

WORKERS  
OF THE  
WORLD.  
UNITE

# THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1923 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.  
VOLUME V, No. 20 [WHOLE NO. 116] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1932 PRICE 5 CENTS

## Comrades, Readers, Friends!

An emergency exists. The life of the weekly MILITANT is at stake. Unless we raise our \$1,000 press fund we shall be forced to retrench.

It is not our habit to exaggerate. When we say that the life of the weekly MILITANT is at stake we mean exactly that. For a long time we have been struggling against a deepening financial crisis of our own. It has developed to the point where we are forced to say categorically—the life of the weekly MILITANT is at stake.

To every comrade, every reader and sympathizer falls the duty of coming to the aid of our press. Comrades active in the press drive should double and triple their efforts. Those not in it should immediately put to himself the question—what can I do to help the Opposition press?

The first form this response should take and, at the moment, the most important, is—a donation. Upon reading this appeal every comrade should send us as much as he can spare. No amount is too large, no amount is too small. And every bit helps.

Upon our own members devolves the added duty of canvassing their friends

### NEW YORK PICNIC—MAY 29th

The drive now going on for the Left Opposition Press will culminate in New York on the last Sunday of this month—May 29th—in the form of a picnic to be held at Tibbets Brook Park. At the same time it will be the occasion when the comrades and sympathizers of the Left Opposition in New York will greet the return of comrades Morgenstern and Goodman, our two Philadelphia comrades now serving jail sentences for "sedition".

Food and refreshments will be on hand. We will have a brief social program, games, rowing, ball-playing and other enjoyments. Keep the date open—Sunday, May 29th.

### Militant Builders

Comrade Hedlund is still at the head of the list although a number of comrades are slowly cutting down his lead. Those who figure on overtaking him with ease are counting without their host. They fail to take into account that Minneapolis is undertaking a systematic canvass of all their subscribers and sympathizers. In this work comrade Hedlund will, no doubt give a good account of himself. On the other hand comrades who want to win one of the prizes described in the last issue should hustle.

The staff and its record to date is as follows with the figures for the month of May (in dollars) in parenthesis: C. Hedlund (6)—11; V. Dunne (6)—9; L. Roseland (3 1-2)—5; M. Dunne (3)—8; L. Nagy (2 1-2)—3; C. Forsen (2 1-2)—3; A. Buehler (2)—2; M. Rosen (2)—2; O. Coover (2)—3; L. Basky (1 1-2)—5; R. Sacharow (1)—4; R. Ruskin (1)—2; W. Curran (1)—2; S. Zalmanoff (1)—1; P. Carlson (1)—1; C. Cowl (1)—5; F. Schulman (1)—1; F. Barach (1)—4; C. Johnson (1)—2; S. Lessin (1)—1; N. Berman (1); G. R. Herman (1); J. Ross (1); H. Milton (1-2)—1; T. Drobny (1-2)—2; J. Carr (1-4)—3; C. Skoglund—3; F. Cheloff—2; G. Ray—2; M. Gottlieb—1; M. Koehler—1; W. Wynne—1; J. Carter—1; H. Capelis—1; W. Herman—1; A. Swabeck—1; A. Glotzer—1; L. Logan—1; A. Kaldia—1; M. Sterling—1.

## Bring the Unity Negotiations into the Open!

The revelations in last week's MILITANT about the secret negotiations between the Party leaders and the expelled Right wing have awakened a new interest among the Communist workers in the question of unity. And the informal discussion arising from it, according to the reports we have received, is not confined to the horse-trade behind the scenes between the Centrist bureaucrats and the Lovestone group. The revival of sentiment for unity with the Left, that is, with the bona fide revolutionary faction, is noticeable.

There is a logic in this development that was never thought of by the machinators. In part, it is an expression of the fundamental solidarity which the proletarian militants in the Party feel toward the Left Opposition. It is also a sign of resentment against the under cover maneuvers to readmit the Right opportunist leaders; the proletarian elements want a revolutionary counterweight in the Party. Therefore our choice will be heard in the back room conferences, even though we are not there as invited guests. The time is opportune for a restatement of the attitude of the Left Opposition on unity.

and acquaintances for subs and donations. Every comrade on his metal! No stone must be left unturned. Wherever a spark of sympathy exists for our ideas and our struggle the question must be put bluntly—How much can you give to save the weekly MILITANT, to help the Opposition press?

Our readers too can participate in this work. They should not wait to be canvassed. They should respond at once. If possible they should canvass their friends and acquaintances. If they are not in a position to do this they can send in the name and addresses of likely contributors. We will approach them. But in the first instance they should respond with a donation.

The response to this appeal must be immediate; it must continue until we reach and pass our quota of \$1,000. Comrades, readers, sympathizers, will you help?

## The Party and the May Day Demonstration

The May Day demonstrations organized by the Communist Party this year, when taken throughout the country as a whole, were bigger and more impressive than any before in its history. Even when we discount any wildly exaggerated figures of numbers participating and accept a realistic estimate of, for example, about 40,000 in the New York march, 20,000 in Chicago and 8,000 in Minneapolis, it affords a good cross section of the splendid working class response. First of all, this, of course, bears testimony to the effects of the yet deepening crisis moving the American workers toward the Left. But it is also worth noting that, while the Socialist Party this year ventured into street demonstrations of a sort in several cities, it attracted only much smaller numbers. In this comparison we exclude Milwaukee, where the Socialist Party is in control of the city administration.

We have, therefore, in politically backward America a growing response to Communism, a distinct growth of Communist influence. That is clearly expressed in the May Day demonstrations. Also we have an ever more distinct expression of the fact that the new forces set into motion glavitate toward the official Communist Party. That is in the nature of things and holds bright prospects for the party's future. But it should be a telling answer to those disappointed "revolutionists" who persist in looking for revolutionary awakening separate and apart from the party. They will themselves only remain hopelessly outside of the movement.

In practically all of the major cities the party further affirmed the right of the working class to demonstrate for its demands on the International Labor Holiday. In this sense the demonstrations were militant turnouts. And we can say this, even when discounting the disgraceful scene of attacks upon Left Oppositionists in Minneapolis. But yet, compared to these turnouts, the party weaknesses as an actively moving force in the class struggle are all too apparent. Such a comparison reveals an enormous gap which must be closed.

### Experiences from Recent Struggles

The gap is revealed most glaringly in the fields where the party leads actual struggles. We are not speaking in this instance of the question of militancy dis-

## DEBATE

I. W. W. Representative  
Communist Representative

Is the Program of the I. W. W.  
Sufficient for the  
Emancipation of the  
Working Class?

AFFIRMATIVE:  
C. B. Ellis  
Editor, Industrial Solidarity  
NEGATIVE:  
James P. Cannon  
Communist League of America  
(Opposition)

SATURDAY, MAY 14th at 8 P. M.  
at the

LABOR TEMPLE

14th Street and Second Avenue  
ADMISSION: 20 Cents

Auspices: Joint Arrangement Committee

played in such struggles—though that is important in itself and cannot be disputed—but we are speaking here purely in the sense of how does the party lead and what support has accrued to its leadership. We will mention only some of the outstanding examples. There is, first of all, the Pennsylvania and Ohio miners strike of last year. A splendid struggle with excellent militancy displayed. Yet it did not result in a strengthening of the miners positions, organizationally or otherwise. It failed entirely to unite the Left wing and progressive forces in the mine fields. Today there is very little of the National Miners union organized in these districts. We experienced the Paterson and Lawrence textile workers strikes. The party, through the T. U. U. L. union had the leadership of a section of the workers in both places. Yet it conducted a strike policy which resulted in a comparative strengthening of the A. F. of L. forces and a weakening of the Left wing. Practically the same situation has resulted from the recent strike of the New York needle trades workers. To this should be added the fact that the struggle for the unemployed, despite the very large demonstrations at the beginning of the crisis today, has narrowed down to a movement almost exclusively of the conscious vanguard alone.

### What is the Policy Pursued?

How can such a contradiction be possible? We witness a splendid response to the May Day demonstrations organized by the party while in actual struggles it fails to really win the working class confidence and loses ground. The reason for this must be sought essentially in the policies and methods the party leadership pursues. It is not to be sought merely in the question of insufficient party contacts in the factories, nor in the smaller items which are being brought out in so-called self-criticism. Voluminous theses and resolutions have been written on these questions without, however, striking at the essential issue. With a correct policy and a correct orientation these difficulties—although they are considerable—could nevertheless easily be overcome. What is involved is essentially the failure of an orientation which will unite the workers in struggle.

The important question confronting the Communist Party today is particularly the one of a correct united front policy. We have no intention at all to propose that a united front policy is a universal solution for all times and under all conditions. On the contrary we think that the method pursued in the May Day demonstrations of a purely formal united front appearance does not at all serve the purpose. May Day demonstrations have become a revolutionary tradition and should be so maintained. It would be far more correct for the party to conduct these demonstrations in its own name, also in the formal sense, and call upon the working class to give its support on that basis. For the participation in the coming elections this is more so the case. The party has the duty of presenting a Communist program and entering Communist candidates and appealing for the working class support to Communism. To assume a formal guise of a united front election activity is merely to confuse the essential issues and does not help in the least.

The matter of actual struggles for the elementary needs of the workers is, however, an entirely different affair. And that holds true under politically advanced conditions as well. In Germany today, the threatening danger of Fascism demands imperatively the working class united front. In the United States today the conditions of the working class struggle demands it just as imperatively.

## Tom Mooney Must Be Freed!

Free Tom Mooney! Free Tom Mooney! shouted tens of thousands of workers in New York's May Day parade. Free Tom Mooney!—with a spirit the rain could not dampen. One knew that all over the United States hundreds of thousands of his fellow workers were shouting the same demand with the same spirit. It was the voice of the class conscious vanguard, the future troops of the revolution, demanding the freedom of the living symbol of their struggle against capitalism. One had only to hear the measured beat, the deep tone of their shouting to realize how profoundly stirred they were by the monumental hypocrisy and brazen impudence of that watch-dog of capitalism, his excellency, the governor of California, he, who "convinced" himself of Mooney's guilt and refused to free him.

Free Tom Mooney! It was the response of the American working class to the impassioned cry of Mooney himself against this latest insulting verdict of capitalist class justice. Mooney's letter of April 23 to Ralph says clearly that his place is in the ranks of this vanguard, in the front rank of the war against capitalism. Tom Mooney—has today grown to be a mighty oak, admittedly too dangerous to be at liberty during this desperate economic crisis, because he symbolizes the onward march of the revolutionary workers toward a better civilization—"You have continued in the role of your predecessors in making of me a symbol of the cause of labor. I accept the high honor you have conferred upon me with the greatest of humility. This service I will ungrudgingly render to my class, with the greatest of devotion, loyalty and fidelity. I give—gladly and willingly—my very life to the cause of the toilers all over the world, regardless of race, color, creed or nationality. I will never cease this holy struggle until every last instrument used in this dastardly frame-up is completely liquidated and a classless society will replace what now passes for civilization." This is revolutionary talk.

Under the circumstances, for what better mandate to organize the movement to free Mooney could Communists ask? Mooney is ours even in his thinking. Will we take his mandate and mobilize the masses behind the vanguard? This depends now upon the leadership of the Communist Party.

This has been amply demonstrated in the very strikes mentioned above. The building of a serious Unemployed Movement is quite inconceivable without an approach to the existing workers organizations for united pressure to obtain the demands which in reality involves the employed and unemployed alike. A serious movement for the liberation of Tom Mooney, the Scottsboro boys and all class war prisoners requires this tactic. And above all, the defense of the American working class in the present reactionary onslaughts upon their elementary rights and conditions demand a definite change toward employing the united front tactic.

—A. S.

### OPPOSITIONISTS SLUGGED IN MINNEAPOLIS ON MAY DAY

By comparison with standards established during the past few years, the Minneapolis May Day demonstration was a gratifying event. Without doubt it was the largest turnout of workers for a parade and demonstration since 1924.

The method of assembling the workers from the different sections for general mobilization at Bridge Square was well (Continued on page 2)

The responsibility is theirs. The rank and file has already demonstrated its determination to fight. What is necessary now is to oblige without delay a serious approach to the whole working class with the idea of setting them in motion for the freedom of Mooney. They must be approached in the first instance through their organizations.

We do not care how reactionary the leaders of the reformist organizations are, the cause of Mooney is dear to their rank and file. And our mandate gives us the right to be heard. If for the nonce the shouters of names, the Stalinists, will restrain their vocabulary of epithets and denunciation, will substitute for slander and abuse the simple proposal of a united front of working class organization on the sole issue of freeing Mooney, the Communists can and will succeed in winning the support of the workers. Of the possibilities which this would open up for the fight for relief and for Communist influence, we need not speak here.

The Stalinists insist nowadays upon being assured in advance of the leadership of any movement they enter. For example this is what they proposed to the Marine Workers' Defense Committee. Failing this they make every attempt to smash the movement. They smashed the Mooney conferences in Staunton and Belleville, Illinois last winter because they could not slander their way into the leadership. In Minneapolis and St. Louis—the same story.

Mooney has almost guaranteed that the Communists shall lead the movement for his freedom. What are the Stalinists waiting for? Do they want personal

appointments written on the stationery of the Comintern and witnessed by a notary? What holds them back? What limits them to demonstrations of the vanguard and street runs?

They have reached an impasse. The masses, it is now clear even to them, are not their property and do not obey their beck and call. They must now go to the masses in their organizations and work with them as equals. For this they have every requisite in the objective situation and every help from Mooney. But for this they must throw overboard their fake united front from below and their ideological weapons of slander and abuse.

This turn is not easily made. There are the "counter-revolutionary" Trotskyites who have been agitating for this turn right along. They will lose face when the party rank and file sees that the "counter-revolutionists" were correct after all. Bureaucratic prestige is no small matter. It is not to be lightly thrown away.

The party rank and file can resolve this dilemma. It can raise its voice through discussion and resolution. It can and must say that it demands the immediate calling of genuine united front conferences of all working class organizations on the sole issue of fighting for Mooney's freedom.

For its part, the Left Opposition will continue to hammer home this theme. And when the conferences are convened, as in time they must, we will enter them to fight with the party rank and file for the freedom of Mooney, for the unity of the Communist vanguard and the advance of Communism.

—T. S.

## France After the Parliamentary Elections

The victory of Herriot's Radical-Socialist party in last Sunday's run-off elections in France only culminated the recent trend toward the bourgeois Left in that country. The Radical-Socialists, who, as one of the writers in the capitalist press so aptly puts it, are neither socialists nor radicals, gained some forty-three seats, rising from 113 to 156. The socialists, the French section of the Second International received an increase of twenty-three seats making their present total in the Chamber of Deputies 129. All the Right wing bourgeois parties lost heavily, especially the party of Tardieu. The Communists retained their 12 seats (Two former Communist deputies in the French parliament had been expelled from the French party and that accounts for the false figure of 10 representatives ascribed to the C. P. in the old house by the bourgeois press. The acknowledged parliamentary leader of the French Communists, Marcel Cachin, suffered defeat in a constituency from which he had been returned to the Chamber time and again for years.

The capitalist press expresses surprise that the French moderates should attain such an advance so shortly after the constant gains of the reactionaries in Germany. But there is nothing at all to be surprised in all this. The Radical-Socialists have not for one moment concealed their intention to uphold the traditional French policy, the unconditional defense of the treaty gains of the world war, through which France has obtained her immoderately expanded political domination in Europe. On the other hand, the French politicians know full well that a reactionary regime in Germany will be even more dependent upon French "good will"—because of the in-

ternal situation such a regime would produce in the Reich—than the present Brüning government. Taking all this into consideration, it costs the French bourgeoisie very little to provide a safety valve for the growing dissatisfaction of the masses languishing under the rapidly progressing economic crisis—in this self-made Radical-Socialist party.

Despite the election trick of Tardieu—the attempt to utilize the assassination of President Doumer by a White Guard Russian for the purpose of creating a wave of reaction through misrepresenting the assassin as an "agent of the Comintern"—the "coud reasoning" of the republican bourgeoisie prevailed in the elections. Herriot and his followers are preparing to take the helm. Their position, as a result of last Sunday's poll is so strong that they are not directly obliged to any of the other parties for support. Naturally, the leaders of the socialist party, greedy for the ministerial chairs, are making all sorts of overtures to the victors. But, from indications in the press, it appears that the latter are more inclined to bargain with the Centre parties, allegedly for the purpose of avoiding any serious repercussion on the Bourse that might result from the constitution of a "Left" cabinet. Painleve, the Herriot men's choice to succeed Doumer in the presidency according to the latest newspaper reports has withdrawn in favor of Lebrun, the candidate of the Centre-Right, so as to "maintain national unity and the continuity made necessary by the President's death". If this report is true then a definite trend toward collaboration between the election victors and Tardieu is in order.

The results, in so far as the Communists are concerned, are not very encouraging. The French party has barely been able to hold its own, at a time when increased unemployment, wage reductions and general poverty sweep the country. Reports are still forthcoming as to how the party carried on its election campaign, but judging from the results, it could not have been anything but defective. In France, which is commonly known to be the hearth of reaction in the world today and which also figures most prominently in all plots and planned attacks against the Soviet Union, the importance of influencing the working class in a revolutionary direction, is self-apparent. To allow the reformists and the bourgeois demagogues to canalize the resentment of the toiling masses of France at this time is especially dangerous. The future will bring far greater tests than the elections. If the French Communists are to be prepared for them, the policy of the party which is closely bound up with the entire policy of the Comintern must be re-orientated accordingly. The results of the French elections represent another warning for the Communists and the revolutionary workers. They point to the necessity we have stressed time and again, of reexamining the fundamental principles, strategy and tactics of our International.

## The Police Shootings in Melrose Park

Last Friday witnessed another manifestation of Capitalist democracy in this land of the free and home of the brave. In one of the suburbs of Chicago, in Melrose Park, the brave defenders of law and order opened up a volley of machine gun fire on a meeting of unarmed, defenseless unemployed workers who had gathered to protest against police brutality and to demand the elementary right of free speech, of demonstrating in common against the ravages of the capitalist economic order which has reduced some twelve million toilers to starvation in the United States alone.

Nine workers were wounded, three of them seriously. The shooting took place with the approval and under the command of the local authorities of Melrose Park, known for their intimate connections to the local industrial nabobs, the American Can Company. American legionnaires, racketeers and reactionaries of every description participated on the side of the authorities. In reporting the event, even the capitalist press had to assume an apologetic tone, in line with its general hypocrisy. The Melrose Park incident will take its place together with the Chicago massacre of

last summer and the Detroit murders of this winter, as a characterization of the desperate methods the ruling class employs against workers who dare to voice their discontent with the economic conditions it imposes upon them.

It is by such examples that the bosses intend to cow the hungry unemployed to abject submission in the face of their misery. But these methods have been tried before. The millions of jobless and their families will not suffer in silence. They will fight. They are realizing more and more that the only way out for them is through struggle.

Determined and broad action for free speech and against outrages of the Melrose Park type can be understood as a necessity by all workers. The Communist party, having the interests of the working class at heart at all times, sensing its needs at every moment and pointing out the road to it at each step, must take the lead in unfolding such a broad action by penetrating into every trade union, into every factory, into every workers organization with a proposal for an extensive united front against police brutality and the right of free speech and assembly for the workers.



## LETTERS FROM THE MILITANTS

## A Criticism of the Needle Trades Article

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

Dear Comrades:

My attention has been called, somewhat belatedly it is true but still in time, to the article in the April 15 issue of *The Militant*, entitled "Left Wing Victory or Treacherous Bargain." The appearance of an article of this type over the signature of J. P. Cannon is cause for great concern—concern for the revolutionary integrity of *The Militant* and apprehension for the honest detachment of comrade Cannon. It is quite in order for the Right wing of the C. P.—the Lovestonites, to besmirch themselves with fabrication woven out of their own disordered minds, but for *The Militant* to fall a victim to as openly treacherous and perfidious a piece of work that has ever been attempted by the Schlesinger Right wing, is to almost believe in the possibility of the impossible. Amongst a few misleading statements comrade Cannon makes, is one that "The third group, the weakest numerically and one that came to life only recently and has played very little part in the life of the local, is the 'Left wing' group directed by the C. P." This statement is absurd. The slightest knowledge of the situation in the International L. G. W. U. and especially Local 9 points out clearly that the strongest forces of the Left groups are concentrated in Local 9. The Left group of Local 9 was the first to defeat the \$3.75 tax, proposed by the International administration. In the elections for the Executive of Local 9, last December, the predominant Kirtzman-Lovestonite Bloc was so uncertain of its ability to retain control over the Local that it opened a speakeasy, used approved John Lewis vote-stealing methods, etc., (all ancient history). Here was a perfect opportunity for the I. L. G. W. U. administration to order the election illegal and corrupt and call for new elections, thereby practically assuring the defeat of the Kirtzman Bloc. It did not grasp this "opportunity". The reason is apparent and especially to the Right wing forces. Another inaccuracy: "The Left wing group", states comrade Cannon, "came to life only recently." By innuendo this would compel one to believe the group was formed "recently". Not so. It is a fact that the group has been in existence since early 1930 and was incorporated in the officially organized Left wing groups in March, 1931. All these misstatements pale into insignificance beside the major charge, the idea of a secret deal. Does comrade Cannon know that a leaflet was distributed publicly by the Right wing group endorsing the Left wing candidate. Was this also part of the deal? The cloakmakers knew all along that the "Rights" had endorsed the "Left" slate. There was no mystery about this such as Cannon's article attempts to create. Does Cannon believe the discredited Right wing endorsement through a leaflet would rebound to the credit of the Left group. Certainly not, one would have to be dull and stupid to believe this! Manifestly, this was an attempt on the part of the bloc and infamous Schlesinger group to swing votes to the fake progressives. This is borne out by the bloc of the Right and Center in Local 1 and a separate Right wing slate in Local 22. The bloc between these two "opposing" camps in the recent Dress Strike betrayal is additional evidence, if more is needed.

Otherwise comrade Cannon's remarks on the "Company Union and slogan of 'Unity' are absolutely correct and valid. I can only conclude that comrade Cannon was misinformed by a few overzealous Left Oppositionists. I hope to see this letter appear in the columns of *The Militant* as a sign of good faith on the part of the Editorial Board of *The Militant*.

Yours for Unity in the Class Struggle,  
—A. BOJARSKY.

(Reply to comrade Bojarsky's criticism appears on page 4.—Ed.)

## The Bureaucrats Act against Oppositionist on Waterfront

NEW YORK, N. Y.

When that old fogey, Andrew Furuseth of the International Seamen's Union, back in 1921, threw out members of the Union from the hall, after they had fought militantly on the picket line for over three months, because they exposed the sell-out policy of his leadership, I thought that American seamen would never allow such a bureaucracy to grow again in their unions. But history seems to repeat itself.

When I stepped into the Marine Workers Industrial Union hall last Monday morning, as I have done almost daily for the past eight months, I was immediately accosted by half a dozen huskies and ushered into the office for the purpose of identification concerning the author of an article that appeared in *The Militant* of February 2, which dealt with general conditions on the waterfront.

After some fruitless efforts at questioning and record searching, I went back into the hall and was there immediately surrounded by Hudson, secretary of the union, and his Chinovniks, some of whom smelled strongly of bootleg liquor. All of them crowded around me with insulting remarks. When a certain Gallagher pointed me out as the writer of the article, Hudson thundered, shaking his fist under my nose: "Get the hell out of this hall or we'll throw you out. You dare write articles about me in *The Militant*!"

I protested that I am still a member of the union, and that if I have done anything wrong, I have a right to get an open hearing before the membership. Hudson, again swinging his fist, threatening, replied by shouting: "See this—here is your hearing."

In due respect to the property and the office equipment of the union, which would have been damaged in the scuffle had the provocateurs succeeded in starting it, I left the hall, calling to the attention of the comrades the actions of the bureaucracy.

Readers will recall that the article in question criticized the point of view of this same Hudson that American seamen are "relatively better off than the other workers", that they have not felt the effects of the crisis and that their wages have not been cut generally. The official party has often encouraged criticism—self and otherwise—from the membership. But it seems that standards and limitations are established by the few bureaucrats who are in control of the apparatus.

If anyone were to say that all this "encouragement" of criticism is merely a ruse of the official leadership, the average rank and file will object: that is the correct line of the party and the union—the line laid down by Lenin. But let a member from the floor arise and attempt genuine discussion. Instantly he finds himself jeered and made uncomfortable. The bureaucrats appear to want only yes-men.

The sincere worker and honest critic has to fight his way. He is almost certain to be unpopular, to be in a minority. Often he finds himself outside of the union and forced to go into another organization. When I walked out of the union hall, several members followed me and expressed their disagreement with the actions of Hudson and his gang. They told me that my criticism had been correct and has in some respects already been effective in the activities of the union. The delegates to the Soviet Union are no longer selected as formerly, but under pressure from the rank and file, are now being elected from among the membership. The article of Hudson we quoted has been condemned and likewise the splitting tactics of the functionaries.

It is a common truth that everything that is good and healthy in the Soviet Union can be traced back to the program of the Left Opposition. This is also true on every smaller battlefield. The Opposition has to show the way, in spite of the attempts of the bureaucrats to discredit it.

The bureaucracy of the M. W. I. U. has its roots not only in the National Office or in the party. They can be tracked down through the R. I. L. U. to the very doorsteps of Stalin. The manifestations of new life in the Marine Union are certainly heartening. But they are only temporary and we cannot hope for any real change of policies until the Left Opposition is readmitted into the Comintern and the Russian party. Only with the readmission of the Left Opposition under the leadership of comrade Trotsky will all the ills—all the splits and groupings—vanish and the Communist forces once more united against the capitalist class and its lackeys.

—PAUL SCHWALBE.

## From a Railroad Worker

Dear Comrade:

I wrote to the railroad worker L— at Kansas City. I also wrote a similar letter to a railroad fireman at Everett, Wash. L— is a locomotive engineer on the Kansas City Terminal Ry., and a member of Division No. 824, B. of L. E. The brother at Everett is, S—. He is local grievance man for his Lodge at that point on the Great Northern Railway, Cascade Division. I ran a locomotive on that Division in the summer of 1907. I was a visiting member of brother S—'s Lodge several times that summer. The Lodge is No. 501. I sent brother S— a Six months sub. for *The Militant*. I am working on both S—, L— and other progressive minded railroad workers throughout the country with the view of building up a minority Left wing, on a National scale, inside of the Railroad Unions upon a program of definite proposals. Economic development has already made the workers more responsible to practical proposals and slogans, even if they instinctively know that they are proposed by Communists.

On Sunday, April 24th, C. R. Hedlund attended a Union meeting of all Twin City Lodges of Locomotive Firemen. This meeting was the culmination of several months efforts on the part of the Left wing locally under Communist guidance. We are working on the idea of setting up a local machinery for the holding of periodical Union meetings of all railroad workers to break down craft isolation and permit the R. R. workers to get together in big meetings and there to take up some of the most burning questions for discussion and treatment. This will give the Left wing the opportunity to furnish the rank and file with program and leadership, and it will also give us an opportunity to expose the bankruptcy of the Brotherhood bureaucrats and their do-nothing policy.

Although all Firemen's official meetings are supposed to be strictly secret and admission is only gained by submission of secret password and grip, C. R. Hedlund was not only admitted to address the meeting but was invited to remain until its close and was also permitted to participate in the discussion. He spoke to the meeting on the role of the two administrations of the B. of L.

E. and the B. of L. F. & E. were playing in trying to keep him and other militants from joining the ranks of our organized brothers. I also stressed the vital necessity of amalgamating these small and helpless 21 railroad crafts; on paying labor officials union wages and not a thousand dollars per month when one half of the union membership was out of work of any kind; and for us full-time workers to divide the work with those brothers who have been laid off until such time that we can mobilize a movement to secure a six hour day: He also urged the necessity of providing for Union meetings of all R. R. workers. All of it was enthusiastically received. He was then successful in getting the B. of L. E. members invited also to their next Union meeting which will take place in the Lodge Hall of No. 814 of the Firemen on the evening of May 24th.

—A. E.

## May Day in Minneapolis

(Continued from page 1)

thought out. The sections in the various parts of the city and along the line of march up Nicollet Ave. to the Parade Grounds, were adequately and effectively directed. If those workers who followed the marchers along the sidewalks are taken into consideration, the numbers participating in the meeting and march will easily reach 10,000.

Literally hundreds of placards and banners of revolutionary significance were carried by the marchers. Communist party banners almost without exception. Communist literature was the only kind on sale, Communist buttons and tags calling for a struggle against imperialist war, were everywhere in evidence. It was, beyond the slightest possibility of a doubt the official party's demonstration.

Merely to say that the Party led the demonstration would be to ignore the real attitude of the party leadership. The party really dominated this May Day. From the first propaganda letter to the last word from the platform on the Parade Grounds. This was done by the simple expedient of mechanical exclusion of all workers and organizations who were even suspected of harboring any difference on any political question. During the weeks just before May Day, after the call had been issued. The Communist League (Left Opposition) on several occasions sent representatives and delegates to the meetings which were called "united front" meetings. In each case, our comrades were denied admittance to the hall and refused all opportunity for work within the "united front".

Now it must be clearly understood by the workers who read this article, that the Communist League and most of its friends, knew beforehand what to expect from the party leadership and were therefore prepared. After being rudely excluded from the meetings of the committee on agreements, our comrades and friends proceeded, under instructions from the League, collectively and as individuals, to work for the success of the demonstration. The League issued a special leaflet calling upon the workers to turn out for May Day and support the central demonstration. Our comrades and their close supporters were instructed to assemble in the different sections and join the marches to Bridge Square, to take an active part in the meeting and to assist in every way possible in making the main march, a militant and impressive event.

Our loyal and effective work for the success of the May Day meeting most effectively branded as lies, the vicious tales circulated by the party leadership. They were, of course, not content to let our conduct in the meeting further expose them and decided to provoke trouble at any cost. This took the form, in the march up Nicollet Ave., of an attack upon three of our comrades, who were in their places in the column.

These comrades, M. and G. Dunne and Louis Roseland were conducting themselves as Communists should, they were carrying Communist literature which called upon the workers to join the demonstration. Several of the party workers guards, acting no doubt, under the mistaken idea that they were doing their duty, grappled with these comrades, tore the literature from them and trampled it under foot. During the scuffle that ensued, reinforcements were called by one of the lesser bureaucrats, who jeered as our comrades were overpowered and Roseland was slugged about the head, receiving a bad cut over the right eye. This display was the most violent act of the day, by the Party workers but by no means the most alarming manifestation of non-Communist attitude towards workers.

At the entrance to the Parade Grounds, worker guards had been stationed in impressive numbers. The task that had been assigned them was, to prevent the comrades of Trotsky from entering the grounds with literature of any kind on their persons. Further, the guards demanded that our comrades keep silent, not to discuss with the workers. The demand was "No Communist leaflets, no talking at this 'united front' meeting".

Only a few short weeks ago, right here in Minneapolis, the police made the same demands upon the very worker guards who carried out this task. The bosses' cops backed up the demands also with threats and with slugging.

It is not our purpose to intimate, in any way, that the worker guards are in league with the police. Not by any means, but we know that it is our duty to bring to the attention of the worker Communists, the false attitude forced upon them by the doubly false and badly frightened leadership. Only terrified bureaucrats could issue this kind of instructions or condone such actions in the ranks of the party of Lenin.

Communism made gains in Minne-

## :: ORGANIZATION NOTES ::

From time to time we have in these columns emphasized the activities of individual branches. Naturally in this respect the bigger and better established ones can show a better record, but that is only a quantitative difference. A review of the work accomplished during the winter months, which are now about coming to a close, would affirm our contention of steady but slow growth, though not yet to the point of taking advantage of the opportunities available.

With but one exception every branch increased its membership during the winter. Three new branches were added. They have so far shown up well. In Cleveland we have as members among others the very early Left Oppositionists such as John Brahtin, Joe Keller, Leo Gleisser and others. This branch undertook extensive propaganda activities from its inception. It held weekly open forum meetings, the secretary reporting excellent audiences usually composed of native American workers in the main. But the branch has taken up work also in other fields. It has organized a Jewish workers club and *Unser Kampf* now enjoys a good circulation in Cleveland. The new branch in Youngstown is numerically smaller and therefore has had to contend itself with more modest activities. In the main the comrades there have conducted individual propaganda, making some very valuable contacts and extended the *Militant* circulation. From our new branch in Newark, N. J. we have already carried several reports which give testimony to its substantial activities.

Regular open forums have been conducted during the winter months by the branches of New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, St. Louis and for a while in Kansas City. The St. Louis branch, despite its small numbers, made particular energetic efforts in this respect. Some very excellent meetings were held and a general good attendance came to the forum. As a result new members have now been taken into the ranks. In St. Louis the

Communist movement has never been numerically strong, which first of all accounts for the smallness of the Left Opposition. Yet our members from the beginning led in important activities in the city, particularly in unemployment demonstrations. After that it suffered a relapse and disappeared for a while but became reorganized again and is now going forward. It has now many new good contacts.

Spartacus Youth Clubs have been organized so far by the branches of New York, Minneapolis and St. Louis. Jewish workers clubs have been organized in New York and Cleveland. Study classes have been conducted this winter by the branches of New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, Philadelphia and for a while in Boston. While the Philadelphia branch has gained new members it has lately suffered under the handicap of two of its most active and leading comrades Morgenstern and Goodman serving a term in prison for their revolutionary activities. Both comrades will, however, be released by May 17th and can thus soon be welcomed back into the active ranks, again strengthening the Philadelphia branch and the Left Opposition as a whole.

Our members have everywhere taken their place in the ranks of the general working class struggle and given an account with credit to themselves. It is necessary, however, to state that on this score there is still much to be desired. But the obstacles in the way are mainly the ones of the natural limitations set for an opposition group. For example in many instances the party bureaucrats yet succeeded in setting up barriers to our participation in "United Front" activities. But in regard to this we can also affirm that these walls of isolation are being broken through.

Our Toronto branch has recorded irrefutable proof of this. At the onslaught by the reactionary authorities upon the official Communist Party, our branch took its position, after some hesitation as to how to proceed, squarely for the party defense. It made valuable contributions for effective united front organization of the defense. So much so that its co-operation became quite generally accepted—at least without any open bureaucratic hostility. Our members were in the thick of the defense work and thus able to demonstrate in actual practice our readiness for a united fight for the Communist principles. That practical example helped to further the prestige and strengthen the sympathetic contacts for the Left Opposition. It is to be expected that the Toronto branch will now go forward to new growth.

## BOOKS BY TROTSKY

## DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL\*

A Criticism of Fundamentals\* Part 1 and 3 140 pages, publishers of this book we can

## THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

(Out of Print in paper cover) cloth bound \$1.00

## STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION\*

Part 2 of the Draft Program 86 pages 25c

158 pages paper cover 50c

cloth cover \$1.00

## PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.\*

48 pages paper cover 15c

## THE SPANISH REVOLUTION\*

30 pages paper cover 10c

## THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER\*

64 pages paper cover 15c

## COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM\*

64 pages paper cover 15c

## THE TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION\*

(out of print) 10c

## WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN\*

48 pages paper cover 10c

(out of print)

## GERMANY — THE KEY TO THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION\*

—SHALL FASCISM REALLY BE VICTORIOUS?\*

48 pages paper cover 10c

## HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Vol. 1

522 pages Retail at \$4

By Special arrangements with the offer it to certificate holders at \$3

## THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA

364 pages cloth cover \$1.00

## SINCE LENIN DIED

by Max Eastman 158 pages paper cover 50c

## In Preparation PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

400 pages cloth cover \$1.50

## WHAT NEXT?—VITAL QUESTIONS FOR THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT

200 pages paper cover 50c

Bound Volume of all the pamphlets indicated by \* Only 100 copies available. Cloth cover \$2.00

## SPECIAL RATES IN BUNDLE ORDERS

84 East 10th Street, PIONEER PUBLISHERS New York, N. Y.

polys on May Day. We of the Communist League (Opposition) understand this. The League comrades are proud of their part in these achievements.

—RA.

## THE MILITANT

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern James P. Cannon

Max Shachtman Maurice Spector

Arne Swabeck

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

SATURDAY, MAY 14, 1932 Vol. 6, No. 20 (Whole No. 116)

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 5 cents per copy.

## Pioneer Publishers Notes

## The Spanish Revolution

The Spanish Revolution which began a year ago is not yet completed. Things are happening in Spain, and the reformists of all description are retarding the forward movement of the proletariat. Only a correct Communist policy can lead the Spanish workers and exploited farmers to full emancipation from the capitalist yoke. Read what Trotsky has to say in his two pamphlets "The Spanish Revolution", 10c; and "The Spanish Revolution in Danger", 15c. We have only 60 copies left of the first pamphlet. Get yours before they are all gone.

## Germany

To fully understand the events as they are shaping themselves in Germany at present, every militant worker should read "Germany, the Key to the International Situation" a small Ten Cent pamphlet. Trotsky has written a new book on the subject, supplementing this—"What Next?—Vital Questions for the German Proletariat." We expect to go to press with this book in a month. It will consist of about 200 pages and sell at 50c.

## Bound Volumes of Pamphlets

All the pamphlets marked with a \* in our list of publications, printed elsewhere in *The Militant*, will be bound into one volume and sell for \$2 a copy. We have a limited number of 100 copies. To make sure you get yours, send your order at once, enclosing payment.

## Draft Program

The "Draft Program of the Communist International—A Criticism of Fundamentals," is entirely out of print. We need 25 copies of the paper edition to complete our 100 copies for the bound volume. If you have a copy send it to us and we will reimburse you, or credit you with the price toward the purchase of one of the volumes of pamphlets. "Strategy of the World Revolution is the second part of this criticism.

## China

"Problems of the Chinese Revolution", a book of 430 pages, will be ready for shipment within two weeks. Paper cover, \$1. Cloth bound, \$1.50. Send your order now as we need funds to rush out the book on Germany immediately after this book.

## Certificate Holders

Certificate holders are reminded that they are entitled to 33 1-3% discount from their purchases of our publications. The certificates are now ready and will be mailed to all those who paid their full amount of \$10. Those who can afford to buy a certificate now are strongly urged to do so as it will greatly help us to extend our publishing work, to include all the Marxian classics. If you have already purchased one of these certificates, send in your name and address to Pioneer Publishers.

## Make Our Press Drive a Success!

We go to press in the middle of the second week of the final month of the press drive. We are therefore temporarily unable to comment on the results of the collections. This we will do next week.

The results of distribution week are full of interest. For example, comrade Milton of the New York branch went out to Union Square with a bundle of three hundred copies of recent back numbers of *The Militant*. By announcing "Communism or Fascism in Germany by Leon Trotsky" in a loud voice, he disposed of all he had in about fifteen minutes. An hour later he repeated. It was the same wherever we distributed free.

Because of the free distributions the results fell off a little. We are confident that next week we will more than make up for this slight lull. Our sympathizers are still responding with excellent spirit. A comrade writes from Rockford, Ill., "Although the times are very hard and I have been unemployed for a whole year now, I would not miss one single copy of *The Militant*. So I went out and loaned a dollar from a close friend of mine in order to put up my sub. I will try to take advantage of the sub drive and see if I can't earn me a copy of Trotsky's *WHAT NEXT?* and at the same time stabilize the circulation of *The Militant* here in Rockford." Go to it, comrade!

The quotas and results to date are as follows:

	Quotas	Results
New York .....	\$ 325	\$ 63.00
Minneapolis .....	200	29.50
Chicago .....	100	3.00
Toronto .....	70	
Philadelphia .....	40	
Cleveland .....	40	
Boston .....	40	
Newark .....	35	2.50
Kansas City .....	30	2.00
St. Louis .....	25	
Los Angeles .....	20	4.00
Youngstown .....	10	
New Haven .....	10	
Montreal .....	10	
Duluth .....	10	
Springfield, Ill. ..	10	

Make use of the combined Sub rate of \$2.00 for a year's Sub to *THE MILITANT* and *YOUNG SPARTACUS*.

Make use of the literature premiums: A free paper bound copy of the *Permanent Revolution* with a one year Sub to *THE MILITANT* (Does not apply to combined rates); a free copy of the *Strategy of the World Revolution* with each half year Sub; a free copy of a 10 cents pamphlet with each trial Sub of 13 issues.

Don't forget our special offer of 8 issues for 25 cents good only during the drive.

Name ..... Address .....  
City ..... State .....  
Sent in by ..... Branch.....



# IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

## Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

### Int. Right Wing on Verge of Disruption

Leader of Czech Group Protest Brandler-Thalheimer Slanders Against Trotsky

We are bringing below a letter sent by Alois Neurath, one of the chiefs of the Brandler Right wing in Czechoslovakia, to his Berlin friends. The whole spirit of this document is indicative of the ferment that is taking place in the Right wing International. Faced with serious tests of Communist struggle, the fungus growth of Brandlerism is rapidly disintegrating. The splitting away of the Walcher-Froelich group in Germany, the decomposition of the Right wing in Czechoslovakia and Austria have caused a panic among the summits of the Brandler organization. Brandler has sent out a heart-rending appeal for an international meet of the stress on the extraordinary importance of the American Lovestone group participating in it. What will Brandler do when he discovers that his American bulwark is also breaking up and capitulating to the Stalinists? That is not very hard to guess . . . The internal situation in the camp of world Communism is clearing up. The collapse of the Right wing will only permit the voice of the Left Opposition to be heard all the more strongly by all the worker Communists.

Prague, March 28, 1932

To comrades Brandler and Thalheimer:

Dear Comrades:

In the last number of the *Arpo* (Arbeitervolk)—the Berlin organ of the Brandlerites—you publish, under the heading "Trotsky as the guardian saint of the S. A. P." a calumny of Trotsky. That is nothing new. Trotsky has been slandered and calumniated by the *Arpo* for months. You have never even attempted to take an objective position toward the views of Trotsky. You have, moreover, avoided taking such a position as long as the opposition which has been grouped about you internationally, exists. More than two years ago, at the international conference in Berlin, we decided at that time to carry on this discussion in the *Linköpp* (international discussion bulletin of the Right wing). These decisions remained paper decisions, although, aside from the Austrian group, no other section of the international opposition approved of your position in the Trotsky question.

These facts and the results of your latest national conference have made necessary the convocation of an international conference. The question of the decision with regard to the minority (Walcher-Froelich) was, as I said in my brief salutatory address, not simply a German affair, but a concern of the international opposition. After your national conference, there still remained the hope that you will make up for lost time by putting this question up for discussion before an international conference. The convocation of an international conference, in so far as I know, has been demanded by all groups of the opposition. It has become urgently necessary not only on account of the position toward Trotsky and the German minority, but also and particularly on account of your evaluation of the C. I. policy as well as that of the Russian section in the C. I. Your thesis, that the C. I. policy in the entire world is false, but inside of the U. S. S. R., correct, would most certainly not be approved at an international conference. In this sense I spoke at our National Conference in Asch. We were prepared to wait for the international conference, to clear up all the disputed, fundamental questions there. You are not thinking of calling an international conference. Without any regard for the views of the comrades in the other countries, you hold firmly to the thesis that whatever is being done by the C. I. in the U. S. is correct, but

whatever it does in the rest of the world is false—in the *Arpo* and in *Gegen den Strom*. Naturally, you have the right of propagating this view in the name of your group. But since the unification of the various foreign groups has resulted in an international opposition, the impression must not be given, as long as no discussion has taken place, that your position is in accord with that of the other groups. That is by no means the case.

How unsufferable this condition has become, may be seen, among other things, from the position you take toward Trotsky. In the article cited above, you reprint part of Trotsky's work *What Next*. You add there the remark "And with regard to the step Walcher-Froelich have taken, he says that it means a step forward".

You have, of course, read Trotsky's pamphlet quite thoroughly. You are therefore consciously calumniating, for you know well that Trotsky did not write that, but the contrary, Trotsky writes: "The minority considers an independent and active policy necessary, that is directed not only against Remmele, but against the course and the regime of the Stalin bureaucracy in the U. S. S. R. and in the Comintern. If we interpret the position of Walcher-Froelich correctly, on the basis of the as yet inadequate material we have at

hand, then it means a step forward in this question."

This is what Trotsky writes, and at that, at a time when he could not have known that Walcher and Froelich had given up their organizational independence and gone over directly to the S. A. P. Trotsky therefore emphasizes the independent policy of this group and calls that a step forward. Why, then, do you deceive the readers of the *Arpo* so manifestly? Why the manifest calumny? Does Trotsky welcome their going over to the S. A. P.? These are just the methods of the present C. I. and of the papers of their sections. When, on the basis of such slanders, you come to the conclusion that Walcher is creating out of the S. A. P. an auxiliary troop for Trotsky's Russian factional struggle, you overlook entirely and completely that another conclusion must follow from this: Namely, that you want to make not only out of the C. P. G. O. (Brandler group), but of the other opposition groups, auxiliary troops for Stalin in the Russian factional struggle.

The opposition arose and could only exist in the struggle against Stalin's national and international policies, since and in so far as these policies, in their entirety contradict the Leninist fundamentals. When you returned from the Soviet Union, you yourselves took that

position. Only gradually you left this position. Since you could not and did not want to attain a firm position against Stalin's policies, disintegration has become the fate of the C. P. G. O. The international opposition cannot avoid this fate, if it will not decide to take a critical position toward the internal policy of the C. P. S. U. as well as to the whole policy of the Comintern, the mistakes of which have their roots in the erroneous policy of the C. P. S. U.

Precisely the events in Germany make it the duty of all oppositionists to draw the line, clearly and distinctly, before the criminally erroneous policy of the C. I. Personally, I am completely in accord with the views Trotsky has expressed on Fascism, on the tasks of the C. P. G. and particularly those contained in his great work, *What Next*?

In my opinion, they contain the most astute analysis of the present situation in Germany from the point of view of Marxism-Leninism, the clearest presentation of the present tasks of the C. P. G. and the opposition, respectively. To be honest, it is impossible to vacillate between the fundamental views which Trotsky develops and the present C. I. policy. Either the one or the other. You have decided—that is perfectly clear today—for Stalin, only you do not want to say so openly. The revolutionary working class will decide—the longer it takes, the more certain will be their decision—for the fundamental views developed by Trotsky. This my firm conviction. . . .

With Communist greetings,  
(Signed) NEURATH.

## The Negro and the Class Struggle

(Continued from last issue)

But the solution cannot be brought closer by artificial slogans, such as the slogan of Self Determination. We must minimize the desires of the Negro Petty-Bourgeoisie and enlarge the form of the proletarian interest of the Negro who is, like the white worker, choked with bourgeois ideology. National minorities must be won as allies to the proletariat, if they are oppressed minorities. But in winning them as allies we do not approach the workers of this nationality or race as such. This would be national opportunism. We approach these workers as workers. We know the bourgeois element of the national minorities under Czarism were no better and often worse than the dominating bourgeoisie against the workers. Likewise the Negro bourgeois elements have already proven they can outstrip their white masters. We want allies, but not on the basis of concessions and compromises on principles. But the Negro proletarian is no Negro ally—he is a worker. The cropper and dirt farmer are allies and must be won as such. But in this relation the Negro industrial and agriculture worker is decisive.

A compromise on principle means that the "allies" have captured the proletariat. The program of the Communists (Marxists) is the only one possible for the American Negro for social, political and economic equality and freedom. The road is the road of class struggle, not that of "preparation stages"—self determination, democratic dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry, four class party, workers and peasant parties, peoples revolution, etc.—which give the petty-bourgeois Negroes organizational and political control. Preparation stages in struggles are necessary, but not compromises on principle, passed off as preparation stages.

We must consider slogans and tactics for the race form of the class struggle. This is essential in order to defeat the bosses' policy of divide and rule. Slogans and tactics against the legal and extra-legal discrimination and lynch laws are the order of the day. A will to fight the battles of the Negro masses, as the party has already demonstrated, is a big step forward. Let us not step backward into the swamp of national reformism.

The Negro of America was not snatched from a State or Nation in Africa with national aspirations and ideologies. Neither has America given the Negro as a Negro the material base for nationalism as such. The class struggle of the Negro is not cloaked in a national form (complicated with the national bourgeois influence) that calls for the slogan of self determination at special stages and under special conditions in the struggle. It is cloaked in the race form. The American Negro bourgeois elements are no ally of ours. The problem is complicated enough without adding the national complex to it, which in this case can only result in national reformism.

The racial form of social conflicts has taken the national form where the racial group obtained an economic unit. This has been the case in the past. Blood ties, gens and clans in the process of development from primitive Communism through the stages to an exploiter's society, naturally crystallized as such. But the American Negro presents no such picture. His is a different and far more difficult problem.

The Socialist tells us in substance, that the workers must not seize power in backward countries. We must let the bourgeois revolution take its course develop its industries (nationalism), and then we will win it over. Stalinism tells us that we must move the American Negro into the feeling of national consciousness through the slogan of Self Determination. Of course Stalinism will say, "No, not national consciousness". But we will answer: The slogan of Self Determination for a racial group that does not have a material base for such has even less logic than the socialist position. At least, these non-Marxists speak of a material base for bourgeois power, in one form or the other, in backward sections.

ward sections.

When the proletariat takes power, the Negro worker will take his place as an equal with the white worker. Where the Negroes are the majority (parts of South, etc.), this majority will dominate the Soviets.

The Negro worker and farmer, being even more suppressed and exploited than his white brother requires special consideration from the revolutionary party, even though, economically, he is a worker or dirt farmer. This double exploitation and class suppression is carried out through the race form of the class struggle, which does not include the national form in the political sense. Stalinism says, because the Negro constitutes a doubly exploited racial minority, and regardless of the argument on nationalism, it is proper to present the slogan of Self Determination for oppressed racial minorities as well as national minorities.

Let us consider it in this light for a moment, in spite of the arguments already presented. Adding to what has been said about the slogan of self determination, we must say that it can only be realized, so far as the American Negro is concerned, after the overthrow of capitalism in the South, which means the overthrow of American imperialism as such. Is this transition step needed then? The victory of the proletariat includes within it the solution of the double exploitation of the Negro masses. As for the Negro bourgeoisie, the Negro and white workers will take care of them just as they will take care of the white exploiters. The Soviets of the South will solve this problem, even though special efforts will have to be leveled against reactionary ideological carryovers. But the main struggle against the reactionary ideology is not a problem of the Negroes, but of the whites.

But how about the slogan as a means of winning the Negro masses today for the proletarian revolution? Yes, the

## GERMAN SKETCHES

Lieutenant Scheringer

These days, the former Reichswehr lieutenant, Scheringer, was sentenced to an additional two and a half years of fortress confinement by the Reich's Court for so-called Literary High Treason. This is a purely arbitrary act, an act of revenge on the part of the bourgeoisie against an outsider who is striving toward Communism. It is an act that demands the sharpest protest from all proletarians, one that casts ample light on brutal class justice in Germany. But for Communists, the question cannot end there. For, it is also a question of ideological struggle against all those who wipe out the boundaries between Fascism and Communism and it has become a vital question for the Communist party at a moment when at least 200,000 followers of the C. P. G. voted Fascist in the second ballot of the presidential elections. But Scheringer, whose pamphlets have been far more spread as texts for the younger generation of the C. P. G. than the Communist Manifesto, is the ideological pioneer of this development. Scheringer is not even today a Communist, but a National-Bolshevik. L. Trotsky wrote very correctly about him in August 1931:

"Scheringer and Stenbeck-Fermor (another recent national-Bolshevik proselyte—Ed.) regard the task of the Communist party very graciously as that of a direct continuation of the Hohenzollern war. They are prepared—temporarily in words—to accept the 'people's revolution', if it can serve them as a means of mobilizing the workers for their 'revolutionary war'."

Three months ago, at a public meeting in Berlin, in which the present writer was the speaker, Count Stenbeck-Fermor raised a hue and cry about Trotsky's "calumny" of Scheringer. But for a clarification of the actual state of affairs, it is sufficient to quote what Scheringer—whom we cannot deny a clear, firm and incorruptible character—said on April 8, 1932 before court:

"For me the desire of national liberation was the point of departure that led to my development toward Communism. As long as the working class is oppressed by the capitalists of Germany itself, a national liberation is impossible.

"Only social liberation will give the laboring people a fatherland and this social liberation can be attained only by the revolutionary working class under the leadership of the Communist party. That is also the way by which we shall come to national liberation."

The words of Karl Liebknecht: "Our enemy is in our own country" are given this variation by Scheringer: "Our enemy is not in Russia, but in the capitalist West."

But the *Rote Fahne* and its Brandlerist lick-spittles far from carefully and tactfully criticizing this declare it to be valid. They are not. It is being proved more and more that it was not Scheringer who came to the party, but

slogan will win over many petty-bourgeois elements on the basis of national reformism. But we don't want the Negro petty-bourgeoisie as allies on that basis. The Negro worker, industrial and agricultural, is not even in this problem, because we do not use a slogan of self determination for workers. We win them as workers, even though different racial and sectional (youth and women, etc.) tactics are necessary.

—HUGO OEHLER.

The above is a discussion article. The views expressed are those of the author. Others will follow on the same subject.—Ed.

the party who came to Scheringer. Today, when the fruits of this fatal development are already becoming visible, the warning words of L. D. Trotsky in August 1931 are doubly appropriate:

"The party may, of course, utilize even such individual metamorphoses as a means of disintegrating the camp of the Fascists. The crime of the Stalinist bureaucracy—yes, the direct crime—consists in this: that it declares its solidarity with these elements, that it identifies the voice of the party with their voices, that it renounces the exposures of their nationalist and militarist tendencies, that it transforms the thoroughly petty bourgeois, reactionary-utopian and chauvinist pamphlet of Scheringer into a new bible of the proletariat."

Comrade Pruegel.

It is hard to assume that before April 10, anyone outside of East Reinickendorf, a working class district of Berlin, ever heard of comrade Pruegel, and it is hard to assume that he will play a very great role in the future. He is one of those hundreds of small functionaries, who, after five years of graveyard silence in the party, has dared in an unclear, timid but nevertheless distinct voice to get up against the bureaucrats in a membership meeting, to reject the blabber about the guilt of the members for the defeats of the party and to begin to discuss the political mistakes of the party leadership, particularly in the question of the united front. That is why this unfortunate comrade Pruegel serves the bureaucrat Ulbricht, the "leader of the Berlin proletariat", as scapegoat to the extent of a whole page in the *Rote Fahne* of April 10. The bureaucracy is beginning to feel the ground tremble under their feet. They are faced with an elementary unrest which led to such outbreaks at the Berlin party workers conference after the first ballot in the recent presidential elections, that the conference had to be adjourned and the next one packed with especially picked people. (Permanent Revolution published documents on this affair). The bureaucracy is pouncing on these nameless functionaries with a mixed feeling of hatred and fear. They want to uproot the germs, they want to crush these nameless objectors before the Opposition finds leaders with names.

Externally, the party shows, despite the heavy defeats, as yet a firm and fearless appearance. Internally, the disintegration has reached an extraordinary degree. The spirit of ideological and actual capitulation, raised on the garbage heap of the "national program", has taken the form of numbers in the 200,000 voters who went over from Thaelmann to Hitler in the run-off elections. In the party itself it has long been obvious. The sympathies of the unemployed Communists for the "honest, active" Nazis, the readiness with which they discuss with them and not with the social democratic workers, the anxious and almost sympathetic reading of the Nazi press, the open opinion that Hitler should be voted for "in order to hasten the decision"—all these are enough alarm signals.

All this will, however, force the Pruegels, if we take Pruegel as an example, to throw off their reservedness. Already five units in Berlin-Charlottenburg have adopted a resolution against social Fascism with a crushing majority. The workers' Opposition is beginning to bear fruit. We greet those nameless fighters who no longer fear the filthy attacks of the bureaucracy. Only in their struggle lies the guarantee for the salvation of the party and for victory.

—E. BAUER.

### Nine Years of the Struggle of the Left Opposition

## The German Revolution of 1923 and the «Lessons of October»

(Continued from last issue)

In 1917, the main leaders of the Bolsheviks, before and after Lenin's arrival from Switzerland, had adopted anything but a revolutionary position. Kamenev and Stalin had been for supporting the bourgeois republic "from the Left", and for the continuation of a "revolutionary war" in defense . . . of the Provisional government. Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Nogin, Lunacharsky, Losovsky, Yaroslavsky, Molotov, Tomsky—all of them were either opposed to the October insurrection or in favor of a Menshevik-Bolshevik coalition government. Some of them—like Zinoviev and Kamenev—adopted such a position, even after the Bolshevik seizure of power, that Lenin, who had worked together with them for decades, did not hesitate to denounce them as "strike-breakers and deserters". Trotsky's recollection of these facts and his explanation of them, their causes and effects, opened up a new campaign against "Trotskyism", in which, as had already become customary, the real issues objectively raised by Trotsky were deliberately concealed or smothered under by the bureaucracy. What might have been a brightly illuminated campaign of instruction and enlightenment for the international Communist movements on the art and problems of insurrection was treacherously converted by Zinoviev-Stalin-and-Co. into a lynching campaign against the Opposition and its leader.

It is interesting to note, in passing, the characteristic manner in which the campaign was conducted on an international scale. Letters and telegraphic commands were dispatched by Zinoviev through the Comintern apparatus to the Central Committees of all the national Communist parties with the demand that Trotsky's "Lessons of October" be repudiated and the "Old Guard" of the Russian Central Committee endorsed. Everywhere the wheels were set into motion for the routine of adopting resolutions without discussion or understanding. Petty bureaucrats were found in every party who were ready to condemn or endorse whatever they were told to; those that refused, were systematically undermined, attacked and harassed until their places were taken by obedient apparatus servants.

In the United States, more characteristically, the party membership was browbeaten and blackjacked into a condemnation of "The Lessons of October" without ever having read it! The obscure "Inprecorr" containing the document was never sent here. The work was published only long afterwards in England, by a non-Communist, and although perhaps one or two people out of a million in this country have ever read it, the American party was nevertheless one of the first to rush to the assistance of the Comintern bureaucracy with a sharp condemnation of the "Trotskyist attack upon

the Old Guard". Since then such a procedure has been raised to the level of a routine system. . . .

The attempt was subsequently made, as we mentioned, to make Brandler the scapegoat for the whole defeat. This attempt was resisted by Trotsky, who knew the real source of the catastrophic policy pursued. Because he opposed the policy of finding scapegoats, the legend was thereupon circulated that Trotsky was a defector of the German party leaders. There is not and never was the faintest sign of truth in the legend. Not only did Brandler and Thalheimer promptly join Zinoviev and Co. with a condemnation of "The Lessons of October" (they were among the first, as a matter of fact!), but it was later proved by documentary evidence that it was Stalin and Zinoviev who not merely defended Brandler but have been the ones mainly responsible for the German policy in 1923.

In 1926, after Zinoviev had broken with Stalin, he made public a letter which Stalin had written to him and Bucharin on the eve of the German defeat. The letter gives us the measure of the man, his limited, myopic outlook, his disastrous political course, his ineradicable co-responsibility for the calamity in Germany and its subsequent consequences.

The confidential archives of most of the other leaders would undoubtedly reveal similar documents to indicate that in 1923 they played the same role in the

German revolution, with fatal results, as they sought to play in the Russian revolution of 1917 but were prevented from playing by the sharp intervention of Lenin and Trotsky.

The defeat of the German revolution, plus the crushing of the September 1923 insurrection in Bulgaria and the Estonian putsch of 1924, marked a sharp turn in the history of the Communist International. It not only opened up the epoch of "bourgeois stabilization" in Europe and the ebbing of the revolutionary high-tide, but inaugurated a period of reaction in the Soviet republic and the international. Above all, it was the objective cause for the introduction and the triumph of the reactionary theory of "socialism in one country". It is with this question, and with the Fifth Congress—the first non-Leninist gathering—of the International, that we shall deal in the next article.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

### SPARTACUS YOUTH CLUB NOTICE

The Spartacus Youth Club has changed the night of its meeting. It will now meet Friday evenings, 8:00 P. M. at Stuyvesant Casino. This will enable many comrades to attend who could not do so when the club met on Sunday. The next meeting will take place Friday, May 13, 8:00 P. M. at Stuyvesant Casino, 2nd Ave., and 9th St.

## Now on the Press!

### Problems of the Chinese Revolution

by LEON TROTSKY

THE 1925-27 CHINESE REVOLUTION WAS ONE OF THE FIRST WORLD-IMPORTANT POLITICAL EVENTS IN WHICH TROTSKY'S OPPOSITION TO THE POLICY OF STALIN MANIFESTED ITSELF IN THE CONCRETE. IN THIS BOOK, QUOTATIONS FROM STALIN'S OWN WRITTEN WORDS AND SPEECHES ARE GIVEN AS WELL AS THOSE OF TROTSKY'S AND HIS SUPPORTERS.

READ THIS HISTORICAL DOCUMENT. COMPARE THE PROPOSED POLICIES OF THAT DAY WITH SUBSEQUENT EVENTS IN THE CHINESE REVOLUTION, THEN DECIDE WHO WAS CORRECT. THE LEFT OPPOSITION DOES NOT FEAR YOUR JUDGMENT AFTER YOU HAVE SERIOUSLY READ AND STUDIED THIS BOOK.

PAPER COVER \$1.00 CLOTH BOUND \$1.50

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

Money Is Needed

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th Street,  
New York, N. Y.



## EDITORIAL NOTES

### BRING THE UNITY NEGOTIATIONS INTO THE OPEN!

(Continued from page 1)

Since the position of the Left Opposition on the subject of Party unity, as on all other important issues, is founded on principle, a consistency in its expressions on the matter from time to time can be noted. From our first statement in regard to unity at the Plenum which confirmed our expulsion three and one-half years ago, through the various occasions on which we again raised the question in timely communications to the Party until the present day, we have been guided by the example and teaching of our incomparable leaders, the Russian Bolshevik-Leninists. Just as they, in their platform and in all subsequent declarations, affirmed their desire to remain in the Party, and their willingness to defend their views by the normal processes of Party democracy and Party discipline, so we have always protested against our enforced separation from the Party. We never made any special demands that were not taken for granted and enjoyed by every party member in Lenin's time, and we do not take them now.

Our chief concern, that transcends all other considerations, is the return of the Party and the Comintern to the foundation principles of Marxism. Since 1928, first within the Party and afterward as an expelled group, we have advocated, on all the important questions of the day, the Marxist line of the International Left Opposition against the opportunist and adventurist zig-zags of official Centrism. These views, the correctness of which has been confirmed in every case by the events of the class struggle, we still maintain. We have nothing to repent and nothing to retract.

Unity for us cannot be the formula for a reconciliation with the treacherous policy of the Stalinist bureaucracy, but a condition for the more advantageous struggle against it. The rectification of the truly enormous errors and crimes, not the least of which are the ruinous splits that have been imposed upon the workers' vanguard, will take place only in the course of the most relentless Bolshevik fight against the bureaucrats of Stalinism, and will be finally assured only with their downfall. In order that the workers who sincerely desire the unification of the Party may have no illusions as to its actual meaning, this must be said directly, openly and plainly.

They are deceivers of the Communist workers who, abusing their good will, preach "unity" and capitulate the general sentiment for it without speaking of the principle causes of the demoralizing and splits. No better are those worthless *intriguants* who dicker over "unity" in a dark corner without even informing the workers what is going on, like commission merchants with so many head of livestock at their disposal. No, the first step toward a genuine unification of the Communist forces must be a frank statement of the different positions and the present attitude towards them. All the wishes in the world will not bring unity for struggle in any other way.

This is not to say, of course, that the differences must be settled beforehand, or that the platform of the Left Opposition must be accepted as a condition for unity. We have never demanded that. The demand of the Left Opposition is for Party democracy, as Lenin's party defined and practiced it. A free and open discussion of the disputes within the framework of the Party. A convention whose delegates are fairly and honestly selected on the basis of the discussion. A leadership freely elected by the membership and subject to its control. The right of the minority to work in

the party and to advance its viewpoint a second, a third or a tenth time on proper occasion, within the limits of the party constitution. This is the way Lenin's party clarified its policies, corrected its errors, chose its leaders and safeguarded its unity.

Nobody has invented any other method, and nobody can. The Stalinist substitute only succeeded in derailing the Party from the Marxist track, crushing the initiative of the membership and celebrating its "monolithic unity" with split after split. It is the horrible bankruptcy of this Stalinist substitute that compels the Party membership to think of unity again in terms of Leninism, and to seek a way for the inclusion of the Left Opposition.

There is no doubt that the present objective circumstances accentuate the harmful results of the splits and the consequent weakening of the Party before its class enemies. The sharpening of the class struggle at home, the increasingly heavy blows dealt to the militant workers by the entrenched reaction, the rumbling of impending revolutionary struggles abroad—all this gives a powerful impulse to the sentiments for unity within the Party ranks. The Left Opposition, which has no special interests separate from those of the class and the vanguard, will do all in its power to strengthen this current and help it to realize its aims. From this point of view the last meeting of the National Committee of the Communist League decided to approach the Party once again with an appeal for unity and a series of practical proposals for its realization.

The first of these proposals, which will be transmitted to the Party within the week, will ask the reinstatement of the Left Opposition without any conditions except the rights of Party democracy, and with an undertaking to assume any duties or responsibilities whatever which are assigned to us by the Party.

The second proposal, to be applied immediately while the matter of formal reinstatement remains pending, is that the Party accept the cooperation of the Left Opposition in the class struggle actions, in the trade unions and other organization and on every front where the pressure of the class enemy is heaviest. The Left Opposition will take its place in the front ranks of every struggle without exception and will demonstrate its revolutionary qualities there now as it has in the past. The Oppositionists are ready to prove by deeds their right to work with the Party militants. They will prove by deeds their right to be in the Party.

In the Party or temporarily outside of it, cooperating with the Party in united front struggles or denied the right to participate in them—whatever the circumstances of the moment, the Left Opposition will retain its principle positions, and above all its internationalism. We are united for life and death with the true inheritors of the October revolution, the Bolshevik-Leninists of Soviet Russia and the international organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists which now embraces the world. We do not seek a solution of the problem of unity on a national basis; we do not separate our cause from theirs. If we are readmitted to the American Party our first demand in free discussion will be:

Reinstate the expelled oppositionists in Russia and all other sections of the Comintern! Recall Trotsky from Constantinople and Rakovsky from Siberia! Release the thousands and tens of thousands of Bolshevik-Leninists from the Stalinist prisons and exile camps and restore them to their rightful place in the Party. That and only that will give a revolutionary, international substance to the slogan of Communist Unity.

• • • • •

### REPLY TO COMRADE BOJARSKY

A worker who apparently agrees in part with the trade union policy of the Communist League has criticized the article on the elections in Local 9 of the I. L. G. W. U. which appeared in the issue of April 16th. In order that his differences may be fairly presented, his letter is printed in full on the correspondence page. The doubts we expressed about the genuineness of the victory of the Left wing in the Local 9 elections are attributed by the writer of the letter, comrade Bojarsky, to misinformation about the conditions in this local and the relation of forces between the contending groups. If that were really the case we would have no hesitancy in acknowledging and correcting the error, since honest information is the prerequisite for intelligent and enlightening discussion. But a closer investigation of the matter, including the consultation of a number of informed workers in the needle trades, to whom comrade Bojarsky's letter was shown, has convinced us that our first article was correct, in fact as well as in inference.

As a proof of the strength of the Left group in Local 9 comrade Bojarsky says it "was the first to defeat the \$3.75 tax proposed by the International Administration." If the Left alone had fought this tax, and the other two groups—the Right as well as the "Progressive Bloc"—had defended it, then the defeat of the tax would indeed have been an indication of the strength of the Left. But this is not exactly so. The "Progressive Bloc" was also against the tax, and since this group controls the administration of the local, which in itself is a demonstration of its strength, it is manifestly wrong to conclude that the defeat of the tax showed the supremacy of the Left. We sympathize with the "patriotic" loyalty to the Left which our correspondent shows. But we do not in the least help the cause of the Left by closing our eyes to realities and making exaggerated and easily refuted claims regarding its accomplishments.

Comrade Bojarsky also disputes our statement that the "Left wing group in the local came to life only recently and has played very little part in the life of the Local." Against that he says the group "has been in existence since 1930 and was incorporated into the officially organized Left wing groups in March, 1931." Here again, in our opinion, the criticism is not a refutation. We did not speak of the "existence" of the group, but of its "coming to life" and "playing a part in the life of the Local." These expressions were used deliberately. After the practical elimination of the Industrial Union from this field the Left wing workers in shops under control of the Schlesinger union were obliged to register again. Their eventual formation into a group within the old union was inevitable. But they could not play a really effective part in the struggles within the union. And why? Because the policy of the Party and the official Left wing made it impossible.

First the Party and the Industrial Union declared the I. L. G. W. U. a "company union" and forbade an organized struggle within it. (See the resolutions of the Industrial Union Convention.) It denounced as a "reformist illusion" of the Trotskyites, the idea that it could be transformed into an organ of the class struggle. This insane policy could not stand up under the test of the actual developments. Then the Stalinists "changed" it—in the typical Stalinist way, without saying so, and without changing the theory which motivated it. As a result there was a period during which the Left members were organized into a group within the "company union" for the purpose of splitting away little sections. This middle-headed strategy also suffered a collapse. How can you build a real fighting force within a union if you announce in advance your intention of breaking it up?

Thus it was only recently, that the Party, while still muttering the "com-

## On the Anniversary of Marx's Birth

(Continued from last issue)

Karl Marx in his early youth became a disciple of Hegel. It is not our purpose here to attempt to take up the Hegelian concept more than to say that it represented one of the first serious and thorough endeavors to break with the philosophy of the past—particularly that of the middle ages—which conceived of all things as fixed, constant and eternal, and to formulate in its place a new logic in accordance with the universal process of evolution. The essence of this was the dialectic.

To Marx, the dialectic became the method of investigation of social and economic phenomena. Through it he formulated his materialist conception of history, which belongs entirely to Marx, and Engels. But with that discovery he also separated the dialectic method from the Hegelian mysticism and idealism. It became dialectic materialism. It revolutionized the science of history.

By the means of the materialist conception Marx was able really to explain the course of history, not only in so far as it relates to the past, but also its future stages. That became possible because this conception proceeds from the basis of the economic conditions of each society. It holds that the relations of production, of each given stage are the foundation for its social order, the foundation for its legal and political superstructure, as well as for its division into contending classes. Marx did not discover the existence of classes or the class struggle. That was known long before him. But he added the contribution that its existence is bound up with, and is the result of, certain phases of the material production. He added also the essential contribution that the oppressed class today, the modern proletariat, in achieving its own emancipation must thereby liberate society as a whole from class divisions. Now this will be accomplished through its various stages Marx stated in precise formulation in his letter to Weydemeyer, written in 1852, in part it reads as follows:

"... the class struggle leads necessarily to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat; this dictatorship is but the transition to the abolition of all classes and to the creation of a society of free and equal."

There could be no clearer exposition of the materialist conception of history than this statement. It pictures the results of the relations of production, and the social organization necessarily following from it, traced to its logical conclusion. Yet it skips none of its stages, but clearly and decisively specifies the form of class rule of the proletariat during the transition period, the period between capitalism and Communism and "pany union" idiosyncrasy, gave directives for a more sensible participation of the Left group in the internal affairs of the Local. The fight against the tax was one sign of this turn. The participation in the recent elections was another. But there is yet a long way to go. The correction of the Left policy has only begun. A radical change must yet take place, both in theory and practice, before the Left wing can even become a serious contender for supremacy. To contend that this supremacy has already been demonstrated comrade Bojarsky had to deceive himself as to the obvious facts.

After the reports of the convention of the International and the Plenum of the Industrial Union are received we will return to this subject again. Meantime both the *Militant* and the *Unser Kampf* will be glad to print the opinions of the needle trades workers as to the facts and the inferences to be drawn from them. How does the Left wing stand now and how can it regain its lost positions? Letters on this theme, whether they coincide with our views or not, will be welcomed.

—J. P. C.

the economic transformation of the one into the other. Truly, with the discovery of the materialist conception of history, Socialism became elevated to a science. Yet, how pitiful are those contemptible charlatans who claim adherence to scientific Socialism but reject the Proletarian Dictatorship—that is, under the guise of the common phrase, "it might be alright for Russia, but not in America." The truth about them is that they do not at all accept the essence of Marxism—the forceful overthrow of the capitalist system. They do not accept this sum and substance of all Marx's teachings—the Proletarian Dictatorship. There is not a shred of the revolutionary in them.

Engels says of the Communist Manifesto, that, "the fundamental proposition, which forms its nucleus, belongs to Marx." Here is traced, distinctly in the light of the materialist conception, the historical development which established the capitalist system, from the serfs of the middle ages to the burghers of the earliest towns; and next, to the first elements of the bourgeoisie. Shattering the feudal guild monopoly emerged the manufacturing system. "Thereupon, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry. . . . Each step in the development of the bourgeois was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class. . . . the bourgeoisie has at last, since the establishment of Modern Industry and of the world market, conquered for itself, in the modern representative State, exclusive political sway." The Manifesto could therefore lay down the postulate that the class struggle is essentially a political struggle and that the proletariat must elevate itself to become the ruling class led to this goal by its revolutionary vanguard.

To this we shall here add further only by quoting the proposition: "In place of the old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations". Apparently forgotten, within leading circles of the Communist parties today, are these words. Apparently forgotten is also the conclusion which Marx drew of the social, the international character of the proletarian revolution. In its place has been substituted the theory of Socialism in One Country with disastrous consequences to the world Communist movement.

Viewing the developments in the great French revolution in historical retrospect Marx noted its continuous upward progress. The rule of the Constitutionallists was followed by that of the Girondists and then by the Jacobins. Each advancing force needing the indispensable support of the next succeeding one. "When each party, in turn, had conducted the revolution as far as it could or dared, and wanted to cry halt, it was pushed aside by the bolder spirits who had hitherto supported it, and cleared away by the guillotine." But the proletariat, as Marx observed, had not yet emerged as a separate and distinct force out of the third estate.

In the fateful events of 1848-50, and preceding them, in the July days, 1830, in France as well as the large scale strikes in England in 1842 and in Silesian weavers' insurrection in 1844, the proletariat had emerged as a distinct class but still remained an appendage of the middle class parties. Marx noted that these movements, inspired by Communism on the continent and by Chartism in England could no longer be looked upon as chance phenomena, but were an expression of the aspirations of an oppressed class. And, after the June defeat in France of 1848, Marx could draw the conclusion for the proletariat

which groups itself "more and more around revolutionary Socialism, around Communism." . . . "This Socialism," he said, "is the declaration of permanent revolution, the establishment of the Class Dictatorship of the Proletariat as a necessary step towards the abolition of class distinctions in general, towards the abolition of all the conditions of production on which class distinctions depend, towards the abolition of all the social relations which depend on these conditions of production, towards the revolutionizing of all ideas which emanate from these social relations."

Once again we can add, that here we have, on the basis of the concrete proletarian experiences, the materialist conception of history applied and set down with an indelible imprint for the future.

The revolutionary events during Marx's life time closed with the Paris Commune. The proletariat had then reached a distinct independent class position, though not yet, as Marx observed, a position of revolutionary maturity and preparation. It had not yet created its revolutionary party. Its heroic attempt to maintain a proletarian regime was circumvented essentially because of these weaknesses. And it was on this experience that Marx, in his address to the General Council of the International, made his masterful analysis, culminating in the terse statement: "But the working class cannot simply lay hold on the ready made state machinery and wield it for its own purpose." In these words are again forcefully reiterated the conclusions from the realists of the material world. Today they serve as the proletarian revolutionary strategy.

Our task is today, clearer than ever, to proceed on the foundation of Marxism and to fully comprehend what Marx embodied in his thesis to Feuerbach: "Up to the present the philosophers have but interpreted the world; it is, however, necessary to change it."

We witness today the completion of the process of a dialectic cycle in human society. We have reached the last and final period of the capitalist epoch. The blood and tears in which the pages of the history of its birth were written is again being shed at this stage of its violent decay and collapse. It is giving birth to a new and higher stage. The world is being changed. A glorious beginning was made by the proletarian revolution in Russia. In that we saw the theoretical system of Marx applied and brought to its first victorious conclusion. But in that we found also the closest approximation to the life long revolutionary friendship of Marx and Engels in the unshakable friendship and harmony of views, during the decisive revolutionary events, of Lenin and Trotsky.

The gigantic vision, the enormous and all embracing perspective unfolded in the closing paragraph of the concise statement of his materialist conception of history which Marx embodied in his introduction to the "Critique of Political Economy", is about to be realized. It reads as follows: "The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production . . . the productive forces developing in the womb of bourgeois society create the material conditions for the solution of that antagonism. This social formation constitutes, therefore, the closing chapter of the prehistoric stage of human society."

—ARNE SWABECK.

### MINNEAPOLIS, ATTENTION!

The Minneapolis comrades have arranged a **JAMBOREE** for Saturday night, May 21st, 8 P. M. at the home of the Ulrichson's 4627 Colfax Ave., No. for the benefit of the Left Opposition Press and as a send off for the N. E. C. comrades leaving for the Plenum. All comrades and sympathizers of *The Militant* and *Unser Kampf*, as well as *Young Spartacus* are urgently invited to attend. An unusually interesting program is promised. Johnson, Curran and Miles Dunne have their heads together. Nuff said. Bring your friends!

—THE COMMITTEE.

## Stalinist Zig-zags on the Question of the «United Front»

by LEON TROTSKY

(Continued from last issue)

Everyone should read *THE INFANTILE DISEASE OF LEFTISM*; today it is the timeliest of timely books. It is in reference to just such situations as the present one in Germany that Lenin speaks of—we quote verbatim—"the absolute necessity for the vanguard of the proletariat, for its class conscious section, for the Communist party to resort to tacking and veering in its course, to agreements and compromises with different proletarian groups, with different parties of workers and of small proprietors. . . . The whole matter lies in being able to apply this tactic for the sake of raising and not lowering the common level of proletarian class consciousness, of the revolutionary spirit, and of the capacity to fight and to win."

But what steps does the Communist party take? Day in and day out, it reiterates in its newspapers that the only United Front it will accept, "is the one directed against Bruening, Severing, Leipart, Hitler and their ilk." In the face of a proletarian uprising, there is no gainsaying it, there will be no difference between Bruening, Severing, Leipart, and Hitler. Against the October Bolshevik uprising, the S. R.'s and the mensheviks united with the Cadets and Kornilov; Kerensky led the Black Hundreds and the Cos-

sacks of General Krasnov against Petrograd; the mensheviks supported Kerensky and Krasnov; the S. R.'s engineered the uprising of the junkers under the leadership of monarchist officers.

But this doesn't at all mean that Bruening, Severing, Leipart and Hitler *always* and *under all conditions* belong to the same camp. Just now their interests diverge. At the *given* moment the question that is posed before the social democracy is not so much one of defending the foundations of capitalist society against proletarian revolution as of defending the semi-parliamentarian bourgeois system against Fascism. The refusal to make use of this antagonism would be an act of gross stupidity.

"To wage war for the purpose of overthrowing the international bourgeoisie," Lenin wrote in *THE INFANTILE DISEASE OF LEFTISM*, "and to refuse beforehand to tack and veer in one's course and to make good use of the antagonism (*no matter how temporary*) in interests between the enemies; to eschew agreements and compromises with possible (*no matter how temporary, vacillating and adventitious*) allies—isn't that too funny for words?" Again we quote verbatim: the word we italicize in parentheses are Lenin's.

We quote further: "It is possible to vanquish a

more powerful enemy only by straining one's forces to their utmost; and it is imperative that one make use, most painstakingly, carefully, cautiously and expertly, of any "rift" between the enemies, no matter how tiny." But what are Thaelmann and Remmele under Manuisky's guidance doing? With might and main they are striving to cement—with the theory of social Fascism and with the practice of sabotage against the United Front, the rift—and what a rift—between the social democracy and Fascism.

Lenin enjoined that use be made of "every opportunity to gain a mass ally, no matter how temporary, vacillating, unreliable, and adventitious. Whoever hasn't been able to get that into his head—he said—doesn't understand an iota of Marxism, and of contemporary scientific socialism, in general." Prick up your ears, prophets of the new Stalinist school: it is written here in black and white that you don't understand an iota of Marxism. It's you Lenin spoke of. R. S. V. P.

But, the Stalinists refute, without a victory over the social democracy, victory over Fascism is impossible. Is this true? In a *certain* sense it is. Yet the converse theorem is also true: without victory over Italian Fascism, victory over the Italian social democracy is impossible. Both Fascism and the social democracy are tools in the hands of the bourgeoisie. So long as capital rules, Fascism and social democracy will exist in divers combinations. All the questions, therefore, are reduced to the same denominator: the proletariat must overthrow the bourgeois régime.

But just now, when this régime is tottering in Germany, Fascism steps forward in its support. To lay this supporter by the heels, we are told, it is first necessary to finish off the social democracy. . . . Thus we are led into a vicious circle by schematism dead

as a herring. The only conceivable way out is in the domain of action. And the character of this action is determined not by juggling abstract categories but by the real interrelations between the living historic forces.

"On, no!" the functionaries keep drumming, "we shall 'first' liquidate the social democracy. How? Very simply, we shall order our party organizations to recruit 100,000 new members within such and such a period. Instead of political struggle—merely propaganda; instead of dialectic strategy—departmental plans. And what if the real development of the class struggle, at this very moment, has posed the question of Fascism before the working class, as a life and death question? Then the working class must be wheeled about with its back to the question; it must be lulled; it must be convinced that the task of fighting against Fascism is a minor task; that it will wait and solve itself; that Fascism in reality rules already; that Hitler will add nothing new; that there is no cause to fear Hitler; that Hitler will only clear the road for the Communists.

Is that exaggerating, perhaps? No, this is the exact and indubitable idea that motivates the leaders of the Communist party. They do not always follow it to its ultimate conclusion. On coming in contact with the masses they recoil often from the ultimate conclusions; they make a hodge-podge of divers policies, confusing themselves and the workers; but on all those occasions when they try to make both ends meet, they proceed from the inevitability of the victory of Fascism.

—L. TROTSKY.

(To be Continued)

(FROM WHAT NEXT?—Vital Questions for the German Proletariat)