

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 8 [WHOLE NO. 104] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1932 PRICE 5 CENTS

Labor Fakery Before Congress

The A. F. of L. Bureaucrats Finally Recognize the «Dole»

The other day one hundred A. F. of L. "leaders" submitted a petition for Federal unemployment relief to President Hoover and to Congress. The one hundred marched one whole mile to the White House. It was not exactly a hunger march, this dandy crew of well-groomed portly per-capita absorbers. It must have been a rather grotesque looking affair, in the present unemployment situation.

But this is not the point. There is something else worth noting in this whole affair. For the A. F. of L. high officials it represents a considerable change of front, since the convention held at Vancouver last fall. Above all, it is important to know the reason for this change of front.

First of all, it signifies further evidence of the slowly growing pressure within the unions, of discontent caused by the ravages of unemployment. The petitioners, so humble in this role, but insolently haughty before their union membership, fear the signs of the coming discontent. They fear its becoming directed against the rulers of a system which is causing unemployment and misery. They fear its becoming expressed in genuine class consciousness. Hence they hurry to head it off if possible.

We recall the traditionally reactionary A. F. of L. policy of servile cringing before the desires of the politically distinguished to Washington. It is this which has particularly distinguished its leadership as agents of capitalism. At the Vancouver convention the assembled high salaried business agents despite the changes in the phraseology of the orators, reinforced this policy in full. They frothed at the mouth against the "dole". They went on record against unemployment insurance and any form of federal unemployment relief.

Would it now seem, in view of this petition, that the traditional A. F. of L. policy is undergoing a change. We fear it would be entirely too optimistic to have such expectations; but these gentlemen are quite alarmed at the prospects of seriously rising discontent. And that much their petition reflects very distinctly.

The petitioners ask for appropriations for direct federal relief; for cessation of wage cuts; for the five day week, for the enactment of the Norris anti-injunction bill and, of course, they also asked for the inevitable 2.75 percent beer. How disdainfully Congress ignored the plea of the humble petitioners, was shown by its adoption at this moment of a number of measures of relief to capitalism. There are the examples of the establishment of the two billion dollar reconstructing finance corporation, of the Glass banking bill, etc. On the very same day of the filing of the petition the Senate leaders girded their loins to defeat even the moderate La Follette-Costigan bill providing an appropriation of 375 million dollars for federal unemployment relief. Undoubtedly more attention would have had to be paid to the A. F. of L. heads if they had undertaken to lead a substantial section of the millions of unemployed in a march upon the White House. But that, of course, they had no intention of doing. It is precisely to prevent demonstrations, which can easily fan a flame of real protest and seriously advance demands, that the petition came forward, and came forward in the manner it did. The government need not at all take serious heed of such requests. It well knows the intentions and designs of its obedient servants.

There may be workers, however, who take this change of front at face value, thinking that it indicates a more progressive attitude and hoping that real leadership for unemployment relief can be expected from the A. F. of L. high salaried officials. Such hopes, of course, are doomed to disappointment. It is true that even these reactionaries are subject to a change of front under compulsion and pressure. They may even under such conditions take steps forward and in a progressive direction. But by their position as defenders of capitalism and hopelessly reactionary make-up any such steps would always remain far behind the actual needs of the workers. Essentially they remain a brake upon the movement and looking for the first opportunity to betray. Nevertheless, the pressure upon them, by the deepening of the crisis and by extension of the wage cut drive, will increase. This pressure would be deliberately and consciously aided, organized and directed by Left wing militants. It should be made articulate and effective, not based upon expectation of results from the official

YOUNG SPARTACUS AFFAIR

The Spartacus Youth Club of New York (formerly the Marxian Youth Club) will hold an affair for the Young Spartacus at the Militant Hall, 84 East 10th Street, on Saturday evening, February 27th. There will be entertainment, dancing and refreshments.

All youth are invited to attend this affair as well as the regular club meetings held every Sunday afternoon at 3:00 P. M. at the above address.

OPEN FORUM

Lecture by
ARNE SWABECK

The Left Opposition and
the Unity Ruse of the
Lovestone Right Wing

at the
Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue

Friday, February 19, 1932
at 8 P. M.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION
ADMISSION: 25 Cents
Unemployed Workers Admitted Free
Sponsors: New York Branch Communist
League of America (Opposition)

the party, regardless of the militancy displayed, have constantly decreased in working class participation. The February 4th demonstration was smaller yet than the preceding ones. That downward tendency is also the status of the movement as a whole. This has become an ineradicable record of the working class attitude toward the party leadership and its policies. And this in a situation of growing pressure from mass discontent.

Is it not clear that here a complete change of policy is necessary. Not merely a change on paper but a change in reality?

—A. S.

The Jailed Marine Workers and the I.L.D.

I have received about a dozen letters from party members as well as I. L. D. members during the last week. All these letters deal with the same question—that of the I. L. D. and its relation to the defense of the prisoners involved in the case. I have not enough stamps nor writing material to answer each letter individually so this statement of facts will serve as a reply to all those concerned. If I am judging correctly, it is evident that a misunderstanding exists in many a comrade's mind as to my personal stand on the question of the I. L. D. I shall endeavor in this statement to settle that very question once and for all.

At the time of our arrest Nov. 16, 1931 we were entirely at the mercy of the police and they knew it only too well and acted accordingly. Hence, the inhuman and beastly 3rd degree and brutal beating. Bunker at the time asked me whether I thought the I. L. D. would come forward to defend us. I replied that I was sure they would as the organization of the I. L. D. was supposedly non-political and in any event

non-partisan. On the following day, after having appeared in the Magistrate's Court and after having pleaded not guilty it became evident to me that the I. L. D. did not intend to take the case. Realizing that we were facing the rest of our life in prison if the frame up was successful, it became evident that we must obtain legal advice somehow. I, therefore, put through a telephone call from Tombs prison to Mr. Fishman, an attorney who had successfully defended me in another case. Mr. Fishman arrived the same afternoon and upon hearing the case told me that he would see us through, free or no fee. He has kept his promise.

On the 19th of November, three days after the arrest, I received a letter from comrades Cannon and Tresca, informing me that due to the fact that no one had seemingly come forward to defend us, they had in conjunction with other comrades retained an attorney who would call to see us. The following day, Mr. Sabatino called and has since then handled the case as chief counsel with Mr. Fishman as associate counsel. On or about the 15th of December, one month after the arrest, I received a letter from Mr. Brodsky informing me that he had been instructed by the I. L. D. to offer his legal services. I want comrades to bear in mind that this was the first offer we had from the I. L. D. and it came 32 days after our arrest. Bunker, Trajer and myself discussed the letter and it was decided that I should write Brodsky asking him to call in order to enable us to discuss the question of the committee and endeavor to find ways and means whereby the I. L. D. and the committee could get together on the question. Nothing was heard from the I. L. D. until 9 days later, when Brodsky came. I asked him how the I. L. D. could explain its attitude in view of the fact that when approached by workers shortly after the arrest they had

(Continued on page 2)

World Powers at Loggerheads

Japanese Repulsed in China as Laval Cabinet Falls in Paris

The events of the last week have brought about a very noticeable shift in the relationship of forces among the powers involved in the recent struggle. The unexpected and rather remarkable resistance put up by the Chinese at centering on the Far Eastern question. Chapel has vexed the Japanese aggressors considerably. And the rather cool reception given the French delegation at Geneva, has not served to encourage Tokyo any either. The French imperialists have up to the present been the only ones to play the role of apologists for Nipponese militarism.

The bold stand taken by Tardieu has, if anything, only been of service in the consolidation of Wall Street influence in Europe. Isolated internationally by their strong-headed drive for a sharp solution, the French reactionaries have suffered an internal defeat, through a combination of circumstances, by the downfall of the Laval cabinet. The inevitably more moderate regime that will succeed Laval, will not fail to take into account the desires and demands of the Washington government in continuing, under a new guise, the traditional French struggle for European hegemony. After all, the money bags will remain the determining factor in imperialist politics.

Japan, weakened already by her Far Eastern adventure and losing ground continually in her diplomatic disputes with the West, finds herself entangled in a net of strangling contradictions. On the one hand, the Manchurian expedition and the attack on Shanghai have already proved to be extremely expensive, have sapped her resources like a suction pump. A protracted stay in China can only mean the collapse of her financial structure. Discontent at home is maturing rapidly. Despite the censorship, reports of anti-war demonstrations in Tokyo and in other cities have found their way into the press. The economic crisis and the unemployment it brings can only aggravate this situation for the Mikado's ministers. On the other hand, the Chinese boycott of Japanese goods has al-

ready piled up heavy losses for her industries. And it is primarily the breaking of the boycott that Tokyo is concerned with at present, after the first flush of victory and the ravenous ambitions accompanying it, have dimmed. And even then, it is questionable if the imperialism of the East could repair its losses by merely lifting the boycott, as the situation stands today. At any rate, it may be safely assumed that in the coming weeks, the diplomats at Tokyo will be much more "reasonable" in their negotiations with the U. S., Great Britain and the others until new factors intervene.

The temporarily successful defense of Chapel has no doubt raised the morale of the Chinese troops. That the Kuo Min Tang politicians attempt to exploit this situation is only natural. But it is not their intention to make use of it by rallying the masses for a real struggle. For them, it simply constitutes capital in the bid for the support of American financiers. Washington is not at all reluctant to come to the aid of the Chinese bourgeoisie. The centralization of China and its transformation into a stable market for American goods, has always been one of Wall Street's dreams. Any opportunity to realize this dream will be taken advantage of by United States imperialism.

But the Kuo Min Tang has not yet succeeded in establishing a stable bourgeois power in China. All the experiences of recent years have helped to strengthen the hatred of the masses of the people against the foreign robber powers, America included. They will undoubtedly look upon the Kuo Min Tang's flirtations with Wall Street, with suspicion. This fact cannot help but increase the opportunities of the Chinese Communists to build up their influence and to take the lead in the struggle, supported by the prestige and the backing of the

Soviet Union and the world proletariat. Rumors have been spread about relative to a supposed entente between the Soviet government and the Japanese with regard to the transportation of troops on the Chinese Eastern Railroad. Despite the disgustingly non-revolutionary stand of Litvinoff at Geneva, dealt with elsewhere in this issue, despite the fact that this position at the Disarmament Conference only constitutes another step in the Stalinist degeneration, it is, nevertheless, inconceivable, that there is any truth whatsoever in these rumors. Any such entente could mean only one thing in betrayal of the most elementary duty of a proletarian power—that of intransigent antagonism to the imperialists and their designs against the oppressed colonial masses.

The imperialist powers are busy preparing their households for the coming test of strength. Just how imminent this clash is, may be gathered from the parleys going on at Geneva in the ante-chambers, away from the din of oratorical bombast. These discussions have for their subject the very prosaic matter of restrictions in the use of air-craft bombing on civilians, the distances to be established between battle lines, etc. The utmost watchfulness is required of the international working class. We, too, must be prepared. The tension in Germany, in the face of the March elections, may well give vent to an explosion that will shake Europe. The outcome of the class struggle in Germany will serve as a signal for imperialist action. It is the task of the Communists to lay the ground for a successful counter-action of the proletariat. The first requisite for that is international solidarity. And it is on this point, that the Stalinist leadership in all the parties of the Comintern, and especially in the Soviet Union must be called to order.

—S. G.

The Presidential Elections in Germany

All political parties in Germany are retrenching themselves for the general presidential election to be held in March. At present the nominations are taking place and the most important parliamentary drive in the history of German politics is under way.

Hindenburg has accepted the candidacy of a "coalition" drive to defeat Fascism. He will have the support of the social democracy, the Centrist party, the People's Party, the Economic Party and the Democratic Party. In a word, the "democratic" forces are uniting on the basis of a defense and resistance against Fascism—and Communism. At

the head of this drive stand the socialists. The object is to retain Hindenburg as the "iron man" to save the republic, and also to keep Brüning at the head of parliament.

The Fascists are orientating themselves for the drive. To them the elections do not close the question. They are confident that they can defeat this coalition even on the election field. The Nazi party and their counter-part, the Nationalist party, are grooming their ranks for a united stand against the "coalition". The Fascists are now attempting to force through Hitler's citizenship with the aim of legalizing his participation in politics and acting as a candidate for his party.

It would be the greatest danger to the working class of Germany and the whole world, and particularly the international Communist movement, to believe that the Fascists will terminate their drive for power with the end of the elections. Quite the contrary. In the event of a defeat of Fascism at the election polls, they will begin instantly with a concerted drive for power through an armed coup.

At the moment of this writing, the detailed plans of the combined Fascist and Nationalist front are unknown. There is a certain uneasiness in the ranks of the democratic coalition because of this. They do not know how to resist the Fascist drive. They fear the results of an election defeat of the Fascists because they understand that in such an event, Fascism will resort to an armed struggle against the government.

In this situation the role of the Communist party is of highest importance. Information from Germany demonstrates that the C. P. G. is now concentrating on the elections. Thaelmann is the party candidate for president. The party is now too, preparing for an intensive parliamentary campaign as a fight on two fronts: the fight against Fascism and against the Centre-social democratic coalition, stressing at the same time that the most important fight must be made against the Centre-social democratic coalition, and not the Fascists. But the danger in the present situation lies in that the party sees no further than the elections. It is correct that the party should carry on the struggle on the election field. But that cannot be the final aim of the struggle. For the Communists it is more important to see further than just the parliamentary (Continued on page 3)

From the Needle Strike Front

The struggle of the dressmakers in New York began a week ago under the auspices of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union. The Right wing controlled International Ladies Garment Workers Union postponed the calling out of its shops for more than a week, with the sole object of isolating the fight of those dressmakers who are striking under the banner of the Left wing. While the response to the Left wing was not such as would be desirable, the ranks remained intact all the time since the conditions of the dressmakers are now in danger—now more than ever. The Schlesinger machine will not fail to live up to its record of betrayals: It will again look for all shades of "impartial arbitrators" who will help stabilize the industry at the expense of the (Continued on page 2)

Glutzer Meetings

The national tour for comrade Glutzer is now under way. For the information of our readers in the various cities his dates are quoted below.

Previously we announced that comrade Glutzer has just returned from a visit to Europe in which he also spent about four weeks of fruitful discussion with Lenin's closest co-worker, comrade Trotsky. It is the result of this discussion which will form the kernel of comrade Glutzer's lectures. His subject will be:

WHAT IS EUROPE HEADING FOR?

The following is the schedule for Glutzer's tour:

Boston, Mass. February 19
Montreal, Canada .. February 21
Toronto, Canada .. February 23—24
Buffalo, N. Y. February 25
Meeting under auspices of Proletarian Party Opposition at 416 Pearl St.
Chicago, Ill. February 27—28
West Frankfort, Ill. .. March 1
St. Louis, Mo. March 2
Kansas City, Mo. March 3
Minneapolis, Minn. .. March 5, 6, 7
Chicago, Ill. March 9—10
Cleveland, Ohio March 11
Youngstown, Ohio .. March 12
Pittsburgh, Pa. March 13
The meeting for Glutzer in Montreal will be held at Universite Ouvriere, 85 East Craig St., Sunday evening, Feb. 21, 1932.

Aid in Our Circulation Drive

Slowly we are developing a group of active, militant builders. But it is yet entirely too small, and the results have therefore remained scant. To make the proverbial "power of the press" have a meaning for the Left Opposition, the first step must become an active building and extension of its circulation. And today, with several organs being published or about to appear, the extension should embrace the whole Left Opposition press. This is our immediate aim.

There are still a few months of the winter season left which offers the best opportunities among workers being more attentive, participating more in meetings, and being more easily within reach of our propaganda. We naturally depend upon our comrades to support us, to attend these gatherings, to make their contacts, to sell a copy of the Left Opposition press and to endeavor to get a new sub. When practically organized and carried on, this will also help us in replenishing our depleted treasury

which we assure all our supporters is badly needed.

This we propose to take up particularly during our coming three months' subscription drive, covering March, April and May. Our readers have noticed the special inducement offers. First, in the announcement of the theoretical organ,

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST REVIEW, to appear April 1st as a new addition to The Militant, the Young Spartacus, Unser Kampf, and Communists. Secondly, by the special books and pamphlets offered for new subscribers during this period. All of this material

GERMANY

The Key to the International Situation

by LEON TROTSKY

Single copies -- 10 Cents in bundles of 5 or more—7 Cents

Order Now

Pioneer Publishers, 84 East 10th St. N. Y. C.

has been published at the minimum of expense so as to provide literature of a high quality at a price workers can afford to pay. As to the quality—that we are willing to submit to our readers to judge. But we expect they will also, upon the inevitably favorable judgment, do their part to help build the Left Opposition press.

During the period of the drive, we offer for Militant subscriptions the following conditions:

One year subscription: \$2.00—a copy of The Permanent Revolution (paper bound) by L. D. Trotsky.
Six months subscription: \$1.00—a copy of The Strategy of the World Revolution (paper bound) by L. D. Trotsky.
Three months subscription: \$0.50—a copy of any one of our 10c pamphlets.
THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST REVIEW will appear in 48 pages, bi-monthly in the beginning. The price per copy will be 15c. Subscription will be \$1.50 for 12 issues and \$1.00 for 8 issues. Help us build the Left Opposition Press!

MINNEAPOLIS
COMRADARY
for
"UNSER KAMPF"
Saturday, FEBRUARY 27, 1932
9 P. M.
at the home of
J. E. L. KIN
1127 Gerard Ave., N.

The Jailed Marine Workers & the I.L.D. N. Y. Open Forum

Soderberg Explains the Disruptive Role of the Stalinists in the Defense Negotiations

(Continued from page 1)

turned us down with the excuse that they did "not want to reopen friendly relations with Soderberg". He told me to "forget it." After some discussion it was decided that Brodsky call on Sabatino with a view of cooperating as an attorney and that the I. L. D. get in touch with the committee. To date, Brodsky has not called on Sabatino nor Fishman. From this date, November 15th to January 19th and two days before we were scheduled to go to trial, nothing more was heard from the I. L. D.

On January 19th, Stern, Organizer-Secretary of the New York district of the I. L. D. called and saw me here in prison. He said the I. L. D. had sent him to offer the services of that organization. I pointed out to him that we were going to trial in 48 hours so what could we do now? He stated they had been too busy with other cases. As far as he personally was concerned, he had just arrived from Pittsburgh where he had been at the time of our arrest and therefore did not even know we were arrested until his arrival in New York a couple of days ago. How sincere this individual was can be judged by the fact that at that very moment was resting in my pocket a letter written to some friend of mine dated New York City, Nov. 25th, with an official I. L. D. letterhead and telling my friends that "Soderberg has associated himself with some racketeers", was "an enemy of the workers" and finally that "this is not an I. L. D. case" and warning my friends to "keep hands off." I knew he was lying when he spoke to me but I did not want to do anything that would prevent the I. L. D. from joining with the committee in the defense. I told him that I was still ready and willing to accept the I. L. D. in conjunction with the committee. A few hours later an attorney arrived bringing with

him a statement drawn up by Carl Harker, N. Y. District Organizer of the I. L. D., which in effect asked us to dissolve the committee and discharge the Attorneys Sabatino and Fishman. We pointed out to him that it would be against all ethics and principles to do so now but in order that no one should say that we turned any defense offer down, we would be willing to accept the I. L. D. attorney as associate counsel if that would be satisfactory to our attorneys. That evening I sent a letter to Stern informing him that I was willing to go to any extent to make this a real united front of the defense.

I stated, however, that I would not under any circumstances tolerate a dual defense movement. I endeavored in my letter to make all kinds of concessions in order to leave the door wide open for the I. L. D. to come in. The following day, Mr. Buitenkant, the I. L. D. attorney, arrived and we had a discussion. I asked him to explain the previous actions of the I. L. D. where they had spurned us and even referred to me as a stool pigeon. In reply, he stated that they had been mistaken, that their previous actions were erroneous but that they now were willing to rectify the errors.

I asked him to leave, so the defendants could discuss the matter. I was warned during this discussion by both Bunker and Trajer that the I. L. D. was not sincere in this offer. I refused to believe it at the time. I could not conceive of an organization playing with the very lives of three workers. I could not imagine the extent of their irresponsibility and treachery. How correct Bunker and Trajer were later events have proven. Later Buitenkant returned and shortly after, Sabatino and Fishman arrived. We informed Buitenkant that we could not and would not supplant our present attorneys nor discharge the committee that had worked faithfully for us. My stand was that I was still willing to ac-

cept I. L. D. attorneys as associate counsel with Sabatino as chief attorney, providing arrangements could be made with Sabatino and Buitenkant. It soon became evident, however, that this was impossible due to the obvious belligerent and domineering manner of Buitenkant towards Sabatino. He informed Sabatino that he did not understand the case, knew nothing how to defend it, etc. It should be borne in mind that Sabatino had gone through the case carefully several times but as far as Buitenkant was concerned, he had not even looked up the indictment and certainly had not asked us what it was all about. As Brodsky stated, "It is an ideal I. L. D. case." "We have the dynamite", "We have the workers framed", "And we have the stool pigeon".

That is all the I. L. D. knows about the case to date, yet an attorney that has spent three months working on the case does not know "how to defend it." It was evident that we could come to no arrangement after this. The following day we went to trial and a mistrial was declared. Upon returning to my cell I found a telegram from the I. L. D. offering to take over the defense. Although I at this time was certain that the desires of the I. L. D. leadership was not so much to defend us as it was to disrupt the defense committee, I still wanted to keep the welcome sign up and wired the I. L. D. that my stand was still unchallenged, i. e., I was still willing to accept the I. L. D. attorney with our attorneys, but that there was a danger of a disagreement among the defendants and that there still was time to fight, in view of the mistrial.

This is a true picture of happenings since our arrest and up till January 25th. On that date, the official organ of the party comes out with a vicious attack upon the Marine Workers Defense Committee and accuses the committee of betraying the defendants. As one of those defendants I state openly and knowing the full meaning of my statement, that the betrayal is at the hands of the I. L. D. leadership. Not only have they betrayed the three defendants and viciously stabbed them in the back, but they have betrayed all that is fine, that is decent, that is sacred in labor's principle.

They have shown themselves to the rest of the working class as open collaborators with the prosecution, first at the time of the arrest when they left us at the mercy of the police and treacherously sneaked away and actually assisted the authorities with their thinly veiled provocative articles in their press, and secondly, when they, under excuses of wanting to correct these past errors, came in and came with one purpose only—that of smashing our defense. In their eyes we are but political pawns. Our lives mean nothing to them. They are not concerned. They have played a game in this case so despicable, so utterly anti-working class that it makes one wonder and ask, why? What are their purposes?

Of one thing I am sure, if we are acquitted at our trial it will not be because of the I. L. D., but rather in spite of the I. L. D. There is one gratifying feature about this case. For the first time in modern Labor history has it been found possible for Anarchists, Syndicalists, I. W. W. and Communists of different factions and A. F. of L. trade unionists, to sit at the same table and discuss ways and means of freeing members of their class. This is an achievement but it is precisely this achievement that the party bureaucrats—with their blind, mad, factional rage—are trying to split. They tried, by lies, to stampede the workers at our arrest. They did not succeed. They cannot understand it. I ask comrades, workers everywhere: Support the Marine Workers Defense Committee which is the only body that has the full and undivided confidence of the defendants.

JACK SODERBERG,

Tombs Prison
February 4, 1932

FOR YOUR LIBRARY

Books by Leon Trotsky

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

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

2. THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

(Part 2 of the "Draft Program")
86 pages, two-colored paper cover 25c
Introduction by Max Shachtman

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION

80 pages, paper cover 10c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

208 page book—cloth bound 1.00
paper bound .50

THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Translated by Max Eastman
Vol. I—The Overthrow of Czarism
Special price for shareholders—\$3.00
For members of the Communist League of America \$3.50

Pioneer Publishers

84 East 10th Street
New York City

Unemployed Councils in St. Petersburg in 1906 by Sergei Malyshev Workers Library Publishers.

This pamphlet is an interesting and popular account of the unemployed movement led by the St. Petersburg Bolsheviks in 1906. Although the situation in which this movement developed is radically different from that which surrounds the unemployment here of today, nevertheless one reads these pages with the hope of finding some general experiences which are instructive for the Communists at present. And to be sure, this is to be found in the tactic used by the Bolsheviks in involving the employed workers in the fight for the interests of the unemployed.

The unemployed council movement in St. Petersburg developed on the declining wave of the 1905 revolution, which had already attained its climax in the Moscow uprising of December. The fright which the Russian rulers had experienced as a result of the revolutionary actions of the proletariat plus the well organized movement of the unemployed enabled the Bolsheviks to wrest some concessions from the St. Petersburg city Duma for the unemployed. The unemployed situation itself had been artificially created by the bourgeoisie through a lockout of the workers in the last months of 1905 in retaliation against their revolutionary demands and actions. In the beginning the St. Petersburg Soviet had assumed the responsibility of caring for these tens of thousands of locked out workers, but after its suppression the Bolsheviks commenced the organization of the unemployed councils. Unlike the present unemployed councils which consist of all unemployed who wish to join them, the St. Petersburg unemployed councils were representative bodies. The unemployed workers elected their delegates who composed the unemployed councils. The first unemployed council consisted of thirty delegates.

The author relates how after its organization he and the president of the Unemployed Council went to Lenin to report what had been done to organize the council. "Vladimir Ilyich heard what we had to say, and then said he had some doubts as to whether the Unemployed Council alone could fulfill its program by its own efforts."

Lenin told them: "Through this organization alone you cannot influence the bourgeoisie; you will not be strong enough, and the unemployed workers themselves will not be able to develop this work on a broad proletarian class basis. Therefore, you must immediately extend the Unemployed Council to include representatives of those employed in all the factories and mills in St. Petersburg. You must now begin to agitate in the factories and mills for this purpose, and immediately arrange for the election of these representatives. The Unemployed Council must consist not only of 30 representatives of the unemployed, but of 100 or 150 from all districts, from all factories and mills. This will provide the unemployed with a genuine proletarian leading body which will really be able to exert pressure successfully on the City Duma and on the bourgeoisie generally."

In accordance with Lenin's suggestions, the organizers proceeded with the further formation of the Unemployed Councils.

While the suggestions of Lenin are not applicable in their exact form for the unemployed movement in the United States, nevertheless, the essential idea, that is, that the unemployed themselves cannot compel the bourgeoisie to alleviate their condition to any appreciable extent, but must gain the support of the employed workers, remains particularly true today. In St. Petersburg where the workers had already experienced the organization of Soviets, it was proper to go to the factories to obtain the support of the employed workers. In the United States, unfortunately, this cannot yet be done, that is, not on a mass scale, for the workers are not ready for it. But it is possible to go to the trade unions. It is possible to fight within the trade unions for their participation in the unemployed movement. This of course requires a correct trade union policy and a correct unemployment program, neither of which the Stalinists possess. The proposal of the Left Opposition to organize the unemployed councils on the united front basis is in accord with Lenin's idea. This would transform them from their present feeble and insignificant state into organizations of influence, really capable of conducting a fight to help the unemployed, and develop the class consciousness of the proletariat.

The author traces the progress of the St. Petersburg Unemployed Council and the successes it was able to win until its liquidation when the reaction became very black. Of interest is the story of how the Bolsheviks were able to finance a whole series of strikes with funds obtained by the unemployed council from the City Duma. This was done among other ways by listing the strikers as unemployed. The author narrates a number of other interesting occurrences which makes this pamphlet very readable.

—G. R.

ORGANIZATION NOTES

Our subscription drive is getting under way. That there are real opportunities for extension of circulation of the Left Opposition Press is indicated by letters we have received recently. We quote from one received from a comrade from Pittsburgh: "What I learned for a short while reading *The Militant* and the paper from Greece called *PALI TON TAXEON* (Class Struggle) I never learned for six years reading the *Emporos*, the Greek language paper of the official Communist Party of America. I received your Greek paper *COMMUNISTES* which was sent to me, and found it very interesting." The comrade subscribes to *The Militant* for *COMMUNISTES* and orders some literature.

From a Chicago comrade we received the following: "Please find enclosed money order for \$2. for renewal of subscription to *The Militant*. I am out of work since May last year. The little savings I had are gone and I live on charity at the present time. That has never happened to me before. The only thing they could not take away from me is the same old hatred which I feel for our wonderful order of society, the capitalist system. I hope the comrades are able to keep *The Militant* going as a weekly."

This should be a good incentive to *The Militant* builders. We have had among the most active ones of the recent months such comrades as Hedlund from Minneapolis, Sacharow from Chicago, Schechter from Boston and Goodman from Philadelphia. Comrade Goodman is now going to serve his term in Prison but we expect the Philadelphia branch to follow his fine example and to keep up this work. And we count surely on

more comrades joining the ranks of *The Militant* builders.

The New York branch has elected a special committee in charge of the drive. Each member is required to bring in at least one subscription. The record of accomplishments will be kept on the bulletin board. This branch expects to be in the lead. Comrade Tom Stamm is giving special attention to the subscription drive in his capacity of being in charge of *The Militant* circulation.

Our Second National Tour

This week, comrade Giotzer is starting out on his national tour. Public meetings have been arranged in the various cities which will serve to further bring the views of the Left Opposition on the burning issues of the class struggle before the American workers. It will serve to give added life and added strength to the branches as well as to make more firm their contacts with the Centre. A couple of big features of this tour are to be a planned address over the radio from St. Louis and a debate with A. C. Townley at Minneapolis.

The subject of Giotzer's meetings will in the main center around the issue of the international movement, and particularly of Germany. Comrade Trotsky calls Germany at present the key to the international situation. It is decisively so. We propose to follow up regularly in *The Militant* columns with information of all developments in Germany and endeavor to make a searching analysis into the events and perspectives. We propose that in addition to Giotzer's meetings the branches should wherever possible bring the subject forward at open forums and public meetings arranged by them. They should also, when an opportunity is available, endeavor to have our comrades speak on this subject before labor organizations. We expect the situation in Germany to become a subject for serious discussion by our membership as there are many important lessons to be learned in such discussions. Above all should this opportunity be utilized to spread comrade Trotsky's pamphlet on Germany far and wide.

AFTER THE R.R. WAGE CUT

In our previous article on the Railroad Brotherhoods, we quoted a United Press report to the effect that on Jan. 14, Railroad capital and Railroad labor "sat down across a conference table determined to provide dividends for rail investors and work for unemployed rail men."

Accordingly, the recent Chicago railroad wage conference had a two-fold purpose. First, to provide more profit for the millionaire investors in railroad bonds and stocks, more money for the rich who do not need it and did not earn it, and this money was to be taken from the poor railroad workers who needed it badly for food, clothing and rent, the very necessities of life. Well, the first purpose of the wage conference was accomplished by taking \$215,000,000 from the rail workers wages and giving it to the railroad capitalists. But what happened to the second question on the conference program, to provide work for the unemployed rail workers? That was only a bluff in the first place. The Brotherhood misleaders, who have nothing in common with the workers anyway, never had any intention from the beginning, of getting any work for its unemployed members by accepting a voluntary wage cut for those who were unemployed. Ignorant, incompetent and overpaid as these Brotherhood officials are, they nevertheless know, and admit in their final agreement with the railroads, that wage cuts will not create more work but diminish it.

Complete Harmony prevails at the Wage-Cutting Meet

According to T. C. Cashen, one of the participants at the conference, there was no disagreement between the Chiefs on the question of taking the ten per cent cut for the men. The only difference of opinion which arose in the conference was over "the policy of procedure". The policy agreed upon was to take the cut for the men right there and then. The Chiefs did not want their cronies Dan Willard to wait until they put the wage cut through the mill of the Watson-Parker Law, because that might have delayed the cut for another thirty or sixty days. As a matter of fact the Brotherhood Chiefs were so anxious to serve and please the railroad Chiefs that they worked overtime on Saturday, January 30, in order to get their letter of acceptance in shape for presentation to the railroads on Sunday, Jan. 31st, so the cut could be put into effect on Monday, February 1st. And to show by their own words the brazen betrayal of the railroad workers at this fake wage conference at Chicago by the Brotherhood leaders, we will quote in full their letter to Willard accepting everything the railroads asked for. Read it carefully:

The Palmer House
Chicago, Illinois
January 31, 1932

"Mr. Daniel Willard

Chairman, Committee of Nine
Railroad Presidents
Chicago, Illinois

"After a painstaking review of the proposals and arguments which have been ably and forcibly presented in behalf of the railroads, we feel compelled to reiterate our previous opinion that as a matter of pure right and justice, the railway employees could not be called upon to agree to a ten per cent reduction of their meagre earning. Nor do we wish to give any assent to the theory that wage deductions are to be regarded ordinarily as the appropriate means to promote prosperity. We cannot believe that the public welfare is advanced by reducing the purchasing power of labor. But, with a profound sense of our

responsibility to the workers whom we represent and our country, we have weighed the urgent needs of the railroad industry and the demands of the public welfare in this present unparalleled situation against the individual sacrifices requested of the railroad employees. In the hope that our action may improve the health of our industry, may improve the cooperative relations of management and employees, and may advance the general welfare, we have decided to accept the proposal of the railroads to the employees whom we represent, that—

"Ten per cent shall be deducted from each pay check for a period of one year beginning February 1, 1932:

"Basic rates shall remain as at present;

"This arrangement shall terminate automatically Jan. 31, 1933.

"We attach the following conditions to this acceptance of our proposal:

"(1) That the formal notices served by the railroads whom you represent upon the organizations of employees whom we represent, seeking a fifteen per cent reduction in present rates of pay, shall be withdrawn and further proceedings thereunder discontinued.

"(2) That the railroads whom you represent will agree that without attaching any limitation upon the use of funds derived from this pay roll deduction, the participating railroads will make an earnest and sympathetic effort to maintain and increase railroad employment. "We trust the foregoing proposition will meet with your favorable consideration.

Very truly yours,

"(Signed) D. B. Robertson

Chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association."

We believe that the above letter constitutes the most open and shameful betrayal of the railroad workers in the annals of the Railway Labor Movement. The two feeble conditions incorporated in the letter and numbered, (1) and (2), are both pure fakes, and are merely put in there by the labor skates to cover up their treachery to the workers.

The request for a fifteen per cent cut referred to in condition (1) was never a serious proposal in the first place. If it had been, it would have been put into effect. In all probability it was a suggestion by the Brotherhood leaders to enable them to make the workers believe that their leaders saved them something. As a matter of fact, everyone knew, who studied the matter, that what the railroads really wanted was a ten percent cut and they got it. Press reports released at the very beginning of the conference on January 14, stated so frankly.

In condition (2) where the Brotherhood Executives stipulate "an earnest and sympathetic effort to maintain and increase railroad employment", they got nothing. The railroads agreed to two things and those two they got, namely: A 10 per cent wage cut, and the offer on the part of the labor leaders of cooperation with the railroad management. Items (4) in the final agreement reads as follows:

"The parties unite in expressing unqualified approval of whole-hearted cooperation between management and employees and agree to do everything they can in support of this policy."

The only thing the railroad workers got out of the Chicago wage conference, was another costly lesson on the bankruptcy of its overpaid bureaucracy with its class cooperation policy and the useless character of the craft system of organization.

(To Be Continued)

—A. E.

The Sims Murder

The terror of the boss-class in Kentucky knows no bounds. Not content with brutal repressions and beatings, they have resorted to murder. Cold, planned, premeditated murder.

On Wednesday morning, February 18, William Sims, nineteen year old organizer of the National Miners Union and member of the Young Communist League was shot down by deputy thug, Orbin Miller in the employ of the Rockefeller controlled mine interests in Pineville, Kentucky. He died a few hours later. Lawson Green, a N. M. U. organizer, who was with him when the shooting took place was arrested. As Sims lay dying in a Knox County hospital the inhuman district attorney kept plying him with questions. All urgings from hospital nurses and friends of the young organizer, to have that torture cease, proved futile. When the district attorney finished his inquisition the bed was saturated through and through with the red blood of the young miner and Communist. The end came a short while after.

Murderer Orbin Miller who went through a formal arrest was later released by county Judge Baker of Barbourville. The reason given being that he (the deputy murderer) shot either in defense of himself or his accomplice. "So it didn't matter." But it does matter! It matters to the starving and struggling miners in Kentucky. It matters to all those impoverished southern workers, black and white, fighting for the right to organize. It matters to the entire militant working class.

Lawson's testimony in the mock-trial against killer Orbin Miller was rejected. His testimony was rejected because he was a miner. His testimony was rejected as invalid because he dared tell the miners of Kentucky-Tennessee of their self-like existence. His testimony was rejected because he dared tell them organize. In the County Court of Barbourville, Kentucky, Orbin Miller's testimony proved valid and just because he has a general reputation as a killer. Because he served a sentence in jail for robbing the Cumberland Gap post office. This degenerate's testimony was placed against the testimony of Green Lawson, miner and organizer and the court decided in favor of the degenerate, the killer.

From the Needle Strike Front

(Continued from page 1)

workers; openly or behind the backs of the workers these class-collaborators and parasites will give up what still remains of the conditions that the dressmakers won through many bloody strikes. It is this danger of leaving the conduct of the strike in the hands of the Schlesinger machine and their Lovestone helpers that makes imperative for the Left wing to call for:

(1) UNITED PICKET LINES. (2) FOR IMMEDIATE FUSION OF THE TWO STRIKE COMMITTEES. (3) FOR A CONFERENCE TO CONSIDER THE SETTLEMENTS JOINTLY.

The banner of the Left wing can again be raised high among the thousands of organized and unorganized dressmakers in the struggle for unity, in the effort to bring about One Union, in the fight for better conditions for the needle workers. The great mass of dressmakers will march under the Left wing banner when they see it unfurled for unity.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

The Character of Fascism

An Analysis of the Composition of the Hitlerist Camp

In October 1930, the central committee of the C. P. G. decided overnight, that Fascism is reigning in Germany and that Bruening is its prophet. The 11th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. put its seal upon that, and all expectations, nourished by the "deviations" and inconsistencies in the resolutions, in the speeches of Remmele, etc., that the German central committee would revise this decision and take reality into account, have come to naught. Under the mask of a "theoretical elaboration", a large current of confusion is flowing through the party into the minds of its membership and the only one of the four credos of the Thaelmann article in December which is actually being preached, is: "We live under Fascism!" "Fascism and Social Fascism in the last analysis are two different shades of one and the same basis for the bourgeois dictatorship" (Manuilsky's report to the 11th plenum).

It is therefore not at all strange that the resolutions of the 5th world congress have been raised from their graves and that Stalin's theoretical infantile malades, like "social democracy as a moderate wing of Fascism", "social democracy and Fascism as twins" and other abortions of the same sort are being preached as eternal truths. It is only being consistent for a Warner Hirsch* (*Die Internationale*, Vol. 15, No. 1) to counterpose democratic England and France to "Fascist" Germany!

The question of the evaluation of the situation, the question whether we really have Fascism already in Germany, is of the greatest strategic importance. If one takes an affirmative position on this question then one must come to an entirely different point of departure, to an entirely different (and distorted) evaluation of Hitler, as well as of the Fascist danger in the perceptible future. For in that case the question of a formulation becomes the question of a prognosis of the most likely development.

The theoreticians of the Comintern are operating with commonplaces like "Bruening and Hitler are both merely dictators of the bourgeoisie. Between an open Fascist dictatorship and the Bruening government there is in no case any class difference whatsoever." These are elementary truths for every Marxist.

The essence of Marxist analysis does not, however, consist in the recognition of the general, but of the particular, of the concrete. The essence of a valid political characterization does not consist of the ability of fastening it on to every, but to a definite, political situation.

Can the expression "Fascism" serve as a characterization for a specific political phenomenon, for a definite situation? It can. But in that case, what is "Fascism" actually? A review of European, and especially Italian Fascism, permits us to elaborate certain specific features of it, without any difficulty. Fascism is a unique and new phenomenon of the period of monopoly capitalism, a product of post-war capitalism, an offshoot of reformism.

As the collapse of economy spreads, as reformism begins to disappoint the masses looking for a way out, Fascism is saddled everywhere with the task of intercepting the radicalized masses who are about to turn revolutionary channels and of faking them useful once more for the purposes of finance capital. It is a matter, in this case, first of all, of radicalized petty bourgeois masses and consequently, we see everywhere, as a particular feature of Fascism—its broad petty bourgeois mass basis. Furthermore, we see as a consequence of this, the super-radical and quasi-revolutionary, typically petty bourgeois phraseology, the desecration of the idols of yesterday—democracy, pacifism—and the idealization of the most brutal strongman dictatorship. We see further an unrestricted terror of the Fascists against the working class and all its organizations before and after its seizure of power, through particular organs (Fascist Storm Divisions, etc.)—a terror of such a great quantitative proportion that it becomes transformed into a specific quality. Finally we see the nationalist ideology as a maneuver of diversionist attention from social misery and as the basis of an aggressive foreign policy, which is possible only on the backs of a defeated working class, for whom the revolutionary way out is closed. It is especially significant to take into account, as Alfred Kurella has done, the strong war sentiments current among the Italian workers.

Its origin and the tasks assigned to it by the bourgeoisie, account for the position of Fascism with regard to the social democracy. Fascism, which cannot tolerate any other party, not even a petty bourgeois one, at its side, can least of all tolerate those for whom it must substitute, because they have compromised and outlived themselves. It is quite true that the social democratic leaders would like to rule together with Fascism, but Fascism would not share its power with them. Despite the offer for a coalition made by the Baldesi of the Socialist Party of Italy, the S. P. I. was subscribed even before the C. P. I. Despite all the services rendered to Pilsudski by the Socialist Party of Poland, its leaders nevertheless landed in the fortress of Brest-Litovsk. Just as it is certain that

several D'Aragonas will go over to Fascism, it is certain that the reformist organizations in themselves will be totally crushed.

"Fascism, nourished by the social democracy, will and must eventually crush its skull, in order to reach power. The Austrian social democracy does all it can to facilitate this surgical operation for it, (Trotsky)."

That is why the formula of "social Fascism" is not only harmful in agitation, but also false as a political prognosis.

When we consider, after this brief analysis of Fascism, the present day Bruening government, the differences are unmistakable. Its social basis consists unfortunately, as yet of the reformist workers chained to it by their treacherous leaders and not of the petty-bourgeois masses of Fascism even though it does indeed maneuver with the latter from time to time. The ideology of the Bruenings who base themselves upon a parliamentary majority, is conservative and not quasi-revolutionary. The terror of the state apparatus is as yet in its embryo. It restricts itself to the toleration of the Nazi terror. The foreign policy of Bruening is not that of Hitler. That is what differentiates Bruening from Fascism. What brings him closer to it we know full well; it is the regime of emergency decrees, the factual even if not formal, suspension of democracy, the active support of the Nazis, etc. If we want to evaluate the Bruening government as a whole, we must characterize it not as Fascism but much more precisely as the government of the transition to Fascism, of the active preparation (Groener!) of Fascism.

The difference between Hitler and Bruening consists not in the aim but in the social basis (what Thaelmann, Manuilsky and Co. say about their common social basis is pure twaddle). It consists in the methods. And that is something that must not be overlooked.

The Government Reprisals in Greece

AGRINI, GREECE—January (Our correspondent).—On December 31, 1931 S'ate troopers arrested comrade Demitrios Mylonas, President of the Panrefugees Organization of Agrini, and led him to the Police Headquarters. There the lackeys passed him through the third degree and locked him in a dark cell. At midnight, the Chief of Police Anastopoulos arrived at headquarters and immediately begun to examine our comrade. During the hearing our comrade declared that he is a Communist and as President of the "Panrefugees", he carried the book and a protest leaflet, which they discovered in his pocket.

Immediately, this bestial policeman attacked our comrade with a black jack shouting that he is a member of the Unemployment Committee which met this Monday. Confronted with the Bolshevik courage of our comrade, the beast continued his attack with rabid madness for a whole hour until our comrade began to bleed. At the end he did stop with the threat that he is going to kill him in case he continues to be an active Communist.

The following day they called comrade Mylonas for another hearing.

But how Anastopoulos was able to learn of the meetings of the Unemployment committees which are illegal remains a mystery. In this organizational committee Stalinists also participated and there it is possible that this treachery is the work of stool pigeons which exist in the Stalinist ranks.

The condition of comrade Baboucoupos continues to be the same and the wounds in his shoulders are not healed and therefore he can't move from his bed. The Municipal Hospital shows a criminal neglect and the same attitude is shown by the I. L. D. Our comrades have to care for him. In the meantime the condition of our comrades within the prisons walls remains the same and we urge the formation of a committee of workers and intellectuals to bring to light the criminal activities of the Wardens who are aiming to exterminate our fighters by every device of terror.

We are informed that our comrades of the Averof prisons are going to declare a hunger strike because the Ministry of Justice did not reply to their demands.

The "Students Syntrofia" circulated leaflets and appeals to every intelligent person, worker or intellectual to participate in the rally which is scheduled to be held at the "Trionon".

The Stalinists in Bulgaria

Use Violence against Oppositionists in the Prisons

We are bringing below the document of comrade D. Gatcheff, incarcerated in the Philippopol Prison in Bulgaria, mentioned in the February 6th issue of *The Militant*. It speaks highly of the revolutionary quality of our Bulgarian comrades, whose splendid morale should serve as an example and as an inspiration to all Communists, and to the Left Oppositionists in particular.

To the District Attorney of the Philippopol Court, Petition of the Prisoner Dimitri M. Gatcheff, sentenced to life long imprisonment, a member of the International Left Opposition under the leadership of the brave comrade Trotsky and Rakovsky, against G. Ognianoff, T. Nikoloff, Boris Dimitroff, etc. Mr. District Attorney:

I should never have desired or tolerated your interference into our factional disputes. You are a representative of the power of the bourgeois class against which we are fighting and for which we want to substitute the power of the working class. We are a faction in the labor movement hostile to your class justice and to your class itself of which you are one of the representatives. But in the moment in which my opponents of the other faction turn to you and demand justice from you, I am forced to bring the truth, in the first place, before the working class and then also to the attention of your tribunal. At any rate, the responsibility for this interference on the part of our class enemy into our internal disputes, rests upon my opponents.

For a long time there have been existing several factions within the labor movement; the Right the Centrist and the Left. Of late, the approach of decisive struggles between the classes has brought about an aggravation of the factional disputes.

The Left faction in Bulgaria, as it exists at present, came to the fore towards the end of 1928. The opponents

of our faction, incapable of conducting an ideological struggle and of withstanding our tactics, resort to personal attacks, provocation and threats, employing all the means unworthy of a revolutionist. They have more than once published all sorts of stupidities about us, for which they have never brought any proof. We have answered all these provocations in a firm and disciplined manner, by pursuing our course, the course of the Marxist Left Opposition.

They have threatened our friends that they would throw them out from the third floor windows of the Central Prison. They have spat into their plates to deprive them of the meagre nourishment granted by the class enemy. They have attempted to get two of our friends killed at the hands of paid assassins. (At the Haskovo Prison) they have crushed the skull of one of our friends. They have made attacks upon the lives of our friends in the prisons of Silven, Vidin, etc. They have stolen letters directed to us... That has become a system with them. They murder our friends in Russia, in the fatherland of the workers and peasants. They imprison, they sentence to deportation Bolshevik-Leninists like Trotsky, Rakovsky, Muralov and others. They have shot upon our friends in China and elsewhere. I must emphasize that all these deeds have not been committed by the Communist party but by one of the factions and that is—the Centrist faction, which is only a bureaucratic and paid apparatus, with Stalin as its head. They act without the knowledge or the desire of the Communist party and in this manner they stab a knife into its heart and into the heart of the working class.

Ever since my arrival here, these filthy affairs have also begun with regard to myself. I have more than once challenged them to make public their "accusations" and to counterpose the two points of view. They have always avoided this and have been continuing their attacks.

On the 11th of this month, after some similar quarrels and provocations, I met G. Ognianoff. I told him that they would remain cowards and rogues as long as they would not adopt an open declaration. Upon this, T. Nikoloff and G. Ognianoff almost simultaneously fell upon me with the cry, "Traitor!". Nikoloff beat me with a stick over my head, Ognianoff struck me in the right eye with his fist. This was the cause of the entire scuffle. The result was: One of our comrades was wounded in the head, myself in my ear, and one other also on the head. On their side: Two wounded and several suffering lighter injuries. That is the whole truth, the rest is pure invention.

In No. 16 of the *Russian Bulletin*, comrade Trotsky, condemning the attack against members of the Left Opposition in Canton, states: "We will never employ terroristic methods in the factional struggles within the labor movement. It is the task of the Left Opposition to take special care with regard to this. Firmness, will power and discipline are indispensable!" Yes, we are fighting against the system of provocation, terrorism and cold blooded murder within our ranks. Can we also make use of this? No and never! We can never employ provocations, terrorism and murder against our comrades. But once we are attacked, we must defend ourselves for we are not dogs. Our factional opponents are at present playing in the role of the thief who cries: "Stop thief!"

They are organizing more attacks. They are employing more provocation and they tell stories of threats and provocations coming from us. We declare that we shall answer all their threats and provocations as we have in the past, with firmness and discipline.

We shall not employ the same weapons as they do, and accuse them of being connected with the management of the prison, but we shall tell the working class that they are being tolerated by this management—and that when they raise their hands against us they are acting unconsciously as a tool of the bourgeoisie.

Stalin himself is unconsciously a tool of the Ramsins when he shoots Opposition fighters, when he exiles them, throws them into prison. And the Ramsins are the conscious instruments of French and international imperialism. History also has its logic and that is the logic of the class struggle.

I protest not only against the situation, that my opponents remain "free" (i. e. they are in the regular prison), which permits them to hunt up witnesses and to continue the slanders against us—I protest against the fact that we, who have been wounded and beaten without any guilt on our part, are condemned to solitary confinement and subjected to an insufferable regime. Is it possible that for the necessary enjoyment of sun and air only 30 to 40 minutes are to be granted to us in the day?

I shall furnish you with sufficient evidence that the responsibility does not rest upon my shoulders without attempting to throw it on anyone else. The working class alone will judge who is really guilty and it is to it that I address myself.

D. GATCHEFF

-- Sharp Changes in the Foreign Policy of the French Imperialists --

(Continued from last issue)

For the reasons enumerated in the first part of this article, the Lausanne conference, which is to occupy itself with the question of reparations, that is to say, in the last analysis, with the Versailles Treaty, will be confronted with such troublesome and unstable conditions. If it is to be a matter of taking up the Young plan, the French will refuse to participate in it and will maneuver to postpone it. Germany intends to play its own game there, taking advantage of the attitude of the U. S. England considers it futile to lose its time there, if it should be impossible to include the question of the debts to the U. S. As to Italy, she wants to make of it a tribute from which to appeal to the mercy of the U. S., who are in control of all its railroad stocks, by putting forth the threat of a "united front".

It is indisputable that the development of the crisis and the movement of the proletariat and the impoverished peasant classes of Eastern Europe require some sort of a way out for the bourgeoisie. Germany, Poland, Rumania, Hungary live on top of a volcano. Each bourgeoisie is conducting a fierce struggle against the working class, ruining its own home market, and consequently, also the foreign market of the others, reducing the working classes as a whole to actual servitude. But even this policy is insufficient to resist the monstrous onslaught of America, coupled with the strictures of the economic crisis. That is why the struggle against the proletariat cannot go on without the intervention of a certain amount of agreement among the rival imperialism, that is to say, without some of the imperialisms achieving certain temporary advantages over the others. France intends to maintain her own advantages. For this price, she is ready to tolerate the Fascist counter-revolution in Germany, in order later on to drive its point against the U. S. S. R. The East European states are also being encouraged by France to prepare for an armed struggle against the U. S. S. R. But Germany is still seeking to liberate herself from the fetters of Versailles, from the "tribute". For that is the only means of easing her difficulties, but also at the same time the one by which to shatter the hegemony of France in Europe.

The development of this situation which has been maturing for several months has brought about a displacement in the directing apparatus of the French bourgeoisie. Briand was the man of the period of ascent of French imperialism, on the basis of the Versailles Treaty, after the defeat of the Poincare foreign policy. Faced with new difficulties, he has little by little withdrawn from the scene. Heavy blows are in store for France from the outside. The recent ministerial crisis has reflected this forecast. Some demagogic reserves still exist; they constitute first of all: the radical party, which has just asserted, that in so far as foreign policy is concerned the program jibes with that of Laval.

The necessity of an internal struggle against the proletariat, the growth of unemployment, the awakening of the labor movement, combined with the need to mask the aggressive policy of France and perhaps also the defeats which it has undergone, beneath the veil of pacifism, also constitute important facts. The radicals and socialists will play this role and will doubtless, consciously prepare to play it much more openly in view of the approaching elections.

Thus, once more, and this time with a character of extreme urgency, the clashes between the imperialists show the way to the only genuine solution the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the installation of the dictatorship of the proletariat which alone will solve the problem of the socialist United States of Europe. The C. I. is at present engaged in a struggle along the lines of the "nationalist and social" liberation in the different countries. It provides further

A TIMELY DEBATE NO WORKER CAN AFFORD TO MISS!

COMMUNISM vs. ANARCHISM
IN SPAIN

For Communism: **MAX SHACHTMAN**
of the Communist League of America (Opposition)
Just Returned from Spain.

For Anarchism: **CARLO TRESCA**
Editor of *Il Martello*
— well-known Italian-American Anarchist.

ROGER BALDWIN
Chairman

Friday, March 4, 1932 at 8 P. M.
at **IRVING PLAZA, 15th St. & IRVING PLACE**
Admission: Thirty-five Cents
Tickets can be procured at the offices of *The Militant*, 84 East 10th St., and *Il Martello*, 82 East 10th Street, New York City.

The Presidential Elections in Germany

(Continued from page 1)

any struggle. For us it must be clear that the elections can at best act as a certain barometer of the tendencies to the political situation.

However, to plan the campaign of the party without bearing in mind the situation as it will appear after the elections, the trend of the struggle in the event of a defeat or victory of Fascism, is to lose oneself in a purely parliamentary struggle. Such a situation would result in continued defeats of the party and victory for the black forces of reaction.

What should the party do now? It should prepare for the struggle that will follow the elections. The Opposition has pressed for a change of line on the part of the C. P. G. We have attempted to make the party realize that the situation in Germany is a revolutionary one, that it ought at present prepare its forces for an eventual armed struggle for power. The elections should serve as an indicator of the relation of forces and

If the party is to successfully defeat help in the preparation for the conflict. Fascism and all the forces of reaction, it is necessary that it first change its analysis of the political situation, and reorientate itself accordingly. Concretely, this implies an acceptance on the part of the C. P. G. of the extreme danger of Fascism in Germany. The most important task confronting the party is the organization of the united front of all workers in the struggle against Fascism. But for this it is necessary that Thael-

mann and Company first drop the theory that "the main danger is the social democracy".

If the party does not at once change its orientation, the leadership of the C. P. G. together with the T. C. C. L., will be held responsible for the defeat of the German working class. It is they who are responsible for the failure of such a change today and for weakening the position of the workers which signifies, in effect, strengthening the position of Fascism.

The elections will decide nothing definitely. At best they may postpone for a short time the decisive struggle. Between Fascism and Communism only the armed struggle for power will decide the future. Supposing that the Centre-social democratic bloc should win the elections. It will at best give the working class more time to prepare itself for the final struggle. A victory of Fascism will push to the foreground the extreme acuteness of the situation, and force it to a head. In either case the election result will not change the perspective of struggle.

The party must foresee all the implications beforehand. The elections must serve it as a means of organizing its forces. The C. P. G. must begin to actually promote a genuine united front of the workers and their organizations. The perspective must be that of struggle—to defeat the Fascist front as the step toward the proletarian seizure of power.

—ALBERT GLOTZER.

for an "alliance" of the countries in which this revolution will be victorious with the U. S. S. R. This perspective is false. The United States of Europe on the basis of Socialism will require a complete fusion with the U. S. S. R. As against the anarchy of capitalist Europe, it is not sufficient to counterpose the "harmonious" economic development in the U. S. S. R., for it is not a matter of a simple hypothetical comparison that remains abstract in the eyes of the proletarian masses. As against the pseudo-efficiency of the imperialists, as against the "European unions", as against the conferences of Lausanne and the European "united front", it is necessary to counterpose the agitation around the slogan of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for the realization of a Soviet United States of Europe. The internal ruin of bourgeois Europe is characterized by its extremely chopped up, parcelled off economic picture. This tattered character is an obstacle to the economic development of society as a whole. But the bourgeoisie seeks only profit and the advantages of competition. Only the proletariat, only the broad exploited masses can realize the socialization of the principal means of production, after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the conquest of political power, as well as the socialization exchange production and planned economy for a broadened market, through the elimination of the manifold national barriers winding around Europe. This is the perspective which we counterpose to the bourgeois utopias.

—LA VERITE.

CHICAGO OPEN FORUM
"WHAT IS EUROPE HEADING FOR?"
Speaker: **ALBERT GLOTZER**
SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1932
at 3 P. M.
at
30 N. Wells St.
ADMISSION: 15c
Sponsors: Chicago Branch, C. L. of A. (Opposition)

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 Swabeck

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. 8 (Whole No. 104)
Saturday, FEBRUARY 20, 1932
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy.

EDITORIAL NOTES

LEARN FROM THE WORKERS

The sound impulse of the militant workers to maintain solidarity with persecuted members of their class under all conditions has again been demonstrated by the latest actions of Local 2090 of the carpenters' union in regard to the marine workers' defense. At the same time it has been shown again how far upstart bureaucrats, holding office by appointment and freed from accountability to the ranks, can depart from the principles they claim to espouse, and even to monopolize.

Local 2090 contains quite a few progressive and militant unionists, including a number of sympathizers of the official Communist Party. The I. L. D. has had a strong support there and the carpenters have responded every time to its appeals for class war prisoners. They took the idea of non-partisan labor defense more seriously, apparently, than the officials of the I. L. D. who had talked to them so much about it. Consequently when an appeal was made to them for the marine workers they responded just as loyally as they had done in other cases. The principle had taken root in the union, and the few members, inspired by the Party and I. L. D. bureaucrats, who tried to sabotage the action succeeded only in damaging their own prestige.

It might be thought that this warning would have been sufficient to put a stop to such trifling, at least in this union. But the Stalinist generals and field marshals have hard heads, very little shame and absolutely no respect for the intelligence of the workers. They thought there must be some mistake, and they undertook to correct it. Hacker, the district organizer of the I. L. D., took an evening off from his arduous labors for the principle of non-partisan support of class war prisoners to go to the union and explain that it did not apply in this case. Having learned by the previous experience that the carpenters could not be turned against the prisoners, he switched the attack to their defense committee and proposed that the union should withdraw its support from that body.

The ruse did not work. Without showing any prejudice one way or the other, the carpenters decided to hear both sides before coming to their final decision. They invited the defense committee to send a speaker to the next meeting. After hearing him they voted to continue their support of the marine defense committee until the end, without slackening any of their help to the cases defended by the I. L. D.

In this action the workers gave two lessons to the bureaucrats. On the one hand they showed that what they are really concerned about is workingmen in jail and not the auspices of their defense. On the other hand, rejecting the sabotaging tricks of the Hackers, they maintained their solidarity with the prisoners defended by the I. L. D., in spite of the Hackers. In both cases we believe they were right. Their actions show a line of principle, and that is what is needed to find the right answers to questions of the class struggle.

The lesson will be lost on the bureaucrats of Stalinism because these people think only of instructing the workers, never of learning from them. But we have no doubt it will have its effect on the Communists in the carpenters' union who were made ridiculous before their organization by their attempts to carry out false instructions.

UNITED FRONT IN PRACTICE

We have heard a lot of twaddle about the united front from critics of the Left Opposition who have described our struggle for principle as "sectarianism". But for all that, the first concrete example of the united front which has not involved a sacrifice of principle—the marine workers' defense committee—was initiated by the "sectarians" of the Opposition. So far all of its activities have been of a positive character and we have no reason to regret our participation in it. What the future will bring we cannot know, but this much is already clear: the formation of the committee carried into life an almost forgotten principle, it rendered a timely service to persecuted workers and therefore to the class they represent. Thereby it is justified.

The event may have a certain effect on future developments in the Left wing labor movement. Hopes—as well as fears and speculations, depending on the source—are spoken of all around in this regard. But in our opinion the hopes as well as the fears are considerably exaggerated. We think now as we thought before that the problem of the united front, taking all the circumstances—and primarily the splits and relation of forces in the Communist ranks—into consideration, is a long way from solution. The work of the marine workers' defense committee is at best only a contribution, by way of example, toward that solution.

Most empty and groundless of all is the talk about our participation in this joint struggle signifying a "change of policy" on the part of the Communist League. Those who draw this conclusion show that they know no more now than they knew before about the question of the united front. The defense committee is in no sense a political combination. It is not a union for joint struggle on a wide front of the class struggle. It is a simple agreement to cooperate on a single concrete issue, the most obvious one and the one having the widest appeal and to the honest workers in all camps, and in a case which would brook no delay. You cannot stall around and negotiate very long when workers are facing trial;

you must either help to defend them or desert them. We chose the former course without any illusions as to the possible results and without altering our fundamental conceptions on the subject of the united front in general.

Another point needs to be considered in appraising this conditional, limited and—from our point of view—unavoidable united front action. That is its experimental character. Our part in the endeavor was conceived as a class duty at the moment. We never guaranteed the results of the effort. So far they are good, far better in fact than was to be expected. But we are willing to leave predictions as to the final outcome to others. We will draw our conclusions at the end of the experiment.

Nevertheless the experience up to date has all tended to confirm in practice the conceptions we held in advance regarding the difficulties of carrying through a united front action without the participation of the official Party. The logic of the situation works against its success, and it is only the exceptional circumstances and the limited character of the issue, which we naturally took into consideration beforehand, that prevented a disruption of the present action.

The rude provocations of the Stalinists could only have the effect of nourishing and strengthening the anti-Communist elements, which are present in this case as they will always be. The Stalinists, by their whole course, prepared the ground for the transformation of the defense committee into a concentration point against Communism. This did not happen, and it is not likely to happen. There were and remain certain safeguards against it. By the nature of the case and the origin of the movement the Communist are in a position to fight more effectively against such a distortion. The principle of unity—against the capitalists and not against the Communist Party—has been firmly established in the policy and work of the committee and will not be easy to change. And finally, this direction is strengthened by the attitude of the prisoners who have a decisive word and have spoken it clearly for this policy.

All of this goes to show that we are dealing here with an exceptional situation from which it would be most unwise to draw hasty and general conclusions for the future. We must rather concentrate on the problem of the moment. The treacherous maneuvers of the Stalinists have been branded as they deserved to be. The task now is to hold the defense movement to the basis of principle upon which it has worked up to now, which alone could maintain its class unity and justify its existence.

MORGENSTERN AND GOODMAN

The imprisonment of revolutionary workers is nothing new, even in America

where only the first skirmishes of the great class struggle have so far taken place, and Morgenstern and Goodman are only two more added to many. Yet the departure of these militants represents a unique development and has an exceptional significance. It fell to them to be the first to fall victims to direct class vengeance against the revolutionary wing of the Party. The case against them was purely political; the indictment was based exclusively on the contents of our unemployment leaflet. Hitherto this persecution has been refracted through the distorting lens of the controlling centrism, which is a form of alien class influence upon the movement. In the persons of Morgenstern and Goodman, American capitalism has struck directly at the Left Opposition. Thereby it has conferred a singular honor upon them and upon the cause they symbolize and represent.

Beyond all doubting there will be many more to follow in the stormy times that must intervene between the present period of preparation and beginning and the day of the final victory. Our doctrines which are destined to become the fighting ideas of millions will receive their verification in the heat of mighty conflicts in which no resource of violence and oppression will be neglected by the class enemy. In these fires the cadres of the revolutionary vanguard will be steeled and tested. There will be many victims. The example of Morgenstern and Goodman will have its value for those who are to follow. We can all be confident of this because those who carry our flag into the Pennsylvania jail are not strangers to us. We know them as fighters. These young and unassuming, and yet stalwart, revolutionists take with them our affection and our faith.

Despite their youth, Morgenstern and Goodman have already earned their standing in the Communist movement; there are six or seven years of activity behind them. They belong to the founders and organizers of the Left Opposition in America, and before that they fought on the side of the proletarian tendency in the party. In the ranks of the Opposition they have been distinguished by their qualities of stability and endurance, by their stubborn adherence to principle and their capacity to go against the stream. They combined a courageous open fight for our ideas against heavy odds with the modesty that befits the young revolutionist who doesn't know it all. In them there is not a trace of the ugly presumptuousness of those academic upstarts who conceive of revolutionary education as a set of scholastic exercises. The jail will not hurt Morgenstern and Goodman, it will only make them stronger.

As is known, the Stalinists, who dispose of the party press and the defense organization of the I. L. D. and abuse the good faith of the workers who support them, refused any assistance to our two Philadelphia comrades. They deserted them in the court of the class enemy and gave not a published word of notice to their conviction and sentence. We will not forget that. In the final accounting for their rudeness, their dis-

The Right Wing of Spanish Communism

The Truth Concerning the Actual Policy and Influence of the Maurin Group

The Spanish Communist movement is divided into three distinct groups: Right, Left and the Center representing the "official" wing of Communism. In these divisions, the Spanish movement is not at all unlike the movement in every other important country. Where it differs is in the relative strength of each of the three wings. In distinction from most other countries, the Left Opposition in Spain can easily stand comparison with the official party from more standpoints than one. In addition, the Right wing group in Spain—at least at the time I visited the country; I learn that the ratios have since changed considerably in favor of the party—is as large in one district as the official party is nationally, if not larger. And what is more, enjoys practically a monopoly on the Communist movement so far as Catalonia is concerned.

The Spanish Right is organized into the Catalan-Balearic Communist Federation and its electoral apparatus, the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc which, in all important respects, supercedes the Federation. The Federation was the representative of official Communism in Catalonia until a short time ago when the split took place between the Catalonians and the Madrid Executive Committee of the party over the insanely sectarian trade union policy which the latter sought to impose upon the party members against the will of a majority of them. The trade union dispute which was of such vital importance at the height of the revolutionary upsurge—involving as it did the whole future of the National Confederation of Labor which was being resurrected—was rendered increasingly acute by the extraordinary bureaucratic regime prevailing in the party. The attempt of an irresponsible and unrepresentative clique, terming itself the "Executive Committee" to foist itself upon the membership, willy-nilly, met with obdurate resistance, particularly from the Catalan Communists.

The result was that, as has happened everywhere else, the bull-headed arrogance, their violence and their slander we will also present our bill for their treachery to Morgenstern and Goodman.

In their actions in this case there is revealed, as by a premonitory flash, what these people will be capable of in the future when events will put the great class questions categorically, when no one will be able to dissimulate, to hide or to evade. The day of reckoning will come. Let us hope that it will come before their course unfolds its ultimate logic in a catastrophe for the movement. The names of Morgenstern and Goodman will be a banner for us in the fight to hasten on that day.

—J. P. C.

ance and blundersomeness of Stalinism literally drove hundreds upon hundreds of the best Communist workers into the camp of the confusionists and opportunists. Skillful leader, popular figure in the party and among the workers, revolutionist of long standing and prestige, Joaquin Maurin, with his associates Arlandia, Arquero, Sese, Miravittles, and others, was able to win the leadership over the whole Communist organization of Catalonia "and the Balearic Islands". To such an extent that the official party today, while it grows with sometimes phenomenal speed in other parts of the land, has practically no strength whatsoever in Catalonia, where the Maurinists have some four to six thousand (the figure has increased since I left) in the bloc.

The structural relations between the Federation and the Bloc are reminiscent to an American Communist of the fabulous plan of Pepper & Co. to build a mass party in the United States by the simple expedient of organizing the "Federated Farmer-Labor Party" on a "mass scale" and then suddenly converting it into the Communist Party. In Catalonia, too, the Federation controls the Bloc, and is led by precisely the same people dressed in different uniforms as occasion requires. But there is one feature of it which is worse than what the glittering Pepper conceived. While the still-born F. F. L. P. was at least formally conceived as a bloc composed of various organizations otherwise independent of each other, and admitting no individual membership, the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc is a "bloc" in no real sense of the word. The Communist Federation directs it; like the Federation, the Bloc is based upon individual and not group membership; in a word, it is an enlarged caricature of the Federation itself, and nothing more.

Yet there is something more. The Maurinist justification for the two organizations is that the Federation should be "pure" and take in only educated revolutionists, Communists; it must be somewhat "narrow". But "as Lenin taught", the Communist party, i. e., the Federation, must surround itself with broad mass organizations into which even non-Communist elements may be taken. Such an organization, the Bloc is supposed to be. It is much larger than the Federation; it takes into its ranks all sorts of elements, including "Catalan Left" supporters and people to the right of even this bourgeois group.

The whole point, however, is that the "Bloc" increasingly dominates the "Federation", instead of vice versa—that is, assuming for the moment that the whole idea is not a vulgar derision of Lenin's teachings. In the elections, it is not the Communist organization which is presented, but the candidates and platform of the Workers' and Peasants' Bloc. In this case, substance marches side by side with form. The critical minority which Maurin finally expelled, sharply assailed the whole policy of the Right wing leaders in the elections. Wherever the Bloc was active—and most of its militants are also Federationists—the face of Communism was heavily veiled with the more attractive colors of opportunism. Instead of advancing and popularizing the revolutionary slogans, the Bloc organizers devoted their attention to playing upon the petty bourgeois prejudices of the nationalistic elements. It is no exaggeration to say that the largest proportion of the Bloc's growth has been among the petty bourgeois elements and among the employees and office workers, particularly in Barcelona, where the factory workers in the Right wing organization are very few. On the countryside, the members of the Bloc are mostly peasants, tenants and even small proprietors. These elements, flocking to the banner of the Bloc, do not remain passive there. They exert a growing petty bourgeois pressure to which the leaders yield with a grace learned from the art books of opportunism.

The source of strength of the Maurinists lies precisely there: in its petty bourgeois surrender to the backwardness of the workers and peasants of Catalonia. The party of Macla, the "Esquerra Catalana", the various other factions of the Catalanian bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois, have all moved to the Right since the proclamation of the republic. This is particularly true of Macla, the former idol of the petty bourgeoisie. The marked shift to the Right of what was formerly the Left wing of the Catalonians, has created a vacuum in the field. Politics abhors a vacuum as much as nature does. It seeks to "fill the vacuum." In Catalonia, the space left vacant in politics by the Maclans is being occupied by the Maurinist group, the increasingly popular candidate for the post of extreme Left wing of the Catalonians.

Not having an influence over the decisive sections of the industrial workers, particularly those organized in the C. N. T. (National Confederation of Labor), the strongest trade union center in Spain, controlled by anarcho-syndicalists, and now by the "pure" anarchists, the Maurinists have been making the most desperate efforts to gain a real foothold there. In this field too, the vulgar opportunism of this Right wing group bobs to the surface. In order to lend himself the appearance of a strength he does not possess, Maurin talks constantly of the all-saving head of a united front in which no other organization, not even the official Communist party, figures at all. The syndicalists and the anarchists do not even bother to reply to Maurin's fantastic proposals and schemes. For, with all the insistence upon his "Leninist correctness", Maurin has developed

an idea for Spain which has few if any rivals in recent revolutionary history. He approaches the C. N. T. with the plan that it should take power! Neither more or less. The patent ridiculous of the very idea being propounded to precisely those elements—anarchists and syndicalists—subsequently made it necessary for Maurin to retreat a bit on the slogan.

Maurin spent some time trying to convince me that his group had never raised the slogan of "All power to the C. N. T.!" They had proposed, he claimed, the slogan of "All Power to the Proletariat!" Unfortunately for Maurin, I read that very evening a copy of the popular agitational organ printed in the Catalan tongue and edited by Miravittles, in which the slogan of "All Power to the C. N. T.!" was repeated and elaborated upon. Later on, a copy of Maurin's official organ, *La Batalla*, reprints an interview which he granted the Buenos Aires *La Nacion*, in which he says literally:

"The Trotskyist faction is insignificant. It is made up of a few dozen more or less unknown intellectuals. Its specific weight is practically nil. Towards the Spanish revolution, they take a completely Right (!) position. They advocate that the working class cannot yet aspire to taking the power when it has no constituted Soviet organization. They propose as a solution that the Socialist party should assume the power. Their reformist social democratic past weighs down upon them enormously. The Workers' and Peasants' Bloc contends that the working class should take the power. And through the medium of hypothetical Soviets but with the aid of the existing organizations. Without being syndicalists, we believe that the syndicates (trade unions) can be powerful instruments in the taking of power by the proletariat. We propagate the taking of the power by the C. N. T. We will lend all our aid to a syndicalist government."

What a "syndicalist government" would look like, what it is, what its ingredients are, what it resembles—remain secrets sealed with seven unbreakable seals which not even the syndicalists can—nor have they ever cared to—open. It is hard to believe that Maurin does not "know better"; it is the plan of the Right wing opportunists, however, to win the syndicalist workers by this slogan; what is gained, in actuality, is the muddying of the waters and the spread of confusion among the workers. In this respect the Catalanian Right wing is no different from its sisters-under-the-skin in other countries. Maurin is clever enough, by the way, not to affiliate with the Brandlerist "International". It would gain him absolutely nothing, for he knows what this "International" is worth, and it might shut the door for him to re-entry into the official party on his own terms, i. e., as party leader. He told me that Brandler had sent a letter of inquiry, and that B. D. Volke, of the Lovestone group, had also written to attempt to establish relations. But the wily Maurin wants to have nothing to do with the rest of the Right wing, although he is blood relative to them. Yet he is like Brandler and Lovestone in that he is prepared to criticize the effects of Stalinism in any country in the world—except in the U. S. S. R., where, apparently, the ordinary laws of the physical and mental sciences no longer operate.

It should not be thought that Maurin is in any mood to capitulate on Stalin's terms. He is too flushed with the progress of the Bloc to do that. Already, a delegation of the Comintern containing such stars as Bela Kon and Humbert-Droz has visited Spain for the main purpose of winning over the Federation. But so compromised and discredited is the official party among the workers there, that the Maurin machine was able to nullify practically all the arduous labors of the delegation. Out of the thousands "available", the C. I. got only about three score comrades, led by Arlandia and Sese, who demanded of Maurin that he actually unite with the official party instead of merely writing appeals on the subject. Maurin, who is always ready with an elaborate speech on the absence of democratic procedure and of the right to speak freely in the official party, promptly expelled the whole group of Arlandia and Sese. Here, by the by, a little burlesque was enacted. Arlandia and Sese immediately shouted with the fiercest passion that bureaucracy had gripped the vitals of the Federation, that Maurin was a dictator, that the rank and file could no longer discuss the problems of the revolutionary movement, that expulsions were a bureaucratic answer to criticisms, etc., etc. Their cries had little effect, for only a short weeks before their own expulsion, they themselves, together with Maurin "the dictator", had engineered the expulsion of members of the Federation who sympathized with the Left Opposition and insisted upon discussing the disputed issues—comrades Molins, de Cabo and others. It all depends upon whose ox is yoked!

The Comintern failed to break Maurin's power in Catalonia primarily because the alternative it had to offer caused the Communist workers to shrink away. In this case as in all others, almost everything depends upon the party. An incompetent party, which refuses to learn and therefore cannot teach and lead, will never produce big results. The Stalinization of the Spanish Communist Party is being paid for today by having thousands of militant workers and peasants led deeper into the swamp of compromise and confusion by the clique of Joaquin Maurin.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

The Litvinoff Stand on Disarmament

The "Disarmament Conference of the great Imperialist powers is taking place at a time of the moral collapse of bourgeois pacifism. In the face of the bloody Sino-Japanese conflict, the bankruptcy of the Kellogg Pact, the League of Nations and the various other designs of the imperialists to fool the masses with illusory perspectives of international peace, the imperialists in Geneva feel the shaking of the very foundations of their "peace" institutions. The masses in capitalist countries who are suffering, starving and in a state of fear of an approaching world conflict of unheard of dimensions, have lost their confidence in their present rulers. They seek a new word, for an inspiring thought that would show them the way out of their torturous conditions. Who could be expected to bring them that inspiration if not a representation of the Soviet Union, who could present the exploited and deceived masses that vitally needed message in their hour of desperation, if not the builders of a free working land?

The opportunity to fulfill this historic mission was conferred upon M. Litvinoff by the Soviet Government. Litvinoff did fulfill his mission, but in a tragic manner. His proposals for peace at the Geneva Conference were disappointing and if they had any value at all, it was that of soothing the shattered nerves of the imperialist diplomats and morally strengthening the tottering structure of the so-called League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact and other schemes of deceiving the masses. Litvinoff's proposals may also have the effect of reinforcing the hopes of the soft-boned, chicken-hearted liberals and social-democrats who are sharing in this pacifist fraud with the imperialists. The workers of the capitalist countries, the millions of unemployed, could not read anything out of Litvinoff's proposals.

What did Litvinoff propose as a remedy against war? He proposed disarmament to the capitalist governments, total disarmament, if acceptable, partial, if more practical. How well it fitted in with the program of the Conference and its objectives! The Conference is out to accomplish just this modest task of reaching a common agreement on reducing armaments. They all talk about it. They all offer plans to achieve it. Litvinoff's proposals were just appropriate for the occasion. Besides, he is moderate and conciliatory. He is ready to compromise on a plan of partial disarmament so as not to appear "impractical" to the imperialists. In a word he was obliging

and willing to cooperate. If there was any distinction between his proposals and those of the French or Italian delegates, that distinction was only technical, but not in essence. As put by the New York Times correspondent: "Litvinoff completes the circle of these suggestions. As was fitting for the delegates of the New Russia he went to the extreme limit." Litvinov repeatedly emphasized, "The only way to prevent war is general and total disarmament." This half truth is the crux of the whole problem. As a Marxist, Litvinoff must know that this half truth lies at the foundation of bourgeois pacifism and that it is an utterly false theory. He must know that according to Marx, wars are inevitable under capitalism. He did not, however, mention a word about the abolition of the capitalist system as a condition sine qua non of the abolition of wars. He did not as much as suggest the necessity for the international proletariat to achieve the socialist revolution if not in their own interests, at any rate in the interests of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, he said, "The sole aim of the Soviet government is to build up socialism in the Soviet Union." In other words, the Soviet government wished to be assured by the capitalist governments that their capitalistic nature will not assert itself in regard to the Soviet Union.

The same New York Times correspondent remarks, that, "in international quarters, the Soviet delegation was credited with being marked with moderation and as likely to increase the possibility of success for the Conference." Surely, the correspondent has in mind the moral success of the imperialist leaders of the Conference. Thus Litvinoff's mission instead of being an inspiration to the international proletariat has turned into its opposite by rendering moral success to international imperialism. Such is the logic of Stalinist dialectics. Litvinoff went to the "extreme limit" of this logic.

For the sake of comparison with the true Bolshevik-Leninist attitude taken by another representative of the Soviet government, we shall quote from Chicherin's note to President Wilson in reply to his message to the U. S. Congress of January 18, 1918, on the question of the League of Nations and the conditions for World Peace. Dated October 24, 1918:

"But the League of Nations must not only settle the present war. It must make all wars impossible. It cannot be unknown to you, Mr. President, that

the capitalists of your country contemplate continuing in the future the same policy of conquests, and of exaction of high profits from China and Siberia, and that fearing the competition on the part of the Japanese capitalists they are making military preparations in order to overcome the resistance which may be offered them by Japan. You undoubtedly know of similar plans of the ruling capitalist circles with regard to other territories and other nations. Knowing this, you will have to agree with us that it is not possible to leave the factories, mines, banks in the hands of private individuals, who always use the great means of production created by the masses of the people to export the products and capital to foreign countries, to extract from them excessive profits, provoking imperialist wars by their struggle over the booty. We propose, therefore, Mr. President, that the expropriation of the capitalists of all countries be adopted as another of the basic principles of the League of Nations, etc. . . ."

Why did not Litvinoff take this correct stand? He could not because that would not be in accordance with Stalin's theory of "Socialism in one country," which is a reversal of Leninist internationalism. This morbid theory is the original source of the opportunism and moral stagnation to which the official Communist movement is doomed by the Stalin leadership. It is this spurious theory that has limited the role of the Communist parties to that of mere frontier-guard of the Soviet Union, with little value and significance in the international proletarian revolution.

Lenin's internationalism is considered by the Stalin leadership "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism" and its place is taken by national opportunism. Marxian teachings on the laws and development of capitalism are substituted by petty-bourgeois pacifism and putrid opportunism. The signing of the Kellogg Pact by the Stalin Government was a violent breach of Lenin's internationalism. Litvinoff's proposals at the Geneva Conference are of the same character.

Lenin conducted a bitter struggle before and after the world war against pacifism. The Stalin leadership at the Geneva Disarmament Conference has given aid and comfort to the imperialists and their pacifist agents. Let the Communist workers take note!

ALBERT ORLAND.