a supposedly revolutionary gymnastic which is only incoherence, stupidity and incompetence, cannot be imposed from above for long, for each trade unionist measures the consequences of it. A Communist nucleus can be a fiction and exist only on paper—there are more than one of them—but in a trade union there must be members, and when it is deprived of them, it is not easy to rebuild it.

Besides, the Confederation leaders have seen what happened in Czecho-Slovakia not so long ago, where, all of a sudden, the minority found itself the majority and turned the leadership out of doors.

Also, events are proceeding with an accelerated rhythm. Where three years were necessarily in Jouhaux's time, not even three months are needed now. The Confederal congress was held the middle of September. At the beginning of December, the decisive move is already begun. There are sharp conflicts, actual splits. At Tour-

*Confederation Generale du Travail, the Left Wing trade union federation under leadership and control of the Communist Party, against whose mechanical, arbitrary and erroneous policies a growing minority has rebelled—Ed.

coing, two unions are cut off from their federations which have established new organizations against them. It is around them that the struggle will be concentrated.

From the day after the confederal congress, we pointed out the intention of the confederal leadership to split. Comrades reproached us for it. They did not believe it themselves and told us: "Why speak so soon about a split?" Experience shows how difficult it is to defend oneself in such a case and how the majority triumphs precisely because it alone knows well what it wants, because it takes the offensive and systematically conducts the fight to attain its aim. By constant provocation it seeks to drive the *minoritaires* into blind alleys, it pushes them to commit mistakes which it thereupon does not fail to exploit to the full.

The defence against the trade union directing center's intention to split demands above all an exact policy which alone makes it possible to pursue the battle as a whole. It is possible that for some trade unions life is possible, for a time, only in autonomy. The minority must be able to judge. It must be able to decide the necessary retreats, to give up, for example, trade union leadership, when the forces are substantially equal and there are always a thousand ways to contest a vote, rather than to sanction a partial split. We know what weight the position of the railwaymen had at the time of the time of the first split; the break among them was made precisely under these conditions. But all this is impossible unless the minority is given a solid basis at the outset.

We are convinced that the minority has weakened itself by the position it has taken; it has shown itself primarily anxious about numbers, as was demonstrated by its publicly affirmed solidarity with the "six" municipal councillors of Paris*, a strange political action on the part of men who make use of the name of revolutionary syndicalism. But whatever may be the mistakes committed by the minority and those it will be led to commit tomorrow it would none the less hold true that the responsibility for the split would devolve entirely upon the confederal leadership and that it would be the result of the incoherent and pernicious policy of the last few years. That there should be "Right wingers" in a trade union organization, even of the type of the C. G. T. U., is inevitable; a trade union is not the party and even the Communist parties find it hard enough to eliminate their Right wingers. The right policy for the C. G. T. U. consists precisely in educating and winning progressively the timorous and too-prudent elements, and to increase constantly the number of trade unionists fully conscious of the revolutionary task they must accomplish. Its present leaders have believed that they can lead the trade unions as they lead the party. The resistance did not take long in making itself felt, and in order to save themselves, they now want to break up the C. G. T. U. But that is what they must be prevented from doing.

—A. ROSMER.

Paris, December 13, 1929.

New Turn in German Trade Union Tactics

The convention of the revolutionary trade union opposition met in Berlin on November 30 and December 1.

This convention, which the German Communist Party prepared for many months, had at the beginning, a very specific aim. It was that of creating in Germany a sort of minority movement in the trade unions, of reuniting into a red bloc the opposition existing in the various organizations and thus to establish the first conditions for the creation of new trade unions in Germany.

But in the course of the preparations

*Leaders of the French Right wing, led by Louis Sellier, who recently quit the Communist Party and ranks of Communism.—Ed.

for the convention, a series of experiences showed the German C. P. the contrast that existed between its theses on "the radicalization of the masses" and the reality.

A series of strikes led by the party and the revolutionary trade union opposition remained isolated and were concluded with heavy defeats. The hope of arousing a chain of solidarity strikes by simply starting strikes at certain points, collapsed lamentably, and had to collapse because—without even considering all the tactical errors committed—the radicalization had not attained, in the German proletariat, the degree that presupposes the leadership of the party.

The leadership was incapable of drawing this lesson from the experiences of recent months but it nevertheless had to recognize that experiences such as that of the pipe-layers do not strengthen the influence of the party on the masses, but on the contrary reduce this influence substantially. It should then have had to adopt a different policy at the convention of the revolutionary trade union opposition, which ought to be the beginning of the elimination of new organizations; but the leadership maintained its estimate of the situation and its false evaluation of the processes of regroupment in the masses; in this way it only increased the prevailing confusion.

There were 1122 delegates at the convention, of whom 27 were from enterprises employing from three to ten thousand workers, and 25 delegates from big factories of more than ten thousand workers. But the great majority of the delegates had not been elected by genuine workers' meetings but merely chosen in small meetings of the opposition where, in most of the instances, only a fraction of the workers in the factory were present. It is therefore a great exaggeration to say that these delegates represented two million workers.

Nevertheless, the convention although entirely dominated by the party, could have marked the beginning of a broad front of proletarian defense against the serious offensive of capital, on the condition that the situation were correctly estimated. The principal report was made by the famous trade union strategist, Merker, member of the Central Committee of the C. P. G. He duly outlined the progress of rationalization, the brutal offensive of the bosses but he had nothing to say of "the revolutionary wave", of the powerful proletarian counter-offensive, of the "storming battles" of the working class that the Wedding Congress of the Party still announced in June. The delegates had still less to say about it. Their speeches indicated a profound fury against the reformists, the terrible consequences of the brutal employers' dictatorship, they showed everything save the impetuous drive of the masses of which the leadership of the party speaks daily.

The attitude of the English delegate representing the Red International of Labor Unions who, at the beginning of the congress was not yet acquainted with the tactical reversal, proved very well how surprising was the sharp turn and consequently, how disconcerting; the new zig-zag of the Executive Committee of the Communist International came so brusquely as to thwart the plans of Losovsky who had first intended to come to the convention himself. Under these conditions, the turn that has just been acknowledged was not a renunciation of the false tactic of the C. I. and of the C. C. of the German Party. Added to the wrong estimate of the situation, which is not abandoned, pinned on a system of erroneous methods that prevent the mobilization of the masses, this reversal leaves the door open to any kind of an interpretation and to all adventurist and opportunist digressions.

Berlin, December, 1929

—KURT LANDAU

IN THE NEXT ISSUE
 ROSA LUXEMBURG

The 11th Congress of the British Communist Party

The British Communist Party held its XI Congress at Leeds. One might think that the debate would be rather animated, in view of the incidents that preceded its convocation. But there was nothing of the sort. It is true that the most important things took place behind the scenes and that the public part of the congress was very limited. The Right was of course denounced, but the Right wingers were not named. It is a peculiarity of the English party. The Right is always spoken of there as an abstraction; no one knows or rather no one wishes to say who represents it.

The chiefs of the party, who did not have a brilliant accounting to present, recognized their mistakes and delivered speeches in conformity with the orthodoxy of the day. Pollitt, who remains national enough, did not announce that England is at present before an immediately revolutionary situation; after having discoursed on the first, the second and the third period, he finished his speech as follows: "If we are asked whether this country must follow the example of Russia, we will reply without hesitation: Yes! It is only by the social revolution and armed insurrection that the workers can secure power."

The little palace revolutions that had agitated the summits of the party for the last few months were terminated by the return of Gallacher to the political bureau where he will again find Campbell, Horner, Pollitt, Bell and Cox who had kicked him out.

It is not, of course, the kind of a congress that could give the party a new spirit, and it is very significant to note that in a situation as favorable as the present—as a result of the general discontent provoked among the workers by the policy of the Laborite government—it does not succeed in growing. Even the bourgeois journals are not sparing in their rallery towards the British party and even the Communist International. One of them under the title "A Starving Credo", writes:

"Three years ago the British Communist Party boasted of having more than 10,000 members. It no longer has even a quarter of them today, and what remains is rent by internal dissension, personal and political. The final disaster, over which there was so much lament at Leeds, coincided with the new policy imposed by Moscow . . . It is really true that the Communist International stopped discoursing and discussing on the decline of capitalism and took note of the fact that what is really declining in the world is Communism.

These journals are burying Communism too soon. But it is certain that the incoherent policy of the Communist International has been disastrous to it. Now it discovers that what is needed is a daily paper. When one knows what an enormous enterprise a daily paper is here, the huge sums it requires, one is stupefied by this new folly. What is needed to bring the party out of its atrophy, is a deepgoing examination of the situation and the policy followed since 1925. But such an examination would show that if the British Communists have made mistakes, the ones principally responsible are not they but the leaders of the Communist International, and naturally this will not be done.

At a by-election held in Scotland, the Communists presented a candidate, Isobel Brown, who received 1,448 votes, the elected Laborite having 18,465 and the conservative 13,270. The figure of the Communist vote is relatively respectable if one considers that it was the first time the Communists faced the struggle in this district. However, it should be remembered that Scotland is now the "reddest" part of the United Kingdom and that in the other districts the Communist candidates in the general elections received far from similar votes. Nevertheless, the deposit of 150 pounds sterling (about \$730.00) was lost, the number of Communist voters being less than one-eighth of the votes cast. The new electoral tactic, which should be studied as a whole, thus remains pretty expensive.

—S. B.

London, December 10, 1929.

The Austrian Crisis and Communism

Continued from Last Issue

Fascism is the second proxy of the bourgeoisie. Like the social democracy, and on an even greater scale, fascism has its own army, its interests and its logic of movement. We know that in Italy, fascism in order to save and strengthen bourgeois society, was compelled to be violently antagonistic not only to the social democracy but also to the traditional parties of the bourgeoisie. The same can be observed in Poland too. It should not be imagined that all the political organs of the bourgeoisie act in perfect harmony. Fortunately, it is not so. Economic anarchy is supplemented by political anarchy. Fascism, fed by the social democracy, is compelled to split the latter's skull in order to get to power. The Austrian social democracy does all it can to facilitate this surgical operation for fascism.

It is hard to imagine more concentrated nonsense than the reasoning of Otto Bauer which consists in saying that violence is admissible only for the defense of existing democracy. If this reasoning is translated into the language of the classes, it means: Violence is permitted to guarantee the interests of the bourgeoisie organized as a state, but it is inadmissible for the establishment of a proletarian state.

Bauer's Juridical Formula

A juridical formula is appended to this theory. Bauer chews over again the old formulae of Lassalle on law and revolution. But Lassalle spoke before a court. There his arguments were in place. The attempt to transform a juridical duel with the state attorney into a philosophy of historical evolution is nothing but the subterfuge of cowardice. According to Bauer, the application of violence is permissible only as a reply to an already accomplished coup d'Etat, when the foundations of "law" have already disappeared, but it is inadmissible twenty-four hours before, when it is a matter of preventing the coup. Along this conception, Bauer traces the line of demarcation between Austro-Marxism and Bolshevism as if it were a question of two schools of criminal law. In reality, the difference lies in the fact that Bolshevism strives to overthrow the domination of the bourgeoisie while social democracy strives to eternalize it. There can be no doubt that if a coup d'Etat were carried through, Bauer would declare: If we did not call upon the workers, when we had powerful organizations, a legal press, forty-three percent of the deputies, the Vienna municipality, to rise against the fascists who formed anti-constitutional bands attacking law and order, then at the present time, when the fascists have the state apparatus and base themselves upon a new law created by them, when we are deprived of everything, made outlaws, when we have no legal connections with the masses who are, moreover, manifestly disillusioned, oppressed and are passing over to fascism in increasing numbers—the proposal for an armed insurrection at the present time under such circumstances could be made only by adventurists or Bolsheviks. By turning their philosophy around 180 degrees in this manner, the Austro-Marxists remain entirely true to themselves.

The slogan of domestic disarmament surpasses by its reactionary baseness everything that we have heard up to now about the social democracy. These gentlemen beg the workers to disarm in face of the armed bourgeois state. The fascist bands are after all only auxiliary detachments of the bourgeoisie; dissolved today; they can be called to life again at any moment and armed twice as strongly as at present. As for the workers, no one will give them arms if the social democracy disarms them with the hands of the bourgeois state. The social democracy naturally fears the arms of the fascists. But far more does it fear the arms in the hands of the workers. Today, the bourgeoisie is still afraid of a civil war: first, because it is not yet certain how it will turn out, and second, because it wants no economic convulsions. The disarmament of the workers insures the bourgeoisie against civil war and consequently raises the chances of a fascist coup d'Etat to the maximum.

The demands for the domestic disarmament of Austria is a demand of the Entente countries, of France in the first place, and England in the second. The semi-official French journal, *Le Temps*, explains severely to Schober that domestic disarmament is necessary in the interests of external peace as well as in the interests of private property. In his speech in

By L. D. Trotsky

the House of Commons, Henderson developed the same theme. In defending the Austrian democracy, Henderson defended the treaties of Versailles and Saint-Germain. Here, as in important questions generally, the Austrian social democracy is only the transmitting apparatus of the bourgeoisie of the victorious countries.

The social democracy is incapable of taking power and it does not want to take it. The bourgeoisie finds, however, that the disciplined organization of the workers by the social democracy, involves it in too much of an expense. The bourgeoisie as a whole needs fascism to hold the social democracy in check, and when necessary, to throw it on the scrap heap. Fascism wants to take power and is capable of seizing it. As soon as it seizes power, it will put it completely at the disposal of finance capital. But that is the road of social convulsions; it also involves a great expense. That is what explains the hesitations of the bourgeoisie, the internal struggle of its various social layers, and determines its most probable policy in the next period: with the aid of fascism to compel the social democracy to help the bourgeoisie reorganize the constitution in such a way as to combine the advantages of democracy and fascism,— of fascism for its essence and of democracy for its form—with the avoidance of the expenses for democratic reforms and, if possible, the expense of a fascist coup d'Etat. . .

Will the bourgeoisie succeed in this way? To the very end and for a long time, it cannot succeed. In other words: the bourgeoisie cannot create such a regime as will permit it to base itself peacefully upon the workers as well as upon the ruined petty bourgeoisie, without being involved in expenditures either for social reforms or the convulsions of civil war. The antagonisms are too great, they must find a way out either in one direction or another.

Austrian "Democracy" Condemned

In one way or another—the Austrian "democracy" is condemned. After the last attack of apoplexy, it can of course still recover and live on for a while its feet dragging behind it and its tongue barely mumbling. It is possible that a second attack will be necessary to put an end to it. But its fate is decided in advance. Austro-Marxism is entering a period of expiation for its political sins. The social democracy that saved the bourgeoisie from Bolshevism is now facilitating the saving of the bourgeoisie from the social democracy itself. It would be absurd to close one's eyes to the fact that the victory of fascism would involve not only the physical extermination of the handful of Communists, but also the pitiless crushing of all the organizations and all the points of support of the social democracy. In this regard, as in many others, the social democracy only reproduces the history of liberalism, whose belated child it is. More than once did the liberals help feudal reaction triumph over the popular masses only to be liquidated in turn by the reaction.

* * *

History has, so to speak, set itself a special task: to refute, in the crassest form, the prognoses and directives of the Comintern since 1923. That is how it was with the evaluation of the revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923; with the evaluation of the world role of America and the Anglo-American antagonism; with the course set for a revolutionary wave in 1924-25; with the estimation of the driving forces and the perspectives of the Chinese revolution (1925-27); with the estimation of British trade unionism (1925-27); with industrialization and the Kulak in the U. S. S. R., and so on without end. The same thing is happening now with the estimation of the "third period" and social-fascism. Molotov discovered that "France is in the first ranks of the revolutionary wave." While in reality, the revolutionary situation is at hand in Austria, where—and this is the most significant part of it—the point of departure of possible revolutionary development is not constituted by the struggle of Communism with "social fascism," but of the clash of the social democracy with fascism. In the face of this compact, the unfortunate Austrian Communist Party has landed completely in a blind alley.

Yes, the collision between the social democracy and fascism is now the most important fact in Austrian politics. The social democracy takes one step backward

after another, makes one concession after the other, crawls on its belly supplicates, and surrenders one position after the other. But the clash has a real character, it is a question of the head of the social democracy. A further advance of the fascists can—must—push the workers and even a part of the social democratic apparatus far behind the limits marked out in advance by Seitz, Otto Bauer and others. Just as revolutionary situations developed more than once out of the conflict between liberalism and the monarchy, which later went over the heads of both opponents, so a revolutionary situation can develop out of the clash between the social democracy and fascism—two antagonistic proxies of the bourgeoisie—which will pass over the heads of both of them.

The proletariat revolutionist would be worthless if he did not understand, in the epoch of the bourgeois revolution, how to estimate the conflict between the liberals and the monarchy, and instead of utilizing the struggle in a revolutionary manner, throw the two opponents into one pot. The Communist is not worth a copper who, in face of the collisions between Fascism and the social democracy, shouts down this conflict with the naked formula of social fascism, which has no content at all.

Such a position—the policy of a shouting and empty Leftism—closes the road for the Communist party to the social democratic workers in advance and gives rich nourishment to the Right wingers in the Communist camp. One of the reasons for the strengthening of the Right wing is that in its criticism it touches the open and indubitable wounds of official Communism. Weak as the party is in making its way to the social democratic workers, just so is the Right opposition strong in making its way to the social democratic apparatus.

The ignoring or incomprehension of the order of revolutionary crisis, political minimalism, the perspectives of eternal preparations—these are the principal features of the policy of the Right wing. They make themselves felt most strongly when the leadership of the Comintern seeks to create a revolutionary situation artificially in an administrative manner. In such cases, the criticism of the Right wing has something convincing in it. But it has nothing in common with revolutionary strategy. The Right wing supported the opportunist policy in the most revolutionary moments (Germany, China, England). They improve their reputation with the criticism of bureaucratic adventurism, so as later to play over again the role of a brake at the decisive moment.

What Is Social-Fascism?

The policy of the Centrists not only nourishes the Right wing but brings grist to the mill of the Austro-Marxists. Nothing can save the Austrian social democracy in the next period—nothing but the wrong policy of official Communism.

What does "social fascism" really mean? No matter how shrewd the honest "theoreticians" make themselves look, they can reply to this question with nothing but the statement that the social democracy is ready to defend the foundations of the bourgeois regime and its own positions in the bourgeois regime with the aid of armed power against the workers. But isn't this the general characteristic of all "democratic" parties without exception? Did not Kerensky and Tseretelli smash the peasants and the workers in the honeymoon days of the democratic revolution? Did not the French Radicals employ armed might against strikers before and after the war? Is not the history of the rule of the republican and democratic parties in the United States at the same time the history of sanguinary clashes with strikers? If all this is fascism, then the history of class society is the history of fascism; then there are as many fascisms in the world as there are bourgeois parties: liberal fascists, radical fascists, national-fascists, etc., etc. Then what meaning is there in the appellation? None at all. It is only a noisy symptom for class violence.

In August 1914, we named democratic socialism—social imperialism. With this we said that the social democracy is a special kind of imperialism adapted to the working class. Imperialism unites the social democracy with all the parties of the bourgeoisie without exception. "Socialism" distinguishes it from these parties. Social-imperialism defines it as a whole.

But socialism, unless one wishes to

play a senseless game with words, is not the general characteristic of bourgeois parties, but constitutes a specific bourgeois party, which has specific conditions and tasks that are opposed to the other bourgeois parties.

One can answer to this that the hostility of the bourgeois parties among themselves is only relative. That is not only correct, but it is a truism which does not, however bring us one step forward. The fact that all the bourgeois parties, from fascism to the social democracy, put the defense of the bourgeois rule above their programmatic differences, eliminates neither the differences between these parties, their struggle among themselves, nor our duty to utilize this struggle.

The Austrian social democracy, more than any party in the Second International, is intertwined with the working class. For this reason alone, the development of the revolutionary crisis in the country presupposes a series of deep-going internal crises in the social democracy. In Austria especially, where the differentiation is belated, it is not out of the question that an "independent" party should split off from the official party and at one blow, as was the case in Germany, make it possible to give the Communist Party a mass foundation. This is no absolute road, but, according to circumstances, quite possible. The perspective of a possible split of the social democracy under the pressure of the revolutionary crisis can in no case lead to a more moderate attitude of the Communist Party to the future "Independents" or the candidates for the "Independents". The need for implacable exposure of the Left of the Max Adler type or of a newer type requires no demonstration. But it would be wrong if, in the course of the struggle against Fascism, one did not see the need for an approach of the Communist Party to the broad masses of the social democratic workers who still feel themselves to be social democrats and count themselves as such. It is the direct duty of the Communist Party to criticize the bourgeois character of the social democracy to these workers, to show them that to make the policy of the social democrats equivalent to that of fascism when the social democratic workers mortally hate fascism and their leaders fear it just as mortally, means to act in contradiction to real political relations, means to infuse these masses with distrust to Communism, means to strengthen the union of these workers with their leaders.

The Danger in the Stalinist Theory

It is not difficult to foresee that the throwing of the social democracy and fascism into one pot brings forward the danger of idealizing the Left social democracy, when the latter comes to a serious clash with fascism. That has already been demonstrated by experiences in history. It must be remembered that the equalization of social democracy and fascism, proclaimed for the first time by the luckless Fifth Congress, found its necessary antithesis in the capitulation before Purcell, before Pilsudski, before Chiang Kai-Shek, before Raditch and before LaFollette. That is entirely legitimate. Whoever makes the extreme Left of bourgeois society equal to its extreme Right, that is, Austro-Marxism and Fascism, is inevitably preparing the capitulation of the Communist Party before the Left social democracy in the critical moment.

This question is very closely connected with the slogans in perspective for the Austrian working class: Soviets of deputies and dictatorship of the proletariat. Generally speaking, these two slogans are closely connected with each other. The formation of Soviets is conceivable only under the conditions of a revolutionary situation, an aroused movement of the masses, under the condition of a great and growing role of the Communist Party, that is, under the conditions that precede or accompany the conquest of power by the proletariat.

But in Austria, more than in any other country, there is an open possibility that the slogan of Soviets will not coincide with the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, yes, will even stand directly opposed to it, that is, by the transformation of the Soviets into a weapon against the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is all the more important to understand and foresee this because of the fact that the epigones (Zinoviev, Stalin and others) have made a vulgar fetch of the slogan of Soviets, in which they substituted the or-

*I cannot dwell at length on this question, especially since it is discussed in sufficient detail in my "Criticism of the Draft Program of the Comintern".

Continued on Next Page

Church Reports Marion Hell

But All that Preachers Offer Are Empty Promises and Pious Prayers

NEW YORK-(FP)—The department of research and education of the Federal Council of Churches starts the New Year with an extensive report on the strikes at Marion, N. C. which in the main upholds union contentions. For background a survey of the economic status of the industry is added.

Statements of Pres. R. W. Baldwin of the Marion mill and Pres. Mabry Hart of the Clinchfield mill regarding hours and wages the Federal Council investigator found to be at odds with the story told by strikers themselves. Against the mill owners' claim that the state 60-hour law was observed, it was found that many worked up to 67 hours a week. Against the \$14 average wage said to exist in Marion, the investigator discovered four workers getting more and at least 15 less. Torn from the Federal Council's report are these specimens:

Worked More Than 64 Hours a Week

Woman, spooling room, worked 12 hours a day, 64 1-2 hours a week, earning \$7.50 a week.

Woman, spooling, worked 12 hours and 20 minutes a day, earned \$8-\$9 a week.

Man, spinning room, worked 15 years for Marion mill, earned \$18 a week, 11 hours a day.

Woman, weaver worked 7 years for company, averaged \$17.15 a week, worked 11 hours and 10 minutes a day.

Girl, 15, has worked one and a half years, spinning room, averaged \$5 a week—made \$6.50 one week, the highest she ever made—worked 11 hours and 15 minutes a day, said about 40 girls in her department, on same hours, most of them 14 or 15 years old. Her sister, working through the noon hour, a 12 hour day, sometimes made \$11.50

a week at the very highest.

Man, oiler, \$11 a week. Man, sweeper, \$11 a week.

These workers told the churchman of the "almost deafening noise of the looms, the high temperature, the humidity, the dust and lint in the air" as creating extreme fatigue. In the Marion mill there was no ventilating system, the workers were not allowed to open the windows, no spittoons were provided, toilets sometimes overflowed and drinking water fountains were installed in the toilets.

The Federal Council report deals fully with the causes of the two strikes, the events preceding the massacre of Oct. 2 and union activity. Passing to the relief need, now being met by church bodies and administered by the Quakers, the report tells of this case:

Workers Shun Church

Mrs. Her oldest son, 18 years old, one of the strikers killed by the sheriff's forces. Her husband died last year. Has five children still living—boy, 16, girls 14, 9, 7, 3. Mrs. herself has worked in the East Marion mill for two years in the spool room, averaging about \$7 a week. Hours 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. Question: Have you any milk for the children? Answer: No, we have to just give them anything we got—sometimes some oatmeal, occasionally a little sugar—mostly just flour, pork and lard. Asked county for school books for two children as she could not buy them County refused. So girls go to school without books. Teacher keeps threatening to whip them, if they don't bring books, and that keeps the children all tore up, but I just can't do anything about it." Mrs. said, "They say they're going to put us out

of our houses and it's sort of worrisome and I would like to get plans made for the children." Mrs. attended the Methodist mill village church, but the pastor "talked against the union since before the strike. Said it was the wrong thing and people ought not to join. Got so he wouldn't speak to us union people. So nobody goes to that church except a few non-union people.

Pontiac Has «Novel» Way to Cut Wages

PONTIAC, Mich.—(FP)—Workers in Pontiac plants of the Fisher Body Co., General Motors subsidiary, are getting a free college course in political economy, right on the job. They are learning how GMC keeps its promise not to cut wages, made to the nation through Pres. Hoover.

"Here's the way they work it", an experienced Fisher worker told Federated Press. He has been employed by Fisher Body for several years.

"Last year at this time I was doing the same work I do now—stamping out body panels on a punch press. Saturdays we worked five hours. I put a new die in my machine, got it adjusted and running right—that took about 3 hours. In the remaining 2 hours I would run out about 500 panels at 40 cents a hundred—that's \$2. I received that amount, plus 3 hours' day work at 60 cents an hour for the time spent in make ready—that's \$3.60. For the morning's work I got \$5.60.

No Pay for Make Ready

"This year I go to work Saturdays on the same job for the same five hours. I spend 3 hours on make ready—work far more difficult than the actual running. I spend 2 hours running panels at 40 cents an hour. But I am paid nothing for the three hours' make ready, and for my morning work I just get the piece rate for the panels—that's \$2. So I average 40 cents an hour, or 20 cents an hour less than my day rate.

"I put in a kick the other day, and the boss says: 'Go on home if you don't like it; there's thousands of men outside waiting for your job.' If I go home that means out of Pontiac, as this town is owned by General Motors.

Unemployment Raises Mortgage Shut-downs

By Joseph Hutter

PHILADELPHIA-(FP)—In this "city of homes", foreclosures on workers' house mortgages have mounted to such an alarming number that the real estate board is appealing for a moratorium. Three months after the mortgage payment has become overdue, the worker can expect the sheriff at the door.

In 1920, 402,000 Philadelphians were buying their homes, usually a section of rooms in monotonous rows of tenements. High rents were an incentive then to home-owning. Now unemployment is forcing home-buyers to lapse on mortgage payments. Fore-closures in the last two years were:

	1928	1929
February	627	1200
July	792	1150
October	989	1200
December	1041	1183

Lumber Camps Aren't Hit by Prosperity

By Harold R. Johnson

IRONWOOD, Mich.—(FP)—While Pres. Hoover is making "prosperity" appeals to the big employers the lumber barons of northern Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota are severely reducing the living standards of the woodsmen.

In the Hines camps of Wisconsin, loggers were cut from a previous wage of \$40-\$45 a month to \$35-40 with another \$5 cut promised after the first of the year. The big Backus and Brooks firm (Intl. Lumber Co. of Minnesota) was paying only \$35 a month for general woodsmen on Nov. 1 and has since dropped them to \$30. Other Minnesota outfits are paying \$35-\$40. All wages include board and lodging, but not compulsory hospital fees.

Michigan wages have not yet been slashed generally from their \$45-50 level

A Bit of Olgin's Infamy

In the Jewish organ of the Communist Party, the Freiheit of Saturday, January 4, 1930, we read a story which we translate accurately word for word and reprint, headline and content:

TROTSKY STILL HOPES FOR A CZAR IN RUSSIA

"In yesterday's 'Sun' there is printed a special cable from Berlin about an interview that the renowned German writer Emil Ludwig, had with Leon Trotsky on the island near Constantinople where he is now located.

"According to the correspondent of the 'Sun', Trotsky declared that there is a possibility that a czar may again rule in Russia. Only—even the czar will not be able to wipe out the gains of the revolution.

"Trotsky repeated his old arguments that the Soviet Union is going downhill and—he still hopes..."

It is hardly necessary to say that a reference to the dispatch in the New York Sun (1-3-30), whatever may be the truth or falsehood in what it says as a whole, will show that it does not contain the slightest word that might lead anyone with half a good eye to write and publish the headline over the reprint in the Freiheit. It is a piece of knavishness, pure and simple, fished out of the venomous sewers from which come most of the stories against Trotsky published in the Stalinist press. Whoever may have been the pitiful scribbler that headlined the Freiheit story, the responsibility for it rests with the editor of the paper, Moissaye Olgin. Like Minor, his colleague in charge of the Daily Worker, Olgin is experienced in the struggle against Trotsky; he fought him and Lenin both before and after November 7, 1917. But at that time he did it as the feature writer of the Jewish Daily Forward. Then as now there was no infamy too nauseating for him, no falsehood too repulsive, and the pits of his dishonesty were bottomless. He learned 10 or 12 years ago, to grub in the garbage of the bourgeois press for some bit of filth to fling at Lenin, Trotsky and the Bolshevik revolution from the columns of the respectable "socialist" organ of Abraham Cahan. He even reprinted and commented favorably upon the calumnious Sisson "documents" that "proved" Lenin and Trotsky to be German spies in the pay of the Kaiser.

Later Olgin changed from a "socialist" to a "Communist" with the ease of the man-about-town who changes linen for a new social function, but his congenital hatred of true Bolsheviks did not change. It now has an opportunity for expression in the attacks on Trotsky, which fall into line with his pre-"Bolshevization" day attacks. So little has changed! Trotsky remains a Bolshevik; Olgin remains the poseur and dilettante, the dandy who is the darling of Greenwich Village salons and the East Side cafes, the dabbler in Communist politics who sniffs the journalistic gutters for filth to throw at Trotsky and the Bolshevik Opposition.

Is Olgin so vain as to believe that any worker with a spark of the rebel in him will do anything else but turn sick to the stomach upon reading that headline? No, every proletarian, even he who does not believe with the Opposition, will stop and reflect that the case for the Stalinists must be weak indeed when they must resort to such proclamations, (so entirely typical of all the "arguments" against Trotsky) as that Trotsky, the lion of the Russian revolution, is still (!) hoping (!!) for the return of a czar in Russia.

But we cannot believe that it was written either by a worker or for workers to read. It was undoubtedly meant for the edification of Olgin's circle of decadent friends and admirers who fawn before the distinguished litterateur and cry: Bravo, Moissaye! A Hit! Yes, bravo, Moissaye! On to further infamies!

in the northern lumber district.

Michigan loggers average, from camp to return, 9 1-2 hours a day. Food is barely edible and many camps have no bath-houses and poor sanitary facilities. Body lice, bawdy houses, bed-bugs, bad bosses and booze are among the handicaps to a decent life. About a third of the loggers are unemployed. Job hunters sleep on the floors in the camps and likewise in town booze joints, often in the way of the thirty

The Austrian Crisis and Communism

ganizational form for the class content.

It is by no means out of the question that, if not in the present then in the subsequent stages of the struggle, the Austrian social democracy will see itself forced to proclaim the general strike (as the British General Council of Trade Unions did in 1926) and even to sanction the creation of Soviets so that the leadership may remain all the more securely in its hands. Naturally, this will be bound up with a greater and lesser crisis in the party. Friedrich Adler will have to be dragged out of reserve, and others besides. Max Adler, or some one even more to the "Left" will again show that Soviets plus democracy give the combined state and liberate us from the necessity of seizing power and the dictatorship. Not only the social democratic workers, but also the worker-Communists, who are accustomed to hear day in and day out that the social democracy and fascism are one and the same thing, will be taken by surprise by such a stage in the development of the struggle between the social democracy and fascism. And yet this stage would be more complicated, a more integrated system of betrayal of the interests of the proletariat by the social democracy. For under the leadership of the Austro-Marxists, the Soviets would not only not be the organs of struggle of the proletariat for power but the instrument for holding the proletariat back from an attempt at taking power.

In Germany, such an attempt, at least on a broad scale, would be impossible because the Communist Party there presents too great a force. But things are different in Austria. In the case of a rapid unfolding of events, the culminating point can be reached long before the Communist Party has awakened from its isolation and weakness. The Soviets in the hands of the Austro-Marxists can prove to be a mechanism that gives them the possibility of robbing the workers of the revolutionary situation for the second time, and thereby for the second time saving bourgeois society, and in this case, by the inevitable establishment of open fascism. It is needless to say that in such a case, the very ribs of the social democracy would be broken under the boots of fascism. Politics knows no gratitude.

The slogans of Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat have a purely propagandistic significance in Austria today. Not because Austria is so far removed from a revolutionary situation but because the bourgeois regime is equipped

means—the social democracy. Contrary to the babblers and phrase-mongers, the task of the Communist Party in Austria does not now consist in "arming"—with what?—"the masses"—which?—"and leading them to the final decisive struggle", but rather in "patiently enlightening" (Lenin in April 1917!) the masses. The success of this propagandistic work can be all the quicker and more powerful the better the Communist Party understands what is happening before its eyes.

Above all the stupid, empty, more than audacious equalization of the social democracy with fascism must be thrown into the discard.

The experiences of 1918-19 and the role of the social democracy in the Soviet system must be recalled to the Austrian Communists.

"Domestic disarmament" must be opposed by the slogan of arming the workers. This slogan is now much more immediate and important than the slogan of Soviets and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Put Bauer up as a fascist and the worker does not understand it. But when he is told that Bauer wants to disarm the worker in the end, and thereby deliver him to the fascists—the worker will understand, for this corresponds to his political experience.

One must not believe that one can replace one's lack of strength by roaring, howling and radical words. One must stop fitting the real course of events into the cheap schema of Stalin and Molotov. It must be made clear that neither of them understands anything. The first step toward a rebirth must be the reestablishment of the Left Opposition in the party. But in Austria, as in other countries, a few supplementary lessons of history are still needed before the Communists find the right road. It is the task of the Opposition to prepare this transition. No matter how weak in numbers the Left Opposition may be in Austria, even in comparison with the Communist Party, its functions are nevertheless the same: Propaganda, patient enlightenment. There remains only the wish that the Austrian Communist Opposition will succeed, in the next period, in issuing a regularly published organ, if possible—a weekly paper, which will carry on the propagandist work keeping pace with events.

The publication of such an organ requires great efforts. But it is a task that cannot be postponed. That is why it must be solved.

LETTERS FROM THE MILITANTS

ANOTHER "VICTORY" IN THE INDEPENDENT

Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Comrades:

No doubt, by the time this appears in the *Militant*, the *Frelheit* will have reported another victory for the Party in the Minneapolis Independent Workmen's Circle, Branch 89. It seems that the more decisively the Party defeats itself in the mass organizations with its "barricade" policies the more triumphantly it proclaims victories.

The scene this time, was the election of a delegate to the special convention of the order to be held in Boston, January 12, 1930. After weeks of campaigning in the *Frelheit*, and caucusing with every element willing to negotiate, Moses was finally able to gather together a motley support for himself at the meeting.

In the front rank of the supporters of the Communist party policy and its candidate stood such gentry as H. Supak, well-known needle trades boss, S. Segal, proprietor of a men's garment shop, Shulberg novelty perfume manufacturer, and others of this ilk. This alliance is an excellent illustration of how extreme "Leftism" in theory goes hand in hand with open opportunism in practice. Moses is the same one we have many times exposed for the same practices while in the Party. This is the same Moses who shrieked for our expulsion as "renegades" and "counter-revolutionaries".

Now although the open support of the bosses contributed somewhat to the defeat of the Party, the outstanding honors in all justice, must be given to comrade Saltzman himself. Moses, it seems, was doing a fairly good job organizing his group in preparation for the elections, when the aforementioned strode upon the scene. First on learning, that I, Berg, secretary of the local branch was nominated in opposition to Moses, he launched a campaign of attack against him and all those who might support him as "Trotskyists," "renegades" and "counter-revolutionaries", although Friend Berg is quite innocent of the charge.

In reality, Berg is a typical Left wing I. W. C. worker of whom there are hundreds in the organization, loyal, painstaking and unalterably opposed to the policy of the party in the Independent, and to Moses, whom the party has entrusted with the execution of that policy. No factor contributed more towards crystallizing opposition to the party than the charge that all those who supported Berg as a delegate to the convention were "Trotskyites", "renegades" and counter-revolutionaries. Every self-respecting Left winger, not befuddled by the new phraseology (and many who were) rebelled against this schoolmaster threat and voted overwhelmingly for Berg, though normally their vote might have gone to the party.

It is regrettable that our own comrades did not clearly take the lead for the position of the Communist Opposition. No clear voice was raised in defence of Communism and the Communist party as against the distortions and hysteria of the present party misleadership. It is true that the provocations of the Party bring out passionate rebellion from honest proletarians; but a Leninist direction must be given to this healthy movement, or it will be lost in the swamp of reaction and may become anti-Communist in character. It is above all essential at present for the comrades of the Opposition to clearly define before the membership its policy on all questions pertaining to the future of the order. A means must be given the Left wing (now repulsed by the Party) of rallying around Left traditions and preserve them against the black hand of reaction now reaching out for control of the order.

And this raises the question of the immediate development of a definite Left wing group in the Independent, one which will openly, militantly and clearly speak and act for Communist principles, criticising the maneuvers and phrasemongering of the Party and resolutely fighting for the preservation of proletarian policies within the order.

C. C.

BAKERSFIELD, Cal. — Arch-framer Charles M. Fickert, who sent Mooney and Billings to prison, is evidently getting nervous lest they be released. In a speech before the Bakersfield Kiwanis club he pleaded that he is not "persecuting" the two men; he is only fighting the "anarchistic" organizations that are trying to undermine the foundations of the government.

DIARY OF AN UNEMPLOYED PLUMBER

New York, N. Y.

Dear Comrades:

Inspired by the dazzling figures of projected construction that President Hoover and the lesser presidents of the railroads and business corporations have been announcing so repeatedly for the past few weeks; spurred on by the contentions of President Green in chorus with the whole capitalist press, that as a consequence of the stock market crash the speculative capital will be diverted to "legitimate" business, and primarily to building construction, I had set my alarm clock the previous night for an early morning hour. I had a feeling of confidence that with sufficient effort I would undoubtedly get a job.

Carried on the wings of my new ambition getting up was not difficult although it was still dark. I grabbed the *World*, and—to my great surprise—there was over a column of plumbers' ads. It flashed through my mind that only lunatics invented the myth about a depression in this country. My hand was itchy at the thought of my first pay envelope. I could see the happy face of my wife when at last I announce to her that she can have the money to pay back part of the grocer's bill. Right there and then I decided what creditor can wait longest for his money. But, alas, upon closer examination of the ads, I realized that I was looking at the "situation wanted" section. There were men stating their long experience, high qualities, great speed, excellent references, all around, knowing also steam, lead wiping, etc., etc. and offering themselves to the highest bidder.

Having realized my mistake, I quickly turned the page and without difficulty found the place where once ads for plumbers used to be. As an ugly monument to the prosperous boom days there was the following ad: "Plumber's helper wanted; three dollars a day; husky; one who can work alone; must have own tools. Call early..." They don't want a helper, they want a mechanic sufficiently starved to be willing to work for a helper's wage.

But this was not enough to discourage me this morning. I resolved to set out in search of a job, ads or no ads. I revisited all the contractors I worked for in the past, who for the last six months have been telling me in the same monotonous voice, "nothing doing". "Aren't you in on President Hoover's construction projects?" I asked one of them indignantly. They did not know what I was talking about; they thought me insane.

With every place I had been to, my spirit dropped lower, my confidence of the morning failed me more and more. I was growing desperate. Walking from one end of the city to another, from the Bronx to Manhattan, covering all the plumbing shops on the way, all kinds of thoughts entered my mind. I envied the shop and factory workers. Their industries are concentrated in definite localities, they have their "markets". Although the results might be the same, at least the process of looking for a job is not such a painful one.

Some argue that in the building trades it is impossible to divide the work equally. If the bosses were compelled to hire a new set of men for each building through a labor bureau controlled by the workers, every man in the trade would get his share of work.

As it is now, one must be related to the boss, or lick the boots of the union

officialdom in order to be "fixed up". But what does the officialdom care about unemployment? Only a few weeks ago their salary was raised \$25, making it a total of \$125 a week, besides "extras".

This reminds me. I shall have to borrow some money to pay my dues. Work or no work, this must be paid for otherwise there is a fine imposed. I hope no plumbers died this month. Every dead plumber means an addition of fifty cents to the dues. They sure have been dying lately. Is it because of starvation? —P

WHO SUPPORTS THE STALINISTS?

Minneapolis, Minn.

Dear Comrades:

If I am to judge the role of the Communist Party today by the Minneapolis membership—especially the Jewish section—as well as its supporters, then I must assert that only a miracle can save the situation. As well believe in Stalin's theory of building socialism in one country.

Let us consider for a moment the standard-bearers of Communism, those who are "strengthening the position of the CI line" in the workers movement.

First we have Supak, a manufacturer who exploits from 60-80 workers, and exploits them in the most refined manner, in whose shop the Amalgamated established the union. As soon as the "contract" was completed with the boss, this gentleman was established in the leading councils of the Party.

Then, take A. Sachs, boss plumber, another "comrade", who amassed enough wealth from workers' sweat to build a beautiful home in the fashionable Lake Harriet district.

And Mr. Sell. Every Jewish carpenter or building trades worker knows I. Sell. He is one of the worse exploiters and slave drivers of his men. Yet he also is a standard bearer of the Communist Party today.

Store keepers who donate \$25 at a time to Talmud Torahs and other Jewish bourgeois institutions; sweatshop bosses like Segal; boss barbers like Wolk; American Legion members like Singer and Fink—all these types stand today in the front rank of the Jewish Communist movement in Minneapolis.

Worker-comrades of the Party! What does this mean? Does this not show a dangerous degeneration of the Party support and membership? Is it surprising that the Communist Party which bases itself on an overwhelmingly non-proletarian support, should conduct its bitterest struggles against the Leninist Opposition? It is the duty of all serious Communists, inside and outside the Party to mercilessly pick out and expose the petty-bourgeois elements in the Party and to fight against the wrong policies which allow them to develop in the movement.

Enlist yourself in the struggle to purify the movement from petty bourgeois influences!

MAX KAUFMAN

PEONAGE ON HIGH SEAS

SAN FRANCISCO (FP)—A story of peonage on the high seas was told in the court of Judge St. Sure in San Francisco, when James Lamey, colored cook on a United Fruit Co. vessel, was awarded \$500 damages. Lamey proved that Capt. George Eppelman had chained him to a stanchion in the forward peak of the ship for four days because he had refused to paint the mess room, since this was the mess boy's duty.

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

DAILY WORKER AND ILLINOIS STRIKE

(The *Daily Worker* recently printed a vicious attack upon the work of the Communist League and its supporters in the recent Illinois miners' strike. The following excerpt from a letter by comrade Joseph Angelo, member of the League and one of the best known militants in the National Miners Union speaks for itself.—Ed.)

Springfield, Ill.

Dear Comrades:

The *Daily Worker* is surely getting rambunctious when it stoops so blankly-blank low as to call me a "stool-pigeon, renegade, etc." in its columns. I did my share in this last strike, more than some C. P. members, as for instance, X, who would not go on a picket line because he might be arrested, or Y who would not address a mass meeting in Springfield because warrants were out for his arrest. I was on the picket line in Springfield and led the Taylorville miners to Auburn where we pulled that mine out on strike. I organized the first relief committee and went out and collected relief for the Taylorville marchers. I spoke at Taylorville and when I found out that although every mine was out on strike in that section, no strike committees were organized, I urged the miners immediately to organize strike committees, not only mine strike committees but committees of other workers as well, yet this was not done because X cannot see further than his nose....

—JOSEPH ANGELO

ON TROTSKY

Writing apropos the articles of comrade Trotsky that have been appearing in the *Militant*, the Canadian *One Big Union Bulletin* (12-19-1929) remarks in its editorial entitled "The Growing Influence of Trotsky": "He (Trotsky) commands the respect of both friends and foes and yet he never compromises in the slightest degree. The same undaunted spirit reveals itself whether in conflict with Stalin or the capitalist world. For ourselves we can only say we have gleaned more from his works than from those of any other current Russian writer." We would like to suggest that the *O. B. U. Bulletin* reprint, therefore, the article by comrade Trotsky entitled "Syndicalism and Communism" which appeared in a recent issue of the *Militant*. It would be of particular interest to the readers of the *Bulletin*!

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 205 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. Westley 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.: Newsstands at 5th & Market; 11th & Market; 13th & Market; Market between 19th; 9th & Locust; Warwick's News Depot, 262 So. 11th St.
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; Blederman 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 the Communist League of America.