



The Dress Strike Settlement Some Lessons the Left Wing Must Draw from It

The New York dressmakers' strike came to an end with the workers returning to practically the same conditions as before—that is, to the sweatshop. This was not because of the lack of a fighting spirit on their part. On the contrary. At a time of general working class acceptance of wage cuts without resistance, these dressmakers set a glorious example by walking out and bringing a considerable number of workers along from the unorganized shops. Their ranks were solid. But their officials of the dominant union, the International Ladies Garment Workers, were primarily concerned about not inconveniencing the jobbers and manufacturers. They themselves proved to the hilt our often repeated warning, not only to watch their declarations but also to watch their fingers signing new agreements. Yet it must be said: Above all, this strike demonstrated the disastrous weakness of a situation where workers are divided in struggle.

Inevitably this situation is reflected in the settlements made by both unions. The I. L. G. W., for example, agreed with the jobbers and inside manufacturers upon certain measures of when and how to fix prices of piece work, but without any guarantee of the demanded minimum price amounting to \$1.10 per hour. The employers' demand for a 10 per cent reorganization right was rejected, but still leaving provisions at their command for reduction of the working force at the end of the season. A certain form of union recognition is granted, but it amounts in this case to facilitate the ironing out of conflicts between the various strata of bosses. The jobbers association has agreed to confine their work to members of the contractors association. The union obtains the right to protest any working in the shops over and above the five day week, but even that is left for final decision of the impartial chairman. On a whole, no practical change from conditions before the past agreement expired, but leaving plenty of loopholes for further connivance between the employers and their union agents.

Did the Left wing forces in the industrial union fare better in regard to actual strike gains? In this situation that could hardly be expected. As a matter of fact it had to rest content with agreement obtained one by one in individual shops, generally speaking also on practically the same conditions as prevailed prior to the strike.

The Serious Weakness of Two Separate Strikes

Such is the balance sheet of another settled conflict in which the workers, again forming the battling ranks, became the mere object of maneuvers. Their grievances were identical. All were working in the same industry. Yet there were two strikes, called separately, conducted separately and settled separately despite the unity obtained on the picket lines. This could not be conducive to wringing great concessions from the bosses. That the industrial union—that is the Left wing—side of the fight was conducted in the name of a united front committee altered nothing but brought more confusion to the serious objectives of actual workers' unity.

The actual situation in the New York dress shops is now, as before, one in which working conditions and piece work prices are practically the same in unorganized shops, in shops controlled by the I. L. G. and in shops under industrial union control. That, of course, is no great inducement for workers to organize. After all, to the rank and file the most telling argument for organization is one of conditions obtained by the union. That is true even for the dressmakers who have such a splendid fighting tradition. In the same measure it must also be emphatically stated that, while it cannot be expected that the Left wing industrial union, as a minority organization, can forge far ahead in gaining conditions, if it cannot at least advance a policy which stands out clearly as superior to that of the Right wing officialdom it forfeits its possibility of winning the masses. Mere propaganda for the Left wing position in its abstract sense is not sufficient. When it degenerates to pure and simple demagoguery, as is now the case of the official party leadership of the industrial union, it becomes actually harmful, because the result is that the workers lose respect for the Left wing and lose confidence in its ability. Moreover, the gentlemen in charge of the I. L. G. W. are far more skilled in the art of demagoguery and have proven alert in maintaining their hold upon the workers on that basis. In this strike the Left wing union, under immediate party direction, did not at all show superiority of policy or in leadership of struggle. Here was a plain problem. Workers of two organizations struggling against a common enemy, against conditions commonly abhorred and commonly hated. What was the burning need, if not that of common struggle and common working out of the immediate objectives in such a way to help frustrate sell-outs. This was a plain duty confronting the revolutionary

party and the industrial union leadership. What did the official party leadership propose? It established a shibboleth which it called the united front committee. It called upon the dressmakers to support this committee, informing them that they did not need to belong to either of the two unions. What argument is that for unionization? Is a substitute for either, or both of these two unions, what is needed? Obviously that could not be the need and ultimately it would negate the very right of the industrial union to exist.

The revolutionists among the needle trades workers must first of all tell them categorically that union organization is the vitally necessary instrument of struggle for their everyday needs. Next they must make clear what kind of union is required, certainly stressing the superiority of the industrial form. They must in actual practice help demonstrate the tactics of a militant policy as a substitution for the treacherous connivance with the employers. But the most powerful weapon of the revolutionary party remains the one of unification of the workers against the common enemy and against the treacherous influence of the yellow leaders. That, of course, would in its first step mean a united front of the two organizations and final trade union unity.

In some cases there is no other way out but by separate unions. That was so at the time of the formation of the industrial union. At the present time, however, the question of trade union unity looms as a serious one, and particularly in the needle trades. That at least should be a lesson from the strike. Consequently the Left wing should urge the workers in the I. L. G. W. to remain there and to fight for unity. We do not propose this slogan of unity on the basis of whatever conditions the reactionary officials may desire to lay down. Not at all. It is a fighting

Lovestonites Disrupt Rank and File Movement in the A. C. W. Union

The Lovestone Group in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers' Union has for a long time been in search of a suitable ally among the discredited and discarded officials with whom to initiate an "opposition" movement in the A. C. W. administration. The recent developments in the New York A. C. W. organization finally gave birth to a group which is compelled to rise against Hillman and is in need of some protective covering to be able to rally the workers in a sham fight against the Hillman machine.

Hillman has recently effected an economy reorganization of the New York Joint Board as a result of which a number of officials fell out of their positions. Thus the long sought for ally has been found. Between these officials and the Lovestone group known under the name of Progressive Circle, has been created a united front against the Hillman policies in the Amalgamated. A mass meeting of tailors was called to launch a rank and file movement under their leadership. The tailors responded in big numbers. The situation in the industry is deplorable. The intolerable conditions in the shops and the wide spread unemployment are driving the workers to revolt. Any group with a program for improving their conditions and determination for struggle will easily get a following among them. But that was not furnished by this combination.

The Right wing combination from the beginning secured the leadership of the movement having arranged the details of the meeting. The speakers and the resolutions, left no doubt about the character of the movement they were out to create.

The Rank and File Committee (an organization under Party control) who came to the meeting had little difficulty in exposing the character and aims of the combination, that called it. The meeting ended in a commotion without accomplishments. The Lovestone group in a statement published in the Jewish papers, *Forward* and *Day*, accuses the Rank and File Committee of breaking up the meeting.

Who Will Organize the Revolt

The truth is that the Right wing combination adjourned the meeting to suit themselves. The continuance of the meeting would mean its complete discredit and loss of its control. They did not wish to concede to the demand of the Rank and File Committee members for a committee to be elected from the floor because such a committee would displace them from control. Neither were they willing to discuss anything. Their resolution was to be adopted and their leadership recognized. So the "opposition" movement in the A. C. W. has burst like a bubble. It is to be expected that the organizers of it will now adopt

OPEN FORUM

Lecture by
ARNE SWABROCK
"LESSONS OF THE
DRESSMAKERS STRIKE"
at the
Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue
Friday, March 11, 1932
at 8 P. M.
QUESTIONS and DISCUSSION
ADMISSION: 25 Cents
Unemployed Workers Admitted Free
Sponsors: New York Branch Communist League of America (Opposition)

slogan and implies a simultaneous fight for certain definite conditions. We do not propose unity merely in its abstract sense but for the attainment of specific working class objectives.

Despite the present situation of the sweatshop still obtaining in the garment industry future growth of the I. L. G. W. is not precluded. But with that also growth of the problems of this union for satisfaction of the demands of the workers. Certainly this implies possibilities of formation and growth of a Left wing within the union. With equally as much certainty we can also point to the prospects which are available for growth of the industrial union provided it proceeds correctly. To that can be added the general prospects of a developing workers' resistance to the enemy onslaughts which is destined to assume real proportions for the future. From this must be concluded that on a whole the need and the possibilities for trade union unity of these organizations who are rivals today will increase. This contains a warning which must be heeded.

—A. S.

a course that is more in accord with their traditions and aims, that is, to negotiate for positions and powers behind closed doors.

It is characteristic for the Right wing group to find an excuse for their bureaucratic control in the intentions of the Rank and File Committee members to capture the movement. The Rank and File Committee, in spite of its erroneous policies, has the reputation of an honest and sincere group of workers, while the despised Right wing officials have on their record a whole series of crimes which it has committed against the tailors at Hillman's behest, which even the Lovestone cover would not hide. The tailors will not readily follow them, even though they remain inattentive to the Rank and File Committee.

Who will organize the revolt of the tailors in the A. C. W.? This question is constantly heard from the lips of Left wingers. What can be the answer to it? What does the party do to meet the need of organization of a Left wing in the A. C. W.? What is the reason for the failure of the Rank and File Committee in developing a Left wing movement in the A. C. W. in spite of the favorable situation? There seems to be only one explanation. The numerous blunders of the Left wing in the past and the wrong policies pursued by the Needle Trades Industrial Union in the other needle trade branches have had their repercussions in the men's clothing situation. A year or two ago the Lovestonites could not succeed in gathering a handful of workers at their meetings. Their own following in the Amalgamated consists of less than a half a dozen people. Today they are more successful in getting a response among the workers in spite of their association with the discredited elements. The Lovestonites are exploiting to their benefit the false policies of the Party leadership in the trade union movement. It is significant that in their resolutions presented at the meeting emphasis is laid on the necessity of "categorically rejecting all proposals for a split in the Amalgamated". The resolution also urges the "rejection from the ranks of the movements of all persons who are committed to a policy of splitting the Amalgamated or have loyal duties to a dual organization."

The Rank and File Committee, however, has never made clear its policies or adopted a clear cut program for the men's clothing Left wing. Confusion prevails in their own ranks. A great number of them still cherish the idea of splitting the A. C. W. Many among them consider themselves a part of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union. The Rank and File Committee in general is marking time, lacking confidence in its own forces in spite of the increasing favorable opportunities for a Left wing movement.

(Continued on page 4)

Fake Peace Gestures in Far East Imperialists Jockeying for Position in Coming World Clashes

The day's news hails the acceptance by Japanese imperialism of the armistice proposals made by the League of Nations. That this "peaceful" gesture is merely a continuation of the aggressive policy of the Tokio statesmen along new lines, cannot be mistaken. And it is especially the Wall Street spokesmen at Washington who know this fact and bring their actions in accord with it. A Japanese acceptance of the truce can only take place under conditions favorable to the invaders. Tokio does not conceal these intentions. It is simply putting into play a diplomatic maneuver which it is confident the French reactionaries and a "strong pro-Japanese Tory group in the British cabinet"—actually the backbone of the present conservative government—will support.

It is only natural that the Hoover regime is disgruntled with this state of affairs. One thing is certain: the conclusion of the truce, if it should get as far as that, will hardly mean the end of the Far Eastern episode, but will much rather bring it more closely within the framework of a broad struggle among the world imperialists themselves. The United States, through the mouth of Stimson, in his letter to Senator Borah, has already expressed its determination not to recognize any new transactions, involving China, that will break the boundaries set by previous treaties (The Nine Power Treaty, etc.). The Japanese militarists will not pay any attention to them.

They have already too much at stake. They started out on their Manchurian adventure because they saw an opportunity in the present unstable economic positions of the other powers, to get some badly needed markets for their own hard-pressed industries. In view of the belated arrival on the scene of Japanese capitalism, that was only to be expected. In the meantime, the boycott of its goods in China and the rapidly growing war expenses are further devouring the resources of Nippon's industries. Already the various organs of the Tokio government—the Privy Council, the cabinet—are very wary to make further levies on the population for the conduct of military operations, especially since the latter have hardly met with the desired success. But it is impossible to conceive of anything like a "peaceful" retreat on their part.

The American gentlemen-brigands, whose aim it has been, ever since the inception of the present crisis, to find a solution for it by a vast extension of its foreign market, specifically in a centralized bourgeois China, look with great concern upon Japanese machinations. More immediately, American industry has already sustained losses in its recent increased exports to China (brought about by the creation of a demand for American products, subsequent to the devastations of last year's flood) through the siege at Shanghai, which hardly improves the attitude of Washington. The concentration of the United States fleet in the Pacific, and the maneuvers attending it, are especially significant when viewed from this angle, although not in a direct sense.

In China itself, the valiant fight put up by the Nineteenth Route Army in its defense of Chapel has not brought forth the nation-wide response that many ex-

pected. In the absence of a resolute and conscious class to lead it, the Kuo Min Tang bourgeoisie has for the moment succeeded only in making a football for the imperialists, of the Chinese nation. The most progressive class in the Chinese masses, the proletariat, suffered a frightful defeat at the hands of its own bourgeoisie during the Chiang Kai-Shek-Borodin-Stalin alliance in 1925-1927. The slaughter of the flower of the Chinese working class by Chiang Kai-Shek and the frightful depression following it could only be counter-acted by a slow and patient regathering of its scattered forces, by a wide-spread struggle for the most elementary rights, as was proposed by comrade Trotsky and the Left Opposition at the time. The failure of the Stalinists in control to realize this Marxian tactic and their persistence in sowing illusions about the Red peasant movement in the rural districts, which was only a faint and belated echo of the immense revolutionary upsurge of the earlier years, is again largely responsible for the impotence of the Chinese working masses in the present situation. Its revolutionary rebirth will most probably come with a new wave of proletarian struggle in the other countries, and not in the last place, within the Japanese empire itself. At present, it is first beginning to recover from its tragic defeat, under very difficult conditions.

The events in the Far East and the sharpening conflicts among the capitalist nations cannot be considered in themselves. They are part and parcel of the entire economic and social development of the epoch we live in. The world crisis has brought the course of this development into bold relief. The anarchy of capitalist production, based on the profit system alone, can only be maintained by a widening of the market for each capitalist nation. But a widening of the market, in so far as the capitalists are concerned, can only mean the acquisition, in an economic sense at least, of foreign territories. The fact that all territories outside of the capitalist world have already been distributed now, such new "acquisitions" can only be achieved by sharp struggles among the such new "acquisitions" can only be achieved by sharp struggles among the various imperialists. The conflict between Japan and the United States at the present moment is the most recent illustration of this development. War under our present system can only benefit the imperialists. The workers have no interest in it. While American imperialism is waging a struggle for markets on the one hand, it is making an assault upon the standards of living of its own working class on the other. These two methods represent the two levers of the capitalist solution of the economic crisis. The solution of the working class can only be that of persistent and intransigent struggle against its own bourgeoisie, against its war aims and against its wage-cutting drive.

The capitalist antagonisms, between Japan and the United States, between the United States, France and England, cannot help but lead in their further course, to social convulsions, to revolutionary situations. In the meantime, it is the task of the class conscious workers to prepare themselves, to understand what is going on about them, and to act accordingly.

Alongside with the danger of a war among the imperialists, and not at all in contradiction with it, is the danger of a war against the Soviet Union, against the workers' fatherland. For, aside from being the outpost of the world revolution, which is most odious to the entire capitalist world, the Soviet Union also represents a potential market for capitalist exploitation, while the first danger is most prominent in the Far East, the second centers around Germany. The prerequisite for a capitalist attack on Workers' Russia is the crushing of its most reliable ally, the German working class. And that is why the class conscious worker must pay particular attention to the Fascist menace in that country, the success of which can only mean the destruction of the German proletariat and an immediate attack upon the U. S. S. R.

Sharp solutions of the crisis in the Far East and of the class struggle in Germany are inevitable and close. The first task of the Communists in preparing for the revolutionary situation that will result is to entrench themselves and the influence of Communism among the broad masses of the workers. This can only be done by means of a Leninist united front policy. By patiently explaining to the workers, by sincerely striving for unity in action on the issues of the day, by forcing their reformist leaders into the struggle so that their true and treacherous character will become apparent to the workers—this is the way to prepare the ground for effective action in the revolutionary situation to come, this is the Communist road to the masses.

Secondly, it is necessary to educate the American workers to class consciousness by the concrete example of socialist construction in the Soviet Union. This can best be done by linking up the magnificent successes of socialist planning in the U. S. S. R. With the struggle against the misery brought about by capitalist anarchy, by linking up the absolute need for international solidarity in the work going on in the Soviet Union with the fight against unemployment in this country. The Left Opposition for this purpose long ago proposed the slogan of long term credits to Soviet Russia, with which to buy machinery needed for the fulfillment of the five year plan, and which in turn means Soviet contracts for American factories and a considerable measure of relief to thousands of American unemployed workers.

Thirdly, it is necessary to exert all forces to imbue the working class with militant internationalism. To constantly stress that only the international fighting solidarity of the proletariat can once and for all free it from the yoke of capitalism. Concretely, to explain to them every day what it is that binds their interests up with those of the Soviet Union, of the oppressed peoples of the Far East, with the success or failure of revolution in Germany.

The differences that exist on these questions between the Left Opposition and the Stalinists are differences of historic importance, questions of life and death for the revolutionary movement. To fight against the reactionary theory of socialism in one country which cripples that international solidarity without which the workers in America as well as those in Russia are doomed to defeat; to fight against the Centrist policies and tactics of Stalinist Centrism ("united front from below", "social Fascism", etc.) which abandon the working masses to the reformist fakery; to unfurl the banner of Marxism-Leninism as the guiding light of the revolutionary vanguard, today; when it is being dragged in the mud—the Left Opposition is ready to undergo all the hardships in the world. The persecutions and slanders of the party bureaucracy cannot for a moment hinder us in our historic struggle, in the struggle for a Leninist party, without which there can be no proletarian victory. Confident of the future, the Left Opposition will patiently continue its course, which is the course of regenerating the Communist movement. It is the hardest and most important task of the moment.

—S. G.

Glotzer Tour Meets Success

The best meeting yet held for the Left Opposition in Chicago is the report of comrade Glotzer's lecture, Sunday Feb. 28, on the prospects of the revolutionary movement in Europe. About 150 workers attended the meeting participating in an excellent discussion after the lecture. This attendance really defied all the efforts of the local party leaders to prevent its success.

Instructions had previously been issued to all party units that no member was to attend Glotzer's meeting on pain of disciplinary action for any violation of this rule. A special party observer was selected to attend, and to attend alone in order to check up on possible recalcitrants. However, the observer failed to put in an appearance while the workers showed up in good numbers eager to head what the Left Opposition representative had to say.

From Boston the tour went to Montreal, Canada. In that city we have no regular organization. Nevertheless it became possible to gather a small meeting of about 30 Communists which resulted in more convinced supporters for our platform. Toronto was the next stop. The handicap to be surmounted in that city are already known to our readers. The reactionary drive against all working class and revolutionary activities now pursued by the capitalist government is particularly aiming to suppress all semblance of freedom of speech and of assembly. Under these conditions a meeting could be arranged only under the greatest difficulties. Nevertheless there was an attendance of about 60 workers, including a good many official party members and close party sympathizers.

In Buffalo comrade Glotzer spoke under the auspices of the local branch of the Proletarian Party Opposition group. While not the most effective advertisement was made, nevertheless fifty workers attended, including some official Party members. Discussion with these P. P. Opposition group comrades have already served to clarify their understanding of our position. As a result the Buffalo branch is proposing to its national group to orientate itself in the direction of unity with the Communist League of America.

Lenin and Trotsky in 1905

On Some Stalinist Distortions of History

The Russian Revolution of October 1917 can only be written adequately when the role of Lenin and Trotsky are properly placed. Written history at the time of this event elevated the role of Lenin and Trotsky to its proper height in relation to the 1917 prelude of the world revolution. The attempts of Stalinism to revamp this part of history, and to delete Trotsky's role from the pages and replace instead—Stalin, is of no avail. The source of material within our party and throughout the world proletarian camp is so voluminous for this research that Stalin's attempt to erase Trotsky's role only complicates matters for Centrism.

But the 1905 Revolution leaves us no such source of material, as to the position of Lenin and Trotsky. Therefore, the haters of Marxism and Internationalism fall back to this period and slur the position of Trotsky. Fortunately though, we have the material and writings of Lenin and Trotsky of this period, and since the party leadership only lies about Trotsky's position it is necessary to constantly bring this material forward, so that the revisionist and Marxist can decide the facts for himself, as to the position of Lenin and Trotsky.

ON THE FEBRUARY REVOLUTION

Stalinism not only endeavors to misrepresent Trotsky's position in 1905 but also attempts to falsify the role of Lenin, for the purpose of covering up the blunders of the present epigones in the 1917 period. After Stalin "corrected" history, one of the lesser lights followed up in the *Daily Worker* with an article on "The Historical Experiences of Bolshevism and the International Proletariat". One of the many blunders of the article reads as follows: "The Lessons of the year of 1905 enabled Lenin to draw up that strategic general plan which led the proletariat to victory first in February and afterwards in October 1917." This thought conveys the idea that long before the arrival of Lenin in Russia and long before his famous April thesis, which amounts to the rearming of the party, Stalin and his like, who were in Russia, were carrying out a correct Bolshevik line. In other words, Lenin's arrival and Lenin's April thesis did not correct anything, "the proletariat" were led "to victory first in February" (?). In trying to bury Lenin's April thesis to cover their blunders the February period the Stalinists create the source of additional blunders.

In the introduction to Lenin's pamphlet of articles on the "Revolution of 1905" the epigones rehash history again. In one place this introduction says, "On the other hand, Trotsky, who had never had a definite conception of the nature of the bourgeois revolution of 1905, for this reason reached a point, in his theory of 'permanent revolution' when he denied the possibility of the revolutionary alliance between proletariat and peasantry and proclaimed a 'workers' government' to be the immediate aim of the revolutionary uprising. And to this he 'logically' attached the conception that 'without direct and governmental aid from the European proletariat the working class of Russia could not maintain itself in power' (*Our Revolution*, page 278 Russia)."

TROTSKY AND THE PEASANTRY

Can you say these "Communists" misquote Trotsky's position in 1905 because they do not know of his position? No. They quote the above from his book, *Our Revolution* and in that book is sufficient evidence for any class-conscious worker to prove the correct position of Trotsky in 1905. These epigones are quoting Trotsky as the social democrats quoted Marx and Engels.

Trotsky in 1905 said the workers of Russia needed aid from Europe, otherwise they could not maintain themselves—and according to Stalinism this was wrong in 1905. But Lenin, not in 1905 but even in 1918, said the following: "This is a lesson because the absolute truth is that without a revolution in Germany we will perish." (Vol. 15, page 132, Russian edition). And, Lenin again, "Our backwardness has thrust us forward and we will perish if we will not be able to hold out until we meet with the mighty support of the insurrectionary workers of the other countries" (Vol. 15, page 187). What Lenin laid down on this subject in 1918 was equally, if not more so, true in 1905.

Did Trotsky "deny the possibility of the 'revolutionary alliance between the proletariat and peasantry', in the 1905 period, as is claimed? Trotsky, in 1905 said, "It is self-understood that the proletariat, as in its time the bourgeoisie, fulfills its mission, supported upon the peasantry and petit-bourgeoisie. The proletariat leads the village, draws it into the movement, interests it in the success of its plans. The proletariat, however, absolutely remains the leader. This is not the dictatorship of the peasantry and proletariat, but the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the peasantry." (1905, page 281). Many more equally important passages can be quoted to prove that Trotsky's understanding of the peasant problem in 1905 was equal to any and far superior to the epigones of today who lived at that time. Many such quotations can be had in *Our Revolution*, translated by Oigin, or in Trotsky's pamphlet on the *Permanent Revolution* in which he quotes from his works of 1905.

The rank and file Communist members repeat these slanders against Trotsky because they do not know the truth and repeat what they are told. But for the

bureaucrats, it is not a matter of ignorance—it is a matter of plain lies, of revisionism; just as the social democrats skillfully quoted Marx and Engels on the state, giving the rank and file a wrong picture. Let me quote just once more from 1905, page 267-68: "Our revolution, which is a bourgeois revolution according to the immediate tasks it grew out of, knows, as a consequence of the extreme class differences of the industrial population of no bourgeois class which could place itself at the head of the popular masses by combining its social weight and political experience with revolutionary energy. The suppressed worker and peasant masses, left to their own resources, must take it upon themselves to create, in the hard school of implacable conflict and cruel defeat, the necessary political and organizational preconditions for their triumph. No other road is open to them."

Does this look as if Trotsky did not understand the relation of the proletariat and peasantry in 1905? Does this look as if Trotsky did not understand the nature of the bourgeois revolution of 1905? Let the revisionists talk. They have their day as the leaders of the second international had theirs. We, the Marxists, are sure of victory. Material facts and Marxian truths are greater than all the lies of the epigones.

LENIN ON COLONIAL REVOLUTION

In the *Daily Worker* article, quoted above, they say, "The task of organizing the united front of all the exploited and oppressed under the leadership of the proletariat was raised by Lenin to the level of the world problem of the revolutionary alliance of proletariat of the advanced countries with the enslaved peoples of the colonies and semi-colonial countries." This is a jumble and is not the position of Lenin. As Trotsky says, "Lenin thus raised the national liberation movement, the colonial insurrection and wars of the oppressed nations to the level of the bourgeois democratic revolutions, particularly in the period prior to the Russian revolution of 1905. But Lenin did not at all rank the national liberation wars above the bourgeois rev-

olution as this is now done by Bukharin who has turned an angle of 180 degree." (*Criticism of the Draft Program*). And to this day the revisionist rank this movement above the bourgeois democratic revolution.

All of this revamping of history in relation to the 1905 revolution is necessary on the revisionist part, first to smash the Marxian position of Trotsky and second, to enable them to build a case for the use of the slogan of the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, as it appears in the Sixth World Congress Program. In order to do this, they must not only throw overboard all the facts of Trotsky's position but with it the position of Lenin on this subject. This hypothetical slogan raised in 1905 was discarded events concretized the perspective through the 1917 revolution. It was discarded by Lenin, but not by the epigones although he criticized them on this very point in April 1917.

THE "DEMOCRATIC DICTATORSHIP"

The introduction to Lenin's valuable book on 1905 also says, "Because of this circumstance, the 1905 revolution may be called the dress rehearsal not only of October 1917, but of the World October." Because of the colonial conditions of China and India, etc. In other words, 1905 is the dress rehearsal for the backward countries in revolutions and 1917 is the dress rehearsal for the industrially developed countries.

In answer to this, we can show that 1917 has been the dress rehearsal not only for the revolutions of industrial Europe, but also for the Chinese revolution of 1925-27. But to this day the Stalinists and Right wingers have not recognized this historic fact. There can be no other than a dictatorship of the proletariat or a dictatorship of the capitalist in content. The form will vary but the form of the proletarian dictatorship in backward countries will not be a "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasants." On the contrary, the more backward the country, the weaker the country is economically, the more open will our dictatorship with the peasant alliance have to be in order to hold power with a minority of the proletariat and here we have the revolution in countries with the majority of the proletariat, the more proletarian democracy can we have in the early years of our role.

—HUGO OEHLER.

The R.R. Workers and the Wage Cut

A Militant Looks at Conditions in his Industry and Reviews the Past

The article printed below is a discussion article we have received from a worker long active in the Railroad industry. It raises important questions with regard to the Communist approach to the problems of the transport workers, which cannot be overlooked and which deserve the attention of all Communist trade unionists. The columns of *The Militant* remain, as always, open to all points of view among its class-conscious, working class readers, on this as well as on all matters of import to the revolutionary movement.—Ed.

The recent wage cut of the R. R. workers has once again brought the R. R. unions to the foreground of the American labor movement. The several articles in the *Militant* dealing with this event have brought out most of the basic factors of the immediate developments. However, to a certain extent they have one common fault. They are uniform in playing up the betrayal of the officials with very little criticism of the rank and file for their past activities or inactivity.

It is true enough that, in so far as the immediate aspects of the situation are concerned, the betrayal of the R. R. workers by the labor skates stands out in bold relief. It is also true that the R. R. workers (the great majority of those involved at the present time have been in the industry since the war) over the period of the past twelve years have been guilty of inactivity, self-centeredness, narrow craft psychology, passivity, white chauvinism, bourgeois prejudices, etc. While the latter facts do not excuse the labor skates for their betrayal neither does the betrayal absolve the rank and file from their sins of omission and commission.

American Stalinism constantly demonstrates to us that the only method known to the bureaucrats for winning both black and white workers for militant struggle is by a system of patronization. But the history of the American labor movement teaches that workers in such situations are prone to seize upon ex-

cuses of this kind of deserting the unions in the most critical moment, thus making the further onslaught of the capitalist class less difficult.

Every militant worker knows or should know, as was pointed out in a recent leading article on the R. R. wage cuts, in *The Militant*, that the acceptance of one wage cut does not arrest the wage-cutting drive. On the contrary it only wets the appetite of the master class. This was the lesson of the events leading up to the shopmen's strike of 1912. Preservation of the R. R. unions, as weak as they are, is of paramount importance to the R. R. workers at the present moment.

MUST ACKNOWLEDGE MISTAKES

In the struggle to develop the class consciousness of the working class it is as essential to point out to the workers their weak sides as well as their strong points and the role of the bureaucrats must not be allowed to serve as an excuse for the short comings of the rank and file. The novice fears to criticize the workers because he is afraid of offending them. He is likely to rely upon the condemnation of the officials instead. But every experienced agitator knows that the first step toward any militant action is to get the workers to see and acknowledge their own failings. This is less difficult to accomplish than it may seem, for the working class is not easily offended by sincere criticism and they instinctively know that they have been guilty of many offenses against their own best interests.

It is handling the question superficially to lay too much stress upon the lack of activity and preparation on the part of the officials when it became evident that the present wage cuts were the immediate goal of the R. R. Companies. To accept such a viewpoint is to aid the official in erecting a plausible excuse for their capitulation. The labor skates betrayal goes back much further and much deeper than that. Likewise the behavior of the rank and file. The history of the struggle in the R. R. industry over the period of the last twelve or fourteen years is full of events. If the rebel worker is to be of value to the R. R. workers in the present situation he must be able to skillfully present both sides of the picture. Those who are incapable of seeing the weakness of the working class will be sure to overlook their strong points at the critical moment.

UNITY SOLIDARITY A CRYING NEED

It was inevitable that all R. R. workers as well as the R. R. union in general would sooner or later suffer from the defeat of the shop men in 1922. The favored position granted to the Brotherhood unions during and after this strike was little short of a bribe for non-support of the shop men. The Brotherhood members are now receiving the second installment of interest on their policy. No amount of excuses can eliminate the fact that the "Hoger" sat on his back side (two hundred and fifty pounds of solid anchorage) and pulled the throttle while the shop men were putting up a heroic but losing battle. Not a few of them, monkey wrench in hand, "got out and got under": It was thus that "Casey" Jones kept his junk pile running. And the trainmen and conductors were doing their stuff in perfect union. Even the "Fire Boys" with their militant traditions and from whose ranks came the undaunted Gene Debs, shamefacedly kept the "home fires" burning brightly beneath the leaky boilers. This was not the first but second offense, for the Brotherhoods did the same thing during the "out-law" switchmen's strike at an earlier date.

Could the Brotherhood men have struck in sympathy with the shop men in spite of their officials? The shop men set the example in the victorious "out-law" strike of 1919 when they told their officials to jump in the lake. Militant support of the shop men in 1922 by the Brotherhoods, leaving the job in sympathy, would have welded the R. R. workers together permanently with an unbreakable iron band of solidarity. It would have left an undying tradition in the R. R. unions.

Do the shop men then have anything to crow about? Very little. After the "out-law" strike victory in 1919, the rank and file allowed themselves to be swayed by a sense of self-security and self-satisfaction. The plea on the part of a few militants to take the maintenance of way men into the shop federation, for the most part, fell on deaf ears. They, the "skilled shop men", disdained to be too closely associated with "common" (some of the so-called laborers had almost as much skill as the shop crafts) laborers. Several of the shop craft unions (particularly the machinists) were more afraid of being "contaminated" by the Negro workers (who wanted nothing better than a chance to fight side by side and shoulder by shoulder with their white fellow workers) than they were of the R. R. bosses.

The writer knows whereof he speaks, for the main part of his effort during this time was in the direction of bringing the maintenance of way men into the shop federation. Opposition came not only from the officials but from the rank and file as well. Even where there was sympathy for the idea there was little concrete action and much passivity. In the midst of the strike of 1922 every shop man realized the mistake. But it was then too late. Instead of admitting the mistake however, some of them took to blaming it all on the then President of the Maintenance of Way Men. Although that culprit deserved to be condemned and kicked out of the labor

movement, the principal blame belongs to the shop men themselves, for it was they who placed the weapons in this faker's hands by their past policies.

The shop men are also to be blamed for their feeble effort toward the bringing of the several other A. F. of L. Railroad unions into a closely knitted strike alliance and making the R. R. Department of the A. F. of L. something more than a soft spot for such job holding scoundrels as Bert M. Jewel.

It is just at such a time, when the workers are compelled to suffer the consequences of past indifference, that the lessons flowing from past experience must be hammered home to them. In such a time, the logic of the militant minority has tenfold force. Those who waste too much time on the scoundrelly acts of the officials are often wont to divert attention from the more permanent lessons that the working class must learn before any lasting improvement can be made in their status.

Unless the events over the entire period from the end of the war onward are understood and explained, all comment on the present situation will be well nigh useless to the Railroad worker. The whole history must be reviewed and interrupted in language understandable to the working class. Treachery of the officials either past, present or future must not be allowed to become an excuse for individual desertions from the ranks of the old unions. The weaknesses and mistakes of the rank and file must be minimized. They must be brought out in the open in order that they may be overcome and they can be overcome only by militant activity and real solidarity. There must be no deserting of the unions at the critical moment. The workers must be made to understand that the crying need is One Big Union of all the Railroad workers from the track laborer to the "Hoger" and that the way to get it is to work for it. By substituting unity for dissension, and solidarity for petty self-interest, the Railroad worker can not only regain all lost ground but can march ahead to new victories and the six hour day for the entire Railroad industry.

—J. M. AGITATOR.

- A Story of Boss Violence in the Illinois Mine Fields -

Andy is a young coal miner. He works in one of the big coal mines of southern Illinois. His job is possibly the most hazardous on the main line. Andy and I started into the labor movement at the same time. One evening an organizer of the Young Workers' League came to our mining camp. He flayed capitalism, he spoke of the struggles of youth in the working class' general fight through out the world. The orator was convincing. Our early experience had taught us that he was right. We joined the Young Workers' League and became absorbed in the fight energetically. We did the best we could, we studied and everything in line with our class duties, was fulfilled to the greatest extent.

Nine years later, we again were together at the recent Indianapolis convention of the United Mine Workers of America. We joined together in a room during the two weeks in the convention city. Every morning we journeyed together at the conclave. We listened attentively to the orators. The infamous John L. Lewis, President of the International Union, bellowed and growled away at the insurgents. As we watched the portly, pot bellied, bushy browed, "leader" of "our" union, prance around with his air of sophistication, we began to wonder among ourselves, where such a species of a coal miner had ever originated from! We saw with our own eyes and heard with our ears, this betrayer of the miners for years and his cohorts. We had not made any mistake in the nine years that we had opposed this tool of the coal operators.

During the hectic sessions of the convention we took our place in the fight against the erroneous policies of the officialdom. Andy is not an orator, his early beginnings in the pit had not permitted him to get the education one deserves. Like scores of stevedores of the class struggle, Andy's deeds are not measured by the wonderful language of a silver tongued speaker, but are transformed daily into action by his fights against the mine bosses and his service to the membership of his large local union in which he serves in the capacity of secretary. During the rank betrayals of the Lewis machine throughout the entire proceedings of the convention, Andy's teeth gritted, his mind was where the minds of the officers the union were farthest from; he thought about the miners back home, the miners in the unorganized fields, suffering, starving, dying like rats.

Upon our return home, we prepared for the regular local union meetings. Duty bound, we take the fight back to the coal miners of southern Illinois. Once more the United Mine Workers of America has met in an International Convention, and once more the Lewis machine has further hog-tied the coal miners of the continent. Andy, as a delegate from his local union reports to a well-attended meeting. He exposes the packed convention, the professional hand clappers that were brought in by the official wrecking crew. Nothing was done for the miners! To send delegates to such a convention is like sending delegates to hell, Andy tells them. The miners know it. Their freedom to fight the coal operators and their murderous

attacks against them are stifled, not by the forces without, but by the forces from within, paid by the coal miners themselves in handsome salaries.

In the local union, as in every mass section of organized labor is present a stool pigeon of the coal company. One gangster by the name of Whitlow. Formerly on the district payroll of the reactionary clique, alleged to be on the payroll of the Lewis machine at present and for a fact deputized on several occasions to break local "wild cat" strikes and to slug and kill Communists. A general rumpus takes place in the local union meeting as the stool pigeon takes offense to the remarks of the delegates. The miners boo and jeer the agent of the bosses. Andy calls his bluff and challenges him to lay aside his brass "knucks" and his gun and to come in the center of the hall like a man. The complexion of the gangster turns pale, later it becomes green as his cowardly constitution falls him in a man to man fight. The gangster, like the rest of his ilk, is exposed. He must suffer the humiliation of being exposed! He is not now in the dark corners of the street gangling militant workers, his hand is called by a young miner. The meeting is tense, every miner is determined that no other aides of the gangster will interfere. But like all other cowards, the gangster and four of his lieutenants sneak out of the hall with a mad rush. Andy follows them outside, the young militant's indignation is past control. We follow Andy. As we approach the stairway, the gangster has a dead aim on

Andy, his wolfish eyes gleam like a demon in the darkness of the night. The murderer's gun barks twice. Andy is temporarily floored, the bullet strikes Andy in the back, piercing his abdomen. The other bullet strikes another young miner in the leg. A waiting automobile rushes the bandits away whom the enraged miners, speeding to the sheriff's office. The gangster receives the protection of the County Jail, as his blood lust body trembles from fear.

Andy is rushed to the hospital along with the other victim. Doctors hurriedly speed to and fro, as the young victims goes under the knife of the surgeon. Hundreds of miners swarm the dark shadows of the trees surrounding the hospital, awaiting news, hoping against hope that their young leader will live. At home, a young wife with her infant will have to be notified . . . What a task!

While Andy fights for his life, while every tissue and corpulence exerts itself for life, as his gentle face is covered by a deathly sweat, the officers of law and order caucus with the murderer. The gangster has nothing to fear from the "law", he is encouraged to murder by the very "enforcers of justice"! "After all, shooting a Communist, especially a hunk, is no more serious than shooting a nigger, they're worse than niggers." This is the report from the County Office of the great American democracy, the land of equal opportunity, pursuit of happiness and symbol of world freedom.

—GERMINAL.

The Militant Subscription Drive

In the center of the drive to build the Opposition press stands the task of boosting the circulation of *The Militant*. This can be done in three ways. It is necessary to increase the paid subscription list. From March 1st to June 1st the subscription drive will take place. The branches of the League should take up the drive in an organized manner. The New York branch has organized two teams with a captain at the head of each. The progress of the teams will be recorded on a specially designed chart on the bulletin board. During the drive with each one year subscription of \$2.00 we will offer to the subscriber a paper bound copy of the *Permanent Revolution*; with each six months' subscription of \$1.00 the *Strategy of the World Revolution*; with a three months' subscription of \$.50 any one of our 10c pamphlets. Everywhere our comrades should canvass our sympathizers and their friends for subscriptions. The progress of the drive will be reported in *The Militant*.

The second way of boosting the circulation of the *Militant* is by going after expired subs. Our branches will be notified regularly in advance of the expirations. They are expected to canvass for renewals. Renewals will be considered on the same basis as new subscriptions and will be entered to the credit of the comrades. Where we have no branches, if our comrades will undertake this work, we will inform them regularly of further expirations.

The third method of boosting the circulation of *The Militant* is to increase the newsstand and bookstore sale. To help our comrades place *The Militant* on stands and in book stores we have printed posters with a picture of comrade Trotsky and the simple statement "Leon Trotsky writes every week for *The Militant*." These posters are attractive and should be placed on only those stands which carry or will carry *The Militant*. The publication of the first volume of the *History of the Russian Revolution* will no doubt be attended by a wave of publicity. It is our intention to ride the crest of this wave. The posters should be ordered immediately, and placed immediately. The bundle orders should also be remitted at once. Where stands carry *The Militant*, an attempt should be made to persuade them to increase their orders. The posters will be furnished gratis. But they should be distributed discriminatingly as our supply is limited.

If all our comrades pitch in this drive should make it possible to raise the circulation of *The Militant* 100%.

WANTED Literature Agents

Unemployed comrades who can devote a few hours daily can help themselves and at the same time spread the literature of the Left Opposition. Write for particulars.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
New York City

Lectures on the History of the Communist International

On Wednesday, March 9th when comrade Shachtman begins his series of eight lectures on the *History of the Communist International*, the Left Opposition, in New York, will take another step to provide workers with an education along Marxian lines which the Stalinists have distorted to fit the needs of their factional strangulation of the party. The subject was chosen with this view in mind.

The lectures will trace the rise and development of the Third International under Lenin and Trotsky; its Stalinization and degeneration subsequent to Lenin's death, and its future perspectives. The lectures will be popular and designed to raise class consciousness as well as to equip workers with accurate factual data theoretically along the lines of Marxism-Leninism.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL A Series of Eight Popular Lectures For Workers

by
Max Shachtman

- March 9th—Origins of the Third International
 - March 16th—The Founding of the New International
 - March 23rd—The Twenty-One Conditions of the International
 - March 30th—The Struggle for the Conquest of the Masses
 - April 6th—The Last Leninist Congress
 - April 13th—The First Victory of the Right-Centrist Reaction
 - April 20th—The Triumph of the Epigones
 - April 27th—The Future of the Third International—What Next
- LABOR TEMPLE—14th St., and 2nd Ave.
at 8 P. M.
QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION.
Admission 15c per lecture
\$1 for the course

«Young Spartacus» No. 4 Out

The March issue of the *Young Spartacus* is ready for sale and distribution. It contains a summarized article by comrade Trotsky on Germany and Fascism, a report by Albert Glotzer on Imperialist War and the Class Struggle, an article on the murder of Harry Simms, one of the "Logic of the Theory of National Socialism", a brief biographical sketch of Karl Marx and other interesting items.

The comrades should make efforts for effective distribution and sale of the *Young Spartacus*.

The editorial board of the *Young Spartacus* wishes to apologize for the four blank pages which accompany some of the copies of this issue. Due to a misunderstanding the "form" of the *Young Spartacus* was removed from the press before the press work had been completed, and its contents distributed. We had no alternative but to use the eight page copies (four pages printed and four blank). These copies contain the complete issue of our paper.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

German Political Scene

BERLIN, Feb. 16, 1932

The terrible effects of the crisis, increasing in its intensity, are apparent to all. At present, the articles of the American reporter, Knickerbocker, are making their way through the world press. It must be said that he does not exaggerate at all. The hordes of beggars and prostitutes are growing on the streets daily: a symptom of the constantly spreading misery. But even those who do have work, find it impossible to live a normal life on their ever more and more reduced "wages."

Under these circumstances it is rather astonishing, on first consideration, that no strikes whatsoever broke out at the time of the last wage cut, in January, despite the fact that the C. P. G. agitated for strikes with all its forces, once again sacrificed a good number of the few who still remain with it in the factories. But the cause here is the same as that for the lack of all the other activities. By its false "third period" tactics, the party has isolated itself from the masses organized in the trade unions, who form the decisive element for any sort of action. In this manner, the masses who want to fight remain without leadership, and the leadership that wants to fight—without masses. This new bankruptcy of the trade union tactics in the course of the strike attempts in January has caused the bureaucracy to carry out a certain turn in trade union policy with increased energy; that is, all forces are now being concentrated for the work in the trade unions. But unfortunately, this work is being carried on in such a spirit that great successes cannot be expected.

NAZI TERROR INCREASES

The most striking feature of the situation—and one should not be distracted from this by all the parliamentary maneuvers—is the growth of the National Socialist movement, if not in numbers, then in power, in spite of all the minor injuries inflicted on Hitler. The extra-parliamentary activity of the Nazis has once again taken a big bound. Only to mention two examples (which, by the way, have taken place right in the midst of Red Berlin): an assault by Nazis on a workers' colony in Felsenck—entirely after the Italian model—and the disruption of a protest meeting attended by several thousand Communists by a few hundred Nazis. The latter case is altogether unheard-of. It is the first time such a thing has happened. Here, as well as in the case of other murders of workers, and in the scuffles at the universities it is naturally the Communists who are arrested. The Nazis are generally set free. It is at all surprising, when Minister Groener—and that is very significant too—who still hauled Nazi officers before a court martial a year ago, today opens up the "republican" army for the Nazis? In order to round out the picture, we must also mention that the organizers of the pogrom of which we have spoken above, and in particular a certain Count Helldorf, have all been acquitted.

With regard to the presidential elections, we have reported before. It is, of course, self-evident that the Left Opposition will, as always, support the candidate of the party. The very probable renunciation of a candidacy of its own in favor of Hindenburg by the S. P. G. will naturally offer exceptionally favorable opportunities for the Communists in the election struggle. The task imposed by this, namely, to take advantage of the parliamentary gain for extra-parliamentary actions will, however, be possible only with a turn in the tactics of the C. P.

UNITED FRONT IS ONLY SOLUTION

The position of the S. P. G. in the presidential elections is naturally breaking up its "iron front," created under such hopeful circumstances, almost immediately. That was a bloc of all republican organizations for a struggle against Fascism, carrying on a theoretical campaign with many well attended meetings, which had, to be sure, very little practical value for the fight against the Fascists, but did nevertheless effect the dissatisfied S. P. G. members so strongly that the growth of the Socialist Labor Party (the split-off from the S. P. G.), for example, had come to a standstill. At the present, only a united front policy, as outlined by comrade Trotsky in his latest pamphlets, is needed to drive a deep wedge into their ranks.

To report more in detail about the S. L. P. G. very much space is required, for this prototype of a Centrist party has almost as many tendencies as members. There can be no doubt that a rapid process of differentiation is going to take place within it. On the one side, in the direction of reformism, towards which a great part of the leadership doubtlessly tends, and in the direction of Communism, to which a great part of the worker members stands very close. Not a few of them will stop at Stalinist Centristism, if it will not only turn slightly in the German question. These are aided by preparatory work on the part of those Brandlerites in the S. L. P. G. who preach against criticism in the international and the Russian questions. It is well-known that the "genuine" Brandlerites themselves are on their way back to Stalin. The creation of an equal Centrist party has

made their attempt at the establishment of one like it—superfluous. Part of them have gone over to the Centrist party, the others want to go back. What will become of this former part of the Brandlerites in the further course of the process of development inside the S. L. P. G., it is hard to say with certainty, in advance. The perspectives are not very good for them, since Walcher, Froelich, e.c., have a very great, but nevertheless very questionable tradition (1923) behind them.

It is also quite indisputable that with even the meagre activities of the German Opposition, great parts of the S. L. P. G. will, at any rate, have convinced themselves of the impossibility of their fundamental idea (or rather, fundamental

mistakes,—the creation of a new Communist party—place themselves on the positions of the Left Opposition and fight with us to reform the party. For it is hard to describe the extraordinary popularity that comrade Trotsky enjoys within the ranks of these workers who are coming from reformism to the revolution. No wonder. These workers feel no need of the theoretical marginaline of Brandler-Thalheimer or the stammering of Thaelmann; they are anxious to learn Communism at its source. This has not only instigated the Stalinists to a new campaign of slander, but even Brandler could not sleep peacefully until he too had contributed in his moribund little sheet, his compound of falsification and insults under the misleading title, "theoretical article", which was quite worthy of a Yaroslavsky. But this will not stop the onmarch of the Trotsky pamphlets, which speak out that which millions of workers feel as a necessity.

—E. BAUER.

The Spanish Communist Party in the Revolution

Points of similarity in the Russian and the Spanish revolution can be found in numerous questions. It is when a comparison is made between the state of the revolutionary party in both countries that the striking contrast is found. The Bolshevik party under Lenin and Trotsky was fully equipped for the struggle for power and drove inexorably and successfully towards that aim. In Spain, the Communist party, deprived of rudder, sails and crew by the ravaging storms of Stalinism has floundered helplessly in the trough of events and has served as one of the principal factors slackening the progress of the proletarian victory.

It does not always take a revolutionary situation to demonstrate the disastrous effects of eight years of the domination of Centristism in the Communist International. But such a situation does reveal with the clarity of a flash of lightning the wreckage in the field of ideas and organization which the Stalinist current has left in the wake of its campaign against "Trotskyism", that is, against the tested principles of Marxism. The tragedy of the Chinese revolution is to be attributed to it. The setbacks suffered by the proletarian movement in England during the big strikes six years ago, in Austria during the Vienna insurrection, in Germany for the last few years, in short, wherever the Communists have been confronted with historic tasks, may be traced directly to the poisonous doctrines distilled in the laboratories of the Stalin machine. Now the "great organizers of defeat" are diligently pursuing their appointed task in Spain. The responsibility for the situation lies directly in the hands of the central Stalinist clique, for it has ruthlessly extirpated any sign of independent thought and leadership in the national sections, substituting for them puppets in office who practise a servile obedience towards the "infallible chiefs"—a condition which has one advantage: it makes it impossible for these chiefs to unload the responsibility for defeat upon anybody else, try as they will.

MANULSKY ADMITS ERRORS

It is a truism to affirm that no small question is involved. The question of the Communist party is decisive in the Spanish revolution. Only anarchists can believe that without a proletarian vanguard organized into a political party for the purpose of leading the class to power, and capable of reaching that goal, the workers of Spain can achieve their emancipation. But in actuality, one of the main reasons for the persistent strength of the anarchists in the Spanish labor movement has been the absence of such a party. Just look at the following, great condensed record of the official party leadership, registered, moreover, in a revolutionary period when uncorrected small errors assume downright threatening proportions.

Every Communist infant now "knows" that one of the unforgivable crimes of "Trotskyism" is its penchant for "leaping over stages", for "not distinguishing" between the democratic and the socialist stages of the revolution. This stupid falsehood has been dinned into the ears of every new recruit to the movement. No doubt but that the present leaders of the Spanish party accused their own Oppositionists of the same thing. But when the monarchy was overthrown, these revolutionary savants, far from "leaping over" any stages, simply failed to see that a "new stage" had been reached. In this line of thought they were merely giving a faithful imitation of Manulsky and the other appointed leaders of the Comintern, which did not prevent one of the official scapegoat-finders from stating (correctly, but more than a year afterward) that:

"The party was taken by surprise by the fall of the monarchy; it saw in it nothing more than a change of front, without seeing the change in the class relationships, and in principle it roundly denied that the bourgeois-democratic revolution has commenced."

In other words, the Stalinists, who have introduced into Marxism the positively gifted idea of the bourgeois revolution "growing over into" the socialist revolution, made the simple mistake of not recognizing the bourgeois-democratic revolution even when it burst before them with a deafening roar. (After the fall of the monarchy, the French Communist Party plastered the walls of

Paris with posters announcing: "Nothing has changed in Spain!")

As soon as the party leaders woke up to the fact that a revolution had taken place under their very noses, they proceeded to "act with determination". While the masses of workers and peasants, and certainly the petty bourgeoisie, were still reeling deliriously under the influence of their democratic illusions, the party contended itself with flinging into a void the "radical" slogan: Down with the bourgeois republic! Partial slogans like urging the seizure of land by the peasant, were scornfully pushed aside and in their place the slogan of Soviets was issued as a slogan for immediate action, and of course, "Soviets under the leadership of the Communist party". Naturally, neither the workers nor the peasants paid the slightest attention to such fantastic absurdities. The Stalinists acted throughout like the man who has come too late for his train and then, after going home because "there is still time for the next one", misses that one too.

The interest in democratic demands aroused in the masses by the fall of the monarchy found no reflection in the activities and slogans of the official party. Neither by word or deed did it give the masses any indication that only the proletariat and its revolution could really solve the democratic tasks with which Spain is still confronted. In this manner, it lengthened the term of imprisonment to which the popular masses were condemned in the ranks of the republican and socialist demagogues who were thus enabled to pursue their hypocritical course of unfulfilled and unfulfillable promises.

In the trade union field the party piled blunder upon blunder. And here it had to deal not only with the social democracy which was already discredited among the majority of the workers (although it still remains no mean factor), but with the anarchists and syndicalists who had a revolutionary prestige among the masses which only an intelligent Marxian policy could possible shake. Instead, therefore, of sinking the roots of the party in the National Confederation of Labor (anarcho-syndicalist) and the General Union of Workers (Socialist), the party was forced by its leadership to waste invaluable time in what the official Comintern critic (Stirner) now calls "the premature creation of small and lifeless Red trade unions". Result: in the socialist trade unions, the Communist influence remains quite negligible. In the anarchist unions, with hundreds of thousands of members and the decisive influence upon the workers, the party's hold is just as inconsequential. In fact, throughout Catalonia, the industrial heart of Spain and the seat of power of the N. C. of L., the Communist party does not even exist because the vast bulk of the organized Communist workers have been

ATHENS, GREECE

On January 23, there died in the Municipal Hospital of Athens, comrade Theodore Papoucoupolos, for two years a member of the Archio-Marxist Youth. Comrade Papoucoupolos and nine other members of our organization were arrested during the illegal demonstrations on the Fourteenth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution and condemned to 42 months of imprisonment and deportation. Imprisoned in the Averoff Reformatory he was savagely maltreated by the guards because of his revolutionary attitude. All the comrades were beaten up for 10 consecutive hours on the flat of their feet. As a result of this maltreatment, our comrade Papoucoupolos suffered from a swelling and a gangrene developed. His leg was am-

putated, but the poison spread all over his organism and after 50 days of martyrdom he succumbed.

Here is a version of the incidents that took place on the day of his burial, according to the bourgeois journal "Eleftheros Anthropos" of January 24.

"The Communist Incidents of Yesterday"

"The Communist Injured at Averoff Dies"

"During the Funeral Fighting Takes Place"

"Clashes between Police and Archio-Marxists"

"Attacks Made to Snatch Away the Corpses"

"Yesterday morning the young Communist Papoucoupolos died at the Municipal Hospital, where he had been transferred from Averoff Prison, to which he was committed with other Communists for violating the Anti-Communist Law, and at which he was maltreated by a guard. At the Hospital, his foot was amputated, but it was impossible to save him. The death of the young Communist Papoucoupolos, due, according to the hospital physicians, to septic poisoning caused by the injury, provoked bloody battles between police and Communists at his funeral yesterday. The fighting was provoked in the following manner: "As soon as the death of the young worker Papoucoupolos became known, the Organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists (Archio-Marxists) circulated the leaflet printed below among the workers:

"Workers: Your comrade Papoucoupolos is dead. A victim of bourgeois savagery, this young worker has given his life to the struggle for bread and freedom of our class. The butchers have slain him in the prisons.

"Workers: Do not allow this crime to pass unpunished. Raise your voice in protest and prepare the ferment of revenge. All out to his funeral today at 8 o'clock near the Church of the First Cemetery. Follow our young comrade to his last resting place! Down with the capitalist assassins! The martyrs of our cause must not be forgotten!"

Organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists (Archio-Marxist Left Opposition)

"At 3 o'clock promptly, the Archio-Marxists began to arrive in groups and demanded that the corpse be handed over to them for the funeral. The brother of the victim and his parents appeared for the same purpose. But the police gathered in front of the Hospital, and executing the orders of the Police Department, refused to hand over the body of Papoucoupolos to the Archio-Marxists. In view of the refusal of the police to grant the demands of the Archio-Marxists and the insistence of the latter on taking possession of the body of their comrade, saying that "he belonged to them", the incidents mentioned above took place. Seeing that the assembled would not depart even if they attempted to disperse them by force, the police tried to remove the corpse through a door at the rear end of the Hospital, out of the sight of the Communists.

"After the transfer of the corpse, the Archio-Marxists were informed that the dead had been interred in the First Cemetery."

"An attack against the Police"

"Following this, the Archio-Marxists turned en masse to the First Cemetery. But a great contingent of police gathered there, with Chief of Police Nascos at their head.

"At the First Cemetery the Archio-Marxists again demanded that the corpse of Papoucoupolos be given to them, but the police refused and occupying the gates to the cemetery, prohibited them from entering. Upon this attitude on the part of the police, the Archio-Marxists began to climb the walls and in several minutes they were all inside the cemetery. Once inside, they attacked the police, entered the chapel of the cemetery and took possession of the unfortunate Papoucoupolos. Immediately, they hoisted the dead on their shoulders and started to sing revolutionary funeral songs in preparation to the interment. The police, with fresh reinforcements, commanded the Archio-Marxists to abandon the dead and to leave. They refused. A lively scuffle took place between police and Archio-Marxists. The police finally succeeded in dispersing the Archio-Marxists, chasing them with nightsticks among the graves. Later on the police buried the dead after an official ceremony.

"But the incidents of yesterday did not end at the cemetery. The dispersed Archio-Marxists reformed their ranks in front of the University to protest the unjust seizure of the dead by the police. Three speakers harangued the crowd, attacking the police, condemning its interference and characterizing it as "unheard-of cruelty". . . . Later the Archio-Marxists headed for the Court House. A committee petitioned the District Attorney, protesting against the attitude of the police and declared for the first time, relatives and friends have not been allowed to bury their dead, entrusted to policemen with nightsticks! The District Attorney declared himself incompetent to act in the matter. After the committee left the Court House, new incidents were provoked. A skirmish

took place between police and Archio-Marxists resulting in one policeman being wounded and in the arrest of seven workers."

At the time of their arrest for the demonstration of the Fourteenth Anniversary, our comrades declared before the Tribunal that they were Bolshevik-Leninists. A lawyer comrade defended them. The official organ of the party did not breathe a word of all this and classified them as members of the party. Seven days after our paper Pali Ton Taxeon brought news of the crime committed in the prison, the party paper launched an attack against the state for the maltreatment of comrade Papoucoupolos, whom it called a member of the Young Communist League affiliated to the party. The young martyr wrote a letter, published in the Pali (The letter mentioned appeared in The Militant of January 6, 1932 —Ed.)

The party organ did not breathe a word about it, but continued to exploit the fact in the branches of the I. L. D. where they refused to let our comrades take the floor. At the same time, the I. L. D. forgot the martyr and failed to send him either medications or food. The day of his death they went so far as to demand the corpse for the funeral, although the deceased was a member of our organization and despite the fact that his brother is also a sympathizer of ours. At the grave, a Stalinist outraged all those present with the shout "Down with the Archio-Fascists", but the worker-members of the party, who had joined in our united front, silenced him. The party membership considered the dead as a member of the working class. But the Stalinist bureaucrats attempted to exploit him for their own ends, not mentioning anywhere that the victim was a member of our organization.

Pali Ton Taxeon, in its editorial on January 26, drew the following conclusions:

"The death of comrade Papoucoupolos has given the members and sympathizers of the Communist party an opportunity to demonstrate their sentiments. Despite the efforts of the Stalinist bureaucracy to exploit comrade Papoucoupolos, as is its custom in other working class questions, the workers of the party understood that the victim was a victim of their class and they realized the united front with us in their chagrin at the actions of the bureaucrats as they have realized it in the course of the struggle. For them, the Archio-Marxist Papoucoupolos was a revolutionist and a member of a revolutionary Communist organization. The Stalinist bureaucracy is responsible before the workers of having attempted to transform the dead into a banner for its own exploitation against our organization. The workers have judged them and condemned them for it."

The Memorial Meeting

On the First of February, our organization organized a memorial meeting for comrade Papoucoupolos. 1500 workers participated. Bloody clashes took place in front of the cemetery where the police force attacked with stones for a whole hour until it was finally forced to shoot at the demonstrators, to disperse them. Later on, demonstrations were held in the town proper. 141 were arrested, but due to the broad participation of the working class and its militant manifestations, the arrested were set free. This has aroused the fury of the bourgeoisie and the judges responsible for the acquittals have been severely reprimanded.

The Stalinists fixed another hour for the memorial in order not to permit their sympathizers to come in contact with us. We defeated this maneuver by appearing at the hour set by them. We took the initiative in the demonstration and we transformed it into a success for our organization. The following day, the official organ of the party was forced to admit that Papoucoupolos was an Archio-Marxist.

Spanish C. P. in Revolution

(Continued on column four)

tral party organ is edited by the turncoat Pumarega, which is, perhaps, as it should be, under the Stalinist regime.

With the conditions in almost perfect harmony for the progress of the Communist party, with virtually everything in its favor, the party has nevertheless only made the slightest gains, gains which, considering the possibilities, are really closer to losses. Instead of dominating the stage of events, official Communism drags out a distracted existence somewhere in the wings. Stalinism has robbed it of its vigor, paralyzed its limbs, upset its ideological balance, divested it of its power to attract the masses. Only a stiff antidote of Marxism will enable the Communist movement to shake off this noxious disease. Communism is not dead in Spain, as its enemies hope. It has only been momentarily prostrated by Centristism, and it will revive with new strength under the influence of the Left Opposition. The Bolshevik-Leninists of that country already number a thousand strong and they bear the future in their hands.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

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

30 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

BOOK REVIEW

«The History of the Russian Revolution»

Leon Trotsky: *The History of the Russian Revolution. Volume 1: The Overthrow of Tsarism.*—Translated by Max Eastman.—Published by Simon and Schuster, Inc., New York.—\$4.00.

With the enforced leisure imposed upon him by the Stalinist faction for the past four years, the organizer of the Red Army, the comrade-in-arms of Lenin, has forged another great weapon for the international working class in its struggle for a higher form of society, for liberation from the capitalist yoke. And that is precisely what his *History of the Russian Revolution* is. A weapon, a manual of action for the proletarian revolutionists the world over.

If the Russian revolution in itself served to inspire in thousands of proletarian fighters in every country the spirit of Bolshevik internationalism, then this *History of the Russian Revolution*, by the scientific analysis of its inner processes, will teach these fighters how to put that spirit into practice.

Without for one moment leaving out of sight the broad historical outlines of the event, Trotsky displays a painstaking devotion to detail, a penetrating preoccupation with the minutest shadings of action, policy and thought such as only a craftsman is capable of. The whole gigantic scene, all of its complicated mechanism, rises before the reader with the whole lucidity of its deep internal logic. Neither the intrigues and counter-intrigues of the reactionary camarillas within the decrepit Romanov monarchy, nor the nuances of policy among the representatives of the big bourgeoisie, nor the squirming and vacillation of the petty bourgeois leaders are left out of account. Each is accorded its proper place and weight in the continuity of the narrative, each is evaluated from the point of view of the tactics of the revolutionary party.

The major place, however, is of course ceded to the chief actor in the immense drama—the masses. “The most indubitable feature of a revolution is the direct interference of the masses in historic events.” And it is the study of the revolutionary consciousness of the masses in action that makes the book doubly valuable for the Communist militant. Here, the masses are shown marching ahead with determination while their “leaders” turn and twist and attempt to avoid struggle. Here the masses are shown smashing through the hardened shell of the conservative ideology accumulated by them in the course of peaceful times by bold, revolutionary, everyday action.

The picture of the masses streaming into the streets in February to proclaim the downfall of the Romanovs, while the “democratic” Milukovs plead with the doomed dynasty for a “constitutional regime”; the picture of the masses demonstrating openly for the dismissal of Milukov in April, while Kerensky and Tseretelli and the other conciliators tremble lest the bourgeoisie leave all the power to them; and once again the picture of the masses rallying to the Bolshevik banner against the “offensive” in June, while Kerensky and Tseretelli prepare to outlaw the Bolsheviks as German spies, are only a few of the impressions that will help bring home the lesson of the tremendous historical importance of the masses to those who are dedicated to lead them in the struggles to come.

The masses are not to be trifled with. In the last analysis, it is they who decide, who and what shall prevail. And it is this fact that the Communists, who are needed by the masses just as much as they need them, must understand. “For better or worse, the revolutionary party bases its tactics upon a calculation of the changes of mass consciousness.” Just to talk about the masses and their role, is not enough. It is necessary to understand what is going on in their minds. “However, the processes taking place in the consciousness of the masses are not unrelated and independent... consciousness is determined by conditions.” To understand these conditions and their reflections in the mind of the people, a revolutionary, Marxist party is needed for “the active orientation of the masses by a method of successive approximations”. Without a Marxist understanding of the character of the Russian revolution, of the relationship of class forces within it, and of the specific period of time in which it broke out, a successful conclusion was unthinkable. And it was just this understanding that Lenin brought to the Bolshevik party in April 1917, when the Bolshevik leaders, along with the other political chiefs, lagged behind the consciousness of the masses.

Lenin's rearming of the party is regarded by Trotsky as the most important factor in shaping the course of the revolution. Just as the “interference of the masses” formed the unmistakable general feature of the revolution, the

rearming of the revolutionary party, and the orientation of the masses subsequent to that, lent it its specific, ultimate character. In the chapter, “Rearming the Party”, the role of the proletarian vanguard and that of the revolutionary leadership as a whole, is expounded with convincing precision. The personality of Lenin, his indispensable value for the progress of the masses to power, is cast in its true light. His great historical significance is enhanced by an objective, Marxist evaluation. Lenin's was the power of determining the conditions of the consciousness of the masses and of “actively orientating the masses by a method of successive approximations”. And it was this power of Lenin's, combined with the “interference of the masses” of the party itself in the rearming of the party (up to then disoriented by Kamenev, Molotov and Stalin) that brought the Bolsheviks to the fore as the veritable leaders of the revolution.

Of especial value to the theoretical considerations involved in the estimate of the February revolution, is the appendix to the chapter “Peculiarities of Russia's Development”. The dangerous practical implications of a schematic conception of the dialectics of economic development are pointed out in all their sharpness. Without a realistic, Marxist view of the specific character of Russia, without applying the Marxist theory of the permanent revolution to it, it is impossible to grasp the logic of the events of 1917. How can the impotence and the amazingly rapid elimination from power of the Russian bourgeoisie be understood without it? How can the dominating role of the young and numerically weak Russian proletariat be conceived of, from a different point of view? Those who are inclined to consider his characterizations of Kerensky, Milukov and the other protagonists of the big and the petty bourgeoisie as caused by personal malice only fail to give the slightest attention to Trotsky's scientifically grounded analysis of the social basis that produced them. Trotsky cannot be held responsible for the ridiculous spectacle of the Kerenskys and Milukovs any more than he can be held responsible for the precarious position of the Russian bourgeoisie in 1917. That was merely due to the peculiarities of historical development. And the same holds true for the portraits of Stalin, Tseretelli, Kamenev and the others, as well.

The chapter of “The Peasantry” is particularly significant in so far as it explodes the myth of the Stalinist epigones of an eternal alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry—as though it were created in heaven. It was certainly not Lenin who developed this disastrous theory which has since his death produced such frightful results in China and elsewhere. Lenin's conception of the alliance with peasantry like Trotsky's, was based on the temporary relationships of forces within the country. It was precisely the weakness of the bourgeoisie and the immature development of capitalism in Russia, Trotsky points out, that made the peasantry—always incapable of independent action—more amenable to an alliance with the proletariat. The agrarian problem of the Russia of 1917 and the actual attitude of Lenin towards it, are presented with telling proof.

The History of the Russian Revolution is a challenge to the bourgeois historians, it is a challenge to the social democrats and the Stalinists as well. Retracing the events step by step, illuminating each step with irrefutable facts and documents, Trotsky builds up the Bolshevik resume of the February revolution, and flings historic truth in the face of all the slanders and distortions to which this great event has been subjected in the past. It once more proves that only the Marxists can afford today to say what is, to speak out the truth. Without feigning historical impartiality, beneath the cloak of which reaction so desperately attempts to spread its deadly poison, Trotsky gives a fearless and objective account of events as they took place. The right to draw his own conclusions from the facts no one can deny him. That is his revolutionary duty. But, in order that his conclusions may be most effective for the progress of the revolution, the Marxist knows that he must base them upon reality.

The great work of comrade Trotsky is so packed with action, so closely cemented with documents, so impregnated with powerful revolutionary lessons, that a brief review like the present cannot, by far, even attempt to do it justice. *The History of the Russian Revolution* is not merely a new publication, it is a creation that will become part of the life of future revolutionary generations. We shall come back to it again from time to time.

ATTENTION. BOSTON!

“What Is Europe Heading For?”

Lecture by

Albert Glotzer

Who has just returned from Europe, after a visit to **TROTSKY**. He will give us **TROTSKY'S** views on the European situation.

on
Sunday, March 20th, 1932, 8 P. M.
at the
ELM HILL BLDG.
532 Warren Street
Silver Collection at the Door
Audience: Communist League of America (Opposition), Boston Branch.

Rakovsky on the Five Year Plan

We are bringing below a chapter from a larger work by comrade Rakovsky. Although the figures cited have, in part, grown antiquated and, in part, been surpassed, this work is nevertheless of exceptional significance. For the first time problems which facilitate a Marxist examination of the results of the five year plan and of the process of development in the Soviet Union are raised and subjected to a thorough analysis.

Christian Georgevitch Rakovsky is one of the most prominent personalities in the international revolutionary movement, with a record of versatile activities and of participation in the revolutionary movements of several countries behind him. He is now 59 years old, 42 years of his life—ever since 1889—he has spent in the revolutionary working class movement. Hailing from Dobruja (formerly Bulgaria, later Rumania), he still enjoys the greatest degree of confidence on the part of the Balkan proletariat. In the years 1905-1907 he founded the Rumanian socialist party and trade unions. During the war he participated in the Zimmerwald conference. The Russian revolution liberated him from imprisonment in Rumania. Since then, he occupied some of the most important positions in the civil war. Elected president of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, he remains at this post for four years, when he is sent to hostile England as the Soviet Ambassador to that country. From this post he is transferred to that of Ambassador to France. Wherever he goes, he remains faithful to his revolutionary internationalism. He showed himself prepared to exchange his position as Ambassador for the life of an exile when he saw the leadership of the C. P. of the Soviet Union deviating from the Marxist line. Ever since 1928, he has been living in exile, at first in Astrakhan. Physicians pointed out that Rakovsky would not, at his age, be able to bear the life of an exile, that he was doomed to physical destruction there. After this, Stalin deported him to Barnoul in Siberia! Stalin knows that the frightful cold and the general climate of that place will destroy this fighter physically. Every sincere worker must raise his voice against these shameful deeds. Rakovsky must become the model of the revolutionary youth that flocks to proletarian internationalism. The campaign of physical destruction conducted by Stalin against the Bolshevik-Leninists cannot destroy the ideas of the Left Opposition. In spite of everything, they are forging ahead and penetrating the masses of Communist workers.—Ed.

The extraordinarily strong quantitative increase in production over that of last year is absolutely indisputable. The gross value of heavy industry for three quarters of this year (1930) amounted to 11,705 million Rubles (prices remain equal) as against 91,374 million Rubles for the past year. This is an increase of 27.4 per cent. Although this increase is 3.7 per cent lower than that prescribed by the plan, it is nevertheless to be considered as exceptionally high. This would be sufficient ground for optimism, were we to stop with the mere mention of the fact, without going into an analysis of the accompanying circumstances and phenomena which are bound up with this rise in the quantitative co-

Lovestonites in A. C. W.

(Continued from page 1)

The Necessity of A Correct Policy

With a correct policy it is possible to reach the masses of clothing workers at this time and get them behind a serious movement against the betrayals of the Hillman officialdom. Hillman's grip on the organization has been greatly shattered and his prestige irreparably damaged. His betrayal of the tailors in the strike of last July and the recent wage cut imposed on the hitherto privileged cutters have created the conditions for a unified struggle. The cutters who paid the price for Hillman's fake struggle against racketeering are now realizing their common interests with the tailors. Hillman's policy of serving the bosses at the expense of the masses of clothing workers is forcing him to wipe out all vestiges of union conditions and reduce all branches to the lowest level of working standards. The bosses have succeeded in not only breaking the condition of the workers but also in weakening the Hillman administration. The time is not far when they will be ready to discard even the services of the Hillman bureaucracy as these services are approaching the point of exhaustion. When Hillman becomes useless to them, the fight against the A. C. W. will be the next stage in the history of the industry.

The Left wing must be prepared for great struggles. The Rank and File Committee has a great task to perform. The Lovestone Right wing combination holds no gains for the clothing workers, but it can, however, temporarily succeed in misleading the workers and cause more betrayals. The Rank and File Committee must stave off their demagogic advances. This cannot be accomplished by merely disrupting their meetings, even though they may not deserve any other treatment. There should be a consistent ideological preparation of Left wing forces and the adoption of a correct and clear policy. A thorough analysis of the past error and a correct approach to the present situation will clear the way for a much needed Left wing movement in the A. C. W.

—ALBERT ORLAND.

efficients. I have already pointed out that a growth in the quantity figures themselves does not represent an adequate criterion for the evaluation of the actual growth of the productive forces, nor even for determining the existence of any such growth in general. A genuine yardstick for the increase of the forces of production, and consequently, a guarantee for further raising the quantity figures, can be given by the following three factors: (1) the basis upon which these quantity figures have been achieved; (2) the relationship between the quantity and the quality coefficients; (3) the measure of accumulation and extension of industrial capital.

Two main types of increases in the quantity figures are possible: (1) an increase on the basis of the extension of investment capital, which is generally connected with a rise in the productivity of labor (in the Marxist sense of the word: i. e., an increase in the product of labor, figured per person, on the basis of the transition of industry to a higher level); (2) an increase on the basis of the old figure for investment capital (and consequently on the old technical basis) at the cost of its more intensive exploitation. In the latter case, a rise in the quantity figures is generally bound up with an increase in the intensity of labor and with a relatively big growth of the labor forces. In practice, both these methods of increasing the quantity figures generally go hand in hand, and the task before us consists of determining the share of each. An exact calculation of this is hardly possible (in any case it is impossible on the basis of the material I have at hand) so that it becomes necessary to employ a series of indirect indices which, in my opinion, suffice to give a general conception of the state of affairs. It is indisputable that in the course of the last year a certain extension of industrial investment capital has taken place regardless of the non-fulfillment of the plan in the main fields of production and regardless of the insufficient amortization. It is indisputable that this is also the case in the course of the present year, so that an increase of quantity has, to a certain extent, taken place also on the basis. But when we approach this question from the other end we are easily convinced that in reality, the rise in quantity has taken place on the basis of the methods of the second order. We have, above all, an enormous increase in the burden borne by the old investment capital through the introduction of the uninterrupted working week and the increase in work shifts. . . .

According to the control figures, the increase in the labor product per worker should have “supported itself only in a very slight measure on a rise in the intensity of labor”. In practice this has worked out differently. Already in the first half year the number of workers increased 14.3 per cent in comparison with the same period of the past year. The increase in the number of workers surpassed the assumptions of the plan more than fourfold. In so far as the increase in the labor product per worker is concerned, that amounted in the first half year to about 18-19 per cent instead of the 25.3 per cent prescribed by the plan. If we could determine with precision to what extent this increase in the product of labor took place at the cost of improvement in the technical basis and to what extent at the cost of a rise in the intensity of labor, that would, of course, throw even more light on the subject. But at present we can only give an approximate calculation on the basis of the figures cited above. The introduction of the five-day week, in connection with uninterrupted work in the factory, signifies in itself an increase in the working time of the factory equipment amounting to 1-6 or 16.6 per cent. If within these three quarters of the year about 50 per cent of the workers, that is, about 1-2 of the industry, went over to the five day week, then this increased exploitation of investment capital alone must have brought with it an increase in production of about 8-9 per cent. The increase in work shifts must have brought an increase of 1-2 per cent. The increase in the number of workers tended in the same direction; since it took place in a considerable measure at the cost of an increase in unskilled workers, that meant an opportunity for the skilled workers to better exploit the equipment. Finally, when we take into consideration the fact that the transition to uninterrupted work in the factories meant the automatic abolition of a

CHICAGO ATTENTION

There will be a
Special Meeting
on
Wednesday, March 9th, 1932, 8 P. M.
Speaker: AL GLOTZER
Subject: American Policies in the Far East

Open Forum at 1435 N. Western Ave.

CHICAGO OPEN FORUM

Sunday, MARCH 13, at 8 P. M.

“LESSONS OF THE PARIS COMMUNE”

Lecture by

CHARLES CURTIS

at

1435 N. Western Avenue

MINNEAPOLIS

WORKERS OPEN FORUM

Sunday, MARCH 13, at 8 P. M.

“THE PARIS COMMUNE”

Lecture by

CARL COWLE

at

1530 E. Franklin Street

Admission Free Everyone Welcome

series of idle periods for equipment of a purely technical character, then it is probably not far from the truth to assume that 15 per cent of the increase in production is to be attributed to the introduction of the five-day week, the increase in the work shifts and the growth in the number of workers; in other words, to the rise in the intensity of the exploitation of the equipment.*

The remaining 12 percent are to be attributed to the increase in the productivity of labor, to the increase in the intensity of labor and to the extension of investment capital. As we shall see further on, the lion's share must be attributed to the increase in the intensity of labor, which diminishes the specific weight of the influence of the two other factors with regard to the quantitative growth proportionally. I repeat that this calculation (I had to leave a whole series of details out of consideration) is only approximate but it is sufficiently exact to permit at least one conclusion with regard to the growth in quantity; the growth in quantity was produced, in a decisive measure, not at the cost of an increase in investment capital and not at the cost of an improvement of the technical basis, but at the cost of a more intensive exploitation of the investment capital that was at hand, with the increase in the number of workers on the one hand and the rise in the intensity of labor on the other. But such a method of increasing the quantity bears within its bosom the precondition for a breakdown, not to mention the fact that it in no way guarantees a further quantitative rise in industry. This method of increasing quantity very rapidly clashes with its

* Data regarding several isolated undertakings and branches show that these figures are actually even considerably higher.

Uphold Our Revolutionary Classics!

When young comrades, who are too much impressed with their own importance, express it in supercilious scorn for the revolutionary classics, it is time to issue a serious warning. There is only one short step from such an attitude into either the camp of the useless petty bourgeois intelligentsia or else into the foul pollution of the most abominable revisionism. This latter is precisely what happened to one of our young comrades in an article entitled “Honor Bolshevik Leaders” and appearing over his signature in *Young Spartacus* No. 2. He stepped with both feet into that foul pollution.

It is said in that article: “Rosa, in her inaugural address, again investigated the new problems brought forth by the conditions of the war and post-war period. She re-examined the teachings of Marx and Engels on the questions of armed insurrection, guerrilla warfare, force and violence and concluded that history had once again placed on the agenda the tactic advocated by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto in 1847-8, but later proclaimed by Engels as outlived. (Emphasis ours—A. S.)”

In criticizing Rosa Luxemburg Lenin once quoted two simple lines from a Russian proverb: “It sometimes happens to eagles that they descend lower than chickens, but chickens never succeed in mounting as high as eagles”, and he added, “she was and remains an eagle”. In its reversed form this would apply to our young comrade. The outrageous statement emphasized above looks too much like the attempt of a chicken to mount even higher than the eagle.

In ascribing these views to Engels our young comrade cites in parenthesis, evidently as his proof, the introduction to “The Class Struggles in France” by Marx. Perhaps he was unaware of the fact that long ago evidence has been unearthed of how this introduction, when appearing in print by the Berlin *Workers*, was miserably garbed by the German social democrats of the revisionist school, notably by Bernstein. The extent of this garbling became clear when Ryazanov discovered the original Engels manuscript, of which he has since produced photostats, showing the important deletions which had been made. Some of the results of his findings Ryazanov published in “Unter dem Banner des Marxismus” (Vol. 1 No. 1, German edition). In English these findings were reproduced by Trachtenberg in the “Workers Monthly” for November 1925.

What Engels himself thought of the printing of the introduction and of the garbled version becomes quite clear in his letters to Kautsky (then still fighting revisionism). First in his letter of March 25, 1895, he says: “My text has suffered some because of the scruples of our Berlin friends, due to timidity over the anti-socialist laws which, under the circumstances, I had to consider.”

Again in his letter to Kautsky dated April 1, 1895, Engels said: “To my astonishment I saw today printed in the *Vorwarts*, without previous knowledge, an extract from my introduction so dressed up that I appear as a peaceful worshiper of legality quondam (in spite of all). The more pleased I am that now the whole appears in the “*Neue Zeit*”, so that this shameful impression is obliterated. I shall tell Liebknecht very definitely what I think of this, and also those, whoever they may be, that gave him the opportunity to distort my meaning.”

Engels spoke in a similar vein, of the “mean joke” played on him, in his letter to Paul Lafargue, dated April 5, 1895.

own natural boundaries. Neither the intensive exploitation of the machine nor the intensification of labor can be increased endlessly. This sort of method has another meaning entirely—and that too, from an economic point of view—when it is applied only for a short period of time and when, parallel with its application, the possibility is given to create within just as short a period of time, the material basis: a new investment capital*. But this same fact, that such a method must be seized upon and that it is elevated into a system, is precisely the proof for the fact that we are far behind with the creation of the material basis. The measure of depression in the working class with whose aid Centrism hopes to make up for lost time, further proves how great this backwardness is. The essence of the present situation consists precisely in this fact, that it has indisputably become evident that this backwardness cannot be liquidated within a short time merely with the aid of the internal resources of the country. Before I go over to a consideration of this question I still want to deal with three factors which prove from different angles and in different ways that with regard to the increase in quantity we have arrived very closely to the boundary, beyond which a further growth on the given basis is impossible.

The first and most important of these factors is the quality of production. It suffices to pick up anyone of our papers to become convinced that in this regard the situation is catastrophic. Neither agitation nor administrative measures, nor measures of a juridical character have been able to put a halt to the process of the deterioration of the quality. The facts are sufficiently well known so that I will only confine myself to a few of the most obvious examples.

(To Be Continued).

—CHRISTIAN RAKOVSKY.

* Such a method can be dictated for example by a condition of war when the questions of reproduction generally recede to the background.

It is perfectly true that Engels, in this introduction, draws a sharp distinction between the conditions of 1848 and those of 1895. This is as it should be. And it is particularly in this respect that the deleted parts assume their enormous significance. We shall quote only one.

In drawing the sharp distinctions of difference in the two periods Engels says: “Does this mean that the street battles will play no part in the future? Not at all. It simply means that conditions have become far more unfavorable for the civilian fighters since 1848, and far more favorable for the military forces. Street battles in the future may be successful only if this unfavorable situation can be neutralized by other factors. Such fights will therefore be far less usual in the earlier stages of a great revolution, than in its further course, and will have to be fought with greater resources of strength. Such battles will rather resort—as in the great French revolution, and as on September 4th and October 31st, 1870, in Paris—to open attack than to the defensive tactics of the barricades.”

Is there in this powerful testimony any evidence of Engels having proclaimed the tactics of the Communist manifesto as outlived? None whatever. On the contrary, the letters quoted contain the wrath of the revolutionary teacher against the monstrous falsifiers.

Such accusations made against Engels become a blot upon the Communist movement which we must eradicate. With our modest means we must hold aloft the banner of Marxism and particularly so in the Left Opposition. We can well afford to be humble students endeavoring to learn from our great teachers. We must guard against this supercilious, know-it-all attitude which steps with both feet into the foul pollution of social reformism. Comrades guilty of such an attitude must be called to order sharply.

—ARNE SWABECK.

N.Y. Paris Commune Affair

The Paris Commune Celebration to be held by the New York Branch on Saturday evening, March 19th at the Irving Plaza, 15th Street and Irving Place will be a joint mass meeting and entertainment. Comrade Swabek, National Secretary of the Communist League of America (Opposition) will speak on the Significance of the Paris Commune.

There will be a chorus of forty Hungarian comrades, a group of dances by members and sympathizers of the New York branch, as well as other forms of entertainment.

There will be refreshments on hand.

A LECTURE OF INTEREST TO JEWISH WORKERS

The first lecture of the Left Opposition in the Jewish language in New York will be given by comrade M. Lewitt, Sunday, March 6th at 3 o'clock in the Stuyvesant Casino, 2nd Ave., at 9th St. His subject will be: **What Does Left Opposition Stand For—Its Program and Aims.** Following the lecture there will be questions and discussions. The price of admission is only 10c. Unemployed workers will be admitted free. This lecture will be held under the auspices of the **Unser Kampf Arbeiter Club**, an organization of Jewish workers sympathetic to the Left 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 Swabek

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.

SATURDAY, MARCH 5, 1932

Vol. 5, No. 10 (Whole No. 108)
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.
Bundle rates, 8 cents per copy.