

WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE

THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME V, NO. 3 [WHOLE NO. 99]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 16, 1932

PRICE 5 CENTS

Bankers and Jobless Relief

The Tammany Government Machine Is Whipped into Line

For many years, the large banking interests, reported to be led by J. P. Morgan, have been attempting to force through a higher fare on the New York City subway systems (I. R. T. and B. M. T.). All the methods so typical of modern business practice have been used in their endeavor. For many years the people of this city have been bombarded with statistics as to how they would benefit by a higher fare, with a complete tabulation of the fares paid in other cities, of the relationship between the standard of living and the price paid for a subway ride, etc., etc. Now a final effort is being made this time, after all the years of preparation, the workers of the city can already begin to discern the smaller slot of the turnstile made to accommodate a thin ten cent piece.

All the subways in the city were built by the city government. After completing them, they were turned over to the private companies for operation. The important provisions of the contracts were: (1) the right of the city to recapture after due notice, and with due compensation; (2) the five cent fare; (3) the payment to the city of certain sums for its original cost—the payments to begin only after a minimum profit had been set aside for the company.

Increased Fare Fight

It was not many years after the original contracts had been drawn up, before the companies began to fight for an increase in the fare. It must be understood that the clause pertaining to part of the profit to the city was easily done away with. The individual capitalist never cares to share his profits with anybody else, even in his own class. Subsidary companies were organized, enormous rentals paid for property leased—all for the purpose of keeping the rate of profit well below that minimum above which part of the profit would have to be shared with the city government. This they have succeeded in doing to a great extent.

As regards raising the subway fare the task was a more difficult one. No political grouping dared take up the bankers' proposal. The issue might have been great enough to swamp any political machine out of office. The bankers bided their time; now they are ready to strike.

The bankers against the Tammany machine! How paradoxical this sounds. Yet there is an element of truth in it. The thieving Tammany politician looks upon the taxes paid into the city treasury as rightfully belonging to him. During times of prosperity the actual business men, real estate owners and bankers of the city raise no violent protest against "normal graft". After all, the Tammany machine is behaving rather well in keeping down the workers and protecting private property. However, during times such as the present, we begin to see strong protests being raised against the grafting politician, who continues to handle the "public funds" as he was taught to by his predecessors.

Cutting Down Relief

It is the bankers and large industrialists, however, who have the final say in this squabble for the diminished booty. Curtail expenses; decrease the budget. This is their war cry. Bond flotations, their weapon. The city administrations are quickly brought into line. The first thing to be chopped off is anything but the most meager sort of unemployment relief. Detroit, where some in the local government "held out" for a little better relief, was soon brought into line. The New York banks have now refused to float the necessary bond issues to tide the city over its temporary deficit.

New York City is at present feeling the lash of the whip held by the Morgans and Otto Kahns. The whole thing started with a law that forbids the comptroller (treasurer) of the city to sell any short term bonds below par, or at a rate of interest higher than six percent. Ordinarily, should New York City bonds fall a little below par, the comptroller can raise the interest rate on the issue to be floated, thus enabling him to sell them at or above par. The city government is constantly borrowing on short term loans to tide it over until the taxes fall due. Last September the city borrowed at an interest rate of less than two percent. In the middle of December the rate to the city, for a flotation during that month, was five and one half percent, bringing it dangerously near to the 6% limit. During the past few weeks however, the New York City bonds have been depressed heavily. They are now selling below par. One need not look far for the guilty one. Short term government bonds usually remain in the direct control of the bankers. The city now needs \$90,000,000 to cover its current expenses. The bankers have agreed to advance the money (float the bond issue) only if—the city agrees to curtail expenses.

The first thing hit at was the "home relief agencies". Part of the \$90,000,000 was to go for the unemployment, "re-

lief". Already, the stations have shut down, leaving the almost 1,000,000 unemployed here, with no aid whatsoever.

The Bankers' Idea

The bankers have a second idea in mind; they were quite frank about it—put all city enterprises on a paying basis, raise the fare on the subways. Now their time has arrived. Those who pay the fiddler call the tune. The tune is to have as its only note the clink of a ten cent piece.

The approach that will be made we might even try to predict. The politicians who have the "interests of the people" at heart—were forced to accept the increased fare by the bad bankers, who threatened to cut off the unemployment relief. Furthermore, they will say, the city as a whole will benefit, for they say nothing at the present about recapturing the lines. The probability is for a rise in the fare, followed not by a taking over by the city of the existing lines, but rather by the handing over to the old companies of the new subway built.

This is the picture of capitalist government; a sewer of vice, graft, intrigue and counter-intrigue. Only a working class revolution can sweep away the whole rotten mess. —H. P.

OPEN FORUM

Lecture by

ARNE SWABECK

The Revolutionary
Movement in America
To-Day
Impressions of a Tour

at the
Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue

Friday January 22, 1932

at 8 P. M.

QUESTIONS and DISCUSSION

ADMISSION: 25 Cents

Unemployed Workers Admitted Free

Auspices: New York Branch Communist
League of America (Opposition)

Is Stalin Preparing New 1923 in Germany?

What is happening in Germany? What is the position of the Fascists? Where does the German Communist Party stand and what does it propose to do?

These questions, of such vital importance to the militant working class, and an answer to which it cannot even expect to find in the capitalist press, it now also fails to find where they should

be: in the columns of the official Communist press.

The Advance of the Fascists

The Fascists continue to make rapid progress which is compelling recognition from all the sections of the bourgeoisie. The Hitlerites gain in arrogance with every new accession of strength. Bruening is finally compelled to bring into his councils the Austrian adventurer and beg him to return from the Reichstag which the blackshirts left, so that a presidential election may be avoided by an arbitrary decree to hold over Hindenburg at least until the "present disturbed situation is calmed". And Hitler, grown more cocksure with his recent successes, refuses the outstretched palm, and together with Hugenburg makes clear the determination of the Fascists to press forward until the issue is joined decisively.

Hitler does not merely have his heart set upon the conquest of power—the aim of every class party—but feels that the moment is swiftly approaching when the die will be cast. Bolshevism or Fascism—there are no other ways out for Germany right now. Towards socialist emancipation or black, long-enduring reaction—no other road is open out of Germany's present impasse. And while Hitler presses forward, the leaders of the German Communist Party are buying into the future by providing themselves with passports and visas for a quick departure when the storm breaks loose!

Bruening is giving ground to the Fascists. The social democrats, by their despicable cowardice, by their disarming of the workers, are leaving the doors wide open to the Hitlerites. The latter have thus far received no decisive check; on the contrary, their ranks are approaching a point in strength where no further gain can be expected by "legal" methods, where the unceasing conflict of interests must come to a violent solution.

And what does the Communist party say? What is it doing? From the *Daily Worker*, one learns absolutely nothing on these points. Every few days an inch or two of type is thrown into its columns to inform the reader that the German party has formed a few more nuclei and gained a few more hundred members. But from its columns not even the most careful reader can glean the fact that the fate of Germany is now hanging in the balance; not only of Germany, but

(Continued on page 4)

Japs Subsidize Russian Whites Hire Semenov, Notorious Cossack Adventurer in Mongolian Drive

The Chamberlain incident has been officially closed. Though reluctant at first, the Japanese government has finally bowed in apology to the all-powerful American imperialism. To be sure, the conflict of imperialist interests in the Far East is by no means over. There is a good deal of bickering going on around the proposed invocation of the Nine Power Treaty by the United States and the Japanese are just as alert as before on that point.

The Nine Power Treaty is supposed to guarantee the "administrative integrity" of China and through that, the policy of the "open door" to all the Western Powers. Against the contention of the Americans that by their invasion they are transgressing the provisions of that treaty, the Japanese reply that quite on the contrary, their sole aim of intervening in Manchuria is just precisely to preserve that "administrative integrity" of the country and to make the policy of the open door secure! Active, aggressive interest in the Japanese adventure is flagging for the moment. But the Nipponese are hardly started in their intent. Instead of adventures with peasant armies, the Chinese Communists must concentrate on rallying the city proletariat without which it will not be able to crush the Kuo Min Tang and successfully drive out the imperialist invaders. At one point of the process now unfolding, the interests of the Chinese masses and those of Soviet Russia will reveal their close interconnection with special sharpness. To face such a situation confidently, it is necessary to boast less and to pay more attention to the actual course of development of the struggle.

Having pretty firmly established their hegemony by means of puppet governments in Manchuria, the Mikado's generals are slowly but consistently forging ahead, in the direction of the Great Wall on the one hand, and in that of Jehol and the other Mongolian provinces,

on the other. Due to the interference of the other capitalist governments, the Japs have not been able to increase their reinforcements in Manchuria as rapidly and as freely as they would like. Consequently they have been suffering considerable losses as a result of the inevitable and severe guerilla warfare carried on more or less successfully by the natives in a land unfamiliar and hard Military campaign, the Japanese government is clearly keeping an eye on the possibilities that might offer themselves to anti-Soviet moves in the near future.

The immediate objective of this new alignment will no doubt be the subjugation of all of Mongolia under the Japanese yoke. The link between the present Jap expedition and their future designs is the People's Republic of Mongolia, a territory on which the Ataman is already prepared to advance.

Developments in the Orient almost always bear a slow and drawn out character broken by violent jerks. But eruptions of a political character are not subject to conditions of the soil. And these self-same slow processes in the

Japanese-Chinese-Soviet tangle are indisputably generating just such an eruption in the immediate future.

For the working class to meet such an event adequately it is absolutely necessary to continue to stress the community of interests between the Soviet Union, the world proletariat and the oppressed colonial peoples. The greatest watchfulness is required of the Soviet government to maneuver for the foreign invaders.

The *Daily Worker* refers to these bands of guerilla fighters as "Red partisan detachments" in connection also with high-sounding reports of more sweeping victories by the Chinese "Red Army" What greater proof the Stalinists have for this contention than for the contention—for example—that Father Cox's "army" represented the American unemployed we do not know. But then again, irresponsible and lavish boasting has ever been the bane of unprincipled political groups and of the Stalinized Comintern in particular. How sincere and interested workers are to be able to distinguish between friend and foe, between progress and retreat, how judge on the basis of experience what their revolutionary tasks are, the bureaucrats of the official Communist party and their confusing press are very little concerned about. As they sow, so will they reap.

Semenov At Work

Harassed by the difficulties on their path the Japanese are resorting to other methods. A dispatch to the *New York Herald Tribune* on January 12 reports that the notorious Russian White Guard general, Gregory Semenov is engaged in a movement to "effect the independence of the vast territory of Inner Mongolia with the sanction of Japan". The dispatch says further that Ataman Semenov "is known to have received pay from the Japanese for several years". The Cossack general claims he can raise an army of 50,000 former czarist troops as well as 100,000 Mongolian cavalrymen.

Condemn M.N. Roy to Exile

Manabendra Nath Roy, Right wing Communist affiliated to the Brandler group internationally has been condemned by the British imperialists in India to 12 years of deportation to a penal colony for "waging war against the king". The imperialist knot is determined to insure its holders against the seething revolt of the Indian masses no matter in what channels it flows.

Unbridgeable differences separate ourselves, the International Left Opposition from the Right wing liquidators of Communism. But we do not for one minute hesitate to aid in their defense when they are under attack from the open class enemy.

Stalinists Disrupt Mooney Confab

The apathy which prevails in the Illinois coal fields has been lifted to some extent by the campaign under way to demand the release of Tom Mooney. For this issue, the miners are evincing a readiness to struggle. Conferences have been organized in Staunton and Belleville. Plans are being laid and pushed for conferences in other mining centers. These conferences are largely the result of the efforts of local militants co-operating with the St. Louis branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition). The line of these conferences is based upon Mooney's August 20 appeal and the Opposition's endorsement of this appeal (*Militant*, 9-5-1931). It stresses the united front as the key to the problem of uniting the workers in a struggle to force Mooney's release and the release of all class war prisoners.

The Opposition delegates fight resolutely in these conferences for this policy. All attempts to exclude the I. L. D., the C. P., and the party organizations are resisted by our delegates. On the other hand, our delegates, while supporting the party's resolutions and themselves introducing resolutions against the Illinois criminal syndicalism law, are equally resolute in fighting the attempts of the Stalinists to divert the conferences along the lines of a fight against criminal syndicalism in general.

What has been the party's policy in these conferences? Caught unawares by their organization, the Stalinists limited their participation to long-winded speeches and general attacks upon all non-Communists and especially against the "counter-revolutionary" Trotskyists. But this policy acted as boomerang. Their slander discredited only themselves and by contrast with the policy, sincerity and activity of our delegates, increased the prestige of the Opposition in the eyes of the miners. It goes without saying that we use the advantage which accrues to us to redeem from discredit the ideas of Communism.

After several months of their futile policy, the Stalinists realized that more "decisive" measures were required to wreck the campaign and to undo what had already been accomplished. On Sunday, December 27, they descended on the second session of the Staunton conference en masse. They packed the conference with delegates mobilized from Springfield, East St. Louis, and even Chicago. On one pretext after another they interrupted the proceedings with irrelevant speeches and slander. The A. F. of L. delegates voted with their feet. Delegate after delegate left. The result is best expressed perhaps in a letter from one of the local militants who has participated in all the struggles of the Illinois miners since before the war.

Trotsky's 'History' to Be Out Soon

We have just been informed that the first volume of the "History of the Russian Revolution", by comrade Leon Trotsky will be off the press and ready for sale on February 27. This gigantic work written by the organizer of the insurrection will be complete in two volumes, the second of which will appear about the 1st of June of this year.

Volume one begins with the February revolution and deals with the period up to June 1917. The second volume continues from this period up to and through the October insurrection and the Bolshevik seizure of power. The books approximately 500 pages each, will contain many photographs and maps. Max Eastman translated both volumes from the Russian. They are published by Simon and Schuster Company and will sell for \$4.00 a volume or both for \$7.50.

—T. STAMM.

Marine Defense Meet

Hundreds Gather to Protest «Dynamite Plot» Frame-Up

On Thursday evening, January 7, a mass meeting in defense of Jack Soderberg, Thomas Bunker and William Trager, victims of the harbor bosses' "dynamite plot" frame-up was held at Webster Hall. Over 500 workers attended the meeting, which was held under the auspices of the Marine Workers Defense Committee.

For the first time in years, New York workers belonging to various political tendencies met together, swayed by a feeling of genuine working class solidarity in the face of the vicious class enemy.

Comrade James P. Cannon, of the Communist League of America, (Opposition) was the first speaker at the meeting at which Carter Hudson, chairman of the Marine Workers Defense Committee presided. Comrade Cannon eloquently presented the case of three defendants, pointed out the political background and the purposes behind this latest attack of the capitalist class and appealed to the workers present to support the Marine Workers Defense Committee and its efforts to repel the designs of the bosses in this case as in others by a frank and real united front.

Other speakers included A. J. Muste, of the Conference of Progressive Labor Action, who pledged the support of his organization to the defense and its willingness to cooperate with the Committee; Ben Gitlow of the Lovestone group, who made an appeal for funds for the defense; Walter Starret of the Road to Freedom Anarchist group and Carlo Tresca, editor of *Il Martello*, who cited

similar frame-up cases in the history of the American working class.

All speakers were well received. Despite the manifold political shades and colors, all appeared to be united to prevent the capitalist class from taking advantage of the dissensions within the working class for their own ends. The meeting represents a commendable attempt to close the ranks in warding off the blows of government oppression of workers and workers' institutions. As such it will undoubtedly call forth more and bigger meetings and manifestations of the same sort in the future.

The official Communist party and the I. L. D. were conspicuous by their absence. But many rank and file party comrades sat in the audience. The absolute necessity of action in cases such as that of the three marine workers will not fail to awaken the workers, Communist and non-Communist, to proletarian solidarity. We hope that rank and file pressure will lead the party and the I. L. D. to realize the mistake of their passivity in this case quickly. For the sake of the working class as a whole, as well as for that of the party. Such mistakes are dearly paid for. The force of united working class defense is irresistible. It is bound to overcome all obstacles.

The first Marine Workers' Defense meeting has started the drive. It is up to every class conscious worker to contribute his bit to the fight for the release of Soderberg, Bunker and Trager. Let no one stand aside.

—S.

New York Banquet Feb. 6

To Greet «Unser Kampf» and Three Returned Comrades

Arrangements are now being made for a banquet in New York on Saturday, February 6, which every Left wing militant will want to attend. The banquet, given by the Communist League (Opposition), will be a joint affair with all our Jewish comrades and friends, for the purpose of greeting the first issue of *Unser Kampf* (Our Struggle), official organ of the Left Opposition in the Yiddish language, and of welcoming back three of our leading comrades who have just returned and who will speak at the banquet. They are comrades Albert Glotzer, who has just returned from a trip to Europe during which he stayed for a number of weeks with comrade Trotsky at Kadikoy; Arne Swaback, who

has just returned to New York with an enthusiastic report of the growing strength and influence of the Left Opposition throughout the country wherever he had meetings on his lecture tour; and Max Shachtman, who has come back from a trip to Spain, England and France. All these comrades will give their impressions of what is going on in the various parts they visited and the banquetgoers will find it of tremendous interest.

Definite arrangements for the hall and the program have not yet been completed, but all friends of the Left Opposition in New York are urged to keep Saturday, February 6 open on their calendar. Further details will appear in the *Militant*—watch for them.

ROSA LUXEMBURG

On the Anniversary of Her Assassination by the German Social Democrats

A generation of Communists standing on the shoulders of Lenin needs little originality to detect the theoretical shortcomings of Luxemburgism. But history is something more than a factional football. Memorable in dialectic and intensity, the struggle of Rosa Luxemburg against the opportunism of the most powerful party machine in pre-war Social Democracy has indisputably entered the life-stream of the Communist International.

Rosa Luxemburg never ceased to collaborate with the Polish movement from which she sprang, returning to her native Warsaw during the revolution of 1905. But as well as formative influence, her main sphere of activity was the German Social Democracy in whose problems she first intervened on the occasion of the revisionist offensive on Marxism.

Imperialism and Social Democracy

Its state unification achieved, Germany in common with Western capitalism after 1870 experienced a phase of expansion due to the opening of the world market and colonial exploitation. As a result the bourgeoisie could profitably pursue the strategy of concessions to the upper crust of the working class. The Social Democracy had never been altogether free of an element of petty-bourgeois illusion; at the union of the Eisenach and Lassalle factions in 1875 Marx's criticism of the Gotha program fell on deaf ears. Later the Erfurt Congress (1891) did adopt a program which though defective especially in its political demands, was generally speaking a recognition of scientific socialism. Once the repressive anti-Socialist law of Bismarck collapsed, a Right wing, confounding the interests of the proletariat as a class with the favored position of the labor aristocracy, began to maneuver for "practical politics". The pioneer of this tendency was Vollmar, whose pamphlet "The Isolated Socialist State" (1878) unmistakably anticipated the Stalin theory of socialism-in-one-country. Vollmar combined nationalism with reformism, his agrarian proposals stirring Engels's deep indignation. In Vollmar's wake, the Schippels and the Heines advocated the voting of military budgets, protective tariffs and the like.

Bernstein's Revisionism

The classic exponent of revisionism was Edward Bernstein, whose "Socialist Fundamentals" (1899) was a complete rupture with Marxism and a confession of the faith of the Fabians. Within the Marxian breast dwelt two souls, he contended, the one evolutionary-reformist, the other revolutionary-utopian. Bernstein undertook to purge Marx of the unscientific entanglements of Hegel and the political romanticism of Blanqui. For dialectical materialism he substituted the categorical imperative of Kant; the labor theory of value he supplemented with the marginal utility of Boethius-Bawerk. The contradictions of capitalism do not lead to economic catastrophe and social revolution. The growing middle class, the democratization of capital and diffusion of ownership by the joint stock corporation are tendered to disprove the prognosis that the concentration of industry is accompanied by the centralization of wealth. The beautiful credit system, the efficient trusts and modern communication facilities eliminate the cyclical crisis. In a word, here is an idyll of an organic capitalism peacefully evolving towards socialism, over an unending road of reforms, under the spell of a social-democratic majority in the Reichstag. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an apocalyptic vision. The movement is everything—the goal is nothing.

Bernstein's sources are obvious, a re-

visionary hash of Louis Blanc, Proudhon, Lassalle and the miserable "Katheder-sozialisten". While Kautsky, the official guardian of orthodoxy still maintained an ambiguous silence, Rosa Luxemburg forcefully insisted that theory and practice could not be divorced without fatal consequences and that revisionism would replace class struggle by class collaboration. If goal without movement is utopian, movement without goal is surrender to bourgeois liberalism. The every-day demands have significance only as they are linked up with the conquest of political power. Reforms are by-products of class struggle; they cannot basically change the character of the relations of production. So far from being the political lever of socialism, parliamentarism is the historical form of the class rule of the bourgeoisie in its struggle with feudalism, and is already decadent. The workers must rely on their own mass action. The whole economic lore of Bernstein is the generalized

view of imperialism. Parliamentary cretinism and the inevitability of gradualness have been dealt shattering blows by the epoch of wars of revolutions. Between economics and politics there is no automatic reflex action. Ideology is only one of the elements of the superstructure. When she wrote "Opportunism has been knocked on the head", Rosa Luxemburg was unduly sanguine. The huge bureaucracy of the party, trade unions, cooperatives proved decisive. At every important turn, the Centrists reigned but the Right ruled. At successive Congresses, the Right wing receded formally but in fact retained their positions. Marx and Engels had predicted that a split between the middle class and proletarian elements was inevitable but it was in Russia under Lenin, and not at the Dresden Congress that this operation was executed. Waging her battles against such an apparatus, Rosa tended to identify centralization with opportunism, and to depend on the elemental mass

The Precious Heritage of Rosa

The years that pass by since the cruel assassination which deprived us of her active aid do not serve to dim the luster of the great revolutionist that was Rosa Luxemburg. Her unflinching devotion to the historical interests of the proletariat sprang not only from the depths of her character but also from her exceptional understanding of the teachings of Marx and Engels. No mere closet ideologist, she flung herself into every battle of the German proletariat, one of which brought about her premature death. But she had already left more than enough behind her to insure an ever-green memory for the future. From what she taught so brilliantly by word and deed, the revolutionary movement still has much to learn, however the Marxian today may challenge some of

the views she stood for. But this challenge will always be made soberly, objectively, and with the greatest regard for time and place. The genuine Marxian will be repelled by the dispicable slanders of Rosa which are passed off as "criticism" by those who, while arrogating unearned authority to themselves, have not, in reality, the least right to reproach the one who at all times stood so far above them. We mean Stalin, who just recently sought to besmirch Rosa in the interests of his factional position, and Kaganovich and more recently the repulsive turncoat, Radek. Their calumnies make an objective estimation of Rosa's role more timely than ever. Maurice Spector's contribution in this issue has been conceived in this sense. —Ed.

viewpoint of the individual capitalist. The new developments in capitalism—credit, combination, etc.—do not cure but intensify the basic contradictions of anarchic capitalist production.

In pitiless judgment on revisionism, theory has been reinforced by Time, the greatest revolutionary of all. On the very heels of Bernstein's smug evangel burst the crisis of 1900, to be followed by another in 1907 and still another in 1914. As we write, the world is staggering under one of the gravest industrial and commercial crises in capitalist history, with the United States, the model country of trusts and efficiency, as deeply involved up to the hilt. During the late lamented "new economic era", bourgeois economists, journalists, engineers attempted to revive Bernstein's illusions in substance, if without their philosophical garnish, on American soil. "The most fundamental stabilization," wrote Professor Commons, "has been that of credit and prices through the cooperation of the banks organized in the Federal Reserve System." The American working class would derive its salvation from increased savings, life insurance and employee stock ownership. "The labor banks," declared the economic wizard Carver, "constitute the only revolutionary movement in the world." The Baltimore and Ohio Plan of union-management cooperation was tantamount to "industrial democracy".

The Struggle Against Opportunism There is no doubt that theoretically revisionism was bankrupt from the outset. It completely failed to estimate the real qualitative changes that were taking place in capitalist society with the ad-

movement spontaneously to correct the course of the party. "The only part to be played in the Social Democracy by the so-called leaders is that of the explanation to the masses of their function in history". Lenin too emphasized that the masses must gain their own political experience, that for victory the vanguard must muster millions but the role of the revolutionary social-democrat was that of a modern Jacobin bound up with the organized proletariat. Rosa relied too much on process, and tended to underestimate the importance of organization. It cannot be doubted that the conditions of the development of the Russian Revolution necessarily contributed to give Lenin his unparalleled insight into the problems of Marxism, itself the product of a revolutionary period. It must be accounted a defect, for example, of Rosa Luxemburg's polemics with the revisionists that she did not, in reply to Bernstein, take up the problem of state-power. Plechanov raised the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat at Brussels and again at the Amsterdam Congress (1904) but the Second International as a whole, and Kautsky its principal theoretician, completely failed to realize the significance of the problem. The reconstruction of the doctrine of Marx, based on the experiences of the Paris Commune,

as to the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, was the work of Lenin.

The Russian Revolution

The Russian revolution of 1905, for the first time since the Commune, shocked the West out of its parliamentary routine. The Russian proletariat marshaled every form of mass action, from the economic strike to armed insurrection. The mass political strike became a central subject of discussion. At first Kautsky welcomed the methods of the Russian revolution and took up a seemingly radical position towards the strike as a weapon in the immediate struggle for power. But when it became a question of applying the lessons of the Russian revolution to the struggle over the Prussian franchise he changed his tune. He was now for the old tested tactic of parliamentarism. "The elemental mass movement would produce unpleasant as well as pleasant surprises and development would again assume the catastrophic character of 1789 to 1871". The correct strategy, was "attrition", to exhaust the bourgeoisie by trench-warfare.

Rosa Luxemburg's point of departure in these debates was the totality of the class struggle. She refused to recognize the legitimacy of any water-tight compartments between the party and the trade unions. She strenuously resisted the demands of the trade union bureaucracy for the "independence" of the trade unions from the party and their "neutrality" in the political struggle. At the Jena Congress of the Social Democracy it was decided to resort to the general strike if the government sabotaged the issue of the franchise. The reply of the Cologne trade union congress was to prohibit the "propagation and discussion of the general strike". A year later at Mannheim, the Cologne resolution was substantially ratified by the party Congress and the bureaucracy had gained a signal victory.

In the view of Rosa Luxemburg, the centre of gravity of the proletarian struggle lay in mass action, not in parliamentarism. She did not share the reformist conception of Bernstein and Hilferding who approved of the Belgian general strike of 1903 merely because it was an auxiliary action to a parliamentary objective. But once again she could not define the whole problem of the organization of the revolution at the time, and would likely have been regarded as mad or hounded out as anarchist and Blanquist if she had. In the words of Trotsky "a revolutionary general strike that inundates all the banks of bourgeois society became for Rosa Luxemburg a synonym for the proletarian revolution. . . . A general strike does not yet decide the question of power but only raises it. For the seizure of power it is necessary to organize the armed uprising on the basis of the general strike". The danger of revolutionary fatalism, of the "temporizing attitude towards the fundamental tasks of the revolution" was exemplified by the Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin attitude in the Russian October and the Stalin-Brandier-Thalheimer capitulation to the line of least resistance in the German crisis of 1923. It should be mentioned that Trotsky adds that Rosa left the stage without having said her last word.

It was these discussions of the role of mass action that brought about the definite cleavage between the "Left Radicals" under the leadership of Rosa and the Kautskian Centre at the Magdeburg Congress in 1909. Kautsky openly proclaimed that the main danger in the party was no longer the revisionists but "the rebellious impatience of the extreme Left". (To be concluded).

—MAURICE SPECTOR.

How to Make the Kentucky Miners' Defense Really Effective

A conference for the defense of the Kentucky miners now on trial was held on January 6 at the Labor Temple. It was called by the General Defense Committee of the I. W. W. and called to order by a representative of this committee who appointed a chairman. The latter in turn called for the election of credentials and resolutions committees. While these committees were in session, the conference was addressed by James O'Neal of the Socialist party, Muste of the C. P. U. A. and a representative of the I. W. W.

The report of the credentials committee followed the speeches of the above gentlemen. Strange as it may seem, the Workmen's Circle branches predominated. Very few unions, about 6 or 7 in all, were represented. The other delegates represented either educational organizations or political groups like the S. P., the I. W. W., Industrial Union League, the Road to Freedom, etc. One of the delegates, representing a Workmen's Circle branch, wanted to know "why a section of the labor movement that has a big influence among the working masses, especially in New York, is not represented here at all". In answer to a question as to whom he meant he named the International Workers' Order, the Needle Trades Workers' Industrial Union, the I. L. D., the Communist party and its factions, the Communist League (Opposition) and the Lovestone group.

A Working Class Reply to Splitists

"We did not invite any organization that will introduce friction into the conference," was the reply. Another delegate, also of a W. C. branch, took the floor and stated that "while I represent a fraternal organization and therefore non-political, I believe I speak the mind of the majority of my organization when I say we do not believe any more in the speeches of these 'gentlemen' that have addressed this gathering tonight."

We have seen their comrades in action, like Scheidemann, Noske and Zoergel in Germany, MacDonald in England,

only the international revolutionary movement can and will solve the problems of the working masses. At the same time I believe we can and should unite for the defense of the Kentucky miners, as of all other political prisoners in the U. S. It took quite some effort on the part of myself and my co-delegate to induce the membership, because of the objection that there are too many defense organizations, to send delegates to this conference. They finally agreed to send us as observers and to bring back a report. Unless a sincere and honest effort should be made on the part of the leadership of these different defense organizations to consolidate all the forces for the defense of political suffer and the rank and file of the labor movement will not stand for that much longer."

This speech was greeted with some applause, which was unexpected by most of those present. Next on the order of business was the arranging of a mass meeting. The delegate that asked the question about the absence of the Left wing, was not satisfied with the reply made by the organizers of this conference. He made a motion that all other labor organizations, regardless of their political opinion, be invited to join this movement. The first and only one to speak against it was Carlo Tresca, of the anarchists. A feeling of fear has embraced some of the leaders of the conference. A motion to stop discussion followed. Before taking it to a vote Mr. Bert Miller, ex-crony of Lovestone, expert in executing Stalin's orders to expel and beat up Left Oppositionists, enlightened the delegates that what the motion really means is "to smuggle into this conference the Communist party". Despite the "enlightenment" of the renegade, the motion did get about 20 votes on the Aye and Nay vote.

The Need of the Movement

Now, it is high time for all in the labor movement, regardless of their political beliefs, to act in this direction, that is, to consolidate all their defense

The Obsolete Craft System in the Railroad Brotherhoods

The extraordinary importance assumed at the present moment by the situation in the railroad industry makes a survey of the state of the trade union movement in this field of more than usual interest. Conferences continue to be held between the workers' "representatives" and the railroad magnates, and a cleverly organized newspaper agitation is being carried on, with the sole aim of reducing the wages and worsening the conditions of the workers. The problem of resisting this monstrous offensive is unbreakably bound up with the question of how things stand in the railroad brotherhoods. In this latter field especially, our comrade A. E., an old militant of the Left wing, is a competent observer. The present article is one of a series which our comrade has promised to contribute.

One of the things which the railroad workers in this country need most is a new trade union structure. The present structural formation of the railroad unions belongs to the stone age of trade unionism. It is the most out-of-date, the most antiquated form of labor organization known.

The railroad workers are at present organized, or rather disorganized, into twenty-one different craft unions, as follows: 1. Engineers; 2. Conductors; 3. Firemen; 4. Brakemen; 5. Switchmen; 6. Telegraphers; 7. Signalmen; 8. Clerks; 9. Boiler-makers; 10. Sheet Metal Workers; 11. Machinists; 12. Carmen; 13. Sectionmen; 14. Stationery Firemen; 15. Train Dispatchers; 16. Sleeping Car Conductors; 17. Longshoremen; 20. Marine Engineers; 21. Masters, Mates and Pilots. The last three belong to the inland and coastwise water transportation in connection with the railroads.

At the head of each one of these 21 useless craft organizations we find literally swarms of overpaid bureaucrats whose combined annual salaries runs into the millions. All Brotherhood journals and magazines, including the Washington weekly, *Labor*, are under a complete stranglehold of these high salaried officials. The pages of the respective constitutions are littered with gag-laws of every description to protect the officials from organized criticism by the rank and file. These gag-laws are very effective in preventing needed organizational changes which would prove detrimental to the personal of officers' salaries, freedom of expression, etc. The main function of the local lodges is to collect dues and forward them promptly to their respective Grand Lodge Headquarters for enjoyment by the officials.

Bureaucratism and Class Collaboration As might be expected from the above arrangement these craft officials advocate mutual admiration and cooperation between the representatives of organized capital and themselves as spokesmen for the railroad workers. The present Brotherhood officials know full well that they cannot protest and promote the railroad workers' interests against the well organized employers by keeping the workers divided into twenty-one separate organizations on the railroads. But these officials have allocated to themselves salaries which run from \$6,000 to

\$15,000 a year, plus a most liberal expense account, and their work is easy. Their main tasks are: keep the "Reds" out of the unions; maintain complete control of all mediums of information inside of the Brotherhoods; keep enough gag-laws in the constitutions to forbid all other means of expression by the membership; keep on friendly terms with the railroad officials at the expense of the workers for the privilege of collecting dues from these helpless crafts.

The Brotherhood officials realize that they would not be able to maintain these weak and anemic unions without the consent of the railroad management. Hence the importance of maintaining friendly relations with them. This condition necessarily eliminates all possibility of a well organized struggle for better wages and working conditions, shortening of hours, etc. Strikes are only permitted on small individual roads as a smoke screen of false display of militancy, are called and then forgotten. The M. & N. A.; the Virginian Ry., and the Western Maryland strikes are typical examples of this farcical strike policy. The Watson-Parker Law is a deliberate attempt to abolish strikes altogether and is the fruit of joint action between the Brotherhood officials headed by Robertson and the railroad officials headed by W. W. Atterbury.

In the present move on the part of the railroads to cut wages in order to increase profits, as in 1921, the railroad workers will receive another concrete lesson on the price they have to pay for permitting a lot of overpaid official drones to chain them to an obsolete craft system of organization. (To be continued).

SWABECK TOUR

SWABECK IN PHILLY

Comrade Arne Swaback spoke here on Jan. 10th. His lecture, "The Economic Crisis and the Left Opposition" was followed with the liveliest interest by the 40 workers comprising the audience. The presence of several C. P. members and sympathizers, as well as a few Lovestoneites, afforded our comrade an opportunity to broaden his subject matter to include all the most essential points of the platform of the Left Opposition. He dealt with the perspectives of the crisis; the effect of U. S. capitalism's home and foreign policy; the necessity of a worker's united front against Fascism in Germany; and reviewed the criticism by the Opposition of the policy pursued by the C. I.

The question period developed some lively discussion. Some of the party members left at this point, probably in fear of being inveigled into a free discussion. The questions covered topics upon which we have differences with the Stalinites and the Lovestoneites. Particular interest and sympathy was shown in our trade union and united front policies by most of the audiences.

This meeting was the first this year of a series of lectures under the auspices of the Philadelphia Branch on problems of the Communist movement, by our leading comrades of the Communist League in the East.

The previous night, a banquet was held as a reception to comrade Swaback. A good time was had by our comrades and friends, who came despite the bad weather. At both the banquet and the lecture a collection was taken to help our work along.

The study class in "Marxism" is proceeding very successfully. A new class "History of the Three Internationals" is being formed and will be conducted by comrade Morgenstern.

L. G.

SUCCESSFUL PITTSBURGH MEETING

Efforts made by some of the petty bureaucrats of the Pittsburgh party organization to break up the meeting scheduled for comrade Swaback in this city on January 7 came to naught. The meeting was held at a Greek coffee house on Wyle Ave., the time set for 7:30. A good audience appeared among them about a dozen party members led by the Greek fraction who had previously served notice that they would come to break up the meeting.

A few minutes before the appointed hour the Greek fraction organizer took upon himself to open the meeting and to give a lecture. He endeavored to tread very softly on questions of dispute with the Left Opposition, however, struggling hard to emphasize that anyone who did not carry a card in the official Communist party could not speak in the name of Communism. In this manner it was expected to take the meeting away from the Left Opposition but it did not succeed. Rather it became, regardless of the Stalin organizers, a joint discussion affair.

As soon as the Greek party fraction organizer had concluded his speech, comrade Sifakis of the Left Opposition arose introducing the next speaker, comrade Swaback, asking the hearers of devote the same attention to latter. Swaback spoke without the slightest interference. Those who had come with the intention of interfering evidently found it better to listen. After this lecture those party members present asked a number of questions which gave comrade Swaback the opportunity to clarify further the issues of dispute. Meanwhile the Greek party fraction organizer, the leader of the "breaking party" slunk out of the place.

FOR YOUR LIBRARY

Books by Leon Trotsky

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

86 pages, two-colored paper cover 25c
Introduction by Max Shachtman

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

A Criticism of Fundamentals
Introduction by J. P. Cannon
140 pages hard paper cover 35c

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION

80 pages, paper cover 10c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

208 page book—cloth bound 1.00
paper bound .50

THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA

Introduction by Max Eastman
364 page book formerly \$2 now 1.00

MY LIFE—600 pages 5.00

COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM

The Trade Union Question
Introduction by James P. Cannon
64 pages, paper cover 15c

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER

64 pages paper cover 15c

PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.

48 pages, paper cover 15c
Special Rates in Bundles of 5 or more

SINCE LENIN DIED

By Max Eastman
1924 50c

158 page book printed in London

Pioneer Publishers

84 East 10th Street
New York City

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

Revolt Brewing in India

Ghandi Holds Masses in Check by Reformist Maneuvers

Ghandi, V. Patel, J. Nehru have been arrested by the Indian authorities. As a protest, the cotton, the bullion, the piece goods, the seed and the stock exchanges in Bombay and other cities have been closed. The boycott against British goods is in full swing. Civil disobedience is the slogan of the nationalist leaders.

On the surface, the above incidents give a fairly comprehensive characterization of the present situation in British India. Strikes of workers are, as yet, not on the order of the day. The Hindu hartal or patriotic strike, still dominates the political scene. For the time being, the nationalist bourgeoisie still holds the reins firmly. The revolutionary masses are still spell-bound by the shrewd and soothing voice of the "Mahatma". And it cannot be doubted that the personality of Ghandi still represents an enormous factor in the political life along the Ganges.

A Shrewd Mahatma

In a recent interview with Parisian newspapermen, Ghandi expressed the opinion that in the event of "sudden" emancipation, a free India would not very well be able to dispense with a regular standing army. Yes, the Mahatma said this. The newspapermen showed questions on the saintly man and he answered nearly all with saintly patience and serenity. There was one question, however, which he evaded with the sleekness of an eel. That question was in regard to his attitude toward the Russian revolution. "I am too humble", the Mahatma replied to this question, "to pretend to omniscience. Consequently I must declare that I do not know what to think of the Russian revolution". The "Mahatma" did not appear pleased at all by the suggestion of a comparison between the Indian revolution and the Russian.

Would it be too rash to assume on the basis of all this that the great principle of Oriental ethics—non-violence—is in the last analysis, only a cloak for the fear the Hindu bourgeoisie has of the armed masses? Hardly. The Russian bourgeoisie (and the Spanish bourgeoisie in its turn today) shouted at the top of its lungs that its revolution was "bloodless" and covered its fear of the people with less effective, to be sure, but nevertheless just as guarded ideological ceremoniousness. The Russian bourgeoisie was faced with war times that accelerated the march of events and with a resolute and firmly established working class party. Its end came rather swiftly. The course of the Indian bourgeoisie, which kowtows no less to the foreign imperialists, will probably, considering the times and more than that—the geographical situation of the country—be a much lengthier one.

The colonial character of India makes its revolution dependent to a large extent, upon the attitude, the aid rendered it by the British working class. In the course of events, the attachment between the seasoned proletariat of Great Britain and the youthful proletariat of India, which is historically inevitable, will no doubt develop into the determining influence in that country's future. For the present, however, both the British as well as the Indian workers are still to be found in the background of the scene. The further progress of the German revolutionary movement in Europe and of the Chinese in the Far East will, sooner or later, serve to set the former two into motion.

Signs of Militancy

In the meantime, a few signs of rising militancy are already visible on the periphery of the new movement. At Srirangar, a crowd estimated at 12,000 persons attacked the police station and liberated three prisoners. Despite the manifold assurances by the nationalist leaders that the masses would abstain from violent action, the British police forces have taken all possible precautions. The viceroy of India, Lord Willingdon, has unleashed a savage system of repression all over the country. Police and soldiery have been armed to the teeth. An ordinance has been issued outlawing all meetings of groups of more than five persons. The gentlemanly Willingdon, quite a hand with a cricket bat himself (the papers say) seems of late to have become an enthusiast of the native "lathi", applied by his troops with utter abandon to the skulls and bodies of demonstrators in the public squares. The

British soldiery have recently been increased to fully 68,000 men, the native to more than 175,000. They are apparently expecting serious trouble.

Just how soon the activity of the masses will rise above the heads of their nationalist leaders, it is hard to tell. The Communist party, young and weak as a result of the Menshevik policies of Stalin-Bucharin in the Far East up to 1927 and due to the entire loss of revolutionary perspective since, is almost without any influence at all. The Ghandi

Kangar textile workers and the railroad workers of the G. I. P., who have already made Indian history in the past, have not yet been heard from. But they are sure to figure more prominently in the near future. The lathi, after all, does not distinguish between the masses, it strikes and hurts them all. But it is not likely that the workers of India will long be fascinated by whatever it is that "Mahatma" Ghandi is spinning—in his cell or out of it. The workers, once they are started, will act and act forcefully. For the Communists, the present situation in India represents an excellent opportunity to approach the masses, to build up their cadres and to consolidate their influence and their following for the more decisive struggles to come.

—S. G.

Thaelmann's Belated Self-Criticism

The Leader of the German Communist Party «Examines» Some of Its Mistakes

For years the Stalinist Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany has been considering itself as infallible in its political decisions. But since a mistake remains a mistake whether it is recognized or not, the effects of the false line of the party leadership frequently lead to such dangerous moods in the party that it is frequently considered absolutely necessary at the top to undertake a "turn". This is thereupon motivated "theoretically" by the highest instances, and naturally a good

deal of noise is made about the "Bolshevik self-criticism" with which it is done. The result which the "theoreticians" of the Central Committee then attain is usually this: The policy of the party leadership is "entirely right, but subordinate party instances have not understood how to carry out the errorless line correctly."

Thaelmann's Self-Criticism

Entirely of this type is the "self-criticism" with which Ernst Thaelmann occupies himself in the November-December double number of the *International*, where he writes to "establish a series of ideological deviations and political weakness, aye, even political mistakes in our revolutionary mass work". But in order to avoid even the appearance of wanting to criticize the line of the C. C. itself, he immediately adds that the mistakes were of course not committed by the whole party but were based upon an "insufficient political education of individual comrades and functionaries" or upon an "inadequate comprehension of the decisions adopted at international and German party congresses". These remarks of Thaelmann alone already adequately characterize the type of this "Bolshevik self-criticism".

But let us now examine more closely what the "leader of the C. P. G." says concretely in his article of 30 pages. Thaelmann discovers here that the struggle against the Prussian government has up to now not been conducted sharply enough:

"We must go further beyond this to the declaration that even in the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat, not without our being to blame, there were present at least sub-conscious moods to the effect that Braun-Severing were nevertheless perhaps a 'lesser evil' than a Hitler-Goebbels government in Prussia. Such an influencing of the revolutionary workers by the deceitful social democratic ideology, such remnants of social democratic thought in our ranks, are, however, as we must declare in complete agreement with the decisions of the XI Plenum, the worst danger for the Communist party."

Obviously, therefore, certain C. P. G. comrades arrived at the idea that a Hitler government in Prussia would act in an even more reactionary and anti-working class manner than the then Braun-Severing government. The party comrades in question surely did not mean by this that the S. P. policy of the lesser evil in parliament was correct. But they were of the opinion that the more dangerous enemy today is Hitler and that the party must therefore lead the main attack against him. For Thaelmann, however, such an opinion is "the worst danger for the Communist party!"

Further in the course of his "self-criticism", Thaelmann himself is obliged to admit that in the attitude of the party towards Fascism, great shortcomings came to light. He writes:

"We yielded at least in part to the false theory of the 'inevitability' of the Fascist dictatorship under monopoly capitalism, or at all events, we did not always develop a sufficiently sharp struggle against this false theory, a theory which leads us off the road."

As an example of this, Thaelmann quotes from the September 1931 number of the C. P. G. paper, *Der Propagandist*, the following passage:

"A social democratic coalition government, which confronted an incapacitated, split-up, confused proletariat, would be a thousandfold greater evil than an open Fascist dictatorship, which came forward against a class conscious proletariat, determined to struggle and united in its mass."

By this is completely confirmed what the Left Opposition and particularly Trotsky have criticized most sharply for months: namely, that there are forces at work in the C. P. G. which not only consider the seizure of power by the Fascists as inevitable, but as downright desirable under certain circumstances.

EXPIRATION OF SUBSCRIPTION

If the number of your wrapper is 99 or under, your subscription has expired. To ensure that you do not miss a single issue of *The Militant*, send in your renewal immediately to *The Militant*, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.

~~~~~

#### Minneapolis Open Forum

Among the lecture arranged for forthcoming weeks at the Minneapolis Forum are the following:

All meetings, unless otherwise mentioned are at 3 P. M.:

Sunday, January 24, 1932: DEBATE: "Socialism versus Communism". Speakers: O. P. Victorian, representing the Socialist Party against Carl Cowl representing Communist League of America (Opposition).

Sunday, January 31, 1932: "The Proposed Railroad Wage Reductions". Speaker: C. R. Hedlund.

All these lectures and debates will be held at the Workers Open Forum, 1530 East Franklin Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. The Admission is free.

That the party leadership is now compelled to come out openly against these ideas only shows the extent to which such defeatist moods were already wide spread in the party.

A whole section of Thaelmann's article is concerned with the too well known "theory" of the people's revolution, as invented by the party leadership in connection with the teachings on the "national and social emancipation". These slogans were raised in their day in order to win the petty bourgeois strata for Communism, in connection with which to mention nothing else, it was completely overlooked that the most immediate task of the C. P. G. must be not the winning of the middle classes but the winning of the majority of the proletariat. And it is precisely here that a slogan like that of the "people's revolution" is not only worthless but directly harmful, since it does not sufficiently emphasize the class standpoint.

Thaelmann himself is slowly beginning to perceive this when he writes in his article:

"Only when we win the proletarian majority for Communism can we realize the further tasks of drawing the allies of the proletariat from the middle classes into the anti-capitalist united front and thereby create the premises for the people's revolution of Marx and Lenin. Every smearing up of these fundamentals, every abandonment of the preliminary need of the struggle for our own class is a break with Marxism, a break with Leninism!"

But who raised this "break with Leninism" to the point of a "theory"? Nobody but the Central Committee of the C. P. G. itself, which, for example, in a resolution of January 1931, established the "people's revolution" as the "main strategic slogan of the party". Is it then to be wondered at if subordinate functionaries of the party thereupon apply this slogan as it should be understood according to this C. C. conception? Such a thoroughly good-believer of a functionary was A. E. who wrote, as far back as December 1930, in the paper *Der Propagandist* that

"for the strategy and tactics of the proletarian revolution it is primarily a matter of winning the petty bourgeois strata for the proletarian revolution or at least of neutralizing them."

This was entirely in harmony with the line of the conceptions of the "people's revolution" then advocated by the C. C. and established officially as late as January 1931. Now—Thaelmann needed a whole year for this acknowledgment—it is suddenly established that the quoted conception of A. E. "has nothing more in common with Marxism and Leninism". Which is of course correct to the extent that the corresponding line of the C. C. really had not much more to do with Leninism.

(In passing: For A. E. to be treated as a scapegoat is especially harsh. Alexander Emel was at one time punished as an Oppositionist in Russia. In the German party, after a probation period of a year, he sought to earn his spurs by expressly separating himself from Trotsky's views at every opportunity, most recently in the question of the Spanish revolution. And he is just the one whom the Great Thaelmann has now sought out as the whipping boy!)

Finally, we cannot let pass unchallenged what Thaelmann has to say in his article on the question of individual terror. It would undoubtedly be correct for the C. C. to disassociate itself publicly from individual terror, but it is to fall into the other extreme when Thaelmann writes:

"Those workers who let themselves be misguided by the planned Nazi-provocations by defending themselves with the same methods of individual terror, are moving away, with regard to the methods of the proletarian struggle for freedom, from the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism"

Taken literally, this means that henceforth the C. P. G. members are to be prohibited even from forcible defense from Fascist assaults. This is going much too far. Terror can only be broken by terror and it is just the "leader of the C. P. G." who should understand that under the conditions created by the Fascist acts of violence, one cannot act in accordance with the principles of the sermon on the mount.

In conclusion, let us point to still another observation Thaelmann made at the end of his lengthy article and which we can join with heartily:

"It appears that in spite of the great successes of our party, its theoretical level, the ideological-political level of our party work, is inadequate, and absolutely requires a fundamental improvement."

But the very next sentence, which qualifies the decisions of the leadership as "unobjectionable and correct", indicates that Thaelmann is not at all the man to undertake a genuine, serious self-criticism. Bureaucratic superficiality and fakers' autocriticism are the essence of Thaelmann's article. There can be no talk whatsoever of a turn for the better. Such a one can, in general, not proceed from above; it must result from the pressure of the members themselves. The Left Opposition will support with all its strength every step of the party members in this direction.

Berlin, January 1932

—W. M.

### The Results of the Toronto Elections

The recent municipal elections held in Toronto have, in the shade of events of the past few months, gained a significance historic in the annals of Canadian elections.

The bourgeois candidates (in civic elections all candidates are "non-partisan"); they do not officially run on a party ticket) all agreed upon the fact that no major issues existed; that whoever was elected to sit at the City Hall would be on a program of better sidewalks, more sidewalks, and the insistence on stringent economy (naturally at the expense of working class relief measures). That there were 50,000 unemployed in the city, well, so long as they were keeping quiet at the soup kitchens and not demanding unemployment relief, they were not an issue. If 6,000 bailiffs' notices of evictions were issued, that was a sign that prosperity was around the corner. Wages being slashed, and factories closing down, throwing workers and their families upon the mercy of charity, that was not an issue for the civic fathers. As long as the working class and the dispossessed elements of the petty bourgeoisie did not organize for the betterment of their conditions, the bourgeoisie were quite content with the status quo, and intended to further confuse the masses with the spirit of civic duty.

#### The Communist Ticket

But the Dominion and Provincial authorities were more considerate of the interests of the hard working capitalists, and had taken measures a few months before by the arrest of the eight Communist leaders, and their trial and conviction to 5 years in the penitentiary. After overcoming the legal red tape they were released on bail until their appeal, and to the dismay of the authorities Tim Buck was nominated for the Board of Control, and John Boychuck (another of the defendants, with another comrade, were nominated for alderman. The Communist party now being an outlawed organization in Ontario, they ran as candidates of the Toronto Workers' United Front Conference. The main campaign was centered around Buck, the controllership necessitating a city-wide campaign and vote.

Buck, as the Communist candidate, naturally was the only candidate to bring out the working class issues; the need for relief and insurance at the expense of the state, and the fight against Section 98 of the Criminal Code, which suppressed the rights of free speech and assembly. At every election meeting Buck was received with tremendous enthusiasm; a Communist candidate was receiving sympathetic hearings and ovations such as the bourgeois candidates did not receive. The press religiously kept a strict silence on the Communist campaign, not a word of publicity did they give it. A contract was entered into with the *Daily Star*, a Liberal (!) paper, to let Buck speak over its radio station, but after the *Star* realized they were acting as liberals in allowing this, the contract was immediately broken, the money returned, and an excuse offered that "under the circumstances, etc., etc."

#### A Safe and Sane Candidate

But there was a "labor" candidate in the field, and a very popular one. The social democracy may be proud of its sons; the Toronto branch, known as James Simpson, and the backing of all the newspapers and he received plaudits from all sections of the capitalist class for his wisdom, and especially his "safe and sane" labor policies. For him but one issue existed—to be re-elected to the Board of Control and taste further of the fruits of office. On the slate of the reactionary Orange Order he was first

choice. After working his way on the backs of the working class, he was no longer interested in its problems. Backed by a powerful press, and every means of agitation he was sure of election. To offset the influence of the Communist program the bourgeois concentration block put out Simpson as the man to look after their interests during the present period.

Election day, January 1st, was a day as dull and dirty as capitalism itself. A continual rain kept back many people from the polls, and especially destitute workers who could not clothe themselves properly.

Simpson, the labor faker, headed the list. Although the total number of votes polled was lower than last year, the vote of Buck doubled; the reactionary press lamented that "Tim Buck Communist, was the only one of nine candidates who increased his vote over last year. Despite his recent conviction on charges of membership in an illegal association and seditious conspiracy, he polled 5,974 votes, 2941 over his last year's figure of 3,033—an increase of 97 per cent." The two other Communist alderman candidates polled 505 and 758 votes each, both being higher than last year.

The qualifications for voting demanded that one be a tenant or householder; those whose taxes were in arrear were deprived of the privilege of democracy; thus the dispossessed workers were not able to vote. The votes for Tim Buck were votes of protest against capitalist reaction and for immediate unemployment relief. The thousands of people who applauded him, did not all vote for him; it was a spontaneous enthusiasm.

### Government Repression in Republican Spain

The repression being carried on by the Republican leaders takes on forms that even Primo de Rivera and Berenguer never dared to resort to. Spaniards are being expelled from Spain. We of the Left Opposition are the favored victims.

A very striking example: Our comrade Jose Ramos Lopez is, to be sure, Spanish—the son of Spanish parents born at Buenos Aires, but a naturalized Spanish citizen. The Argentine police expelled him from that country as a revolutionist and as a Spaniard. Ramos came to Spain, to Sujo to live with his family. He is a Communist and one who stands up for his ideas. First he is arrested at Sujo, then at Cadiz, where he is held a government prisoner for three months. The governor of Cadiz promises him his release on the condition that he return to Sujo. A few days later, several "Civic Guards" and gendarmes come to the prison at six o'clock in the morning, and seize our comrade. His protests are of no avail. The governor had promised him his release on that very day. But instead, he is thrown on board the steamer "Uruguay", leaving a few minutes later for the Argentina. No one was informed of anything until our Cadiz comrades came to the prison on their daily visit to comrade Ramos.

The bourgeois, reactionary Republic has committed another abominable crime. What sort of fate will Urburu have in store for our comrade?

The bourgeois press has refused publication to our protests. The cynicism of the reactionaries is becoming more detestable and more criminal under the Republic than it ever was under the monarchy.

#### Liberty and Equality Under the Republic

A short time ago, the Spanish Catholics met at Valencia and held a mass meeting and demonstrations against the Republic. The workers who wanted to demonstrate against Catholic and monarchist reaction found the "Republican" authorities on the side of the latter. The Catholics and monarchists can speak and act against the Spanish people, only we are denied the right to propagate our ideas.

In Valencia also, I gave a lecture on December 14, which had been announced in advance. The governor refused permission to announce the meeting as one bearing a political Communist character and it had to be announced as an educational affair. The workers attended en masse. We had excellent success.

Other lectures were organized by the comrades in the various provinces. But when I had completed my lecture in Valencia, I was called before the chief of police who informed me that he would not authorize any more of my lectures and that I had committed an offense comparable to libel against Largo Caballero

(the minister) and against the Republic. Since my lecture had been announced under the name Henri Lacroix, they believed that I was a Frenchman and had no doubt taken preparations to deport me from the country when the Police Department of Madrid let the misinformation chief of police of Valencia know that Henri Lacroix is really a Spaniard and demanded my immediate return from Valencia. I was forced to take the first train out and to escape to Galicia, where the Republic also "governs".

—HENRI LACROIX.

Before leaving the United States for Spain, after the proclamation of the Republic, comrade Ramos was an active militant among the Spanish-speaking groups of the anarchist and I. W. W. movement in New York. Our movement attracted him to the extent of engaging for quite a time in friendly discussions between him and some of our comrades. Upon his arrival in Spain he joined the Communist party and became an adherent in it of the views of the Opposition. His revolutionary activity in Cadiz brought about his imprisonment and the recent decision—entirely arbitrary—to deport him to the Argentine. While in Spain recently, comrade Shachtman established contact with comrade Ramos in prison, from whom he subsequently received the letter which we reprint here:

Cadiz Prison, 11-17-1931

Dear comrade Shachtman: I received your letter and was glad to hear from you. How are you getting along. I was surprised to hear of your arrival in Madrid. I believe you can gather some notes about the Spanish revolution and the forces of the workers throughout the country, notes which you can later reproduce in the pages of *The Militant*.

You can see how my old friends, the anarcho-syndicalists, are playing the game of the bourgeoisie. If you remember, when I was in New York, I didn't believe this, but when I saw how they cooperated in the establishment of the Republic and fought together with the bourgeois forces, I woke up and learned that only a proletarian party can lead the revolution.

The official party does not want to carry on a serious work and give a political education to the proletariat. It rather wants to fight against the "Trotskyists", but now I think that under the flag of the O. C. E. (Left Opposition in Spain) and with the solidarity of the international sections, we can arrive swiftly at the unity of the Spanish Communists on a revolutionary line with the goal of the proletarian dictatorship. Yours for the victory of Bolshevism, RAMOS.

### אונזער קאמף

"UNSER KAMPF"

צוויי-וועכנטלעכער ארגאן פון דער קאמוניסטישער ליג פון אמעריקע

(פאזיציע)

84 EAST 10th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

אבאנעמענט-פרייז: אין די פאראייניקטע שטאטן — \$1.00 א יאר; אין אויסלאנד — \$1.25. אין איינצל-פארקויף — 5 סענט.

Enclosed please find \$1.00 for one year's subscription:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... STATE .....



EDITORIAL NOTES

DARROW AND THE SCOTTSBORO CASE

The withdrawal of Clarence Darrow and Arthur Garfield Hays from all participation in the legal side of the Scottsboro case has called forth a chorus of praise from the bourgeois press. Darrow didn't like the agitatorial methods of the International Labor Defense. "You can't mix politics with a law case" he said. He would take part in the legal defense only on the condition that the I. L. D. keep out. The withdrawal of the famous lawyer on these grounds affords the brass check newspapers—whose attention was drawn to the Scottsboro case by the stormy agitation of the I. L. D.—another occasion to point a moral about the harmful effects of "Communist interference" in behalf of any victim of bourgeois justice. Liberal snivellers and muddle-headed workers, whose thinking is done or them by the ruling class, are echoing this judgment.

Such arguments are not worthy of a moment's consideration. The I. L. D. was absolutely right in rejecting the presumptuous demands of Darrow and Hays, and the Scottsboro prisoners showed wisdom in supporting the stand of their defense organization. Any other course would have signified an end to the fight to organize the protest of the masses against the legal lynching; and with that would have ended any real hope to save the boys and restore their freedom.

There are people, of course—and too many of them—who hold a contrary view. But they are the credulous ones who have faith in the justice and fairness of the class courts. We rejoice at the blow that has been dealt to this servile and treacherous philosophy. It is true that the lawyers in question are celebrated in their trade. But from our point of view that fact only invests the calling of their bluff with a greater significance and merits for it a warm approval.

"You can't mix politics with a law case"—that is a reactionary lie. It is father to the poisonous doctrine that a labor case is a purely legal relation between lawyer and client and the court. It was under that sign—with the same Darrow in the leading role—that the McNamaras and Schmidt and Kaplan were sacrificed, and the labor movement was dealt a blow from which it has not yet recovered. It was the influence of this idea over the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee which paralyzed the protest mass movement at every step and thereby contributed to the final tragic outcome. Not to the courts alone, aid not primarily there, but to the masses must the appeal of the persecuted of class and race be taken. There is the power and there is the justice. The affair of Darrow, the Scottsboro prisoners and the I. L. D. will help to inculcate this lesson.

UNITED FRONT PROSPECTS

The most noticeable single trend to be observed in the ranks of the more or less radical workers is the sentiment for unity of action. This sentiment permeates all the organizations to a considerable extent, and it corresponds to the needs of the day. As a consequence of this there is a great deal of unity talk to be heard. Some of it is a sincere expression of

the workers' feelings and moods, some of it a bait to catch their attention. The effect of all the talk so far, has been negligible. The labor movement, including its radical sections, has not been divided and disrupted without profound causes. Talk alone will never bring about the desired unity in struggle. It may, and to a certain extent does, exert a retarding influence on the process. Every hypocritical argument, every dishonest maneuver in the name of unity works against its actual realization.

On the other hand, the increasing pressure upon the workers strengthens their impulses for a common front of struggle, and raises the issue ever more insistently. Concrete manifestations here and there of solidarity in action are to be seen. And these are the best gauge by which to judge the prospects for the formation of the united front of militant labor. From this standpoint, last week's mass meeting for the defense of the indicted marine workers has an exceptional interest. No single event in recent years has done so much to raise the hopes of the radical workers that a way can be found, despite all the differences between the various organizations and groups, for the radical workers to get together for a united fight against the class enemy.

This mass meeting, like the defense committee which sponsored it, was an experiment in co-operation on a single issue of the class struggle—the defense of persecuted workers. No one can deny that it made a good showing. The hall was packed to the doors and the sentiment for unity resounded in the applause which greeted speaker after speaker who dwelt on this theme. Militant unionists, communists, anarchists, syndicalists and socialists were represented on the platform as well as in the audience. The chief feature of the whole affair, and the one that determined its enthusiastic spirit, was the formal appearance of a united front. There is every reason for the partisans of the united front—among whom we belong, to regard the demonstration as a significant step forward.

It is no less necessary however, to see the short-comings and the weak sides of this first experiment. There were not a few members of the official Communist Party in the audience, but it was not represented on the platform. Despite invitations of the defense committee, the party and the I. L. D. withheld participation in this public demonstration of support for workers under prosecution. There are people who put this fact down to the credit side of the meeting. They want a united front—without the Communist Party. But that is absurd as well as reactionary. The workers supporting the official Communist Party constitute the strongest and most dynamic force in the radical labor movement. The progress towards a genuine united front, with power behind it, has to be measured first of all by the pressure developing within the party ranks in favor of such a policy.

The mass meeting for the marine workers in prison helped to consolidate the sentiment for the united front in the ranks of all the organizations which took part in it. In addition to that it had a value, as an object lesson, in stimulating these sentiments in the rank and file of the official party. This was probably its greatest significance.

(Continued from page 1)  
of the whole of Europe, not excluding the Soviet Union. The danger of Fascism is casually referred to from time to time. Every time it is mentioned, it is falsely explained: For the *Daily Worker*, like for the rest of the Stalinist press, the "social-Fascists" are trying—no less!—to put Hitler into power, which is apparently unnecessary in view of the fact—according to the D. W.—that Bruening and his regime are already Fascist.

But never yet has the *Worker* sought to arouse the party members or the militant workers in general to the acute danger. Never has it presented to its readers a clear statement as to what the German party leaders plan to do to stop the Hitlerite march to power.

And in truth it cannot do so because the German Stalinist high-priests look upon Hitler's capture of power as inevitable. Some of them write coolly that a Fascist dictatorship—our readers will find the exact quotation elsewhere on these pages—is a "lesser evil" compared to a social democratic coalition. All of them take the attitude that anything that happens is preferable to adopting the only policy suitable for the situation: the organization of the 'united front' of the Communist and the social democratic workers—what the Left Opposition proposes.

**Boastful Claims and Sorry Realities**  
Month after month now, the German Stalinists have been substituting bureaucratic boasting and self-content for a policy of vigilance and united action. "We are growing. The Fascists are at the end of their rope." After every vote cast since the last Reichstag elections, the German Stalinists have announced that Hitler has reached the apex of his strength. But the Hitlerites have continued to grow in spite of these prognostications. Their increases have far outstripped those of the C. P.: in Mecklenburg-Schwerin, in Brunswick, in Oldenburg, in Hesse, in Hamburg, in Bremen, and only last Sunday in the elections to the Lippe Diet, where the Fascists jumped from nothing to 9 seats, while the C. P. G. mover from one member to two. These electoral gains by themselves are far from fatal to the proletarian cause because, first, there is a "political limit" to such gains by the Fascists, and second, the issue of power will not be decided by these votes. An editorial in one of the shrewdest organs of the American bourgeoisie, the *New York*

*Times* (1-12-32), commenting upon a review of the situation by the *Berliner Tageblatt*, observes that to argue from Hitler's recent electoral gains

"that it needs only another few months of the same pace to produce a Hitler majority in the nation is erroneous. It is contention of the article (in the *B. T.*) that Hitler cannot keep on gaining, and for the simple reason that the 'reservoir' whence he has been drawing his votes is 'about exhausted.' The Fascist gains have been made at the expense of the former Right parties, and by now these have been pretty well absorbed by the Hitler following. . . ."

In one sense at least the essence of these observations is correct. The Hitler reservoir is being exhausted—a fact about which Hitler is not at all unaware. The enemy is not always stupid—far from it. Hitler knows, as the Communist know (or should know) that the elections are merely a barometer of the moods of the classes. Hitler knows too that for the seizure of power votes are not enough. Hitler knows further that his votes are approaching a "political maximum" under the given conditions and that a violent attempt must be made to seize power before the crucial moment has passed. Hitler knows, finally, that "the strength of the National Socialists lies at the present moment not so much in their own army as in the dispersal of the army of their mortal foe." And it is principally upon the continuation of the latter condition that Hitler is staking his cards.

The *Times* editor continues: "The (German) writer finds that against Hitler stands a 'proletarian bloc' consisting of the socialists and Communists, in which he has made virtually no dent since his impressive debut of September 1930." This is too "sanguine." It is true that the Communist and socialist masses hate Fascism. But they do not yet constitute a bloc for the simple reason that not only have the socialist leaders no heart for a fight against Fascism which might lead to a proletarian revolution—rather than lead up to that eventually, they will lay down before Fascism—but the official Communist leaders are determined to form no bloc, no united front with the social democratic masses, a united front which, if realized, would crush the Fascists under the terrific weight of the combined proletarian mass.

There lies the crux of the difficulty

Stifling the Labor Defense

In a previous article on the dangers, confronting the I. L. D. because of the mechanization of the organization by way of the "group system", it was said that this new plan of organization would deprive the membership of the enthusiasm for activities so much needed in order to carry on mass defense work. Only six weeks have elapsed since this was predicted and already there can be seen the correctness of this estimation. Fortunately, not all of the branches of the I. L. D. have as yet been reorganized on the group plan, but branches that have already undergone this "successful" operation show definite signs of regression. For example, the model branch of all branches in the district for membership, meeting attendance, sale of Labor Defenders and other propaganda literature, is now showing definite signs of disintegration and demoralization as a result of having been put through the process of the group plan.

The following are facts appearing on its balance sheet to date—meeting attendance ranging from 50 to 75 members immediately prior to its being reorganized into an underground form of organization, dropped to but 13 members attending the first meeting and 17 members the second meeting after its reorganization, and with a corresponding effect upon its general line of activities. To illustrate, the branch, which holds the record of having sold 800 Labor Defenders the month prior to the "operation", now is faced with the prospect of hardly reaching more than half of that quota for the current issue. The mechanical grip upon the branch is so choking the life out of it that even the organizer of the branch (a good machine man) realized the danger and stated at the last meeting: "I had my doubts about the group system from the very beginning and now we can see that it will not work."

A more glaring example is not needed to show the actual demoralizing effects to the mechanical group system holds for the rest of the I. L. D., now in the process of reorganization. Judging by these first signs of results, we will soon be justified to use the very popular expression "the operation was successful but . . ."

R. ULCHIN.

The Swaback Meeting in Youngstown

On January 6, comrade Swaback spoke in Youngstown on the differences within the international Communist movement. The meeting was attended by twenty-five interested workers. Members of the S. L. P., of the C. P. and the Y. C. L. were present and participated in the discussion which followed.

A small group of Stalinists attempted to provoke a fight by a running fire of interruptions, but had to desist when they received no encouragement from the workers present. In the discussion period their leader asked for the floor, received it, and launched into a tirade of slander against Swaback and the Opposition in general. He concluded with an appeal to everyone to protest by leaving the meeting. A worker, indignant at this tactic, jumped to his feet and protested against such provocation. He said, "You were given the floor. Why don't you give arguments instead of slander?"

But as everybody knows, a Stalinist is not infrequently impervious to sense. The Stalinist general and his army of three left the meeting. A Y. C. L. member, despite all their exhortations refused to leave. He said he could see no harm in discussing the differences between the Opposition and Stalinism.

The workers were of the same opinion. For several hours, they asked questions and indicated by their opinions that here in Youngstown, the wall of Roman Catholic ignorance in which the party rank and

file is kept, is breaking down. We will continue this work to demolish it completely and to reestablish the unity of the Communist vanguard.

—FRANK CHELOFF.

THE SPANISH ARTICLES

Pressure of space in this number compels us to hold over the first of the series of articles on the situation in Spain, by comrade Max Shachtman, for the next issue of the *Militant*, where it will surely appear.

Announcement that Gov. Roland H. Hartley of Washington had granted a parole to O. C. Bland, one of the five remaining prisoners in the Centralia Armistice Day cases, was made a few days ago from the state capital in Olympia. At the same time the governor extended indefinitely the leave of Eugene Barnett, who was paroled last May to care for his wife, then facing a critical operation.

Friends of the prisoners are greatly encouraged by these developments. Some three years ago the governor received a petition urging their release from 3,500 residents of Centralia, which has only 3,000 registered voters. Eight of the trial jurors also have made affidavit declaring that if the court had permitted them to know all the facts in the case they never would have convicted.

The official leaders have followed one false and criminal policy after the other in recent years, swinging from a sterile and noisy adventurism to an equally clamorous and fruitless opportunism. In recent months, had they set themselves such an aim deliberately, they could hardly have done more to prejudice the interests of the struggle against Fascism. With Hitler advancing rapidly, the Thaelmanns, Remmeles and Neumanns not only shouted from the house-tops that the "Social Democratic Party is the main enemy!", but entered into a vulgar competition with the Nazis to see who could outbid the other in playing on the nationalist prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie (the notorious "Program for National and Social Emancipation"). They not only repelled the social democratic workers, even those who were beginning to rebel against Wels, Stroebel and Co., by the thoroughly false cry of "social-Fascists" who must be driven out of the factories (and the "little Zoergiebel's" out of the playgrounds—literally!), but finally entered into a shameless support of the Fascist Prussian Referendum of a few months ago—an action which pleased and profited Hitler, on the one hand, and Wels on the other, but only brought disgrace to the banner of Communism.

Now, in the face of all the boasts of the immediate past, in the face of all the braggadocio and loud-mouthed radicalism, the Stalinists not only reject the imperatively needed united front with the social democratic workers, but are preparing to quit the field of battle without firing anything more deadly than a manifesto . . . from exile. No other construction can be put upon the policy and acts of the Thaelmanns. And a capitulation now would be a repetition of the Brandlerist surrender of 1923 with even more fatal consequences.

Days pregnant with great historical significance are ahead in Germany. False policies, obstinately maintained, will produce ruinous results. A change in time, resolutely applied, will eliminate much of evil that has been inflicted upon the movement in the past. From whom can such a change be looked for? From Thaelmann and Co. Hardly. Then from the Comintern, from Stalin? Again, hardly. What the "Master" thinks of the present situation in Germany, nobody is permitted to know. During the most stirring days of the Spanish revolution, the "leader of the world revolution" found nothing to say about the tasks of the Communists, or else no need of saying anything. The present German crisis once more finds the Communists without the benefit of Stalin's counsel. But its benefits would be more than dubious. For we already know—try to conceal it as he would—what Stalin advised the Communists to do under almost identical circumstances. In August 1923, on the eve of the decisive events in Germany of more than eight years ago—as the minutes of the 1926 Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union will testify—Stalin wrote his views on Germany to Zinoviev and Bukharin. We quote this extensive and illuminating passage:

What Stalin Once Advised

"Should the Communists strive for the seizure of power (at the given moment) without the social democrats, have they matured to this point—therein lies the question, in my opinion. Taking over the power, we in Russia had such reserves as: (a) peace, (b) the land to

the peasants, (c) the support of the overwhelming majority of the working class, (d) the sympathy of the peasantry. The German Communists have nothing of the sort at the present time. To be sure, they have the Soviet state as a neighbor, which we did not have, but what can we give them at the present moment? If the power were now, so to speak, to collapse in Germany and the Communists seize it, then they will fall through with a crash. That in the 'best case'. But in the worst case—they will be smashed to a thousand smithereens and set back. The matter does not lie in the fact that Brandler wants to 'educate the masses', but in the fact that the bourgeoisie, plus the Right social democracy, would quite definitely convert the educational demonstration into the decisive battle (for the moment, they have all the chances for it) and would smash them. Surely, the Fascists are not asleep, but it would be better for us if the Fascists were to attack first: this would assemble the whole working class around the Communists (Germany is not Bulgaria). Besides, from all reports, the Fascists are weak in Germany. In my opinion, it is necessary to restrain the Germans and not to spur them on." (Our emphasis).

Every child now knows the results of Brandler's capitulation in 1923, the Brandler who hardly needed to be "restrained" (by the way, is not the restrainer, Stalin, today the sworn foe of . . . Brandlerism?). Today, in a more critical world ambience, capitulation without a struggle would have ever more far-reaching effects. Once in power, Hitler would not only be in a position to exterminate the flower of the German proletariat, but would inaugurate a prolonged period of reaction throughout Europe. And yet, the persistence of the Stalinists in their breakneck course, their refusal to adopt the proposals of the Opposition for a united front with the social democratic masses against the Fascist reaction, their inescapable responsibility for the division in the ranks of the proletariat which is confronted by the Hitlerites, is paving the road to power for the latter.

The Party Rank Must Speak!

The Thaelmann course, pursued with the approval of the Comintern, is traceable to Stalin, traceable as far back as 1923. This course is heavy with peril. It can and must be changed. The Communist workers can compel a change. The party members—not only in Germany, here too—must speak out loudly and demanding. We have no small squabble to settle here. It is about the "key to the international situation" that the Left Opposition, with comrade Trotsky at its head, is speaking now, the key which the Stalinists are allowing to slip from their hands. The party members must speak because silence now is a crime.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

"Anti-militarist propaganda must be cast over the whole nation like a wide net. The proletarian youth must be systematically imbued with class-consciousness and with a hatred of militarism. This kind of agitation would warm the hearts and arouse the youthful enthusiasts of the young proletarians. The proletarian youth belongs to social democratic anti-militarism. It must, and will be won over if everyone does his duty. He who has the youth has the army." —KARL LIEBKNECHT.

WHAT IS FASCISM?

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER TO A COMRADE

I am writing you today regarding the question of Fascism. It would be well if you were to discuss three questions with the English comrades, since in this manner we can arrive at conclusions and definite views.

What is Fascism? The name originated in Italy. Were all the forms of counter-revolutionary dictatorship Fascist or not? That is, prior to the advent of Fascism in Italy.

The former dictatorship in Spain, of Primo de Rivera, is called a Fascist dictatorship by the Comintern. Is this correct or not? We believe that it is incorrect.

The Fascist movement in Italy was a spontaneous movement of large masses, with new leaders from the rank and file. It is a plebeian movement in origin, directed and financed by big capitalist powers. It issued forth from the petty bourgeoisie, the slum proletariat and even to a certain extent, from the proletarian masses, Mussolini, a former socialist, is a "self-made" man arising from this movement.

Primo de Rivera was an aristocrat. He occupied a high military and bureaucratic post, and was chief governor of Catalonia. He accomplished his overthrow with the state and military forces. The dictatorships of Spain and Italy are two totally different forms of dictatorship. It is necessary to distinguish between them. Mussolini had great difficulty in reconciling many old military institutions with the Fascist militia. This problem did not exist for Primo de Rivera.

The movement in Germany is analogous mostly to the Italian movement. It is a mass movement, with its leaders employing a great deal of socialist demagoguery. This is necessary for the creation of the mass movement.

The genuine basis is the petty bourgeoisie. In Italy it is a very large base—the petty bourgeoisie of the towns and cities, and the peasantry. In Germany likewise, there is a large base for Fascism. In England there is less of that base because the proletariat is the overwhelming majority of the population:

the peasant or farming stratum only an insignificant section.

It may be said, and this is true to a certain extent, that the new middle class, the functionaries of the state, the private administrators, etc., etc., can constitute such a base. But this is a new question that must be analyzed. This is a supposition. It is necessary to analyze just what it will be. It is necessary to foresee the Fascist movement growing from this or that element. But this is only a perspective which is controlled by events. I am not affirming that it is impossible for a Fascist movement to develop in England or for a Mosley or someone else to become a dictator. This is a question for the future. It is a far-fetched possibility.

To speak of it now as an imminent danger is not a prognosis but a mere prophecy. In order to be capable of foreseeing anything in the direction of Fascism, it is necessary to have a definition of that idea. What is Fascism? What is its base, its form and its characteristics? How will its development take place?

The aim of this is to show the English comrades that the question is not a simple one. It is necessary to proceed in a scientific and Marxian manner.

Now another question. Naturally, it is important that you occupy yourself with the isolated elements of the Left Opposition, but it is no less important to pay close attention to what is taking place in the Communist Party, the Independent Labor Party and the Labour Party. The first tremors or the earthquake must have produced very great cracks in the wall of the house, and the Bolshevik-Leninists can gain an influence among a large section of the labor movement. It is necessary to direct your attention not only to our little section but to everything that is happening in this great organism.

This letter is in very rough form. I have not even checked its contents but I trust that you will get the general sense of the ideas expressed. . . . Kadikoy, November 15, 1931.

—L. TROTSKY.

GERMAN OPPOSITION

On Sunday, December 13, the Enlarged National Committee of the Left Opposition of the German Communist Party (Bolshevik-Leninists) met with representatives from Saxony and Wasserkante (Hamburg) present. A more extensive representation from the provinces was not possible because of financial difficulties.

Organization Growing

From the reports on the state of the organization it could be seen that the Left Opposition, freed from sectarianism has experienced a gratifying development in the course of the past six months. In Wasserkante, the formerly small group has become a relatively strong faction of the party, consisting of party functionaries to the extent of two-thirds. This local group is developing a stirring political activity. Likewise, the Saxon organization can account for further progress in the party and especially in the Youth. The Southwestern district has developed a certain political activity in recent times. Especially in Bruchsal have our comrades understood how to realize the united front in practice. A unity committee of all the proletarian organizations has been formed which places the entire working class of Bruchsal in struggle against Fascism. Other localities of this district have been similarly worked upon. At the same time we have succeeded in forming in groups in the Ruhr district, in gaining new connections in Schleswig, Upper-Schleswig, the Rhineland, Magdeburg and in many other cities, and the possibility exists of forming new groups in these localities in the near future.

In Berlin, the Opposition has made very good progress. This is expressed primarily in the formation of faction groupings in a series of party wards. The work in the party will undoubtedly soon be crowned with greater success.

The growth of the Left Opposition may best be measured by the constantly increasing distribution of our literature. The editions of our pamphlets have doubled in size from time to time, and the edition of the latest pamphlet has reached the number of 15,000 copies. Most of the editions have already been completely or almost completely sold

out; we are confronted by the need of issuing new editions. Our influence has risen enormously and we are not wrong in contending that in a very short time we shall gain strongly organizationally.

The weakness of our organization still lies in the insufficient organizational activity as measured by the present-day political requirements, as well as on the field of poor and slow accounting. In this connection, however, it should be observed that in spite of it the organization has managed its publications out of its own organizational forces.

Adopt Political Resolution

The main point on the agenda was the discussion on the political situation. A vigorously serious discussion developed in dealing with the draft of the resolution. Before all, it was a question of the immediate perspectives of the struggle in Germany and of the question of the struggle against Fascism. The united front as the central problem of the struggle against Fascism and its concrete application were especially the subject of the discussions. The draft of the resolution was unanimously adopted with supplementary additions. This draft is to be presented for discussion in the groups and serve as a preparation for the next conference.

One of the most important decisions of the Enlarged National Committee meet-

THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the Communist League of America [Opposition] at 84 East 10th St., N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern James P. Cannon  
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector  
Arne Swaback

Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. 5, No. 3 (Whole No. 99)

Saturday, JANUARY 16, 1932

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy