

**WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE**

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

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

VOLUME V, NO. 21 [WHOLE NO. 117]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1932

PRICE 5 CENTS

Congress Talks Unemployment Relief For the Workers - Only the Jingle of the Government Coin

Events are moving swifter than usual in the United States Congress. There hangs over it the threatening cloud of the huge unemployed army, growing more hungry, more sullen, and showing signs of restlessness, and for the relief of which the government has done absolutely nothing. The swifter moves are undoubtedly inspired by the fear that is foreshadowed in the dastardly police shootings in Dearborn and in Melrose Park. The agents of privilege in the Senate and in the House are as deliberately arrogant, as were the savage "upholders of the law" when they faced the starving workers in these two places. The latter instances indicate the more concrete side of how the capitalist government really intends to deal with the unemployment problem. This is where capitalism revealed itself in its true nature.

Yet this fear is the outstanding motive force behind the events in Congress. With that follows the scurrying for special consideration and for special gains for the various privileged interests from any measure contemplated to restore "prosperity". In addition, it is an election year, and the lawmakers have enough at stake to maneuver for the most favorable position.

There is a national treasury deficit now of over \$2,500,000,000 giving incontrovertible testimony to the crisis in capitalism. The Congress is still struggling with the balancing of its budget. Bipartisan alliances are made feverishly and broken up again. Clashes of special group interests bring forth epithets such as "dastardly lies" and "damnable lies". Senators and Representatives vociferously proclaim their "honesty" in the face of the heavy lobby bribes.

The insurgents—the so-called progressives, headed by La Guardia, La Follette, Costigan, etc.—sponsoring the interests of the embattled petty bourgeoisie, were the first to become vociferous. The proposed manufacturers' sales tax went down to defeat. It caused the majority leader in the House, Rainey, to declare gravely, with words to this effect: you gentlemen have gone further toward socialization of property than any nation outside of Soviet Russia. The administration omnibus bill was shaved down to leave almost nothing. And the deficit remains. Meanwhile the leaders of industry and finance, "suffering" under the crisis, and clamoring ever more loudly for their pound of flesh. So, now the heavy hitting artillery is moving forward in Congress. But mobilized are also the pitiable efforts of the reactionary trade union leaders.

Representatives of seven leading railroad unions have declared to the President that unless immediate steps are taken to increase employment and relieve distress, they, "will be obliged to demand a dole". What a terrifying threat! And so, to apply immediately the necessary soothing, they come forward with the Smith Debt Plan. They propose the President to appoint a commission composed of five representatives, one for labor, one for the farmers, two outstanding business leaders and one financial expert. This commission is to stimulate trade and export from the United States. Their plan at once won the approval of democratic politicians. And why not? It is as cast in their own mold. Now these trade union flunkies want to appear in the lion's role. When facing the wage cut demands of the railroad magnates they were, however, meek as rabbits. But they have now again only the idea in mind of greater collaboration with the outright capitalist representatives in making the counterfeited relief measures seem palatable to the workers and help pull the wool over their eyes. Never for once would they entertain the idea of even calling upon their union phalanx to exert the pressure of their numbers or to utilize their strategic position, of moving the wheels of transport, to fight for their right to live, and to resist the onslaughts upon them.

The "relief" measures proposed in Congress are practically all of the same character. There is no real difference between the proposals of Senator Robinson and President Hoover. Both embody a \$2,500,000,000 plan for "relief". That is, only about \$300,000,000 of this is to go to the various states and municipalities to be doled out in miserable charity rations. The fat morsel, the \$2,000,000,000, is to become tax exempt bonds to be used for private profit making enterprises. Politely, they are called self-liquidating enterprises.

Here we have the outrageous arrogance of a capitalist government. The existing unemployment situation has long ago called for unemployment insurance for the millions of jobless and penniless workers. A few miserable charity crumbs to them is all so far. And there is no indication that actual relief, that actual unemployment insurance will be granted until the workers sufficiently arouse their latent mass power to compel consideration over the opposition of the capitalist politicians.

On the other hand, the tax exempt bonds advocated in Hoover's proposal for investment for further exploitation, is to be handled through the Finance Reconstruction Corporation. What that will mean, is indicated in the very first "relief" loan granted by this institution to the Missouri Pacific railroad, half of which went to pay maturing loans to Wall Street bankers. It will mean investments to fatten dividends and strengthen the capitalists to administer further wage cuts.

Some of the more sceptical of Wall Street's uncrowned kings predict that this new bond flotation will cause inflation. Not that they are opposed to inflation. These real magnates support the Goldsborough bill, which went over with a whoop in the House of Representatives and provides for authorization to the Federal Reserve to elevate the price level to the bourgeois prosperity period of 1921-29.

Truly the United States Congress is making headway toward its capitalist relief. Nothing could please this whole gentry more than to actually accomplish, by strengthened monopoly, a higher commodity price level. What with workers' wages already drastically reduced and the coupon clippers strengthened to administer more cuts, the higher price level should seem doubly enticing.

One of the tasks of the heavier artillery, now moving forward in Congress, is to harmonize the conflicting capitalist group interests. An illustration of one of such problems is afforded in the proposed billion dollar tax bill in the Senate. It contains tariff clauses which immediately became controversial. Representatives of one set of capitalists clamoring for duty on certain products for their investment protection while others, who have the opposite interests, are opposed. This is nothing new. It has just become more glaringly expressed in their present political dilemma.

Yet, through all the clashing conflicts reflected in these higher governmental brackets emerges one common and united aim; namely, to advance the counterfeited relief measures, shielding the real ones for the investors, to ward off the working class drift toward the Left. Unquestionably Congress has so far succeeded in attracting the favorable attention of the more credulous among the masses. Will the capitalist politicians attain their aim of changing the working class leftward trend so as to more easily defeat its demands and crush its growing aspirations? That is the important question.

Much valuable time has already been lost by the failure of the official Communist party leadership to take the elementary steps to build a serious movement which would begin to unite employed and unemployed workers. But there is yet a rich opportunity available. There is now a better opportunity for the workers to learn, by actual experience, what can be expected from the bourgeois parliamentary talking shop. They will learn more concretely that the United States Congress, the same as all other capitalist parliaments, are institutions for the protection of capitalist interests and for the keeping of the workers in subjection.

—A. S.

More About the Unity Negotiations

We have received the following letter from a Party member:

Dear Comrades:

I didn't know you were going to print my first letter. Otherwise I would have left out that part about Gannes and the "Soviet-American Alliance", or asked you to delete it. This "clue" started a buzzing and a search for the "P" who gives out information about the "private affairs" of our leaders. However, there was no harm done.

The upper circles are buzzing with discussion of the unity proposition, and the negotiations with Lovestone are still going on sub rosa. The article of Gitlow in the *Workers' Age* is false in one respect at least, in so far as it gives the impression that negotiations have been suspended. On the contrary—this is absolutely straight from a member of the Polcom—the C. I. man personally held conferences with Lovestone since the publication of the last letter. A short while ago he left the country and Lovestone took him to the boat. My personal opinion remains as before—that an actual agreement is pending and will be concluded. I will go further and say that, in my opinion, the political side of the question is more or less settled and that the final agreement hinges now on forms and organizational position. I haven't enough facts to prove this, but there is enough to warrant the deduction.

For one thing, the tension over the question in the top circles and the extremely serious and concrete manner in

which the possible return of Lovestone is talked about among them is a sufficient indication that they expect a positive outcome of the negotiations. You can't get them to make positive statements of their attitude one way or the other. And when that is contrasted to their previous campaign it indicates to me that they expect something to happen. At any rate they do not want to be caught off guard by any instructions they receive after the C. I. man makes his report in Moscow.

The final decision will be made over there, but the general line of it is already clear. Lovestone will be required to make a political capitulation and to dissociate himself from Brandler. Thus the prestige of the infallible leadership will be maintained. After the capitulation—which in my judgment is agreed upon already—the organizational adjustments will be worked out and we will celebrate our "ideological victory" over the Right wing by readmitting them to the Party.

By the way, some of the comrades who took the campaign against Lovestone seriously have been looking rather hard at Stachel lately, since the stories about his part in the unity conferences came out. If I told you what one of the old hard-boiled Fosterites said to me, you couldn't print it. At the Forum week before last someone in the audience asked him if he had been conducting negotiations with Lovestone, and then skipped on with his learned exposition of some point or other which I can't remember. I guess it wasn't very important.

—F.

Help Save Our Weekly Militant!

Save the Weekly MILITANT! Since last week's appeal our financial position has become worse. Bills continue to weigh on us with Alpine pressure. The situation is crippling all our efforts. We must have money. We must have it at once.

The problem of getting paper and ink for each week's run of THE MILITANT is solved only by Herculean efforts. To make sure that each issue will appear regularly our comrades, readers and sympathizers should respond NOW with donations.

The struggle of the working class against the ravages of the crisis, the onslaughts of the bosses will go on. But will the voice of the Left Opposition continue to be heard regularly every week through its press? Will the Left Opposition be able to influence these struggles as effectively? That is the question that faces us.

Every comrade, every reader, every

sympathizer must realize the extreme urgency of the situation, the categorical nature of the issue which the situation presents. And he must realize, too, that only prompt assistance will pull us through.

In Cleveland last summer we saw unemployed workers pay their last nickels for copies of THE MILITANT. From everywhere we receive expressions of the esteem in which THE MILITANT is held, of its importance, of its necessity for workers. It is known and eagerly looked for from coast to coast.

Will THE MILITANT continue to speak our point of view to these workers regularly every week? Will our most powerful weapon in the struggle for the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky, for the ideas of revolutionary internationalism—will this clarion of the international proletarian revolution continue to appear weekly? THAT DEPENDS ON YOU.

The Philadelphia Convention of the I. L. G. W. U.

The I. L. G. W. U. Convention just concluded at Philadelphia marked, as it were, the official close of a period in the historic struggle between the Left wing and the Socialist-Forwards bureaucracy. It was a temporary triumph for the Schlesinger clique. The correlation of forces of the various factions and groups, as reflected at the convention, is indicative of the process of entrenchment of the Right wing after its erstwhile defeats in the protracted struggle with the Left wing, a process that has been going on in the face of objective conditions favorable for the Left wing, in the face of growing discontent on part of the membership and the recently developed opposition in the three large locals in New York, led by the Anarchist-Lovestonite bloc.

The whole character of the convention was reminiscent of traditional I. L. G. W. U. Conventions prior to the historic encounter between the Right and the Left. The Schlesinger clique ruled the convention, while behind the scenes, deals for offices and other spoils were being concluded under the close supervision of Abe Cahan and Morris Hilquit.

Schlesinger's opening speech at the convention was remarkable for its lack of content and for its demagoguery. The vital problems concerning the membership of the union and the satisfaction of their pressing needs were not at all touched upon in his speech, except for the financial difficulties caused by the decrease in the amount of dues to the organization and the debts incurred during the fight with the Left wing. He spoke of the economic crisis and the cures for it, repeating the banalities and the reformist twaddle of solving the crisis by high wages and full employment. He indulged in talk about "unity" and "harmony", the "solidification of the ranks" and the "common cause." As to policies and tasks for real struggle to resist the growing attacks of the bosses on the conditions of the workers in the industry, as to how to satisfy the need of the

workers in the industry for real unity—Schlesinger did not deem it important to raise these issues. He felt perfectly safe in the surrounding atmosphere of a convention packed with his own henchmen, in which the rank and file of the membership and the genuine Left wing were feebly represented.

A great deal of time and attention was, however, given by the convention to listening to demagogic speeches of "labor leaders" and bourgeois politicians who left perfectly at home there, having come at the invitation of the Schlesinger clique for the obvious purpose of preying upon the time and energy of the delegates and preventing the discussion of important problems.

Among the celebrities who addressed the convention was the mayor of Philadelphia, Moore, whose bloody suppression of the May Day demonstration only a short time before the convention did not stand in the way of his invitation as a "friend of labor". He was even heartily applauded after his vituperative speech about Communists and all other sorts of radicals. The only rebuke came from the president of the Philadelphia Central Labor Trades, Adolph Hirschberg. It was one discordant note in a generally harmonious performance. This seemingly insignificant episode can serve as the best illustration of the reactionary character and composition of the gathering.

The accomplishments of the convention can be summarized in the following acts against the interests of the membership of the union:

The convention defeated, with its packed majority, all the progressive resolutions purporting to curtail the power

Beet Workers Go on Strike in Colorado

Ten thousand workers, mostly Mexicans, are out on strike in the northern part of Colorado. The strike breaks simultaneously with the opening of the picking season which runs a short course. This imposes on the strikers the necessity of quick and effective spreading of the strike and the determined use of means to prevent scabbing. On the other hand it means that the growers will in all probability move with speed to break the strike. The history of strike struggles in this area seem to indicate that the strike will assume a violent form. The *Daily Worker* reports that the sheriff of Weld County is proceeding to swear in a number of deputy sheriffs. The state militia has been ordered to stand by.

A U. P. dispatch to the Rocky Mountain News, published in Denver, says that the growers offered the workers one fifth of the gross crop at the end of the season. The workers answered with a demand of a minimum of \$23 an acre and a cash advance to carry them over. A United Front Committee is leading the strike. It is known that the T. U. U. L. organized and is actually leading the strike. This is as it should be. On the other hand there is no reason why the T. U. U. L. should not appear before the whole working class as the leader of the strike.

At the time of going to press details of the strike situation are very meager. But even at this distance one fact stands out: ten thousand workers under Communist leadership have thrown down the gauntlet of battle to their masters and said that they will fight for the right to live.

GREET MORGENSTERN AND GOODMAN at the New York Branch Plenary, Sunday, May 29, Tippetts Brook Park.

The Political Crisis of Japanese Imperialism

During the past few weeks the lull in the Far Eastern developments has once more been broken. The Manchurian adventure and its effects are making themselves felt with particular intensity. For months, the Japanese invasion of China and the occupation of Manchuria have been characterized by a rather slow evolution. The contradictions in the interests of the various imperialist powers have to a large extent held back the Tokyo brigands from going the full length of their intentions. It was for this reason that they were forced to conclude the "truce" of Shanghai.

In Manchuria, the constitution of the new Manchu-Kuo state and the efforts of the Nipponese to solidify it as a base of operations have been marked with persistent guerilla warfare throughout the country, scattered groups putting up a stubborn resistance against the invad-

ers. The colonizing and stabilizing enterprises of the Japanese master class have consumed tremendous sums, the yield for which, they know, at best lies in the very distant future. The expenses for their adventure abroad have not as yet been met and are continuing to accrue in ever greater volume. The credit relations with foreign finance capital have not been lubricated by these conditions either.

Effects of the Crisis

As a consequence, the economic crisis, which began as part of the general crisis of capitalism after the Wall Street crash of October 1929, has been considerably aggravated. The economic distress of the masses is greater than ever. Industry is at a standstill more than ever before.

That discontent and unrest should develop on a large scale, with this situation for a background, is only to be expected. It is still too hard to gauge the extent and to recognize the direction which this discontent and unrest is taking. But it is certain that the present political super-structure of the Mikado's empire is extremely shaky. Political and social convulsions of a high order are forthcoming, the first signs of which are beginning to come into view.

The Assassination of the Premier

For some time now, reports have been flowing in from Tokio of a growing Fascist movement. It is supposed to base itself upon a split-off from the reformist party, the Japanese section of the Second International, and upon a section of the military. What the precise strength and composition of this party is, is not discernible from the reports. But the rise of such a party is in itself significant in so far as it depicts a new trend in the political life of the country.

A great deal of talk about a Fascist coup d'Etat has been heard of late. The recent assassination of Ki Inukai, the Prime Minister of Japan, has been attributed to Fascist henchmen. Whether this is true or not, it seems quite certain that this act of terror was inspired by the growing despair on part of a large section of the intermediate classes with the involved and complicated and rather helpless position to which the country has been brought by the exploits of the government.

What Is Behind the Terror

This wide spread sentiment of despair and distress, coupled with the enormous conquering appetite of the military cliques appears to be pushing the ruling classes to a precipice. Aims of a forcible issue from the situation, war aims, are no doubt behind the terror that has taken the toll of the foremost statesman of imperialist Japan.

To realize how tense these feelings are, and how intent the aims that accompany them, it must be observed that Inukai was among the most conservative of the die-hards in the empire. He belonged to the acknowledged war party, the Seiyukai. Even he appeared too pacific to the truculent young militarists of the

(Continued from page 3)

Morganstern and Goodman Released

On May 17, two class war prisoners of the Left Opposition, comrades Bernard Morganstern and Leon Goodman were released from the capitalist jail in Pennsylvania. The two staunch Communist fighters have just finished serving a sentence of ninety days for distributing leaflets issued by the Communist League of America (Opposition), calling for participation of all workers in the party's unemployed demonstration.

Morganstern and Goodman were arrested in Philadelphia in February of last year and convicted on the charge of sedition. The charge was based on the fact that the leaflet they were distributing pointed out that the only conclusive way of solving the unemployment crisis is by an international proletarian revolution. Morganstern and Goodman were therefore arrested for being proletarian internationalists and as such served their term in the bosses' prison, as representatives of the international working class.

The courageous example of Morganstern and Goodman, both young Communists, will serve as an example and as inspiration to the whole Communist youth and particularly to the youth of the Left Opposition. The young Communists who come to the Left Opposition will learn by the example of these two valiant fighters not only to uphold and to propagate the Leninist ideas of the Opposition, but also to struggle in the very front ranks of the class battles of the proletariat. The exemplary conduct of Morganstern and Goodman will serve as an instigation to the Oppositionists ev-

erywhere to give the lead to the Communist militants on all fronts.

The two class war fighters are reentering the ranks of the Left Opposition with undiminished enthusiasm, ready to continue their work in the same ardent spirit as before. The Left Opposition welcomes its two foremost fighters back. It rejoices to have them return, to lend their tested strength once more to its activities. The return of comrades Morganstern and Goodman will mean an impetus to increased efforts in the fight

Opposition Youth Debats Anarchist Group

The second debate scheduled by the Spartacus Youth Club of New York will be held on Sunday, May 22nd at 8:00 P. M. The first debate with the Young Peoples Socialist League proved successful, over three hundred turning out to fill the large hall in the Labor Temple.

The subject of the coming debate: "Is a Proletarian Dictatorship Necessary" is an extremely important one, particularly in view of the fact that the negative position will be upheld by the anarchists represented by their youth section, the Vanguard Group. The affirmative point of view will be defended by our comrades, Herbert Capellis and Albert Glotzer.

The debate will be held at the Free Workers Center, 219 Second Avenue. Admission is 15 cents. Don't forget the date and place.

LETTERS FROM THE MILITANTS

Among the Italian Workers in Chicago

In Chicago the leading Italian comrades were expelled from the party some time ago purely as a punishment for their fight against its bureaucratic methods. Several of them came to discuss with me and I agreed to become active amongst them. They were themselves already then leaders of the Italian revolutionary group here and of the Italian Workers Club. Now these comrades have accepted the analysis of the Left Opposition on all important questions of the movement, such as the united front, the situation in Germany and the question of internal party democracy.

The Italian Workers Club which was formerly controlled by the party has now by collective agreement, been reorganized and its name changed to the Spartacus Workers League. This organization is now contemplating and planning extensive activities. My time is, of course, taken up considerably with the work and collaboration with the leadership of this Workers League.

We have already defeated the party bureaucrats here on the Italian field. To the overwhelming majority of Italian class conscious workers here we represent Communism. There are only 5 Italian members left in the party and they are the most degenerate types having hardly any influence and are the object of laughter by everyone.

On May Day we held a well attended mass meeting in Italian in our center on Roosevelt Rd. After this we formed in marching order and marched through the Italian quarters to the Party Demonstration in Union Park. Our whole executive composed entirely of expelled party members marched at the head under our own banners. We had behind us 300 Italian workers. When we entered in Union Park singing and shouting our slogans, the workers assembled greeted us with thunderous applause. The Rubickis and Geberts gaped in surprise and were sickly grins. The party controlled Italians also marched—the whole five of them—and were sore indeed, as they realized the ridiculous figure they were cutting.

We now already have a functioning youth-sports dept. We are organizing a women's dept., and an unemployed council under our direction. We are truly the Communist party among the Italians in Chicago.

—JOE.

Militant Builders

Thirteen new subs came in last week. This brings the total of new subs since the opening of the drive is 216. Most of these subs were sent in by our staff of Militant Builders. The staff is apparently hot after the prizes offered for the highest standing comrades. The staff and its record follow: (figures in parentheses are for the last month and are quoted in dollars): C. R. Hedlund (6)—11; R. Sacharow (6)—10; V. R. Dunne (6)—9; G. Duell (5); M. Lilly (5); J. Sifakis (4)—2; L. Gleisser (4)—2; 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; C. Coover (2)—3; A. Ehrlich (2)—1; S. Frank (1 1/2)—2; L. Basky (1 1/2)—5; T. Vaszily (1)—1; R. Ruskin (1)—2; W. Curran (1)—2; S. Zalamanoff (1)—1; P. Carlson (1)—1; C. Cowl (1)—5; P. Schulman (1)—1; F. Barach (1)—4; C. Johnson (7)—2; S. Lessin (1)—2; B. Houtman (1); S. Gendelman (1); N. Berman (1); G. R. Herman (1); H. Ross (1); H. Milton (1 1/2)—1; T. Drobny (1 1/2)—1; J. Carr (1 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. Capelli—1; W. Herman—1; A. Swaback—1; A. Glotzer—1; L. Logan—1; A. KaldisJ1; M. Sterling—1.

Minneapolis Branch Challenges Wobblies

James P. Thompson, the outstanding orator of the I. W. W. spoke in Minneapolis at the Labor Lyceum, Sunday, May 15th to an audience, the size of which strikingly attested to the precipitous decline in influence of that organization which once held aloft in undisputed leadership the banner of revolutionary internationalism. About 50 persons came to hear the flower of syndicalist thought in this country delineate the nature of capitalist exploitation and the class struggle. Thompson has forceful uninterrupted flow of convincing argument on Marxian economics, punctuated by apt quotations from Marx himself, but fails miserably to explain the politics of Marxism which his syndicalist prejudices do not permit him to understand.

In answer to questions on the subject, he sententiously asserted the argument advanced by the anarchists before the flood: that politics is nothing but parliamentarism, and that the I. W. W. when the working class seizes power, "will do everything necessary, to maintain power, even with a Red Army." The writer questioned whether the Red Army, the jails, the courts, police, etc., could be considered economic weapons. Thompson answered that this was merely a quibble, and then proceeded to launch into a violent personal attack on all "politicians", specifically the Communists, triumphantly "convicting" them of wishing to overthrow capitalism at the ballot box. It was necessary to attack the Soviet Union as a capitalist nation in order to prove his point, which I believe did

Left Winger Expelled from I. L. G. W. U.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Max Deitch, a member of Local 66 of the International Garment Workers Union was expelled from the Executive Board by the Right wingers on it and with the support of the union officials.

He was charged with the responsibility for a leaflet written by the Left wing and distributed to the members of the Union. The contents of the leaflet expressed the sentiments of many members of the Union who on numerous occasions have taken the floor and expressed similar criticism.

Reisel, Fishman and Joffe, officials of the Union, defended and endorsed the expulsion stating that the contents of the leaflet were false.

The members were given no opportunity to approve or reject the action of the Executive Board or to discuss the leaflet in order to determine for themselves the charges made against Deitch and for which he was expelled.

Reisel who acted as chairman ruled that the membership had no power to reject the decision of the E. B. and that the Joint Board only had the power to do so.

This ruling is contrary to Section 17 of the constitution as I understand it. It states very clearly that

"Any member of the I. L. G. W. U. feeling aggrieved at the decision of the Local Union shall have the right to appeal to the Joint Board."

We would do well to pause for a moment and make clear the power and authority of our E. B. The officials of our Union and its E. B. are elected by the membership and responsible to it. The E. B. is responsible to the membership and acts for it between meetings. Any action taken by the E. B. between membership meetings is brought before the membership subject for its approval or rejection.

The Depression Hits South Carolina

"A Smiling Providence"

From the coast to the Appalachian mountains,—the greatest east of the Rockies,—South Carolina is blessed with a pleasing climate in which in many places vegetables grow ten months in the year and roses often bloom the year around. The coast district or "Low Country" is famous for its cypress swamps and lagoons, dense with water-growth and "tall pines wreathed and bannered with Spanish moss", and veiled with "dawn-mists"; its herons, hawks, vultures, eagles; its swamp fish, deer, and alligators; its gardens of azaleas, wisterias, and magnolias; its sea-island cotton; and its rice plantations and aristocracy of a former day. Of the gardens of the Ashley River John Galsworthy wrote, "Nothing so free and gracious, so lovely and wistful, nothing so richly colored yet so ghostlike, exists, planted by the sons of men."

In constant, the mountains of the inland border of the state rise over a mile high. Here is the last resort of a remnant of the Cherokees, driven out of their hunting grounds by the Anglo-Saxon invaders who built their log cabins and set up schools for the study of Greek and Latin and theology while busy subduing "the wilderness". Last resort, too, of spruce and fir, rattlesnake and wild turkey, fox, deer, and bear. Then too, last resort of the pure Anglo-Saxon descendants, driven back into the hills by the plantation system of a former generation and deliberately kept illiterate by the aristocracy of the low-lands, thus producing the "poor whites" of the present day.

Between these two extremes of low-land and high-land lies the major part of the state, devoted to cotton mills and cotton raising. Originally covered with pines forming a beautiful and extensive forest area, it is now well cut over and dotted with light-built houses raised for the most part on brick or wood posts and having no cellars. Few houses in the poorer country sections are painted. The soil is rich in iodine but erodes very easily;—a soil peculiarly adapted to the pine which has been ruthlessly cut down in the past and burned on the spot.

Such is Carolina,—still the land of the log-cabin and the cotton field and blessed with a fertile soil and a wonderful climate under a "smiling providence".

Providence Still Smiles

Carolina during the depression has suffered no great or sudden catastrophe at the hands of Nature either of flood, earthquake, plague or drought. Providence "still smiles". What then of the "human element"?

Let us examine some of the "Needy Cases".

Case 1. "Hope died with the mule. As long as the Jasksons had Mag they

not sit well even with the sympathizers of the I. W. W. some of whom are for the Soviets.

The Minneapolis Branch considers it a question of great educational value to the workers of Minneapolis to arrange a debate with a representative of the I. W. W. in which both sides of the question of the American revolution can be discussed. We hereby issue the challenge.

—C.

Read Communism and Syndicalism by Leon Trotsky for a clarification of the differences between I. W. W. and Communists.

Price per copy—10c

The executive board has no authority to expel any member without the consent of the membership, and only after the members of the Union are given an opportunity to investigate the charges made, and upon which the decision to expel was determined. If that is done—and it was not—and should the members approve the action taken by the E. B., then the complainant has the right to appeal to the Joint Board.

The expulsion of Deitch from the E. B. is an extremely dangerous step and the membership should fight it tooth and nail. The E. B. has no authority to expel a member without the sanction of the membership. Certainly if they have the right to expel a member of the E. B. who was elected by the members they have the right to do anything. And if we disagree, well, we will be told, complain to the Joint Board.

It was interesting to note that not a single rank and file member of the Union defended the action taken by the E. B. Only Reisel, Fishman, and Joffe—all officials—spoke in favor of the expulsion.

The conduct of the chairman was inexcusable. He cut the discussion short when it got to hot for him. The chairman has no right to terminate the discussion without the consent of the membership, and this he never got he never asked for it.

The expulsion of Deitch should be fought against by every member who has the interest of the Union at heart. We must voice our protest. The responsibility for this new expulsion campaign lies at the feet of those members of the E. B. and the officials who instigated and supported the expulsion.

Those responsible will have to answer and bear the consequences. They have taken a dangerous and harmful step. Today they expel an E. B. member, tomorrow, they may expel a member of the Union.

Members of Local 66 on guard! Fight the expellers. Criticism must not be stifled, we must refuse to be terrorized. Deitch was expelled because he was a thorn in the side of those who have expelled him.

Rally to his defense. Demand his reinstatement.

—HARRY MILTON.

The Minnesota Convention of the C. P.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Some time ago the official Party headquarters at Minneapolis sent out a call addressed to trade unions and other working class organizations in the State of Minnesota to send delegates to a Convention to be held in Minneapolis on May 15th, to ratify the Communist Party Ticket for the coming state election. The Minneapolis Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) first learned of the holding of the Convention when the call was read at one of the local trade unions where the writer was in attendance. The secretary of the local union merely mentioned the fact to the members present that there was a call from the Communist party to send delegates to their State Ratification Convention and the apparent intention was to lay the communication on the table without any further action. I immediately raised the question that this communication was possibly one of the most important on the table and should not be laid aside but acted upon.

After some explanation on my part on the necessity and importance of every trade union to familiarize itself with, and support the building of a Communist organization and to muster the largest possible vote for its candidates, the union voted to send two delegates to the C. P. Convention. However, the two delegates selected did not show up at the Convention and when the chairman read off the names of the delegates that were seated he did not mention one single trade union local that had a delegate seated. No name of any delegate was called off except those who were seated by the Party machine. The local Branch of the League sent two delegates and none of them were seated and their names were never even mentioned.

When we entered the hall we were requested by the door committee to sign our name and the organization we represented, after which we were permitted to take a seat. Wm. Schneiderman, the D. O., was speaking on the Party Platform and the State and National Party ticket and wound up his talk in the usual fashion of launching a bitter attack on the "small and insignificant group of renegades and stool pigeons who try to classify themselves as Communists, the Trotskyites." He urged the workers present to hold the "Trotskyites" in the grossest kind of contempt and to deal with them in a way which was fitting for workers in dealing with counter-revolutionary renegades and stool pigeons. After this outburst, which was the climax of the District Organizer's talk, the usual organized applause took place.

Thereafter, everything went smooth and nothing interfered with the operation of the party machine until the writer obtained the floor for the purpose of asking the party leadership how we, as delegates from the Communist League could cooperate with the party in getting the most political benefit out of the election campaign for the Communist movement, its program and candidates?

I told them of my expulsion from the party after giving it my wholehearted support for five years in money and party work and I wanted to know how we could cooperate on the things we can agree on and that we stood for the unification of the Communist movement around a correct program. My proposition evidently baffled the Chairman momentarily and he simply glanced in the direction of Schneiderman who responded promptly and bravely by stating something to the effect that "no smooth or suave talk" could cover up our character as "counter revolutionaries and stool pigeons who cooperate with the police to break up Communist meetings and demonstrations". He further ruled that there would be no more discussion on my proposition and ordered the Chairman to proceed with the regular order of business.

Case 10. "It is getting to be a regular thing in the widow D's home for the five little D's to go to bed without any supper as their mother comes home night after night with no results in her hunt for work. Anxiety and the lack of food for herself will ruin her health before times come if she is not given help. Sixty dollars is needed."

Case 11. "An unbearably empty stomach forced Mr. X to yield to temptation while away from home searching for work to support his wife, little boy and the new baby on the way, and he is now serving a term for theft. Further suffering for his family could be avoided with thirty dollars."

Yield not to temptation.

Case 12. "When de lights in both Uncle Tom's eyes were 'put out' by caracats and Aunt Sally became so crippled with rheumatism that she could hardly move out of her chair, the devoted old couple sat side by side cringing in deadly fear of having to go to the almshouse. Food would be assured by fifty dollars and this fear removed."

Case 13. "The gigantic task of supporting a family of five, the mother disabled and the father ill with pellagra, rests on the thin little shoulders of Jessie Mae, 16, whose jobs consists of a few day's work a week in the mill. Forty dollars is essential."

Case 18. "Working under a high powered light while making a living for his family cost Mr. G. his eyesight and left Mrs. G. and the two children with no support. More trouble came when her brother, who lived with her, lost his job. She is a hard worker but can't always find enough to do to make ends meet. She could manage with twenty-five dollars."

These cases are copied exactly, except for the parentheses inserted, from a leading newspaper of the state and refer to the 'neediest' cases in the State capital. You can see Hoover's point that a little more individualism would help these cases along.

Such was the situation last year during December. To a Russian school-boy these stories would sound incredible, but when he learns about it, that is, what he will think of when he hears America called 'God's Country'.

—GUY SOUTHWORTH.

The party steering committee apparently consisted of Wm. Scheiderman, D. O., Norman Bernick, Tom Foley, Bertha Wise and the chairman, whose name I did not learn. This machine ran into more difficulty when the question of selecting delegates to the party's National Nominating Convention at Chicago came up. The party machine had picked ten delegates with the provision that this same party machine could add more if deemed necessary. This slate of delegates was, like the rest of the program, simply tossed out to the organized hand raisers amongst the delegates in order to leave the impression with honest and unsuspecting workers present that the rank and file had something to say.

Several delegates present objected to this method of choosing the Chicago delegation and proposed that the delegates to Chicago be nominated from the floor and that each delegate nominated should be voted on separately by the delegation present. This idea was severely criticized by the administration wheel horses and Norman Bernick contended this idea "was a wrong approach to the entire question."

Delegate Singer of the International Workers' Order led the fight for Convention election of the Chicago delegation. Schneidermann, after condemning this idea moved its adoption with the knowledge, of course, that the party machine had the majority of the delegates seated lined up and instructed. This plan was again modified to the extent that the ten delegates picked up by the machine stood and others could be nominated from the floor. Then after

nomination were closed each delegate to Chicago, including the ten, was to be voted on separately by the state delegation. One of the ten picked delegates withdrew and nominated another. This action left nine picked delegates. Six more delegates were nominated. Four withdrew, no doubt by previous instructions, and the other two were voted down automatically.

During the fight on the floor for a rank and file picked delegation, Schneiderman practically hurled the same denunciations and epithets at its proponents as he used against the "Trotskyites" and one person after being thus treated left the hall in disgust. Delegate Singer, after being similarly attacked, asked for the floor for a brief moment to answer the attack. His request for an opportunity to defend himself was met with a motion denying him the right to speak, which was carried automatically as all the other party proposals.

So, after all was said and done, after the broad and pretentious call sent out to the trade unions, after the small but sincere struggle in the Convention against the bureaucratic machine, the Minneapolis State Convention called by the Communist party was not able to add or detract one single iota from the entire pre-determined program of the party machine. The League delegates with their proposals of cooperation in the coming election campaign were ignored and instead vile names and abuse were heaped upon us to confuse the workers present. It is the only way a labor bureaucracy can maintain itself. But as it functions it also builds up the forces for its own destruction and these forces were augmented in the Minneapolis Convention.

—BY A LEAGUE DELEGATE.

The I. L. G. W. U. Meets in Philadelphia

(Continued from page 1)

archist-Lovestonite Bloc played a miserable role. It confined itself to the defense of the resolutions dealing with legalistic forms of administration. As regards union policies and tactics, criticism of the class collaboration policy of the leadership and representation of the demand of the broad masses of the membership for a militant program and for militant action, this pseudo-progressive outfit did not show anything by which it could be distinguished from the Right wing clique. The reason for this is not very difficult to explain.

The Anarchists who, in their support of Sigmam against the Left wing proved to be no less reactionary than the Schlesinger clique, found themselves to a peculiar position. All their attempts at posing as progressives were of no avail. They were not taken seriously.

The Lovestonites felt their obligations toward both cliques. They had to atone for their former sins against both. Their position was rather comical. It was manifested in their support of the resolution regarding the Soviet Union. They swallowed the resolution hook, line and sinker. Obviously, with the intention of pleasing their brothers-in-arms, the Anarchists. On the question of the recognition of Zimmerman's rights to office on the Executive Board of his local, his sole support came from Dubinsky, who jointly with the Anarchists administered him a whipping for his sins of the past and a warning for the future. A ritual entirely becoming for a capitulator.

There remained at the Convention the delegation of the "Left Groups" guided by the Industrial Union. This group was represented only by seven delegates and consequently, played no great role at the Convention. It could not, besides, be expected, due to the prevailing hostility, to fully develop its program, to give adequate representation to the Left wing. But even in such a situation, the Left delegation could have made itself felt, provided it had a platform for the convention. But unfortunately, it has none, and its part at the

Convention was therefore, a negative one. It contributed nothing.

The Left delegation came to the convention with the slogan of "Rank and File Leadership" as its program. Every principle and task of the Left wing was to be subordinated to this slogan. And when it came to the test on the floor of the convention, this slogan proved its fallacy and was the cause of confusion and undeserved discredit for the Left wing.

The slogan of "Rank and File Leadership" was raised by the Left delegation in connection with a recommendation to the Convention calling for a cloakmakers' strike this coming June. The Lefts insisted on the consideration of their recommendation of a "Rank and File Leadership" for the strike, and failing in this, four of them voted against the strike. They were condemned by the entire Convention. This condemnation would not count so much against them as the confusion and the misrepresentation it caused in the minds of the workers with regard to the program of the Left wing.

It is totally false to put the condition of a "Rank and File Leadership" to the support of a strike. It is but one of the absurd contradictions flowing from such false slogans. Communists cannot withhold support of a strike even if it is under a reformist leadership. Their duty is to continue the fight for a militant, Left wing leadership in strikes and out of strikes. This is the only way to expose the reformists and to gain prestige for themselves. The Lefts at the Convention committed an unpardonable blunder for which the Stalinist leadership is responsible.

The Tasks of the Left Wing

We wish to reiterate our proposals made to the Left wing before the Convention for the raising of the slogan of unity of the I. L. G. W. U. and the Industrial Union at the Convention. We proposed to demand the readmission of the Industrial Union as a body into and without discrimination. We proposed this on the basis of the pressing need for unity and the demand for it. Such a slogan would immensely strengthen the Left wing and its prestige with the International. We also proposed a united front with the progressive elements, led by the Anarchist-Lovestonite bloc, for common struggle against the Schlesinger machine. We proposed this as a tactic. We said that we have no confidence in the leaders of the "Progressive Bloc", but we look upon its existence and its influence as a proof of the radical sentiments of the workers. The united front with the "Progressive Bloc" would bring the Left wing closer to the workers and prove to them the insincerity of the "Progressives" and the militancy of the Left wing. The Left wing could only gain by such a move.

The Lefts at the Convention did not adopt our proposals. They failed with the Stalinist tactics. It is not yet too late to test our correct tactics of a united front and of the slogan of unity. The time for it is no less opportune now than it was before.

—ALBERT ORLAND.

Put the Press Drive Over the Top!

The final month of the drive is not what it should be. It is necessary to say so right out to make every member of the League and every one of its sympathizers realize that our statement that the life of the weekly MILITANT depends on the success of the press drive is not an exaggeration. This drive must be made a success.

A glance at the quotas and results to date tells the story:

	Quotas	Results
New York	\$ 325	\$ 69.50
Minneapolis	200	38
Chicago	100	8
Toronto	70	
Cleveland	40	4
Philadelphia	40	
Boston	40	
Newark	35	2.50
Kansas City	30	2.00
St. Louis	25	
Los Angeles	20	6
Youngstown	10	1.50
New Haven	10	6
Montreal	10	
Duluth	10	
Springfield, Ill. ..	10	
W. Frankfort, Ill. ..	10	
Trenton	10	
Miscellaneous		14.50
Total	\$ 1,000	\$ 152.00

It can be seen from the above how far we are from even one half of our quota. Now this quota is by no means beyond our ability to reach. All that is neces-

Get a Sub!

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.

NameAddress
CityState
Sent in byBranch.....

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

The Political Crisis of Japanese Imperialism

(Continued from page 1)
country. The restless masses demand action. The assassins of Inukai point to one road of action.

The transportation of whole armies from the Shanghai scene in the direction of the Soviet border, taking place with the alleged intention of putting down the guerilla warfare, makes an attack against the Soviet Union a rather easy target for the aims of the military clique and the reactionary mass support they are receiving in the country. In the whole Manchurian adventure, the Tokyo government has from time to time seen itself forced to merely register and approve of acts perpetrated by the irresponsible and unhampered militarists. The ascent of the Selyukai to power was supposed to bring the government more into harmony with the line of action taken by the militarists. The incidents of last week seem to indicate that the military are on the rampage again, this time going over the heads even of the acknowledged leaders of the military cliques, like the Minister of War, Araki. **An attack against the workers' republic is on the order of the day.**

The Danger of War

Once the military has succeeded in starting a war against the Soviet Union, the support of the entire bourgeoisie will be solidly behind them. The bourgeois knows what choice he has. The assault precipitated by the Japanese militarists can easily be amplified into a conflagration, in which the capitalists of all the major countries will participate. The same depression that grips Japan is likewise holding sway over the other bourgeois nations. Only a spark is needed to bring about an explosion, the effects of which are hardly calculable.

Against the War Danger in U. S.

For us in America, as well as for the Communists everywhere, the struggle against imperialism war is the most important task of the day. Mass demonstrations, mass rallies, parades led by the Communist party, in which the fight against the war danger has had a prominent part, have received a great response from workers all over the country. But it is not enough to demonstrate, it is not enough to propagandize against war. It is necessary to give the anti-war sentiment of the workers a solid organizational form.

It is in this sense that the struggle against the war danger cannot be divorced from the daily activities of the Communists in the fight for the majority of the working class. To really give the struggle against imperialist slaughter concrete shape, it is necessary to penetrate the factories, the shops, the trade union organizations. It is necessary to confront and to influence the workers at their places of work and wherever they meet. That is the only way of assuring their fighting solidarity in case of war. The Communists have to prove to the worker from day to day that they deserve to be followed, that they are really the vanguard of the workers. That alone will give them the opportunity to lead the workers against the imperialist war mongers. Otherwise, without the tested and trusted leadership of the Communists, the strong sentiment of the masses against war can easily be dissipated and directed into channels harmless for the enemy class.

That is why the Left Opposition has fought so tenaciously against the isolationist policies of the Stalinist leadership of the official Communist party, that is why we have rejected the disastrous theory of social Fascism, that is why we have struggled against the harmful slogan of the united front "from below", that is why we have fought for a correct trade union tactic, for a genuine united front policy which unites all workers for common action and serves as the best battle ground of the Communist against the reformists and all the other fakery and misleaders of the workers.

The serious international situation today, the danger facing the Soviet Union requires with all the greater urgency, the return on the part of the Communist party to the line of Lenin, to the method of work prescribed by the first four congresses of the Communist International. There is no short-cut to leadership of the masses. And only under Communist leadership can the struggle against war as well as all other struggles of the workers be carried on successfully.

Greet the Return

OF OUR CLASS WAR PRISONERS
MORGENSTERN AND GOODMAN
at
THE PICNIC
to be held at
TIBBETTS BROOK PARK Plot 8
Sunday, May 29th, 1932

After languishing in one of the most vermin infested jails in the entire United States; after ninety days of isolation in a Capitalist dungeon; after days wasted in prison misery and nights spent in prison horror our comrades **Bernard Morgenstern and Leon Goodman** will be with us again to enjoy whatever liberties are begrudgingly granted us by the powers that be.

Comrades and Revolutionists:
Out to the Picnic!

Nine Years of the Struggle of the Left Opposition

The Reactionary Theory of Socialism in One Country

The fundamental question which divides the Marxian wing of the movement from the Centrists and the Right wing is the theory of socialism in one country. On one side of this theory stand nationalism and utopianism; on the other side stand we, the internationalists and scientific socialists. In its essence, this theory of the official leaders is no less profoundly important than the issues which divided the old Second International into its Right and Left wings.

Although it is not new to the movement as a whole, the theory of socialism in one country was introduced into the Communist movement for the first time in 1924. Prior to that date, it was not only absent from the literature of the revolutionary Communist movement, but our teachers specifically rejected and mocked at it time and time again. Marx and Engels polemized it in so many words. Not a line can be found in the writings of Lenin to be adduced in its defense.

The program of the Bolshevik party, the banner under which it directed the October revolution, does not contain a mention of this "theory". The program and statutes of the Young Communist League of Russia, adopted in 1921, takes special care to refute the idea. Not one single sentence can be found in any of the fundamental documents of the first four congresses of the Communist International to refer to the possibility of building up a socialist society in one single country, and a backward agricultural country like Russia at that. The first draft for a Comintern program, presented to its Fourth Congress by Bukharin and Thalheimer, does not mention the theory or the idea by even the vaguest reference. Whole passages can be found in the writings of the principal proponents of the theory—Bukharin and Stalin (their writings before 1924, of course) which argue directly against this reactionary notion.

In a word, not one solitary theorist or authentic spokesman and defender of Marxism, from Marx himself down to Stalin, can be found who, up until 1924, ever had a word to say in defense of this idea. How and why, then, did it come to be propounded, and finally to be incorporated into the fundamental program adopted at the Sixth Congress?

How the "Theory" Arose
The date with which this theory is inseparably connected stamps it for what it really is. The theory was first promulgated by Stalin in 1924 in the second edition of his pamphlet called "The Theory and Practice of Leninism". We emphasize the second edition, because in the first Stalin still repeated what was the common knowledge and belief of all Marxists up to then. He said in the first edition:

"Its (the proletariat's) most important task—the organizing of socialist production—still remains unsolved. Can these tasks be solved can the final victory of socialism be won without the joint efforts of the proletariat of several highly developed countries? No, this is impossible."

In the second edition, with virtually nothing else of the text changed, we already find that the passage quoted above has been altered to read:

"After the victorious proletariat of one country has consolidated its power and has won over the peasantry for itself, it can and must build up the socialist society."

From this somewhat cautious, but sufficiently clear formulation, the Stalinists have since expressed themselves in the most unrestrained and fantastic manner. Today, for example, we are told by them, on the basis of this theory, that the task which will be accomplished at the end of the second Five Year Plan is:

"... To liquidate entirely all the elements of capitalism, etc., etc., down to active builders of a socialist classless society." (Freiheit, March 7, 1932.)

The Effects of October 1923

Now let us look into the theory itself. It came into existence, as we have mentioned, in 1924, and not by accident. The year 1924 was one filled with tremendous consequences for the intervention. It was the culminating point of the insurrectionary high-tide of the post-war years and the beginning of the momentary stabilization of the bourgeoisie achieved with the aid of America's gold. The German revolution of October 1923 had been cruelly defeated without having fired a shot. The month previously, the insurrection in Bulgaria had ended with a crushing defeat and extermination of the Communist movement. Three months later, the putsch in Reval (Eschonia) disastrously failed to realize the vain hopes put in it by the Communists. This rapid succession of defeats gave the harassed bourgeoisie the "breathing space" it was looking for. The second edition of a world war situation created by the French occupation of the Ruhr was brought to an end. Everywhere, the setbacks suffered by the proletarian vanguard was felt deeply, and the pitiful attempts of Zinoviev, Stalin, Bandler and Bukharin to depict the situation as though the revolution, the struggle for power was still on the order of the day, only served to deepen the disillusionment of the advanced workers. This mirage dissolved quickly. Reality made itself felt only too plainly. The intervention of the United States and the adoption of

the Dawes Plan, with its subsequent "stabilizing" of Germany and temporary regulation of Europe's imperialist antagonisms, soon revealed that the revolutionary wave had subsided, that the battalions of the proletariat had been weakened, that adjustments had to be made to the brief "democratic pacifist era".

How to make these adjustments? The responsible Marxists proposed that the Communists, particularly in Central Europe must once more set about to win the masses of the workers in the struggles around daily issues, that the masses had once more to be assembled in the everyday struggle so that when the next series of convulsions gripped bourgeois society, the Communists would be in a better position to take the offensive in the direct struggle for power. There was no ground for pessimism, said the leaders of the Left Opposition. In a series of penetrating analyses, comrade Trotsky showed at that time that America's intervention in Europe, which involved at the outset a brief stabilization, was only accumulating a mountain of powder magazines which would inevitably blow up with the resounding crash of war and proletarian revolution.

The Stalinist "Adjustment"

How did the official apparatus envisage the adjustments that had to be made following the German defeat and America's intervention? By the apparatus, we refer above all to its most perfect representative, Stalin, all of whose activity in the Russian revolutionary movement has been characterized, and still is, by an opportunist, narrow-minded nationalism. He proposed to solve the problem by turning the back of the Russian republic upon the international revolution and concentrating all attention to the "problems at home". The banner of international revolution, according to the Stalin school, was to be hauled and replaced with the slogan of "socialism in one country".

What ideas lurked at the back of Stalin's head to nurture this theory? The idea that the proletarian revolution in Europe had been taken off the order of the day for an incalculable period; that it had been postponed for decades; that the most profitable efforts could be concentrated in enclosing the Soviet republic within its shell and constructing a national socialist Utopia there. Losovsky, expressing the thoughts that prevailed in the minds of the bureaucracy at that time, wrote that the stabilization of Europe was a matter of decades. And if that were the case, why continue this "infernal babble" about "international revolution" which will not take place for a long time anyway, especially when there is so much to be "done at home"?

The Theory as a Fruit of Pessimism
In other words, the theory of socialism in one country—that is, the fantastic idea that Russia, by itself and without the aid of the victorious workers in culturally more advanced countries, can build up a classless society—was born out of the womb of pessimism, of a defeatist state of mind. It was born and bred in an atmosphere of reaction, and that brand can no more be removed from than the mark of Cain could be wiped from his forehead.

Nothing that has ever been said can refute this characterization of the origin and essence of the theory. The dispute is no academic occupation of closet philosophers and professional hair-splitters. It is a vitally important theoretical question which has a concrete, practical significance of tremendous scope. Together with comrade Trotsky, the Left Opposition argued that to build a socialist society in the Soviet Union, the aid of the workers' revolution in a more advanced country or countries would be required. Together with Stalin and Bukharin, the international apparatus of the Comintern argued that a socialist society could be built up without the

"state aid" of the workers in other countries. If this dispute has a "practical" significance—and it has an enormous one—then the conclusion is an obvious and a disastrous one.

Why? Because socialism is not built in one day. Only petty bourgeois anarchists believe that the "free society" will be established on the morrow of the overthrow of the bourgeois state. The Marxists know, as Lenin wrote, that "the road of organization is a long road, and the task of socialist construction demands a long drawn, stubborn work and real knowledge which we do not possess to a sufficient degree. Also the next generation, which will be further developed, will probably hardly be able to achieve the complete transition to Socialism" (Vol. XV, page 240). If you believe, as Stalin does, that this "long road" is to be fully travelled "alone", before the workers in the other countries have overthrown their bourgeoisie, then you have postponed—at least in your thoughts—the world proletarian revolution for an indefinite period.

The Essence of the Opposition's Struggle: Marxian Internationalism

The Opposition believed and declared: The proletarian revolution in the West is far closer to a realization than is the abolition of classes and the establishment of a socialist society in Russia. If it is not closer, then the proletarian revolution in Russia is doomed! This truth Lenin repeated a thousand times: "We do not live merely in a state but in a system of states and the existence of the Soviet republic side by side with imperialist states for any length of time is inconceivable." (Vol. XVI, page 102.) In this is contained not one grain of "pessimism" or "disbelief in the revolution"; it is penetrated with a realistic Marxian internationalism.

And what is this internationalism? It is no mere loose sentimental bond of solidarity uniting the workers of all countries. It arises directly out of the development of capitalist world economy. The imperialist stage of capitalism, its expansion on an international scale, the tremendous and vital importance of exports and imports for the maintenance of capitalism, monopolies extending to the ends of the earth, the mutual dependence of one country upon developments in another—these are some of the phenomena of world economy. Capitalism has not matured for the socialist revolution in this or that country, large or small, backward or advanced. It has matured for socialism on a world scale. This fact not only creates the basis for a living internationalism, but also for the transformation of the old society by a victorious world proletariat.

But if each country can build an enclosed socialist society by the efforts and resources of its own proletariat, then internationalism becomes an empty phrase for holiday resolutions. If it can be done in backward Russia, then surely it can be done in more advanced Germany, and in France, and England, and certainly in the United States. Then what need have the Communists for a highly-centralized international of their own?

Internationalism As A Necessary Development

Furthermore: the development of all existing society up to now, and particularly of modern capitalist society, has been towards increasing inter-relationships and inter-dependence. Capitalism reaches its highest stage of evolution, it develops to its most majestic economic heights, not by retiring into its respective national shells, but by projecting from each national territory those links which bind it inseparably to the rest of world economy. The countries of the most backward culture, technique, living standards are those that play the smallest role in world economy and trade; and vice versa.

Now, socialism assumes a vastly higher stage of development than capitalism, a higher culture, technique and living standard. It means not only the abolition of classes, but the elimination of the differences between worker and peasant between town and country, the abolition of agriculture by the fact of its industrialization. But this, in turn, means that a socialist society must develop to a much further point along the economic and technical (that is, the cultural) road than capitalism. The theory of socialism in one country implies (and its spokesmen state explicitly) that this is to be accomplished by taking the road back from capitalist evolution which was, as every baby knows, directed towards an increasing economic inter-dependence and inter-relation on a world scale. The Marxists, in contradistinction to this reactionary, utopian idea, declare that the road to socialism presupposes an increasing participation in world economy, not only in the future socialist world economy, but right now, in the capitalist world economy which still exists, the economy to which, according to Lenin, 'we are subordinated, with which we are connected and from which we cannot escape.'

What Internationalism Requires In the U. S. S. R.

But if, in spite of everything, the proletarian revolution in the West is nevertheless delayed in coming? What shall we do then: give up the power in the Soviet Union? This is the "annihilating" argument the Stalinists present as their pitiful defense of an indefensible theory. Not at all! Lenin and Trotsky, who never believed in the utopia of national socialism, stood for seven years at the head of the proletarian dictatorship and never once proposed to "give up power". What they did and what the Left Opposition proposes to do today, is to retain the power in the first fortress to be conquered by the proletariat. In this fortress, while looking forward to the assistance of the workers in other countries to strengthen the position of the proletarian and socialist elements in the country as against the capitalist elements, this means the utilization of "both levers" at the command of the proletariat: the long lever of the international revolution and the shorter lever of laying and strengthening the foundations for a socialist economy at home. What it certainly does not mean is that the Russian proletariat and peasantry shall be deceived with the grandiose illusion that at the end of five more years "socialism will have been established"; for there will be terrific consequences to account for when the awakening takes place.

The pernicious theory of national socialism has already had the most serious effects for the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. On its basis, Stalin and Bukharin for years fought against the plan proposed by the Opposition for the industrialization of the country and the collectivization of agriculture. The bureaucrats were little interested in "Five Year Plans" then—they were too busy strangling the Opposition inside the party and saying to the kulak on the outside: "Enrich yourself"! And when under the pressure of events and the criticism of the Opposition, they finally adopted a radical plan, it was once more on the basis of this reactionary theory that they proceeded to "liquidate the kulak as a class" by administrative decrees and to establish a classless socialist society by a certain date on the calendar as if it were a prize contest that closed on a given day in the month. But a detailed description of these phases of the Opposition's struggle in the Communist International and in the Russian party specifically, we must leave for other articles in this series.

And it is not merely in Russia that this theory had fatal effects for the proletarian revolution. It should be borne in mind that the revisionists always included a tiny "if" in their theory. Socialist society could be built up in one country "if" military intervention from the foreign imperialists could be prevented. "Socialism in one country" kept undermining the possibilities of success of the great Chinese revolutionary movement of 1925-1927 and of the upheaval in the British working class in 1926. In the latter case particularly, did the "if" of the theory—the prevention of military intervention—play a thoroughly fatal role. We can trace the disgraceful conduct of the apparatus leaders during the British miners' and general strikes directly to this theory. An account of the events in England in 1926 and the part played in it by the Stalinists and the Left Opposition—an episode of fundamental importance in our nine years of struggle—we shall seek to give in the next issue.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

SPARTACUS YOUTH CLUB
The Spartacus Youth Club in New York, as already announced, has changed its meeting date to Friday evenings. The executive committee of the club is arranging an educational program for the coming weeks which will be of interest to young workers and students. At its next meeting, May 20, there will take place a discussion on the results of the recent French and German elections.

From Left Oppositionists in South America

Cali, Columbia
April 28, 1932.

Dear comrades:

In this city, as well as in the rest of the country, the political struggles of the working class are going on accompanied by the same mistakes and setbacks brought about by the absurd and absolutely detrimental leadership of the fanatical Stalinists about two years ago there arrived in Colombia comrade Guillermo Hernandez Rodriguez, after a three years' stay in Russia, where, it is said, he studied at the Marxist school at Moscow. He came as the accredited delegate of the Communist International to start and to lead the Communist Party of Colombia as a section of the C. I. On his arrival he was welcomed and hailed by a group of revolutionary workers who had formerly participated in the political struggles of the traditional parties, which had left us with defeats and disasters behind us, desiring to obtain a class struggle political training in order to be able to correctly organize the party of the workers in Colombia.

Under these circumstances and with these desires, we hailed delegate Hernandez Rodriguez, accepting his political positions and the line he proposed for us to follow. Under his leadership, there was organized the committee of the Valle. Meanwhile, comrade Hernandez went to Bogota, the capital of the republic, to organize the central committee of the party, which was effected by a meeting that is known under the name of "El Ampliado". After some work had been accomplished in the capital, Rodriguez returned together with comrade Ines Martell to the Valle district with the object of implanting a solid political base in this section of the country which they considered of the greatest revolutionary importance. A series of meetings were held that were attended by workers and sympathizers. As the comrade delegate took advantage of his position as representative of the C. I. and wanted to impose his authority too rigidly, he came into conflict with the workers assembled. But, notwithstanding this fact, he was able to persuade a small group of comrades who were rather impressed with his Russian experiences, to submit to his authority.

Starting out with this group, he proceeded to expel all those who were not ready to comply with his dictatorial leadership. But since these expelled comrades were sincere revolutionaries (Continued on page 4)

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 pag. 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
paper cover 1.00

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.

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

UNGRATEFUL GOVERNMENT

One of the most pathetic cases of hard luck—and one of the most instructive lessons—in recent days is the denial of citizenship to S. S. Saralief, editor of the Bulgarian S. L. P. paper, by the United States District Court of St. Louis. Saralief, true to the S. L. P. teaching, told the court that he was for the overthrow of capitalism by strictly legal and peaceful means. But even this undertaking to confine the struggle against capitalism within the legal rules and limits laid down by the ruling class itself did not gain for him the coveted citizenship. With that contempt for lackeys whose services are not needed at the moment, for which the masters ever have noted, the District Court booted him and his servile application aside and withheld—to quote the S. L. P. Convention resolution—"the important privilege of American citizenship."

The Weekly People, which never notices violations of the legal rights of revolutionary workers except, inferentially at least, to condone the violations, is having spasms over the Saralief case. It is, they protest, "unjust even according to capitalist ethics." If you understand the point of view of the S. L. P. legalists you have to admit there is ground for their dignified complaints. Those who agree to restrict their operations to the narrow groove marked out by the capitalist law, and spend nine-tenths of their energies in condemning those who refuse to make such an agreement, have a certain right to feel aggrieved when this treacherous servility goes unrewarded. The denial of citizenship to S. L. P. Saralief is an act of ingratitude on the part of the Government. And in addition to that it is a dirty trick. The threat of the S. L. P. convention resolution "to use every civilized method to force a reversal of this most unjust decision" is fully justified by the outrage.

Legal rights have a great value for the working class in the period when it is assembling its forces and working out its policies, and every encroachment on these rights has to be resisted in the most determined manner. The Marxists always understood and defended this position, and no different opinion is admissible in the name of Marxism. The crime of the S. L. P. consists in the fact that they—like so many others who invoke the names of Marx and Engels in order to betray their teachings—make a fetish and a final method of capitalist legality instead of regarding it, as Marx and Engels did, merely as a field for the pre-revolutionary organization and mobilization of the proletariat. It is just such a decision as that in the Saralief case—a flagrantly "illegal" decision in which the capitalist court trampled on its own constitutional provisions—that demonstrates the fallacy of legalistic fetishism. Engels, in advising the German workers to make the fullest use of legality for propaganda and organization, told the bourgeoisie to "be the first to shoot." Neither he nor any other revolutionist ever doubted for a moment that they would "shoot", i. e., violate their own legality when it served their purpose. That is why Marx and Engels always maintained that the emancipation of the workers by purely legal means is an impossibility.

This fundamental tenet of Marxism—which Marx and Engels defended to the last days of their lives—has been confirmed by all the experience of the international proletariat. It is not a small point about which Marxists may have different opinions. On the contrary, it is a sharp and clear dividing line between the revolutionary Marxists and the betrayers of Marxism. The former by no means reject "legality", but they utilize it, organize and prepare the proletariat for the revolution by force and to propagate the idea of its inevitability. The necessity of doing so lies at the root of the whole of Marx's and Engels' teaching. The perversion of this teaching by the S. L. P.—their deception of the workers with the idea that capitalism can be overthrown by purely legal methods alone—brings their betrayal of Marxism into the sharpest relief. The court decision in the Saralief case gives an ironic refutation to the legalistic dogma of the S. L. P.

THE "NEGOTIATORS" SMOKED OUT

The letters of *The Militant* exposing the "unity" horse-trade which the Stalinists and the Lovestonites were negotiating behind the back of the Party seem to have had a wholesome effect all the way around. The information put the proletarian elements in the Party on guard and has stimulated anew their interest in a side of the unity question which the bureaucrats left out of account in their pending "deal"—unity of the worker-Communists with the Left Opposition. In addition to that, the publication of the letters served to convince the diplomats of the Lovestone group at least that the secret game is up that the matter cannot be "arranged" behind the scenes. The Stalinists are no doubt also overcome with somewhat the same conviction, but they have been too busy answering questions lately to find time to issue any statements.

In the latest issue of the *Workers' Age*, Gitlow announces the conversion of his group to the idea of letting the Party members, whose interests were being bargained off over the conference table, have a little information about it. "The Communist Party (Majority Group) is of the opinion—says Gitlow—that there is nothing to gain and a great deal to

lose by keeping the unity negotiations behind a veil of secrecy." Gitlow is right, even if the discovery is several months late and was made only after "the veil of secrecy" had already been torn aside.

In his contribution to the public discussion of the matter which was no longer a secret, Gitlow supplied some additional and important information. For one thing he verifies, what *The Militant's* correspondent merely inferred, that Stachel is the leading spirit in the "unity" maneuver. That is quite in harmony with the proceedings as a whole. Stachel was the right hand man of Lovestone in all his perfidious work within the Party. In the eyes of the worker-Communists he was no less a symbol of "petty bourgeois politicianism" than Lovestone himself. Stachel's initiative in the matter characterizes the whole affair as another of those "rotten petty bourgeois tricks, devoid of principle and of regard for the interests of the movement. By the aid of such methods, and through the instrumentality of such people, a business transaction between adventurers can be ratified; but a unification of the Communist proletariat—never.

Gitlow's revelations go further than "comrade Stachel". (Only a few days ago the same Stachel wrote in the *Daily Worker* that the Lovestones were "foreign elements to the Party of the proletariat." But that only signified a hitch in the negotiations.) Stachel, according to Gitlow, said the Communist International was disposed to act favorably on a unity proposition. And he also said that the present Party leaders have no principle objections to another deal with the Right wing "renegades". Gitlow writes:

"He (Stachel) let it be known that the letter of January 15th was received by the Communist International without any comment from the members of the Political Committee, who had forwarded it to Moscow."

Well, they will have to make plenty of "comment" before the affair is ended. And what is far more important—the Party members will also have something to say. The devastating splits, which the Stalinists and the Right wing together have imposed upon the Communist movement, coincided with the strangulation of Party democracy and the suppression of rank and file opinion. The Party members haven't spoken yet, but their voices will ring out all the louder for the long enforced silence. The evil consequences of the splits accumulate, and with them grows the aspiration of the workers for unity. This aspiration will not be thwarted by the machinations of the splitters in the name of unity while the real issue at the bottom of the disruption—the departure from the Lenin path and the expulsion of the Left Opposition—is left out of consideration. The rank and file inquiry into the negotiations between Lovestone and Stachel may well be the starting point for the necessary and long-delayed discussion of the basic causes of the splits and the principled way to unity.

The Left Opposition will present its unity proposals from this point of view. We are not in the least interested in any kind of secret conferences held in the dark of the moon. We have no use for "propositions" whispered out of the corner of the mouth by some furtive Stachel or other. We have no "capitulators" to offer and no "concessions" to demand. We want to be united with the Party, to wage the revolutionary struggle in common with it, to observe a common discipline. At the same time we insist on the right to adhere to the foundation principles of the Comintern and to advocate them in the normal way of Party democracy. Nothing more, nothing less.

Such proposals need no "veil of secrecy". They can and must be discussed openly, as every genuine and principled consideration—either of unity or of split—ought to be. For it is only when the questions are fairly put and understood by the members, when they consciously act upon them, that the unity of the Party is firmly grounded, or the necessity of split clearly determined. The Stalinist and Right wing bureaucrats have dragged the Party into the ditch by unprincipled maneuvers and intrigues. They will not get it out by these means. —J. P. C.

ST. LOUIS, ATTENTION

A Study Class on the "Fundamentals of Communism" is being organized by the St. Louis branch, Communist League of America (Opposition) with Martin Payer as instructor. All readers of *The Militant* who are interested should come down to the Crunden Branch Library Auditorium, 14th and Cass Avenues. The study class will meet every Friday evening from 8 till 10 P. M. There will be no tuition charges.

THE MILITANT

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

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

SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1932

Vol. 7, No. 21 (Whole No. 117)

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 8 cents per copy.

For the Release of the Scottsboro Boys

It is now a little more than a year since the nine Scottsboro boys were tried on the fake charge of rape and sentenced to death by electrocution. In the past year they have suffered much of the agony of Sacco and Vanzetti, of Mooney. They are innocent of the charges made against them. They are the victims of a dastardly frame-up. They have been beaten by their jailers. They sat in a court surrounded by a howling lynch mob. They have been agitated in jail by officials working hand in glove with the N. A. A. C. P. to induce them to forswear the I. L. D. and place their fate in the hands of the N. A. A. C. P.

They have been forced, not figuratively but in the most literal sense of the word, to live in the shadow of the electric chair. They were placed in a cell directly opposite the execution chamber and forced to witness a number of electrocutions. Anxiety and hope which inevitably accompany appeals to the higher courts have been their's. In a word, they have felt the awful weight of the hand of the organized capitalist class directed in full against them.

It was the I. L. D. and the C. P. which organized and set afoot the working class movement of protest and defense. Not the least part in halting the blood lust of the capitalist south is to be attributed to the fighting demonstrations of white and black workers all over the country, and to the militant protests abroad.

But the victory is not yet won. The day of execution still stands at June 24. The Alabama attorney-general has announced his intention of opposing any further stay despite the I. L. D.'s appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court. If he should be sustained, the boys will be executed on the 24th of June.

To the I. L. D. and C. P. we say: No time must be lost. Every nerve must be strained to rouse the entire working class to demand the immediate and unconditional release of the nine Scottsboro boys. Approaches must be made to their organizations. The workers will respond. If their leaders dare to oppose the movement it will rise over their heads and overwhelm them. Once more, it is clear, the key to the problem of setting the workers in motion is the tactic of the united front of working class organizations.

Action and timely action! Call the united front conferences! Make them genuine united fronts! In these united fronts the Left Opposition will discharge its duty.

N. Y. Picnic

The New York members and sympathizers of the Left Opposition will greet the return of comrades Morgenstern and Goodman from prison at a picnic to be held Sunday, May 29th, at Tibbetts Brook Park, New York.

This affair will also mark the close of the intensive drive for the Opposition press, *The Militant*, *Unser Kampf*, *Young Spartacus*, and *Communists*. Our goal is one thousand dollars. To-date we are a good distance from this amount. The life of the weekly *Militant* depends on the raising of this sum.

There will be refreshments, games and rowing.

The Place: Tibbetts Brook Park—Take Lexington Ave. Subway I. R. T.—Woodlawn-Jerome to last stop, Woodlawn. From there one can take a trolley to the Park. Comrades will meet at the Woodlawn station at 10:00 A. M. Plot 8.

Time: Sunday, May 29th from 10:00 A. M. till dusk.

From Left Oppositionists in South America

(Continued from page 3)

and had acquired some knowledge of the politics of class struggle, we continued our fight, educating ourselves and other workers who after that had come to our side. We were able to organize a Leninist Centre, teaching the works of Marx and Lenin.

After our work had begun to bear fruit, and we were beginning to get results, the official party under Rodriguez's leadership, began to attack the workers of our centre. It would occupy too much space and time to go into detail here on the history of the various maneuvers and activities of the C. I. in Colombia. As the International pursues the same tactics everywhere, they produce the same results, which are sufficiently well known to you.

Now that we have become acquainted with the views which the Left Opposition holds, we have been able to confirm our original position as just and correct, since it is based on the same principles and needs as that of the Left Opposition with which we sympathize and with which we feel ourselves linked up. The literature which we have received from you, we are spreading among the workers of the Leninist Centre as well as among the followers of the official committee of the party, for whose support we are carrying on a daily struggle. This, in spite of the campaign of slander and calumny being organized against us more than before, because we are in agreement with the views of the Left Opposition. We wish to remain in constant communication with you so as to keep up with events and to correctly represent the position of the Left in this country, and in order to avoid all possible consequence of misinformation.

With Communist greetings,
PEDRO A. V.

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

by LEON TROTSKY

(Continued from last issue)

On October 14, 1931, Remmele, one of the three official leaders of the Communist party, said in the Reichstag, "Herr Bruening has put it very plainly: once they (the Fascists) are in power, then the United Front of the proletariat will be established and it will make a clean sweep of everything. (Violent applause from the Communists.)" Bruening's scaring the bourgeoisie and the social democracy with such a perspective—that is intelligible: he thus safeguards his sovereignty. Remmele's solacing the workers with such a perspective—that is infamous: he thus prepares the way for Hitler's domination, for this perspective in its entirety is false to the core and bears witness to an utter misunderstanding of mass-psychology and of the dialectics of revolutionary struggle. Should the proletariat of Germany, before whose eyes the development of events now proceeds openly, permit Fascism to come into power, i. e., should it evince a most fatal blindness and passivity, then there are no reasons whatever for the assumption that after the Fascists are in power, this same proletariat will shake off its passivity immediately and "make a clean sweep". Nothing like this, for instance, happened in Italy. Remmele reasons completely after the manner of the French petty-bourgeois phrasemongers of the nineteenth century who proved themselves entirely incapable of leading the masses but who were convinced, nevertheless, quite firmly that should Louis Bonaparte plant himself over the republic, the people would rise, on the instant, in their defense, and "make a clean sweep." However, the people that had permitted the adventurer Louis Bonaparte to seize the power proved, sure enough, incapable of sweeping him away thereafter. Before this happened, new major events, historical quakes, and a war had to occur.

The United Front of the proletariat is achievable—for Remmele, as he has told us,—only after Hitler assumes power. Can a more pathetic confession of one's own impotence be made? Since we, Remmele and Co., are incapable of uniting the proletariat, we place the burden of this task upon Hitler's shoulders. After he has united the proletariat for us, then we will show ourselves in our true stature. Remmele follows this up with a boastful announcement, "We are the victors of the coming day; and the question is no longer one of who shall vanquish whom? This question is already answered. (Applause from the Communists). The question now reads only, "At what moment shall we overthrow the bourgeoisie?" Right to the point! As we say in Russian, that's pointing one's finger and hitting the sky. We are the victors of the coming day. All we lack today is the United Front. Herr Hitler will supply us with it tomorrow, when he assumes power. Which still means that the victor of the coming day will be not Remmele but Hitler. And then, you might as well carve it on your nose, the moment for the victory of the Communists will not arrive so soon.

Remmele feels himself that his optimism limps on its left leg, and he attempts to bolster it up. "We are not afraid of the Fascist gentlemen. They will shoot their bolt quicker than any other government. (Right you are! from the Communists)" And for proof: The Fascists want paper-money inflation, and that means ruin for the masses of the nation; consequently, everything will turn out for the best. Thus the verbal inflation of Remmele leads the German workers astray.

Here we have before us a program speech of an official leader of the party; it was issued in immense numbers and was used in the Communist membership drive: appended to the speech is a printed blank for enrollment in the Party. And this very program speech is based part and parcel upon capitulation to Fascism. "We are not afraid" of Hitler's assuming power. What is this, if not the formula of cowardice turned inside out. "We" don't consider ourselves capable of keeping Hitler from assuming power; worse yet: we, bureaucrats, have so degenerated as not to dare think seriously of fighting Hitler. Therefore, "we are not afraid". What don't you fear: fighting against Hitler? Oh no! they are not afraid of . . . Hitler's victory. They are not afraid of refusing to fight. They are not afraid to confess their own cowardice. Shame! Out upon it!

In one of my previous pamphlets I wrote that the Stalinist bureaucracy was baiting a trap for Hitler—in the guise of state power. The Communist journalists, who flit from Münzenberg to Ullstein and from Mosse to Münzenberg, announced immediately that "Trotsky vilifies the Communist Party." Isn't it really self-evident that Trotsky, out of his aversion for Communism, out of his hatred for the German proletariat, out of his passionate desire to save German capitalism—yes, Trotsky foists a plan of capitulation upon the Stalinist bureaucracy. But in reality I only gave a brief summary of Remmele's program speech and of a theoretical article by Thaelmann. Where does the vilification come in?

Moreover both Thaelmann and Remmele are only holding steadfastly to the Stalinist gospel. Let us recall once again what Stalin propounded in the autumn of 1923 when everything in Germany was—as now—poised on the razor edge of a knife. "Should the Communists (on the given plane)" wrote Stalin to Zinoviev and Bucharin, "strive to seize power without the social democracy? are they sufficiently mature for this?—that's the question as I see it . . . Should the power in Germany at this moment fall, so to speak, and should the Communists catch it up, they'll fall through with a crash. That's 'at best'. If it comes to the worst—they'll be smashed to pieces and beaten back . . . Of course, the Fascist aren't asleep, but

it serves our purposes better to let them be the first to attack: that will solidify the entire working class around the Communists . . . In my opinion the Germans should be restrained and not encouraged."

In his pamphlet, *THE MASS STRIKE*, Langner writes, "The assertion (Brandler's) that a battle in October (1923) would have resulted only in a 'decisive defeat', is nothing but an attempt to gloss over opportunistic mistakes and the opportunistic capitulation without a fight." (Page 101) That is absolutely correct. But who was the instigator of "the capitulation without a fight"? Who was it that "restrained" instead of "encouraging"? In 1931 Stalin only amplified his formula of 1923: let the Fascists assume the power, they'll be only clearing the road for us. Naturally it is much safer to attack Brandler than Stalin: the Langners understand that quite well . . .

In point of fact, in the last two months—not without the influence of the outspoken protests from the Left—a certain change has occurred: the Communist party no longer says that Hitler must assume power in order to shoot his bolt quickly; now it lays more stress on the converse side of the question: the battle against Fascism cannot be postponed until after Hitler assumes the power; the battle must be waged now by arousing the workers against Bruening's decrees and by widening and deepening the strife on the economic and political arenas. That is absolutely correct. Everything that the representatives of the Communist party have to say within this sphere is not to be gainsaid. Here we have no disagreements whatever. Still the most important question remains: how to get down from words to business?

The overwhelming majority of the members of the Communist party as well as a considerable portion of the officialdom—we haven't the slightest doubt—sincerely want to fight. But the facts must be faced openly: there's no fighting being done, there is no sign of fighting in sight. Bruening's decrees passed by scot-free. The Christmas truce was not broken. The policy of calling sectional and improvised strikes, judging by the accounts of the Communist party itself, did not achieve any serious successes to date. The workers see this. Shrieking alone will not convince them.

The Communist party places on the shoulders of the social democracy the responsibility for the passivity of the masses. In a historical sense that is indubitable. But we are no historians, we are revolutionary politicians. Our task is not one of conducting historical researches, but of finding the way out.

The S. A. P., which during the first period of its existence took up formally the question of fighting Fascism (especially in articles by Rosenfeld and Seydewitz) made a certain step forward by timing the counter-attack coincidentally with Hitler's assumption of power. Its press now demands that the fight to repel Fascism be begun immediately by mobilizing the workers against hunger and the police yoke. We admit readily that the change in the policy of the S. A. P. was brought about under the influence of Communist criticism: one of the tasks of Communism precisely consists in pushing Centrist forward by criticizing its dual tendencies. But that alone does not suffice: one must exploit politically the fruits of one's own criticism by proposing to the S. A. P. to pass from words to action. One must subject the S. A. P. to a public and a clear test; not by analyzing isolated quotations—that's not enough,—but by offering to make an agreement towards taking specified practical steps against the foe. Should the S. A. P. lay bare its incompetence, the higher the authority of the Communist party would rise, the sooner an intermediate party would be liquidated. What's there to fear?

However, it is not true that the S. A. P. does not seriously want to fight. There are various tendencies within it. For the moment, so long as the matter is reduced to abstract propaganda for a United Front, the inner contradictions lie dormant. Once the battle is begun, they will become apparent. The Communist party stands to gain alone thereby.

But there still remains the most important question as regards the S. D. P. Should it reject those practical propositions which the S. A. P. accepts, a new situation would arise. The Centrists, who would prefer to straddle the fence between the C. P. and the S. D. in order to complain first about one and then about the other, and to gain in strength at the expense of both (such is the philosophy evolved by Urbahns)—these Centrists would find themselves suspended in mid air, because it would immediately become apparent that the S. D. itself is sabotaging the revolutionary struggle. Isn't that an important gain? The workers within the S. A. P. from then on would definitely lean towards the C. P.

Moreover the refusal of Wels and Co. to accept the program of joint action, agreed to by the S. A. P., would not let off the social democrats scot-free either. The VORWAERTS would be deprived immediately of the chance to complain about the passivity of the C. P. The gravitation of the social democratic workers towards the United Front would increase immediately; and that would be equivalent to their gravitation towards the C. P. Isn't that plain enough?

At each one of these stages and turns the C. P. would tap new resources. Instead of monotonously repeating ever the same ready made formulas before the one and the same audience, it would be enabled to set new strata into motion, to teach them through actual experience, to steel them and to strengthen its hegemony among the working class.

—L. TROTSKY.

* Bourgeois publishing houses in Germany.—Ed.