

What Fish Committee Means

A Fighting United Front Needed Against the Sharpening Offensive of the Capitalist Class

The bubble of the Whalen documents has been loudly and derisively punctured. That clown and former police commissioner Whalen presented these documents as "proof" that Amtorg the official Soviet trading agency in New York was the center of Communist propaganda for the United States.

Three witnesses called before the Fish Committee have conclusively demonstrated from different angles that these "documents" are absolute and unadulterated forgeries. The first witness exposed sixteen internal mistakes and discrepancies that pointed to their fabrication by Russian white guards. A newspaperman testified that the "documents" had been offered for sale in Washington six weeks before Whalen released them to the New York press. But the most deadly testimony came from the man in whose print-shop on East Tenth street the letterheads of the Whalen documents were printed.

No one in the least familiar with the history of the series to which Whalen forgeries belonged could have entertained the shadow of a doubt as to their true character. The Sisson documents of some years ago, setting out to prove that Lenin and Trotsky were "German spies" could have been convincing only to such a product of the New York Forward as Moissaye Olgin. The celebrated Zinoviev letter could impose only on the willing credulity of a social-imperialist like Macdonald.

This exposure will, of course not stay the activities of the Fish Committee. It is the time-honored practise of the ruling class always to explain away "social unrest" as a malicious foreign importation. When the masses were once struggling in England for the blessings of parliamentary democ-

racy, the aristocracy blamed this movement on the gold of the French regicides. The source of all evil, the Czarist bureaucracy had it, were the Jews. In our present epoch of proletarian struggle, the capitalists find the key to all the riddles of the universe in . . . Moscow gold. The one thing they will not admit is that the roots of the revolutionary are sunk deep in the crisis of a class society that has outlived its historic usefulness.

Commissioned by Congress to investigate Communist propaganda for the overthrow of the government, the Fish Committee was in reality an expedient to distract attention from the misery of the unemployment crisis. In line with this policy, the Fish Committee made a rabid attack on Amtorg. It is no pleasure to the workers of Russia to have to trade with the general Electric or Henry Ford but power in the United States still lies in the hands of the capitalist, not the working class. The development of trade even under these conditions is, however, of direct interest to the American working class. Amtorg bought more than \$107,000,000 of American goods in 1928-9 and was planning to double that in the near future. The goods that Amtorg purchases here mostly with hard cash go towards facilitating the work of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and at the same time inevitably alleviate unemployment for thousands of American workers.

The baiting of Amtorg by the Fish Committee aided by the Matthew Woll's constitutes part and parcel of an attack on the interests of the American working class. The defense of the Soviet Union is their own best defense. This does not mean that the U.S.S.R. is any substitute for the action of the American proletariat. The Soviet

Union is the friend and ally of the international revolution which is the only guarantee that socialist society can be built up and maintained in any country. But the development of the class struggle takes place on the basis of the conditions in each capitalist country. The world organization that fights for the establishment of a chain of Soviet Republics is the Communist International. The functions of the Soviet Government and the Comintern are sufficiently distinct without P. A. Bogdanov, the Amtorg head, having resort to Sokolnikov's worthless, dangerous and revisionist subterfuge at the Geneva Economic Conference to the effect that capitalist and socialist systems can cohabit the world peacefully side by side!

It is imperative to arouse the widest possible mass movement against this Fish Committee and its probable consequences. Elihu Root has already advanced the idea of creating a special secret Federal police, a sort of American Ochrana to spy more effectively over the revolutionary workers. Whether Root's proposal in this form is realized at this time or not, the coming storm and stress period in the class struggle will mark more and more vicious attempts to place heavier shackles on the labor movement. The Department of Justice will be more extensively subsidized and its stool pigeon activities re-enforced. The revolutionary press will have a constant struggle against being barred from the mails. The industrial espionage system will be intensified. The jailing of militants who organize the workers will gain momentum. The capitalist campaign to terrorize the foreign born workers by the finger-print and passport route will revive. The criminal syndicalism and sedition laws of the various states will be brought into more

frequent play.

As the counter-action to this capitalist offensive, the workers must organize a fighting united front. To make the most powerful appeal to the masses in the approaching elections, the Communist Party should demonstrate its re-~~line~~ to place itself at the head of a movement for working class unity. The immediate objectives of this movement should be the release of all class war prisoners, federal, state and municipal grants for the relief of the workless, the enactment of unemployment insurance and old age pensions, the six hour day and the five day week, and the recognition and extension of large-scale credits to the Soviet Union.

—MAURICE SPECTOR

The 16th Congress of the C.P.S.U.

Convoked after two years of calculated manoeuvring for factional advantage the sixteenth congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was one of the most ominous events in the annals of the October Revolution. There has been nothing quite like it in the entire history of Bolshevism.

Enthroned in the midst of the fawning adulation of his faction agents ("Comrade Duranty of the New York Times included) rose the sinister figure of Stalin, the man against whose aims and methods Lenin warned in his last testament, striking a note of the most poignant alarm. Every major leader of the October Revolution had been eliminated and crushed by the bureaucracy and its intrigue. But what was worse—or an accompaniment—the Party momentarily lies prostrate.

A measure of the degeneracy that has set in, is the spectacle of the Right leaders Rykov and Tomsky and others who were compelled by Stalin to drink the bitterest drinks of personal and political humiliation. For such self-abasement there is absolutely no Bolshevik tradition. Lenin never conceived of such a thing against his opponents inside the Party in the most desperate days of the civil war. But the keynote of this congress was that in Stalin, the apparatus-bureaucracy have far more reason to be satisfied than ever under Lenin.

Stalinism reigned supreme at the sixteenth Congress. There was no critical analysis of the course of political and economic events for the past two years. There was no honest and searching admission of mistakes. Self-praise and self-content pervaded the whole Stalin faction. The Congress was a mere fig leaf. It met; it dispersed. A few organizational charges were arranged to make the "Master's" power even more air-tight. Such "congresses" are of the soil of Bonapartism.

It is not the cowardly Rights and their captive leader Rykov who can give leadership to the Russian proletariat in the great crisis that looms up ahead of it. That leadership will come from the iron Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition led by Trotsky. It will come from the thousands of revolutionists who have been imprisoned and deported. It is from the Left Opposition in the Party that the Thermidorians will meet with the resistance that will give leadership to the revolution in the crucial events that are maturing behind the fog of the sixteenth congress. In the next issue of the Militant we propose to publish a detailed analysis of the significance of this congress and the situation in the Soviet Union.

A FORCED RETREAT

For the balance of the summer period, the Militant has been compelled to change its frequency of issue to a semi-monthly basis. This change, which we shall attempt to make as brief in duration as possible, was forced upon us by two factors: the severe unemployment situation which has sharply affected the financial income of the paper, and, added to it, the summer months, during which a certain organizational and financial relaxation usually sets in.

The change to a semi-monthly is an adjustment to this situation. It should be distinctly emphasized to all our comrades and sympathizers that the change is in no sense of the word a permanent one. Plans are even now being elaborated for the return to a weekly publication basis early in the Fall, and a corresponding expansion of the publishing, as well as the general activities of the Opposition.

The change is undoubtedly a blow to our movement, from which all our supporters can help us recover more speedily by immeasurably increasing their financial assistance, beginning immediately. A broadly grounded financial support, ORGANIZED NOW will not only signify a swift return to the weekly Militant, but its re-issuance on a sounder basis.

United, conscientious efforts are required. We expect the militants throughout the country to bend their efforts for a generous response. The return of the Weekly is our joint responsibility. Let it be fulfilled with the necessary speed!

The Mass Workers Join the Opposition!

George J. Saul Also Demands That Party Reinstate Our Group

Comrade Saul has addressed a statement to the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, in which he declares his support for the platform of the Left Opposition. He joins the Communist League of America (Opposition) and demands of the Communist Party that it reinstate all expelled members of the Left Opposition and adopt its platform in the United States; and in the Comintern.

The adherence of George Saul to the Communist League following the action of Hugo Oehler, is still further evidence of the movement of the mass workers in our direction and the dissatisfaction of the honest Communist workers with the present disastrous Party course, and the steady growth of influence among the Communists of the ideas of the Left Opposition. Comrade Saul only recently returned from work for the Communist Party and International Labor Defense in the South where he was very active in helping to organize the Southern textile workers into the National Textile Workers Union. His activity in the Gastonia and other Southern regions brought about his arrest by the southern bourbons and a sentence of six months on the chain gang. A new trial was recently granted him and Comrade Saul is returning forthwith to stand trial.

Comrade Saul was also one of the leaders and active workers for the Communist Party, along with comrade Hugo Oehler, in the Colorado Coal miners strike. He is at present working in the harvest fields of

Kansas and is making his way East and South for his trial in South Carolina. The Left Opposition welcomes comrade Saul into his ranks. The following represents some of the views expressed by comrade Saul on the situation and needs of the Communist movement:

"The contradictions of imperialism are sharper than ever. The objective situation is favorable to the revolutionary movement of the workers toward the proletarian revolution and communist society.

"At the same time there is not the close relationship between our Party and the workers as a class which anticipates a growing confidence in our party as the leader in the class struggle.

"This is explainable when one considers the inner-party situation, the non-Leninist tactics being employed . . .

"The inner-Party situation, internationally and nationally is as follows: Mechanical control by bureaucrats; the non-Leninist tactics being applied in connection with the colonial and semi-colonial uprisings; in trade union activities and strike struggles; too much emphasis on legalism—resulting in isolating the workers' support.

"The strongest defense of the Soviet Union; the most effective struggle against war and imperialism in Europe, in America, throughout the world, will be made through the adoption by the Communist International of the Leninist line of march sponsored by Comrade Trotsky and the

(Continued on page 2)

The Chicago Conference

The Unemployed Gather

By ARNE SWABECK

CHICAGO—

The Chicago unemployment convention, the first of its kind, sharply denoted, in more than one respect, the present degree of development of the unemployed movement in the United States. It was the first culmination point around this burning issue facing the working class. Called by the Trade Union Unity League, its policies became those of the official Communist Party.

While the crowded one day session brought out many healthy aspects it also glaringly showed the extremely narrow character of the movement to date. Moreover, the policies adopted will, instead of overcoming the difficulty, tend further to narrow a basis where now the broadest scope is not only essential but also possible.

Many Extravaganzas

A summary of the speeches made, all bristling with a healthy militancy, would indicate the complete absence of a serious tackling of the problem—how to set the working masses into motion against their class enemy. They were well typified by the first speaker from the floor, following the main report. This speaker, on behalf of the New York delegation, extravagantly pledged: to build the mass unemployed councils to build the mass "revolutionary unions"—to build the mass Communist Party, etc., etc. Nor were any of the "democratic encumbrances" of "ordinary" labor gatherings apparent at this convention. All was cut ready to order, its first business being the selection of a presidium from a previously made up slate. The presidium then proceeded to select those who were to speak from the floor, as per its announcement from lists submitted in advance by district delegations. This method "gently" eliminated in advance anyone who might not hew closely to the official "line".

On its positive side the convention had some real healthy aspects shown for example in a large Negro delegation, 153 out of a total of the announced 1120 registered delegates. Many splendid proletarian types had answered the call and came clearly evidencing the signs of pressure of the economic crisis drawing workers toward the Left, themselves being attracted by a movement which had fearlessly taken up their battles. Otherwise the composition of the delegation showed but little sweep of the movement beyond the general periphery of the Communist Party and closely sympathetic organizations and groups. 484 delegates came from the Chicago district alone, 150 from Michigan, 73 from Minnesota, 92 from Ohio, 56 from Indiana, 53 from New York and a sprinkling from some other states. There were none of those Southern workers who had taken such splendid part in the strikes of the Carolinas.

To understand the basic cause of the present narrow limits upon a movement which has great possibilities and has otherwise displayed vitality in struggle, should now be the object of serious efforts of all militants. Without that no shortcomings will be remedied. It is wrong to conclude as the Party does, that the present situation is one of a "revolutionary upsurge of the working masses in the United States." Riding the crest of such a wave which is artificially constructed will at best get us caught in the dip, and at the worst prepare us for serious defeat when the offensive begins. The March Sixth and other unemployment demonstrations have manifested splendid working class response, but nevertheless what is most outstanding at the present moment is a downward curve. Everywhere increased capitalist reaction; innumerable jailings of Communist and workers on strike (many delegates were arrested on the way and in Chicago); break-up of demonstrations; intensified speed-up; wage cuts, directly and indirectly; the trade unions, including the new industrial unions, losing members. With this reaction also increasing signs of workers' resistance through small defensive strikes. There have lately been, for example, the strikes of the southern textile workers in Elizabethton and Marion and those of the northern section in Nazareth and Aberless, Pa., and Plainfield, N.J.

the short so-called strike of the I.L.G.W.U. in New York; the strikes of the Pittsburg taxi drivers, St. Louis bus drivers and the recent strike of the Pittston anthracite miners. All these were defensive strikes and none under the leadership of the Left. Where the Left does play a role has been on a small scale in the New York cafeteria strikes and the present Flint automobile workers strike.

Such is the picture at the present moment. Within it is contained the visible outlines of the upward curve in which the resistance, as yet isolated, can become a workers' offensive of possibly broad sweep and surely of much sharper conflicts. Each such curve requires its specific tactics. Each has possibilities of growth for the movement and the tactics of one must simultaneously be the preparation for the other.

First Tasks

At this moment the first necessity is the most elementary ground-work. Millions of workers are unemployed and only a small section set into motion. Millions are still blissfully ignorant of their future status as members of a standing army of unemployed. That is the first point to bring home. The bourgeoisie have set to work actively to divide the ranks of the unemployed workers from those having jobs and already with some success to isolate the unemployed movement in its organized expression from the working masses. Can these efforts of the bourgeoisie be effectively defeated in any way than the broadest application of the slogans for work or compensation, unemployment relief, shorter workday, credits for Russia, etc.? Obviously not. Certainly the successful carrying on of the struggle for the unemployed means to spare no efforts really to unite the working class, which cannot be done within the narrow framework of the T.U.U.L. There could hardly be any situation where correct united front policies are so essential than precisely in this one. Could the hypocrisy and deceit of the social reformists and self-styled progressives on the burning issue of unemployment be better exposed than just through a correct and genuine united front policy?

These, however, were not the matters given serious consideration at the unemployment convention. It was keyed up to a very revolutionary phraseology but forgot its elementary tasks. William F. Dunne, in his report for the T.U.U.L. correctly stressed the necessity of unification of all of the struggles of the workers. But from that came the wrong conclusion, in the program of action adopted, entirely to limit the unemployed movement within the framework of the T.U.U.L. Thus the exact opposite of unification. Each union and industrial league is to set up unemployed councils in their industry as a part of the T.U.U.L. General councils, according to the program, are not to be organized where a section of the T.U.U.L. exists. These are mechanical limits which isolate the movement and confine it to that section of the workers ready to join the "revolutionary unions". There could be no better way of actually preventing a mass basis of struggle for the unemployed. The social reformist will thus have a free field to rally all those workers who by vain search for a job are turning away from capitalist ideology but are not yet ready to join the "revolutionary unions". In that broad field they can continue to sow their seeds of illusions and deceit. And it is precisely also in that field where a united front struggle around the burning issue of unemployment as well as Communist activities has such rich potentialities.

The Program of Action

The program of action lists the immediate demands to be made: Work or wages, unemployment relief, no evictions, 7-hour day, free employment agencies, etc. A total of 17 demands. Unquestionably the few most pressing ones, which are also the most elementary ones, must become the outstanding slogans. It would, however, have been more correct and realistic to advance the demand for the six hour day. More realistic, if for nothing else, in view

of the fact that all of the railroad unions have officially gone on record recognizing the six hour day as a necessity.

But among all these demands no room could be found for the pressing one of large scale credits from this country to the Soviet Union to further insure her successful industrialization and build the bonds of solidarity between the working classes of both countries. The Stalinists will probably answer that the Soviet Union "does not need" such credits. But that is contrary to facts. Simeon Zuckerman, vice president of the Amtorg, reports that orders in the United States for machinery, equipment, etc. averaged \$10,000,000 monthly for the first six months of the fiscal year. In April and May of this year, they fell to \$3,000,000 while orders placed in Germany ran to \$10,000,000 because Germany offered a full 100 per cent credit for eighteen months and on some deals for two years or more. He adds:

"A big Soviet construction program in the Urals—metallurgical plants, tractor and machine plants—were planned with the aid of American specialists, who are cooperating in building. But in the present difficult period, which our leaders never attempted to deny or disguise (so!) credits play an important role. If we get better terms from Europe we must place orders in Europe instead of America."

The Chicago unemployment convention did not take up or attempt adequately to solve the tasks which the present situation had placed upon it. Despite its narrowness, a correct policy could have made a substantial beginning toward laying the foundation for a broad genuinely united movement of the working class against the present capitalist reaction and in the struggle for the unemployed. The Left Communist Opposition must intensify its fight for such a policy.

The Iron Heel Grinds Mexican Labor

The white terror in Mexico continues in still greater force than formerly, there having been within the last few weeks numerous, especially vicious, attacks on the working class organizations on the part of the bourgeois counter revolution. Several working class leaders have been murdered by the present regime in widely separated sections of the country. Recently in an armed clash between a Communist demonstration protesting the government's anti-labor policy, twenty comrades were killed at Matamoros Laguna, State of Coahuila.

The Communist Party and C.S.U.M. (Unitarian Labor Federation affiliated to the R.I.L.U.) have been entirely incapable of resisting these attacks on the part of the reactionary forces. The masses under pressure of the general crisis, with its continuous shut-downs, and unemployment reaching the 700,000 mark, continue in a swing towards the Left. The Communists, however, are not able properly to organize this growing discontent, with the result that the anarcho-syndicalists of the General Confederation of Labor, also suffering at the present time the government's persecutions, are reaping a big harvest in fields of organization and influence. Lower California is becoming the scene of great struggles and the anarcho-syndicalists are showing activities far exceeding those of the Communists in both the Imperial Valley Region and in the mining camps of Santa Rosalia in the central part of the peninsula.

Not only is the Party incapable of carrying its struggle to new fields but is even losing heavily in sections where it formerly had great strength. In the State of Michoacan, the local labor federation, while actually manipulated by the state governor who is posing as a "Left" and a "laborite", has been greatly subject to Communist influence from some time back. Recently the Central Committee ordered the Party comrades in Michoacan to affiliate the state labor federation to the C.S.U.M. or else organize a dual organization dependent on the C.S.C.M. The Michoacan comrades, realizing that no profit could be effected by this policy which the masses could not fail to recognize as having an open splitting character, refused to obey the orders of the Central Committee. The Party's organization in the state fell to

Saul Joins Opposition

(Continued from Page 1)
Opposition comrades of the Left.

"The way to overcome the serious mistakes in the internal life of our Parties is to do what Comrade Trotsky and others were expelled for wanting to do, namely, to raise the level of political life in the Communist Parties in all their organizational links on the basis of wider internal democracy"

"The bureaucrats have lied to us long enough concerning the contentions of the Opposition. The methods of the bureaucrats has only resulted in the isolation of the Party from the workers, at a time when the objective situation tends for radicalizing the politically backward workers

"In view of these facts I will my strength and energy to the support of the movement led by the Left Opposition. I stand for the adoption of the fundamental views of the Left Opposition by Comintern internationally and of the views of the Communist League of America (Opposition) in the United States. I stand for the immediate reinstatement of the expelled Oppositionists into the Party and Comintern.

"For a genuine World Eolshevik Party! For the Proletarian Revolution!"

—GEORGE J. SAUL

Yes! No?

The Daily Worker of July 18, 1930, prints the report made by Stalin at the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In it, Stalin says:

"The Chinese workers and peasants have already replied by forming Soviets and Red Armies. IT IS REPORTED that Soviet Governments are being formed. IF THIS IS TRUE, I do not find any cause for wonder. There can be no doubt that nothing but the Soviets can save China from final ruin and impoverishment."

"It is reported"; "if this is true"—that is how Stalin speaks of the much-advertized "Chinese Soviet regime". The Daily Worker, and with it the international Stalinist press, have been filled for weeks with columns of clap-trap sensationalism with "wirelesses from Shanghai", about the 80,000,000 Chinese who have established a Soviet regime in Southern China. These stories were used to justify the false policy of Stalinism in China and to confound the "Trotskyist renegades". Stalin now sings another song. Has the Daily Worker been bluffing, as we said it had?

Has an organized Chinese Soviet regime been established? Does the Comintern really know anything about it or not? YES OR NO?

pieces as a result, but the Communists remain for the most part at their posts in the existing state labor federation.

Comrades Eduardo Calero and Jorge Pino, members of the Central Executive Committee of the Young Communist Federation of Mexico, have been expelled for disagreement with the present Party "line". Comrade Calero has issued a statement in support of the Left Communist Opposition, by which step the Mexican Opposition group finds itself reinforced by one of the finest elements of the youth movement.

Pino and also comrade David Alfaro Siqueiros, recently expelled from the C.E.C. of the Party and from the Party itself as mentioned in a former issue of the Militant, are both among those remaining in jail, after their arrest for participation in the May Day demonstrations. They are being held together with a number of Party and Y.C.F. comrades without bail and without trial.

The Mexican section of the International Red Aid, which for a time, under the able (!) "direction" of Enea Sormenti, made a big stir on the basis of plenty of bluff but with no substantial national basis, is unable to do more in the present crisis with mass arrests, terror and almost complete illegality than to shout an occasional slogan or issue a few leaflets in protest. The Party claims that Pino and Siqueiros are government stool-pigeons and that they had themselves arrested in order to gain prestige among the Party rank and file! Naturally they are not receiving the benefits of the "non-partisan" defense of the Red Aid. —R.B.

Northwest Experiences

Farmer-Laborism in Action

In the last seven years no question has received more serious study and attention by American Communists than the so-called Farmer-Labor Party, or Labor Party question. Up to and including the 1928 elections the Minnesota Communist Party devoted more time, money and energy to the "Farmer-Labor Party" idea than to any other question on its program. Numerous pamphlets and much literature was issued by the Party to show why Communists should participate in the "Farmer-Labor" movement and there fight for a "genuine Labor Party".

After chasing this Labor Party phantom from the moment it made its appearance in the post war days the Minnesota workers, who by training and experience should be best qualified to analyze the question, have come to the conclusion that this entire Farmer-Labor Party movement has nothing constructive to offer the American working class.

Reformist Labor Parties

In the first place it should be made clear to the workers that there are two kinds of political parties, revolutionary and reformist. Practically all Farmer-Labor, or Labor Parties, belong to the last named group. Like other political parties, the character and classification of a working-class political party is determined by its organization and program. The Farmer-Labor Association in Minnesota is of the reformist variety. That is, there is nothing in its program which calls for the overthrow of the present ruling class and to place the working class in power. Like all labor parties of the reformist character, the F.L.A. simply intends to function as a party of a subordinate class to ask for favors from the ruling class, the capitalists. Therefore, it can be seen, that a reformist political party of a subordinate economic class can only obtain for its members such favors as the ruling class is willing to grant them. On the other hand, revolutionary parties like the Communist Parties, have for their main purpose to put the working class in power as the ruling class.

Communist (revolutionary) parties of the workers stand for this because it is necessary. They know that the producing class cannot even realize their immediate needs under capitalist economy and capitalist rule, to say nothing about their legitimate aims. Communists also know, and they teach the workers this fact, that history does not disclose a single instance where a ruling class relinquished power because they were out-voted. More persuasive means were necessary to replace them. Votes are only practical in settling disputes between a class, but votes are useless in settling disputes between classes. This, of course, refers to cases where there are material issues involved, and not to such immaterial questions as to whether Hoover or Smith should be the President of the United States or whether Shipstead or Nelson should have a seat in the Senate. On such issues the capitalists do not object to abide by the result of the vote.

With this all too brief analysis of the aim and purpose of political parties, let us sum up the net results of ten years of Farmer-Labor activity in Minnesota.

Theory of Labor Reformism

The Farmer-Labor Association is supposed to be the organized political expression of the workers and farmers in the State of Minnesota. The intention is, on the surface at least, that through this organization the workers and farmers shall control the legal Farmer-Labor Party which appears on the ballot together with the Republican and Democratic parties. The Farmer-Labor Association is supposed to furnish the program and endorsed candidates for the State Farmer-Labor Party. However, this theory has not worked out very well in practice.

In the first place the organizational structure of the F.L.A. is wrong as a labor party in that it is partly based on individual membership. This arrangement admits politicians and office seekers whose sole ambition is to use the Farmer-Labor Association as a stepping stone to climb into some soft job. The representation to the F.L.A. conventions, where the political programs are written and candidates endorsed is based on territory instead of industry. The territorial basis is the county. There are 87 counties in the state. The farmers control 84 of them. The result of this is that the Farmer-Labor Association

is controlled by conservative farmers, small-town lawyers, small business men and individual office-seekers, all of them incapable of political leadership by decree of history. At the last state convention the organized workers with their mild program were overwhelmingly defeated by the reactionary elements in control. At each succeeding election the Farmer-Labor Association is merely being used as a vote-getting machine for individuals like Shipstead, Wefald Starkey and others. The worker members of the Association merely furnish the votes and the campaign expenses.

A "Two-Class" Party

As mentioned above, one of the most serious defects of the Farmer-Labor Association is that it is reformist in program and outlook. Second, it is made up of two classes, farmers and workers, with the wrong class, the farmers, leading or rather strangling the movement. By the laws of economic development farmers and small business men are unable to furnish political leadership for either the workers or the capitalists, but on the other hand, must of necessity follow one or the other class. For this reason, any political movement headed by farmers or small business will soon find itself in a blind alley or will be forced to surrender its leadership to the workers or the big bourgeoisie. (the big

capitalists).

In the recent Minnesota Primary election the labor vote for the Farmer-Labor ticket was very small. Thousands of workers paid no attention to the election as they could not see any object in voting. The workers have been fed up on broken campaign promises by office seekers masquerading behind the Farmer-Labor label. The wrong make-up and program of the F.L.A. has completely blurred both party and class lines, and party issues in the campaigns have degenerated to meaningless issues between individuals. Since the F.L.A. has become a plaything for ambitious politicians of the Shipstead-Starkey type the endorsements of the Association mean nothing to the workers and are generally ignored. That was the case in the Primary election just past where several endorsed state and congressional district candidates were defeated by individuals who carried no endorsement.

All the efforts which have been wasted in the last ten years by the Communist movement to build and maintain Farmer-Labor parties in the United States can be laid to the Right wing opportunist policy of the Stalin leadership of the Communist International. This false conception concerning the role of Farmer-Labor parties, is but another blunder added to the long string of wrong united fronts sponsored by the Stalin gang in the C.I. It will be the duty of the Communist League, the Left wing of the Communist movement, to furnish the American workers with a correct political program which will guide them along the most direct path toward their ultimate goal. —A.EKSTROM

Why Doesn't Lovestone Answer Trotsky?

More than three months ago, the following letter from comrade Trotsky was transmitted to Harry Winitsky, business manager of the Revolutionary Age, organ of the American Right wing:

Buyuk-Ada, April, 16, 1930

Dear Comrade Winitsky:

I have received your organ regularly. The various addresses signify the same. In thanking you for your kind attention, I nevertheless feel the need of expressing openly to you a certain surprise on my part in connection with your letter. The Revolutionary Age has from its very beginning, and its present director* long before its appearance, constantly and energetically denounced me and my friends as counter-revolutionists. I cannot doubt that this happened out of honest conviction.

You sign yourself, dear comrade Winitsky, fraternally. The sincerity of this salutation, I also have absolutely no right to question. But since we are no diplomats, and what we say must correspond to what

*Trotsky refers to Jay Lovestone.

we think, I assume that if not the Revolutionary Age as a whole, then at least a section around it, no longer regards us as "counter-revolutionists". Would it then not be in place to acknowledge this openly?

I raise this question not in my interest but in the interest of political clarification in general.

In this spirit I also sign myself,

Fraternally,
L. TROTSKY

Three months, and many issues of the Revolutionary Age, have elapsed, but no answer has been made in that paper, unless one can count as such the continued misrepresentations of Trotsky's and the Opposition's standpoint that appear in it regularly. The letter, it is true, was reported at the recent "convention" of the Lovestone group, and interpreted by the professional Trotsky-slayer, Bert Wolfe, as a "bid for unity" with the Right wing! But Wolfe's conjuring tricks are not yet enough to obviate the need for an open reply to comrade Trotsky's letter.

What have Winitsky and his paper to say?

The Man Stalin Chose to Succeed Blumkin!

The French press is announcing new revelations on "the activities of the G.P.U." They are supposed to come from a high Soviet functionary. In fact, it refers to a new deserter of Bessedovsky's type, who as soon as he passes "over the other side of the wall", goes over body and soul to the bourgeoisie and swears to fight Bolshevism with all his power.

The cases of desertion by functionaries of the rotten apparatus abroad have become very frequent. Diplomats, military attaches, commercial agents, bank directors, the whole fine gang that is often recruited from the bourgeois world, seeks the first opportunity to betray the proletarian state. It is a normal condition and that is why we have not bothered ourselves with these people in our press.

But the case of the latest deserter is very characteristic of the Stalinist apparatus and of the struggle that Stalin, with the aid of the apparatus, conducts against the Left Opposition.

Agabekov, the name of the new deserter was charged with a secret mission of the G.P.U. for Turkey, Greece, Syria, Palestine and Egypt. And here is what Agabekov says in Miliukov's paper, Posledni Novosti (Latest News) of July 2nd, 1930:

"It is Blumkin who was charged before me with this mission. Last fall he was recalled to Moscow, and, suspected of Trotskyism, he was shot. I was designated in his place and I was given the order to relieve from their posts all his collaborators suspected of Trotskyism, too."

This declaration explains a lot about

the methods of struggle that Stalin uses against the Left Opposition. In the same declaration, Agabekov says that while he was yet in Moscow he no longer believed in the dictatorship of the proletariat and that he "considered it as the dictatorship over the proletariat". But Stalin does not trouble about such a trifle provided the functionary is faithful to him and accepts all the dirty jobs against the Opposition. All the rest—conviction, fidelity to Communism, etc.—are secondary matters. The Opposition, hunted driven from their posts, deported like Rakovsky or shot like Blumkin are replaced by the Bessedovskys and by the Agabekovs.

The Agabekov case shows us again that in the bitter struggle against the Left Opposition, against the Bolshevik vanguard that has remained loyal to Communism, Stalin employs covert or open counter-revolutionists, people who are ready at the first occasion to betray the Soviet state.

—O.

KLORKEIT No. 4

Note that the fourth number of Klorkeit, organ of the Jewish Left Opposition group in France, has arrived. It contains among other articles the fourth installment of comrade Trotsky's "The Third Period of the Mistakes of the Comintern."

France

Opposition Progress

The minor effects of the world crisis which French industry has already come to experience (textile, wines, etc.) and the pessimistic perspectives created for it by the recently adopted U.S. protective tariff, do not as yet lead the French bourgeoisie to seek methods of despair ("fascisation") as the Party here would have us believe. It senses trouble for the future to be sure. It knows that the crisis is not going to leave France economically immaculate. And for this very reason it strains every effort to reinforce and consolidate its present political domination in the country. A stable bourgeois bloc, purged of all "extremist" elements, is its chief aim.

This was clearly demonstrated by the recent speech of Tardieu at Dijon. By threat and by persuasion he hopes to win over the Radicals to his Republican Concentration, because it is these that he needs to assure stability to his class-government. He openly admits that there are serious problems facing his class (the agricultural crisis, financial disorder, etc.) and he makes a strong plea for cooperation to the different bourgeois parties on the basis of what he has already "accomplished." As a major part of his "accomplishments" he cites his strong-handed suppression of Communist influence! This Communist influence, two, three years ago, was menacing. Today it is impotent! Now, he sees as the task of the government: "positive" achievement.

The Party up a Blind Alley

The Party writers pass over in painful silence this enemy class estimate of the movement. For, it is the solemn truth. The First of May, the inaction displayed in the campaign for the 13 martyrs of Yen-Bay attests it. Yet nothing stirs the leadership from their philistine complacency. Vacant, optimistic phrases are still the substitute for effective class action. As long as the Party will not realize that a strong, solid working class resistance must be assembled to oppose the concentrated power of the bourgeoisie, its influence is going to decline still further. And such a working-class resistance cannot be achieved by "third period" antics, by mechanical control of the mass organizations, by bureaucratic execution of the trade union work, by leaving the basis of reality. By these methods, it only drives the workers into the arms of the reformists of all shades socialists, popists or syndicalist minoritaires. By these methods it discredits Communism as a whole in the eyes of the workers. The masses have to be educated through all possible phases of collective struggle for their historic class task and not by light-headed optimism and talk.

Opposition Growth

With all this tragic sterility of the Party leadership, the situation is, however, by no means hopeless. The Left Opposition is always there, watchfully exerting its pressure, struggling to revitalize the Party. The progress of the Left group is increasing. It was the Ligue Communiste which in conjunction with a majority of Annamite Communists here (who, after having carefully studied the events of the Chinese revolution, know where to find proper Communist guidance for their own) organized the first, real protest demonstration against the executions of Yen-Bay, before the president's palace. This demonstration and the impression it made upon the bourgeoisie contributed a great deal to awaken the membership of the Party to the insufficiency of the leadership and to force the Party itself into (belated) action, governmental measures striking our comrades heavily (expulsion and prison).

In the North of France a strong detachment of the regional C.G.T.U. has joined the Opposition Unitaire (which rallies about the political program of the Left Opposition and the Verite.) The C.G.T.U. Left Opposition is rapidly developing, parrying successfully the calumniating attacks of the both the Stalinist majoritaires and the syndicalist minoritaires ("Committee for Trade Union Independence") In the Party itself, different nuclei and subsections (Tours, 13th Arrondissement, Paris etc.) have started a struggle against the false policy of the leadership, backing and declaring their full support of the Left Opposition. The struggle for the Party and for the reestablishment of a Leninist line has only begun. —S.GORDON

What the 'New Masses' Refused to Print

Concerning the «Defenders» of the October Revolution

Dear Friend:

I have received a copy of the New York magazine the *New Masses* containing articles about my autobiography and about the suicide of Maiakovsky. I do not regret the fifteen minutes I have spent getting acquainted with the American Left intelligentsia. Magazines like this are to be found in several countries. One of their most important tasks is said to be the "defense" of the Soviet Union. This is a wholly praiseworthy undertaking, regardless of whether the Messrs. "Defenders" fulfil it from inward conviction or—as is sometimes the case—from less lofty motives. But it would be foolish to exaggerate the importance of this defense. These groups, sufficiently variegated in their composition, busy themselves on one side with the fringes of the bourgeoisie, on the other with the fringes of the proletariat, and offer no guarantee whatever as to their own future. As the majority of pacifists struggle against war only in times of peace, so these radical "defenders" of the Soviet Union, its titular "friends" from the ranks of Bohemia, will fulfil their mission only so long as this does not demand real courage and genuine devotion to the revolution. These qualities they do not possess. And where indeed should they get them? Their radicalism needs a protective coloration. For that reason it finds its chief expression in the "defense" of the Soviet Union—defense of a state possessing power, wealth and authority. It is a question of defending what exists and is already achieved. For such defense it is not at all necessary to be a revolutionist. You can quite well remain a mixture of anarchist and conservative. But at the same time you can seem revolutionary, deceiving others and, to some extent, yourself. We have seen this in the example of Barbusse and the French paper *Monde*, which belongs to the same category as *New Masses*. From the standpoint of time, their radicalism is chiefly directed toward the past. From the standpoint of space, it is directly proportional to the square of the distance from the scene of action. In relation to their own country, these bold boys always were and always will be infinitely more cautious and evasive than in relation to other countries—especially those in the East.

The best representatives of this type, excelling the rest by many heads both in gifts and character, is undoubtedly Maxim Gorky. He sympathized for years with the Bolsheviks and considered their enemies his enemies. This did not prevent him from appearing at the time of the proletarian revolution in the camp of its enemies. After the victory of the revolution he long remained in the camp of its enemies. He reconciled himself with the Soviet Republic when it became for him an unalterable fact—that is, when he could reconcile himself with it without departing from his essentially conservative outlook. There is irony in the fact that Gorky warred against Lenin at the greatest period of Lenin's creation, but now long afterward, gets along very peacefully with Stalin. What can we expect of the pencil-sized Gorkys?

The essence of these people from the Left wing of the bourgeois Bohemia is that they are capable of defending the revolution only after it is accomplished and has demonstrated its permanence. In defending the yesterday of the revolution they adopt an attitude of conservative hostility to all those who are laying the road to its tomorrow. The future can only be prepared by revolutionary methods, methods as foreign to the conservative Bohemia as were the ideas and slogans of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the day before the October revolution. These gentlemen remain, accordingly, true to themselves and to the social classes which created them and feed them. Furthermore, in spite of a formal veering to the Left, to the "new masses" (!), their conservatism has really grown stronger since they are leaning their backs against—not the October revolution, no!—but against a great state as an "institution", independent of its guiding ideas and of its policy. They were with Lenin and Trotsky—by no means all of them, by the way—after that they were with Zinoviev, after that with Bucharin and Rykov, now they are with Stalin. And tomorrow? Upon that they will express themselves when tomorrow has be-

the bourgeoisie and the social democracy? come yesterday. They have accepted every change in the governmental course as patriotic officials accept a change of uniform. There are always potential Chinovniks sitting around Bohemia. These people are courtiers of the Soviet power, not soldiers of the proletarian revolution.

The workers state, as a state, may have need of such characters for temporary goals, although I have always thought that the near-sighted epigones greatly exaggerate the weight of these groups—just as they exaggerated the value of the "defense" of Purcell or the "friendship" of Chiang Kai-Shek. As for these characters themselves, I am ready to acknowledge that it is better to be a courtier of the Soviet power than of the oil kings or the British secret service. But the proletarian revolution would not be the proletarian revolution if it allowed its ranks to be confused with this problematical, unreliable, fickle and wavering brotherhood.

Their moral triviality assumes cynical and sometimes insufferable form when they, in the character of "friends of the family", interfere in the inner problems of Communism. To this testifies the aforementioned number of the *New Masses* (a paradoxical name by the way for an organ of Bohemia!). These people, you see, think that my autobiography will serve the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, while *New Masses*, *Monde*, and other publications of this kind, are obviously necessary to the

proletariat against the bourgeoisie. This aberration is easily explained: Fooling around the fringes of two hostile classes and revolving continually on their own axes, the Barbusse of all countries naturally get mixed up as to where is the bourgeoisie and where the proletariat. Their criteria are simple. Since the work of the Left Opposition decisively criticizes the domestic policy of the Soviet Union and the world policy of the Comintern, and since the bourgeois newspaper-writers exult in this criticism and try to make use of it—why, the conclusion is perfectly obvious: The courtiers are in the camp of the revolution, and we, the Left Communists, in the camp of its enemies! This is the usual depth of the political thinking to be found in Bohemia.

The bourgeoisie would be stupid if they did not try to use the inner disagreements in the camp of the revolution. But was this question first raised in my autobiography? Wasn't the expulsion from the Party of the President of the Comintern, Zinoviev, and one of the presidents of the Soviet government, Kamenev, a gift to the bourgeoisie? Did not the exile and subsequently the banishment, of Trotsky give the bourgeois press of the whole world a welcome theme for agitation against the October revolution? Was not the denunciation of the head of the government, Rykov, and the head of the Comintern Bucharin, as "bourgeois liberals" used by these facts, brought to the attention of the

whole world, were far more helpful to the bourgeoisie than the theoretical reflections or historical explanations of Trotsky. But what interest has the anarcho-conservative Bohemia in all this? It takes all the foregoing events, because stamped with the official stamp, as once for all given and eternal. Criticism of the Stalin regime is impossible to them, not because the Stalinists are right, but because the Stalinists are today the government. I repeat. These are courtiers of the Soviet power, and not revolutionists.

For revolutionists, the question is decided by the class line, the content of ideas, the theoretical position, the historical prognosis, and the political methods, of each of the opposing sides. If you think, as we think—and as we have proven on a world scale through the experiment of the last six years—that the policies of the Stalin faction are weakening the October revolution, that they destroyed the Chinese revolution, that they are preparing the defeat of the Indian revolution and undermining the Comintern, then—and only then—our policy is justified. The bourgeoisie will grab up the fragments of our true and necessary criticism of course! But does that change in the slightest degree the essence of a great historical problem? Has not revolutionary thought always developed by the road of ruthless inner struggle, at whose fire the reaction always tried to warm its fingers?

I remark in parenthesis, however, that the whole bourgeois press, from the *New York Times* up to the Austro-Marxist *Arbeiter Zeitung*, in its political estimate of the struggle of the Left Opposition with Stalinist Centrism, stands incomparably nearer to the Centrists and never conceals it. You could publish a whole anthology of press clippings to prove this. Thus, in addition to all the rest, the "friends" and "defenders" of the revolution, having nothing in common either with the old or the new masses, crudely distort the genuine picture of the distribution of political sympathy and antipathy among the bourgeoisie and the social democrats.

Lying, by the way, is a necessary accomplishment in a courtier. In the article about Maiakovsky, as I turned over the leaves of the magazine, I hit upon the name of Rakovsky. I read eight or ten sentences, and although I am accustomed to much, nevertheless what I read made me gasp. It is related here how Maiakovsky "hated war" ("hated war"—what a vulgar formulation of the relation to war of a revolutionist!) and how, in contrast to that, Rakovsky, at Zimmerwald "was going to take off his coat and punch Lenin and Zinoviev...in the jaw" for their revolutionary struggle against war. Rakovsky is named here for no purpose whatever except for that of spreading this scandalous lie. It is necessary to spread it because Rakovsky is in exile and it is necessary to justify his being there. And so the courtier becomes a contemptible slanderer. He spreads this stupid scandal instead of seating—once he has named Rakovsky in connection with the war—with what revolutionary courage Rakovsky struggled against war under a hail-storm of persecution, slander, assault and police prosecutions. Exactly for that struggle Rakovsky was thrown into prison by the Roumanian oligarchy and was saved from the fate of Lejoknecht and Rosa Luxembourg only by the revolutionary Russian army.

That is enough. If the October revolution had depended upon its future courtiers, it would never have appeared in the world. And if its further destinies depended upon their "defense", the revolution would be condemned to ruin. The proletarian vanguard can guarantee the future of the country of the Soviets, and prolong the road of the world revolution, only by a correct policy. We must work out that policy, establish it theoretically, and defend it with tooth and nail against the whole world, and if necessary against the very "highest" institutions which have raised themselves up (or rather slid themselves down) on the back of the October revolution. But of those questions we need not speak in connection with the pseudo-revolutionary courtiers from the ranks of the petty bourgeois Bohemia. For them enough has been said.

Yours,
—L. D. TROTSKY

Prinkipo, June 10, 1930.

By L. D. TROTSKY

Hypocrisy for Art's Sake in the New Masses

Correspondence between Max Eastman, Walt Carmon, Mike Gold

The following letters are virtually self-explanatory. They arose out of a letter sent to Michael Gold, editor of the *New Masses*, by Comrade Max Eastman. In this letter comrade Eastman enclosed the article by Trotsky (printed in this issue of the *Militant*) and demanded the publication of the latter in the *New Masses*, in view of the slanderous attacks made by Gold and Earl Browder against the Opposition in general, and Trotsky and Rakovsky in particular, in a previous issue of that periodical. The first reply to Eastman's letter was in the affirmative from Walt Carmon, managing editor of the *New Masses*, followed by a cowardly negative reply from the editor, Gold, which is answered by comrade Eastman. The three letters are printed below.—Ed.

NEW MASSES

112 East 19 St. New York, N. Y.

July 7, 1930

Max Eastman,
Chilmark, Mass.

Dear Max Eastman:

This will acknowledge receipt of your note and article by Leon Trotsky. We are certain to use this in the coming issue. Mike Gold is not in town. Back in a few days. You will probably hear from him as well on his return.

Yours,
WALT CARMON

NEW MASSES

112 E. 19 St. New York, N. Y.

July 16, 1930

Dear Max:

I'm sorry, but I really don't think we should print this in *New Masses*. We reviewed Trotsky's book, because it was "literature", but all of us here agree that the mag. shouldn't become an organ of political discussion and if we give up a lot of space to this Trotsky fight from now on—we immediately lose our function as a literary vehicle—

Sorry

MIKE GOLD

July 18, 1930

Dear Mike Gold:

Your pretense that you will not publish Trotsky's rejoinder to your cheap attack on him because your magazine is too "literary" is an insult to my intelligence. The article to which Trotsky makes this rejoinder was written by an active head of the Workers Party and was a political attack from the first word to the last.

Moreover it was a complete abandonment of the policy of your paper which had been to pussy-foot on this whole issue of the Left Opposition. You refused to let me write about it as a member of your Executive Board, even with an answer by a Stalinist in the same number. When I resigned, the pussy-foot policy was carried to the point of not printing my letter of resignation. When I stated this fact in a communication to *The Nation*, suggesting that this was not a shining example of "brave thinking", you replied justifying yourself on the ground that "We none of us used the magazine to express our opinions". (I quote this confession of yours from memory.)

Moreover about a year ago when I met you on 7th Ave. and asked how the magazine was getting on, you volunteered the information that, "We're through with the Party, we've learned that much anyway." (Here too I am quoting from memory but my memory is good.) It struck me strange that you should offer me this piece of inside information, when all previous negotiations with me had been conducted under the pretense that the magazine was independent of the Party—a "free revolutionary magazine" as it advertised itself. Upon reflection I wondered whether this gratuitous declaration of independence might not mean that you are now directly subsidized by the International.

Whether because you are subsidized, or because you depend upon the party for sales, the fact is that in publishing these attacks on Trotsky and Rakovsky you have at last shown your political colors. You are now overtly what you were before under cover, a Stalinist organ. And yet you have the brass to tell me that you won't publish Trotsky's rejoinder because you are too "literary".

And you have the folly to add, "All of us here agree etc." although you know that ten days ago I received a letter from your associate Walt Carmon stating—what any courageous and independent editor having viciously attacked one man and slandered another would state—that "We are certain to use this in the coming issue."

What happened during these ten days? Do you really expect any grown person to believe that having attacked a political leader with a page and a half of vituperation written by a political opponent, you refuse to publish a brief rejoinder because you are literary? Even people who re-

(Continued on Page 8)

NOTES of a JOURNALIST (Concerning ZINOVIEV, MANUILSKY, and RADOVOY.) by ALFA

Zinoviev and the Evils of Printing

In Number 5 of the Bolshevik of this year, Zinoviev once more "fuses" with the Party—by that single method now accessible to him. Zinoviev writes:

"In 1922, Trotsky predicted that 'the real rise of socialist economy will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe.' This prediction has not been confirmed, just as many other predictions of the author mentioned. The real rise of our socialist economy became possible already prior to the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe. The real rise is developing before our very eyes."

The same Zinoviev, beginning with the same year 1922, accused Trotsky of "super-industrialism", that is, of demanding a too speedy industrial rise. How should this be reconciled?

The Opposition was accused of non-belief in socialist construction and at the same time that it wants to rob the peasantry. If that were so, why did it have to "rob" the peasantry? In reality, the Opposition spoke of compelling the Kulak and the upper layer of the peasantry in general to bring sacrifices for socialist construction—the one which the Opposition was supposed "not to have believed". A fiery belief in socialist construction was manifested only by those who struggled against "super-industrialism" and proclaimed the empty slogan "face towards the village". Zinoviev proposed to the peasantry, instead of cotton prints and a tractor, a pleasant smiling "face".

In 1930 as well as in 1922 Trotsky considers that "the real rise of socialist economy in Russia will become possible only after the victory of the proletariat in the most important countries of Europe." Only it must be understood—and this is not so difficult, after all—that by socialist economy we have here in mind precisely socialist economy and not the contradictory transitory economy of the NEP and that by a real rise we understand such a rise which will completely reconstruct the habitual and cultural conditions of life of the toiling masses, destroying not only the "queues", O wise Zinoviev, but also the contradiction between the city and the village. Only in this sense can a Marxist speak about a real rise in socialist economy.

After his struggle with "Trotskyism" in 1923-1926, Zinoviev in July 1926, officially admitted that the basic core of the Opposition of 1923 was correct in its prognosis. And now for the sake of fusion with Yaroslavsky, Zinoviev once more rushes into all the difficulties and warms over the old dishes.

It is worth while therefore, to recall that this same Zinoviev signed, and in part wrote on the question he now touches, in the Platform of the Opposition:

"When we, in the words of Lenin, say that in order to construct a socialist society in our country a victory of the proletarian revolution is needed in one or more of the advanced capitalist countries, and that the final victory of socialism in one country and a backward one at that as impossible, as Marx, Engels and Lenin proved, the Stalin group ascribes to us the view that we 'do not believe' in socialism and socialist construction in the U.S.S.R." (Platform of the Bolshevik-Leninists, page 72).

Not badly said, is it?

How to explain these scurrings from falsifications to repentance and from repentance to falsifications? On this point the Platform of the Opposition does not leave us without an answer:

"MY LIFE"

All readers of the Militant, and their friends who desire to get their copy of Leon Trotsky, "My Life", should make it a point to order the book directly through the Militant. Shipment will be made the day the order is received, and the cost of the book, five dollars, (\$5.00), covers the postage charge. Send your order, together with money order or cash to

THE MILITANT

24 Avenue, New York, N. Y.

"...The petty bourgeois tendency within our own Party cannot struggle against our Leninist views otherwise than by ascribing to us things we never thought or said." (ibid, page 72).

The last lines were not only signed by Zinoviev, but, unless we are mistaken, were written by him. Truly Joseph Gutenberg has rendered some people a very poor service. Particularly when they have to "fuse" with the other "Joseph" who, it is true, did not invent printing, but works very conscientiously at its destruction.

Has France Entered the Period of Revolution?

The Left turn in the C.I. began in 1928. In July, the "third period" was proclaimed. A year later, Molotov declared that France, together with Germany and Poland, had entered a period of "the greatest revolutionary events". All this was deducted from the development of the strike movement. No figures, no facts were cited. They limited themselves to two or three examples taken from the last numbers of the newspapers. We took (see Militant No. 29-33) the question of the dynamics of the French labor movement in the light of figures and facts. The picture given by Molotov, prompted by the words of others (the role of the prompters, we assume, was played by Manuilsky and Kuusinen) in no way coincided with reality. The strike wave of the last two years had a very limited character, even though it revealed a certain rise compared to the preceding year, which was the lowest of the decade. The weak development of the strike struggle in the last two years is all the more remarkable because France, during 1928-1929 went through an undeniable industrial revival, clear enough in the metal industry where the strike movement was the weakest of all.

One of the reasons for the fact that the French workers did not utilize the favorable conjuncture is undoubtedly the extremely superficial character of the strike strategy of Monmousseau and the other pupils of Losovsky. It became clear that they did not know the state of industry in their own country. As a substitute for that they characterized as offensive, revolutionary and political strikes the isolated, defensive economic strikes primarily in the light industries.

This is the essential part of the analysis we made in our work on the "third period" in France. Thus far we have not seen a single article in which our analysis is submitted to criticism but evidently a very acute need for such a criticism is felt. There is no other way of explaining the appearance in Pravda of an enormous feuilleton, "On the Strike Strategy of the Generalissimo Trotsky", where there are frivolous rhymes, quotations from Juvenal, and in general fathomless wit, but not a word about a factual analysis of the struggle of the French proletariat, (for the last decade), particularly for the last two years. The article which evidently belongs to the pen of one of the recent gifts of the "third period" is signed modestly Radovoy (rank and filer).

The author accuses Trotsky that he knows strike defense but does not recognize the offensive. Let us assume that Trotsky is guilty of that. But is this a reason for renouncing an offensive struggle in the metal industry under the most favorable conditions and at the same time designate petty, defensive strikes as offensive?

The author accuses Trotsky of not distinguishing capitalism of the epoch of rise from capitalism of the epoch of decline. Let us assume that this is so. Let us forget about the struggle over the relation of the crisis of capitalism and its cyclical crises which went on in the Comintern in the period of its Third Congress, when live thought was pulsing in the Comintern. Let us assume that Trotsky forgot all of that, and that Radovoy absorbed it all. But does this give an answer to the question whether France entered for the past two years into the period of decisive revolutionary events, or not? This is precisely what the Comintern has proclaimed. Has this question any significance or not? It would seem that it has. But what does the author of the witty feuilleton say on this point? Not a word. France and its labor movement are completely disregarded. As a substitute, this Radovoy proves that Trotsky is a "mistake" and that he serves the bourgeoisie.

Is that all? Yes, nothing more than that.

But, a well-meaning reader will object, can so much be expected from a young Radovoy? He still has a chance to grow. After all it is not he who creates the trade union policy for France. For that we have serious revolutionary strategists, tested in struggle, as for instance, the general secretary of the Profintern, Losovsky.

Correct—we will reply to the reader—all this would be convincing if...if only the Radovoy were not Losovsky himself. And in the meantime, the matter stands thus: the bouquet of soured light-mindedness and flaccid wit is such that it cannot deceive us.

The leading general, under the modest pseudonym, defends his own acts. With rhymes he drapes the calamities he inflicts upon the labor movement with his leadership. In connection with that, he assails the Left Opposition with all the magnificence of his vengeful irony: it can, don't you see, be completely seated on one sofa. Let the Radovoy investigate: Are there any sofas in the jails that are filled with Oppositionists? But if they really were so few in number as Losovsky would have it, this would not frighten us at all. At the beginning of the war, the revolutionary internationalists of all Europe went to Zimmerwald on a few carriages. We never feared remaining in the minority. It is Losovsky who, during the war, was very much afraid of remaining in the minority and therefore defended in print the Longuevists, with whom he tried by all means to unite us, against us. During the October revolution, Losovsky was afraid that the Bolshevik Party would be "isolated" from the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, and he therefore betrayed the Party which he temporarily joined, and united with us, against us. During the October revolution, Losovsky was afraid that the Bolshevik Party would be "isolated" from the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries, and he therefore betrayed the Party which he temporarily joined, and united with its enemies in the most critical period. But even later on, when Losovsky did join the victorious Soviet power, his quantitative evaluations were just as little reliable as his qualitative ones.

After the victory of which he was not in the least guilty, Losovsky, putting the minus signs where he had previously had his pluses, at the time of the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, declared in a triumphant manifesto that the French Socialist party "no longer exists," and in spite of all our protests against this shameful light-mindedness, retained this contention. When it became clear that the international social democracy nevertheless does exist, Losovsky together with his teachers, crawled on all fours through the whole policy of the Anglo-Russian Committee and was in a union with the strike-breakers during the greatest strike of the British proletariat. With what triumph—with a triumph over the Opposition—did Losovsky, at the session of the Plenum of the Central Committee, report the telegram in which Citrine and Purcell generously agreed to converse with the representatives of the All-Russian Trade Union Central Committee, after they had crushed not only the general strike but also the strike of the coal miners.

After the destruction of the Chinese revolution and the disintegration of the organizations of the Chinese proletariat, Losovsky, at the Plenum of the Central Committee (where he came as a guest because Stalin had not as yet decided to bring him in as a member) reporting the fantastic data about the conquests of the Profintern, gave the figure of the workers organized in the trade unions of China as three million. Everybody gasped. But Losovsky did not even wink an eye. He operates just as lightly with millions of organized workers as he does with rhymes for the coloring of articles. This explains sufficiently why Losovsky's witticisms about the sofa on which the whole Opposition can be seated do not in the least overwhelm us with their magnificence. Sofas as well as furniture in general are undoubtedly in abundance in the offices of the Profintern, but unfortunately there are no ideas there. And it is ideas that conquer, because they win the masses...

"But why did Losovsky sign 'Radovoy'?" we hear a distrustful or a doubtful voice. There are two reasons: a personal and a

political. The personal role of Losovsky is such that it is not of advantage to him to expose himself to blows. In delicate moments of ideological clashes he prefers modest anonymity, just as in the sharp, acute hours of the revolutionary struggle he is inclined to solitary deliberations. This is the personal reason. As we have said, there is also a political reason. Had Losovsky signed Losovsky, everybody would say: Is it possible that in the questions of the trade union movement, we really have nothing better than this? But seeing the signature of Radovoy (rank and filer) under the article, the well-meaning reader retains the possibility of saying: We must admit that Radovoy is a sorry scribbler. But nevertheless we still have Losovsky.

Another New Talent

Only a few months have elapsed since it was declared throughout the Comintern by command of Molotov that the ideological struggle against "Trotskyism" must be considered at an end. Well? The publications of the Comintern, beginning with the publications of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, are once more devoting an innumerable amount of columns and pages to the struggle against "Trotskyism". Even the most honorable Pokrovsky, who is burdened with the labors of instructing the youth, has been moved to the front trenches. This corresponds approximately to the period in the imperialist war when Germany resorted to the mobilization of those forty-five and fifty years old. This fact alone would suggest serious fears for the condition of the Stalinist front. Fortunately, the Nestor of the Marxist historiography has not only grand-children but even great grand-children. One of them is S. Novikov, the author of an article on the autobiography of L.D. Trotsky. This young talent immediately established a record by showing that one can fill one and a half printed pages without presenting a single fact or formulating a single idea. Such an exceptional gift could be developed only under the direction of an experienced master. And we involuntarily ask ourselves: Was it not Manuilsky, in the hours free from the direction of the Comintern, that nourished Novikov at his breast, this blessed baby of the "third period"? Or perhaps Manuilsky had no need of bringing up the young talent? Maybe Manuilsky simply made use...of his own talents? We will not tire the reader any longer: Novikov is Manuilsky. The same one who in 1918 wrote that Trotsky—no more, no less!—liberated Russian Bolshevism from national limitedness and made it a world ideological current. Now, Manuilsky writes, that Stalin freed Bolshevism from Trotskyism and by that definitely strengthened it as an ideological current of the solar system.

But are we not mistaken in identifying the little Novikov with the great Manuilsky? No, we are not mistaken. We did not come to this conclusion lightly, and not by guessing, but through zealous investigation, to be exact: we read five lines at the beginning of the article and five lines at the end. More than that, we hope, nobody will demand of us. But why should Manuilsky hide under the signature of Novikov, somebody will ask? Isn't this clear? To have people think: If Novikov is so invincible then how must Manuilsky himself be! By the way, we will not repeat ourselves: The motives are the same for which Losovsky turned into Radovoy. These people are in need of reincarnation, like shiny pants—of a chemical cleaning.

☐

CORRECTION

In the letter from South Africa by comrade C. Frank Glass published in the March 29, 1930 issue of the Militant, an unfortunate error occurred. The third paragraph read: "The cause which led to the severance of my connection with the C.P. was the newly adopted policy laid down by the C.I. This policy, with its central slogan of 'An Independent Native Republic, with autonomy for national minorities' (meaning the whites mainly) was one to which I was unable to subscribe." It should have read: "The cause which led to the severance of my connection with the C.P. was the newly adopted policy, subsequently confirmed and extended by the C.I., under the central slogan of autonomy for national minorities."

Opposition Problems

Deeper into the Party!

By JAMES P. CANNON

In a previous article on the character and limits of our faction reference was made to the experiences of the German Leninbund, and to the flabbiness of principle which brought it to impotence and ruin. In this case, as always, confusion and looseness on principle questions were bound up with errors in tactics which contributed to and hastened the debacle. One of the greatest errors of the Leninbund in this field, as the results have shown was its false attitude toward the Party. In common with the entire International Opposition we have drawn the lessons of the split in the Leninbund and reacted to a firmer intransigence in regard to principle questions. We must make use of these lessons also in determining our attitude toward the Party. It is particularly necessary now because we stand on the eve of new developments in the Party which will be vitally affected by our tactics.

A Question of Tactics

For us this is a tactical question. We do not make a fetish of the Party organization; our disregard of the bureaucrats' "discipline" is a sufficient indication that we do not put the form before the substance. What we are concerned with at the present moment is the composition of the Party, its influence among the radical workers and the present relation of forces in the struggle in the Communist ranks.

Our task is to win over the workers' vanguard to the platform of the Opposition. A tactic which gives us the best approach to them is the one we must seek and apply. A tactic which hampers our approach to them is wrong on the face of it. Such a tactic would block the path of future development for the Opposition.

Where are the American revolutionary workers today? This question we must answer first of all. Unless we close our eyes to all reality we have to recognize that the great bulk of revolutionary workers who play an active role in the class struggle today are in the Party, and around the Party. The Party has the unquestionable hegemony in the Left wing labor movement. Take the needle trades as an example. It is true that Communist influence has declined as a result of the monstrous errors of the Party leadership; but the Party remains the decisive leading force in the Left wing. The same thing applies to other fields, for instance, the miners'. There are many Communist workers not in the Party; there are many who have dropped out of the Party—thousands of them—but they are not an organized force.

It is possible, with an aggressive policy and an energetic independent activity, to reach some of these revolutionary workers directly and bring them into the ranks of our organization. This we must do. But the main road of approach to them is through the Party. Under the present circumstances and relation of forces a complete break with the Party—a course toward the organization of another Party—would weaken, not strengthen our connection with the Left wing workers who are sympathetic to Communism.

This relation is not fixed and final for all time; it simply determines the attitude for the present and the near future. In comrade Trotsky's letter published in the Militant some months ago he expressed the opinion that the relation of forces in America justified an orientation on our part toward the formation of an independent party. We did not agree with it at the time and we thought comrade Trotsky would change his opinion when he received more complete and detailed material on the situation in the Communist and Left wing labor movement. This proved to be case, as attested by a second letter from him.

Need Flexible Tactics

The peculiarities of our position as a body of expelled Communists impose upon us a flexibility of tactics. Dogmatic narrowness and one-sidedness will be fatal to our future development. We are confronted with the necessity of maintaining our position as a fraction of the Party, despite the prohibition of the officialdom, and at the same time of developing an independent organization with its own independent activities and its own discipline. To combine these tasks, to make each supplement the other is our problem.

The most important means of approach to the Party members is the tactic of the

united front with the Party. Our participation in the demonstration for the Indian revolution was an excellent illustration of this policy and we must follow more energetically in the future. On the same order is our offer to participate in the New York election campaign, our repeated attempts to enter into joint class struggle action with the official Party in behalf of the unemployed, the class war prisoners, etc. By these means we are continually refuting in action the slanders of the Party overseers against us and gaining in the sympathy of the Communist workers.

The Centrist leaders are always aroused to the greatest fury by our attempts to make a united front with the Party in common struggle against the class enemy. And that fact ought to be instructive for our own members. The bureaucrats fear our contact with the Party workers on the firing line of the class struggle. They fear the influence of our example. They fear our arguments and our slogans. They want to tear us away from all contact with the proletarian Communists. This ambition of theirs is quite understandable. But we must not help them realize it by false tactics.

The Party—that is the Party membership—is not a dead body. It is a living organism constantly under the pressure of the class struggle. It cannot be kept in a strait-jacket. The Party reacts to events. It is influenced by criticism—especially so when the Party members see the criticism confirmed in life. Things which have just recently happened in the Party and others which are in a course of preparation bear out this contention.

A long time after the echoes of our expulsion had died down in the Party, after it seemed on the surface, that all our contact was broken—the Party was startled

a few weeks ago by another bombshell. This was the declaration of Hugo Oehler for the platform of the Opposition followed the next week by a whole group of young Communists in New York. There are more to come. Just the other day we received a letter from a comrade in a city where we had no supporters up till now. The letter states that a number of comrades have been reading the Militant very attentively for some time and that they are about ready to make a declaration in our behalf. Hardly a week goes by without similar news.

There can no longer be any doubt that our propaganda is penetrating into the Party ranks and influencing the Communist workers more and more as they see it borne out by events. What is happening now is not the adhesion of isolated individuals here and there, but the beginning of a movement for the Opposition. We are breaking through the wall reared against us by the Centrist leadership. The second layer of Oppositionists is taking shape in the Party.

The Character of the New Movement

The new movement for the Opposition shows certain distinctive features. Its main current is made up of the best types of proletarian Communists who have been attempting to carry out the policy of the Party on the battle-field of the class struggle. Here they are confronted with the contradiction between the bluff and the fakery of the Party jacks-in-office and the realities of the situation. The more these comrades in the field try to apply the official policy the more they bump their heads against this contradiction. The result is a gradual awakening to the fact that something is amiss.

They begin to criticize and to propose modifications, and are met with accusations of "Right wing tendencies" and threats of discipline. The swivel-chair generals in the Party office have no sympathy for the grievances and complaints of the fighters in the field. Slogans and "instructions" cost the Browders nothing; they don't have to carry them out. Therefore they can be as bom-

bast as language will allow. Not so the Party workers in the field.

Deprived of the right to discuss anything really important in the official Party channels, the comrades begin to discuss among themselves. The gap between them and the leadership widens. This process has been going on now for a long time. That it has not exploded before now in a faction struggle over questions of current policy is accounted for by the terror regime in the Party and the lack of "prominent" leaders. This lack of leadership is not altogether a minus quality. While it retards the open manifestations of the proletarian current it drives it deeper into itself, compels it to weigh the questions more carefully and to relate them to the fundamental issues.

The logic of the situation drives the proletarian revolt in the Party toward the platform of the Opposition. Only on that basis can it develop into a real power. There are some who understand this already but who shrink from its implications. To think the conflicts through to the end means to connect the contradictions in local policy with the national, and the national with the international. This leads inevitably to a consideration of the standpoint of the Opposition. To study the platform of the Opposition objectively and honestly means, for a conscientious worker Communist, to support it. This means "disgrace", loss of "position", expulsion, slander. The severing of social relations and other trifles. Some fear this. Others go forward resolutely and tell the truth to the Party. Such a type is Hugo Oehler. There will be other Oehlers.

Closer Bonds with the Ranks

It is our most important task at the moment to establish closer bonds with this coalescing proletarian movement in the Party and help it to take shape as a genuine political force. We must help from a political standpoint. We must stimulate its organization.

Regardless of the vacillations of some of the potential leaders, this movement in the proletarian ranks of the Party will develop and go forward. It will do this because it is rooted in the deepest needs of the Party of the proletariat to coordinate its policy with the realities of the class struggle. And this is not a question of empirical and short-sighted shrewdness and practicality. It is a question, in the last analysis of the Marxist fundamentals on the main issues of international import from which, and only from which, the correct everyday tactics flow. To make this clear to the revolting workers in the Party ranks is the task of the Leninist Opposition. In order to do this we must have the closest contact with the Party. We must go deeper into the Party. The decisive trend of this movement in our direction, already noticeable, is a justification of our attitude toward the Party. The successful development of the movement into a new fighting regiment for Leninism will confirm these tactics beyond all further dispute.

As the new developments show, the Party cannot be judged by the apparatus. With most of these people political stultification has been blended with moral corruption, and their reclamation is beyond the power of politics. Not to trust them, but to fight them; not to count on them for the regeneration of the Party but to see that they will be its first victims—that is our attitude toward them. It is different with the Communist worker who has no axe to grind. Let us not forget this distinction.

Our Independent Activity

One way—and one of the very best ways—to give real support to those comrades fighting for our views inside the Party is to increase the independent activity of the Communist League. The stronger we are as an independent force, the more rapid will be our progress in the Party ranks. The steps we have taken since the Plenum of our National Committee toward the formation of an Opposition group in the needle trades unions as an independent factor has a special value and importance in this regard.

We cannot foretell every fluctuation of the struggle for Leninism in the Communist movement nor the forms it will always take. The main tasks and the main line, however, are clear to us. Under a shower of slander we are organizing the fundamental nucleus of the future Communist Party and we must connect this nucleus with the larger body of worker revolutionaries and win them for our platform. At the present stage of the struggle—which we visualize as a long one—it is above all a fight for the Party. A clear understanding of this will hasten our victory.

The Truth About the Bolivian «Revolution»

The much talked of "revolution" in Bolivia is nothing more than a change of power from the hands of one clique to another of the same semi-feudal military exploiting class. It is one of those many "revolutions" so frequent in the turbulent and instable "democracies" of Latin America at the same time that it reflects the struggle between those elements favorable to British imperialism attempting to scratch the political control of the country from the hands of those indisputably on side of the North American bankers.

The recent occurrences in Bolivia have not the revolutionary class character that the Daily Worker gives them when it states in a recent issue that the workers and peasants almost captured power, which the Party organ interprets as proof that the revolutionary movement in Latin America is becoming "deepened and extended". In other issues of the Daily Worker during the last few days declarations are made in the sense that the Bolivian masses, truly viciously exploited by financial capital are already completely radicalized in the spirit of the "Third Period". This is a false and childish method of analyzing the situation, born perhaps of the desire to make it appear that a real mass movement exists throughout Latin America. "Revolutions" of the Bolivian type, in countries where the mass of the population is made up of peasants with few workers, and where no true class consciousness has yet developed, always turn out to be means by which certain cliques of the exploiting classes dispute for power and for the right to serve imperialist interests.

The state of disorganization of the toilers of Bolivia, in the mines as well as in the countryside could not be less promising. In Bolivia there is no Communist party, nor for that matter any real working class organization. Under these circumstances how could the workers and peasants take power. With this state of affairs, to speak of the workers and peasants almost capturing power, results only in cheap phrase-mongering; it is a miserable bluffing attitude towards the workers that read the Party's press, disfiguring the facts.

At the present time the only ones who

have profited by the Bolivian revolution are certain military groups, some of the liberal petty-bourgeois elements and British imperialism, this latter only, in case the new regime does not reach an understanding with United States finance capital. These internal struggles among the exploiters in order to steal the booty from one another, offer an impulse to the masses for spontaneous participation in street fighting where they serve the ends of the opposition group, and as soon as the workers and peasants demand certain concessions bettering their conditions, they find the machine guns turned on them for the restoration of "order" and the "pacification" of the country.

A situation similar to that in Bolivia existed in Ecuador in 1925, and there were many comrades who interpreted the military rebellion at that time as a "social revolution", while others thought that a petty bourgeois democratic revolution had taken place; in reality it was nothing but a replacement of the dull swords of the old military chiefs for the sharper, newer ones of the younger elements.

Facts should not be exaggerated in this manner. A real analysis of each situation should be made in order to draw correct conclusions so as to better orientate the revolutionary movement of Latin America in particular and the international movement in general.

—CAMILO TORRES

Trotsky's Autobiography has proved to be a dangerous subject for critics of his standpoint to review. The bad luck of the New Masses with this enterprise has not only caused these dilettantes to regret their venture into the field of politics; it has frightened away others who once posed as experts on the menace of Trotskyism. The Revolutionary Age announced in a previous issue that it would review the book, but in the intervening period it thought better of this rash promise. It serves up instead a quotation from a German paper of the Right wing. We would like to know what Loveston has to say about the book. Or does he intend to surrender leadership in the struggle against Trotskyism to the New Leader, the New Masses, and the Daily Worker?

A Review and Criticism

The Communists in the South

By HUGO OEHLER

(Continued from Last Issue)

Success or failure of any struggle depends on how wide your first break is, and how fast you follow this up with additional attacks before the bosses can mobilize a counter attack. This is true in every stage of the development of the struggle. For example in Passaic, the first attack of the workers was followed up with not one

It several victories before the bosses could begin an important counter-attack.

If our first attack is not broadened before the bosses answer, we are not so able to withstand these blows but if we make big inroads and then the bosses attack, it is not felt so easily and we can not only better withstand their blows but answer them much faster before the bosses can follow up.

Such was not our fortune in Gastonia. Our mass picketing was very good, but did not enable us to follow up this first point with anything of consequence. The bosses answered the first blow with the Loray Committee of 100, organized from overseers, thugs and superintendants, led by Major Bulwinkle of Loray Mill. To this was added wholesale arrests by the local police and the cavalry terror, the church and the local press. April 10th the cavalry was removed and 35 deputized American Legion men replaced them. In the meantime the National Textile Workers Union was doing its best to push ahead. Several hundred struck in Bessemer City several miles from Gastonia. The small force of organizers who had strike experience were pressed to handle this mass of determined but inexperienced workers.

The Strike in Full Swing

By April the 15th the strike was in full swing with the W.I.R., the I.L.D., and Communist youth handling the work. The use of police, militia, gunmen and press could be expected.

We did not have long to wait. On April 18, a bosses' mob, under police and deputy protection wrecked the union office in a well-planned fashion. The demolishing of the W.I.R. supplies and the continual wholesale evictions, arrests and intimidations of strikers through the rest of April and in May showed us that the bosses were gaining in the counter attack.

In this whole period from the strike to the mob terror the spirit of the strike rose and repulsed each attack with sacrifice and determination but without effective counter-offense, entirely confined to counter-defense. In this period of attack on the workers we could have answered in a more positive way, if our leading force had been handled right.

Half the time Beal and the other leading comrades were sent back and forth from Elizabethton to Lexington, etc. hundreds of miles with many of those in the Gastonia area handicapped and those in New York ordering these drives as though they were sending some one from New York City to Passaic. Such a broadening out activity and especially in relation to A.F.L. activity must be carried on but not at the expense of our base and Southern center and that only further played into the hands of a powerful enemy attacking us on all sides in the Gastonia area.

Added to this improper draining of the field center was the sending of comrades such as Crouch and Pershing, etc., who may be able to function some places under proper leadership but who only "messed things up" in the strike area with bombastic disconnected "radicalism".

This first mob action and police attacks were answered by rebuilding and continuing the work. Broken picket lines were reformed. Throughout the country the issue was raised for Gastonia and funds started to flow in to help. Mass meetings were held daily at the Union headquarters in Gastonia and workers for many miles around came in and asked for organizers for their mill towns. Hundreds were signed up into the Union from all parts of the area. The "unorganizable" were starting to organize.

The rebuilding and recruiting inspired new hope and the stubborn picket lines of the firm ranks. The union planned to follow up this drive with a new drive on July 1 to close the mill. This belated attack was known to the Committee of 100

before it materialized and the terror of the thugs increased with a plan of ending it all before the new drive would start.

The Company's plan, like the union's fell short with the murderous raid of Chief Aderholt and his death through the workers' self defense on June 7. The planned drive of the union was transformed into a counter attack of the law with the Committee of 100 to follow up and clean them out. The first part of this counter attack of the bosses' legal troops was transformed into their defeat by the heroic action of the striking textile workers. The bosses force followed up the June 7th raid with terror for a week, wholesale arrest, intimidation, searching of homes, beatings, attempted lynching of Beal and others who were jailed.

With the entire force of active strikers and leaders arrested, held without right of bail, the police closed the destroyed tent colony and union headquarters and reaction and terror rode the county.

In this atmosphere came the national representatives of the W.I.R. and I.L.D. and although at first arrested and intimidated the W.I.R. took the lead and opened a new tent colony with the I.L.D. preparing for legal aid. This force brought new hope to the shattered and scattered forces of

The Sources of Manuilsky and Co.

Manuilsky is now drooling about the "Bonapartist" tendencies of Trotsky. The cheap Bohemia of the New Masses and other publication of the same type have also seized on this theme. For these people, Bonapartism is an individual feature of character and not a regime flowing from class relations, from the policy of veering between classes. Where must one's eyes be to discover at present Bonapartism in the Opposition when all the preparations for the Sixteenth Congress represent a repetition, a rehearsal of Bonapartism on the Party proscenium!

But we do not wish to raise here general questions, but to contribute some historical data on the source of the spiritual inspiration of Manuilsky and his American and other pupils.

In 1923 a book by Oskar Blum appeared in Germany giving the personal characteristics of the leaders of the revolution. This book was first to discover in Trotsky signs of the "new Corsican". Before we give a characterization of the book, however, it is necessary to say a few words about the author.

In the period of the first revolution, Oskar Blum was considered a social democrat and a Marxist, a partisan of Plekhanov. In the years of reaction he was suspected of connections with the gendarmerie. Arriving from Riga to Vienna, he addressed himself to Trotsky with a request to help him re-establish his revolutionary honor. On the basis of his own tales, Trotsky came to the conclusion that Blum could not be tolerated in the revolutionary ranks. After the revolution of 1917, documents were found which proved conclusively that Blum was in the employ of the gendarmerie of Riga. Blum was arrested and afterwards, through someone's thoughtlessness, he was freed from jail after which he fled abroad where he published the book about the leaders of the revolution. The general character of the book can be sufficiently determined by the character of its author: it is scurrilous libel.

A Plagiarist from Oskar Blum

A review of Blum's book was printed in the organ of the Bureau of Party History, Proletarian Revolution, in November, 1923, when the campaign of the epigones against Trotsky was already being widely diffused. Nevertheless, in that period, the brains of the Party and the Comintern were not yet pilled up with the tons of gossip and slander and generally with all kinds of refuse, and the official publications had not yet gotten out of the habit of using the language they were writing in Lenin's time. The author of the article in the Proletarian Revolution, not knowing that Blum had sufficient personal reasons to be dissatisfied with Trotsky observed in bewilderment the particular viciousness of Blum with

blacklisted, arrested, evicted and terrorized textile workers.

One of the outstanding weaknesses of our work brought to the surface by this period of reaction following June 7th was that all members recruited in the union were admitted through the Gastonia central office AND IN THIS WHOLE PERIOD NO MILL LOCALS HAD BEEN SET UP, yet we had plenty of material and time to do so. If a few mill locals had been set up the union would have been able to weather this storm in a far greater stable fashion and chaos would not have reigned. And instead of the auxiliary organizations reorganizing and laying a base they would have acted in a helpful secondary fashion and on the whole we would have been able to answer this with greater success.

The mill bosses through the control of Gaston County and the City of Gastonia government as well as the state government, lost no time and indicted 23 for murder—16 for first degree murder.

The fact that the union did not answer this attack and indictment and replace Beal at once, lost our forces valuable time that as far as the Loray strike was concerned could not be made up.

The new force sent in over a month after this terror, July 12th, inherited the strike of Loray and Bessemer that weeks before had been settled as far as life and immediate demands were concerned but a strike that was still officially on. On top of this they inherited the bombastic action of the fly by night organizers sent in, and add to this, the loss of records and chaotic conditions of the union forces after this month period.

regards to Trotsky.

"Therefore", it says in the review, "he let loose at Trotsky. Here the author puts into motion his whole baggage of the most impossible lies, slanders and charlatanism. In the face, the beard, the lips—in everything he anxiously looks for confirmation for his calumnious words. First of all—power. 'He (Trotsky) wanted the revolution,' it says there, 'because he wanted himself. Others spoke about the seizure of power because they considered the historical moment ripe for the transfer of power to the last powerless class. He spoke about the seizure of power because he considered himself ready to fake possession of the power.' (Page 83.) In the building of Trotsky's ministry' exemplary order and cleanliness prevail. Aha! This is the secret of Trotsky's personal power. In Trotsky's military orders, military style is felt—Aha! There are the signs of the new Corsican. And the palace guard, and the body guard—true, not in gilded livery, but—in the orderly uniform of the Red Guard!... The pamphlet ends with a transparent insinuation: 'Material power is in his hands. What next?' (Proletarian Revolution, November 23, 1923, pages 247-248).

Now take Manuilsky's article on Trotsky's "Autobiography". Take the review of the New Masses and the rest of the reptile press: In what do they differ from Oskar Blum? In nothing. What have they added to his revelations? Nothing. Their writings are a direct plagiarism from the stipendiary of the Riga gendarmerie. Is it not because these gentlemen themselves have the psychology of stipendiaries, which is irreconcilable with the psychology of revolutionists?

Lenin on the Libellers of Trotsky

At any rate, the source of Manuilsky's inspiration is revealed very accurately. This, however is not the only incident. There is a more important one which, by the way, has already been quoted by the Opposition, but we will bring it to mind once more because it has incomparable conviction. It is known that the whole campaign against "Trotskyism" began with the question of the peasantry: Contrary to Lenin, Trotsky is supposed to have underestimated the peasantry in general and the middle peasant in particular. The epigones have forgotten the source of this legend. Nevertheless it is rooted in the agitation carried on by the White Guards among the peasants during the Civil War. Lenin, in his day, took advantage of the first suitable occasion in order to dispose of this legend. These are his own words:

"In the Izvestia of February 7th, there appeared a letter from the peasant G. Gulov, who asks about the relation of our Workers and Peasants gov-

The Lying Campaign

Some of our Jewish comrades may have read the account of the India demonstration given in the Freiheit. In the midst of overwhelming paragraphs describing the heroism of the workers in defending their demonstration, was a short reference to the part played by the Communist League of America (Opposition).

The Freiheit reported that we appeared, surrounded by a bodyguard of detectives. According to the reporter, our only purpose in attending the meeting was to advertise our organ, the Militant. Probably the reporter was too exhausted by his struggles to read the whole of the placard displayed by the Communist League of America (Opposition). Or perhaps it is more convenient to forget that our banner, as well as those of the Party, supported the Indian Revolution.

The comrades made short work of us "counter-revolutionaries" prevented our breaking up of the meeting, and destroyed our papers and leaflets, says the article. In spite of the confident report of the Freiheit, however, many of our members remarked the sympathy of the surrounding Party comrades. Most them objected to, rather than helped in, the work of dispersing us. This in itself is a significant fact. It seems that they are beginning to realize that in a matter, such as the Indian demonstration, in which we are at one with the Party, to divide forces and fight among ourselves is the stupidest folly, and the best inducement to police intervention.

Having dubbed us "renegades", the program. In spite of the persistent lies, Party cannot reconcile this supposed character of the Left Opposition with our continued support of the correct part of its however, Party members are becoming more and more sympathetically inclined towards the Left Opposition.

—LILLIAN BORD

ernment to the middle peasantry, and speaks of rumors to the effect that Lenin and Trotsky are not in harmony, that there are big disagreements between them, and especially upon this subject of the middle peasant.

Comrade Trotsky has already given his answer in Izvestia for February 7. Comrade Trotsky says that the rumors of disagreement between him and me are a monstrous lie, propagated by the landlords and capitalists or their conscious or unconscious servitors. I, upon my part, fully confirm this statement of comrade Trotsky. There are no disagreements between him and me, and in regard to the middle peasants there are no disagreements not only between Trotsky and me, but in general in the Communist Party of which we are both members.

Comrade Trotsky in his letter explained clearly and in detail why the Party of the Communists and the present workers and peasants government elected by the Soviets and members of that Party do not consider the middle peasants their enemies. I subscribe with both hands to everything Trotsky wrote." (Lenin Vol. XIV, pp. 28-29, Pravda, No. 35, February, 1919).

This is the way the epigones and their office-holders, among them also the so-called Friends of the Soviet Union, simply repeat for a number of years what Lenin in 1919 characterized as "lies spread by landowners, etc., or their conscious or unconscious servitors."

This is how sadly matters stand. And not by accident. Centrism is not very inventive. It is ideologically poor and possesses a short memory. When this intermediary, shaky, unprincipled current leads a struggle against the revolutionary wing, it must necessarily borrow conclusions from the Right wing. It has none of its own and by its very nature, it can not have. And because by the logic of the struggle, Centrism is compelled to deepen its accusations against "Trotskyism" it is by that itself compelled to look for all the more muddy sources of inspiration. On this road matters have reached plagiarism of Manuilsky and Co. from the agent of the Okhrana, Oskar Blum.

What next?

—D.

If the number on your wrapper is

52

then your subscription to the Militant has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

THE YOUNG VANGUARD

The League's New «Plan of Action»

During the first weeks of the execution of the so-called Plan of Action adopted by the National Executive Committee of the Young Communist League, we predicted that it could not be successfully accomplished with the present false policies and opportunist regime. No doubt there were many members of the Y.C.L. who really believed that our prophecies were based on nothing but a malicious desire to see the Plan fail. But the facts of reality are daily demonstrating that the criticism of the Left Opposition is based on a thorough Marxian evaluation of the situation. The unvarnished fact of the matter is that June 30, the last day of the Plan, revealed an enormous disproportion between the figures on paper and the negligible gains actually made. Did the N.E.C. attempt to make an objective political analysis of the situation and initiate a discussion in the ranks on the basis of the experience of the last few months? To be sure not! For to do so would expose the complete bankruptcy of its false ultra-Left line. Instead there is much yelling that the membership of the Y.C.L. is not doing enough work, that they are substituting phrases for deeds, and that, forsooth, is a very crass expression for the "Left" danger itself.

The New "Shock Plan"

In order to evade drawing the balance of the so-called Plan of Action, it has been renovated, refurbished with a new name—Shock Plan—and extended for three months, to September 30. This however, will not prevent every sincere member of the Y.C.L. from putting the question squarely to himself (and honestly trying to discover the underlying cause of the whole unsavory situation.

Paper plans cannot be substituted for a correct line grounded on the actual situation among the young workers. Administrative decisions and bureaucratic commands and noise. The Shock Plan is a combination of all these negative qualities. It is a screen for all the recent failures, and an artificial attempt to make good all these reverses. An examination of its measures condemn it as an adventurist enterprise.

First, the Plan calls for a whole series of industrial youth conferences. These conferences are to be held in eight different industries—all by September 30. The industries are: textile, needle trades, mining, steel auto, metal mining, lumber and agriculture. The N.E.C. in all its recent resolutions and theses has recognized an unsatisfactory situation in the Y.C.L. But now, under the Y.C.L., has acquired such immense strength and vitality, such resources, so many forces and organizers, that it can simultaneously in the period of a few months enter eight different industries of the United States, and can successfully carry on campaigns which will culminate in mass—mind you, the Plan says "mass"—youth conferences. Do the Steubens, Harveys, Greens, and the other marionettes, who place all these directives so easily on paper, understand the significance of these grandiose schemes? Is this not stupid and criminal adventurism? Can't these light-minded people realize that it would be far better to concentrate on some one or two industries—yes, we are modest and sensible enough to ask for only one or two—where the objective conditions are most favorable and really hold a successful mass youth conference? Whom are these bureaucrats trying to befuddle with their loud prattle?

Second, the Plan, as part of its recruitment quota, calls for the gaining of 500 young Negro workers for the Y.C.L. Here the inventors of the Shock Plan really become realistic. In order to win 500 young Negro workers it is necessary to do mass Negro work, you understand. This is actually stated in the Plan. So in addition to carrying on mass campaigns in eight industries, we are going to hold mass—nothing but mass, mind you—Negro youth conferences against lynching in seven League districts by August 15, and by September 30 we are going to have a mass (note well!—mass) Negro youth organization affiliated to the American Negro Labor Congress (another mass organization whose existence is grossly exaggerated). Presto! It is done.

And thirdly, in addition to waging mass

campaigns in eight industries and holding Negro youth conferences in seven districts by August 15 which must culminate in a mass youth organization affiliated to the A.N.L.C. by September 30, we are going to have, unquestionably, mass unemployment youth conferences and a National Youth Unemployment Day Demonstration on August 20. And of course it goes without saying that by September 30, we will

Scranton Police Seize Communist Workers

Five workers arrested last week in Scranton and charged with sedition are facing 20 years in prison. They were jailed when the anthracite mine owners and their flunkies in political office feared that a strike of 1,200 members of the United Mine Workers Union for equalization of work would develop into a militant struggle led by the National Miners Union. The strike however, was short-lived as the Lewis-Boylan machine ordered the men to return to work.

Those arrested, and held in jail for the Fall Grand Jury are: Dan Slinger, district organizer, National Miners Union; John Little, youth organizer, Trade Union Unity League; Sylvan A. Pollack, district organizer, International Labor Defense; Joe Tash, National Executive Board member, N.M.U.; and Phil Frankfeld, Communist Party organizer. Joe Tash was arrested when speaking at a mass meeting at Dunmore where he was exposing the Lewis machine. The others were taken into custody the following day when state troopers and deputy sheriffs raided the headquarters of the I.L.D. and N.M.U. in Scranton. Without a warrant they placed the workers

Eastman's Correspondence with Gold

(Continued from Page 4)

nounce thinking through a passion for "literature", do not necessarily renounce honorable and decent editorial conduct.

What is your real reason?

Either you backed down because you are too cowardly to print Trotsky's classification of you, or else you consulted your masters, the bureaucrats of the Workers Party, and they forbade you to print the letter.

Either position marks off your paper completely from *The Masses*, from which it borrowed its name. And yet I notice you have chosen just this moment to get out a new line of publicity giving what you call "the autobiography of the New Masses", in which you falsely pretend that it is a mere continuation of the *Masses* and *The*

also transform the Labor Sports Union into a mass organization and win a mass circulation for the *Young Worker*, as well as double the League membership, create 48 shop nuclei, 85 shop bulletins, and recruit 10,000 young workers into the T.U.U.L. "That is what we, Bolsheviks, call a genuine attack." (Stalin). This last quotation confirms the correct line of the Shock Plan.

On September 30, let every member of the Y.C.L. demand an accounting. Let him demand the truth and not be satisfied with specious figures. Then let him draw his own conclusions.

—GEORGE RAY

under arrest, confiscated all books, records and letters and took the organizers to the state police barracks where they were photographed and finger-printed. Only after being held 10 hours were they charged with sedition. Since the arrests several more raids have been made on the headquarters, a move to smash the militant labor movement being the apparent objective.

The International Labor Defense which is conducting the defense of the five workers must develop a broad united front movement for their liberation. Not only the N.M.U. locals which are very weak, but the rank and file of the U.M.W. must be appealed to and asked to participate in the campaign. This is an issue that can be used to strengthen the Left wing movement in the anthracite if properly handled. If a sectarian defense campaign is allowed to be conducted, conviction of the five workers is certain and the many class war prisoners in the United States will have new recruits. On the other hand, a real united front movement will not only be a step for the freedom of the arrested workers but a reservoir of strength for the Left wing movement in general and the N.M.U. in particular.

Liberator. Have you forgotten that your publicity when you started the magazine was to the opposite effect? What is the reason for this change? Is this one more trick suggested by your bureaucratic masters for grabbing prestige at the expense both of sincere ideals and real facts? Did it not once occur to you while you were composing that sweet history, and using my name in advertising your magazine, that it might be honest to mention among those other charming incidents the fact that I resigned from the Executive Board of *New Masses* stating that I despised its sly pussy-footing policies and total lack of intellectual and moral courage?

Yours sincerely,

MAX EASTMAN

P. S. I offer this letter also for publication.

Camp Nitgedaiget in Boston

BOSTON—

Another Left wing organization is being "organized" under the leadership of a few Party members: the cooperative camp Nitgedaiget of Boston. When the camp was founded in 1927, individuals as well as organizations were approached to buy shares. One of its shareholders is John Reed Branch 718 of the Workmen's Circle, and like most shareholders participated in camp affairs and contributed toward its establishment.

To the opening of the camp this season, Branch 718 was formally invited as usual to the banquet and responded by sending a delegate with instructions to buy another share. The branch in turn felt that Camp Nitgedaiget is its home and applied for the camp grounds for its annual outing which was to take place on June 29.

The board of directors of the camp extended their welcome to Branch 718 and all was fine and dandy, until a few days before the outing was to take place a letter was received by the secretary of 718 stating the withdrawal of the invitation to the branch for its outing, due to the fact that the board of directors suddenly realized that the John Reed Branch is a Right wing organization.

Did not this realization come a bit late

in view of the fact that 718 was invited to the camp banquet not so long ago?

And now a question to the ex-manager of Camp Nitgedaiget who is now chairman of Branch 718: How does your own medicine taste, Mr. Robinson? We still remember last summer when the shoe workers of Boston were on strike and a committee came to camp with an effort to raise funds for the strikers. Mr. Robinson bitterly attacked the shoe workers' committee for coming on his ground to exploit shoe workers and was greatly in favor of putting the committee out of the camp.

It is interesting also to hear some of the members of 718 crying for a free platform for discussion when we recall an incident of about a year and a half ago when comrade Cannon was in Boston and our branch of the Communist League (Opposition) appealed for the platform and was rejected by these very members. It seems that it makes a difference into whose window the stone falls.

We hope that the camp board of directors will realize before it is too late the detrimental policy they are adopting in barring workers from the camp grounds while the members of 718 should, in the future, think for themselves and not be ruled by the iron hand of a clique. —C.D.

LENIN AND THE YOUTH

The Young Vanguard, beginning with this present issue will publish a number of important documents and statements by Lenin concerning the youth.

The importance of such publication is manifest although it is one were to judge by the neglect of this elementary educational work by the official Y.C.L., which wastes tons of paper on harmful drivel, one would not at all think so.

All young workers should read these fundamental documents.

In this first installment we publish the Resolution proposed by Lenin at the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democrats in 1903 on the attitude towards the student youth.

Previous to 1905, the various political parties of Russia obtained their propagandists and agitators from the students. This to a large extent included the working class party. With the clearing of the atmosphere that resulted from the storm of the 1905 revolution, and subsequent sharpening of the class war the situation changed and the intelligentsia of which the student youth is a section, gravitated toward their own petty bourgeois and bourgeois parties.—Eds.)

CONCERNING THE STUDENTS

Resolution moved by comrade Lenin on the attitude towards Students

(Passed at the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party held in 1903, with the exception of that portion in parentheses.)

This Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party welcomes the revival of independent revolutionary activity among the student youth, calls upon all branches of the Party to render every possible aid to the youth in its strivings to organize and recommends to all groups and student circles: first, to make it their first duty to imbue their members with a complete philosophy and to get them to study Marxism seriously on the one hand, and Russian Narodnik-ism and West European opportunism on the other as the principle opposing groups within the modern fighting progressive tendencies. Secondly, to beware of the false friends of the youth who are distracting it from serious revolutionary education by vapid, revolutionary, idealistic phraseology and philistine chatter about the harm and superfluity of sharp controversy tendencies, for these false friends, as a matter of fact, cultivate merely lack of principle and a frivolous attitude towards revolutionary work, and thirdly) in taking up practical activity to strive to establish connection with social democratic organizations beforehand in order to be able to be guided by their instructions and to avoid as far as possible important errors in the very beginning of the work.

just out!

BULLETIN OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION
Double No. 12—13 for June—July, 1930

Containing:

Towards the 16th Congress of the C. P. S. U.—The Revolution in India, by Trotsky—The Period between the 15th and 16th Congresses of the C. P. S. U., by Dingelstaedt—Notes of a Journalist, by Alfa—Numerous letters from the metropolises and centers of exile in the Soviet Union.—Two Conceptions, by Trotsky—Stalin and the Red Army by Markin—Letter to the Spanish Opposition, by Trotsky—What is Centrifism? by Trotsky—The German Situation, by Roman Weil—The Jewish Movement in France, by Senine—The Opposition in South America, by Dvorin—Letter from Prague—Etc., etc. 25c a copy \$2.00 a year

Send orders and funds to
THE MILITANT
25 Third Avenue New York