

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. 28 [WHOLE NO. 124]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 9, 1932

PRICE 5 CENTS

## ON THE SPOT

### TROTSKY WRITES ON PROBLEMS OF CHINESE REVOLUTION

"The Problems of the Chinese Revolution" by Leon Trotsky is now for sale. It is published by the Pioneer Publishers, 84 East 10th Street, New York City. The price is one dollar. Not only is the book of tremendous importance as a contribution to the study of the Chinese situation but Trotsky's superb literary style makes the reading of it first class entertainment. No student of the revolutionary movement, no serious class-conscious worker should be without a copy of this book. The Chinese question will loom larger on the political horizon in the future than even during the past several convulsive years. Two interesting reviews of this work have already appeared. The New York Times announced its publication and seized the opportunity to review Stalin, while the Daily Worker confined its observations to a brief mud-slinging review of Trotsky. Neither paper thought it worth while to comment on the contents.

### THE FAT MAN'S DAY IS COMING

If the working class allow this depression to continue much longer our dog-eat-dog society may give way to a man-eat-man society. That's when the old adage, "Nobody loves a fat man" will be reversed, though some may prefer the lean, acting on the theory that "the nearer the bone, the sweeter the flesh". This is a good time to see your dentist and get your fangs sharpened. You should also read the autobiography of some recognized cannibal. You must overcome your prejudice against man-flesh. This prejudice was fostered by man himself as a method of self-preservation. Contrary to a general belief, man is not a cannibal. He is a better eater than a proletarian. His flesh is more tender. This is merely a suggestion, to be taken seriously only in case of emergency.

### BRYAN'S SON IS CHIP OF OLD BLOCKHEAD

The Bryans, like the poor are always with us. Old William, the temperance advocate who used to eat a pound of steak for an appetizer and went out of circulation after he made a monkey out of himself in Dayton, Tennessee, fighting evolution, left us a son worthy of his sire. William Junior is ringing the changes on silver, and claims that bimetalism is the way out of the depression. Here is some of old Bill's bludge as quoted by his son: "No tomb was ever made so strong that it could imprison a righteous cause. Silver will lay aside its grave clothes and its shroud. It will yet rise, and in its rising, will bless mankind." As long as capitalism exists, mankind's lot would not be improved if cuff links or vest buttons became a medium of exchange.

### ZAGARIA IS OUT BUT WICKS REMAINS

A person answering to the tag of Arthur Zagaria was recently removed from the district bureau of the Communist Party in Boston and expelled from the Party on the ground that he was a stool-pigeon. In a lengthy article in the Daily Worker of June 24, the Boston District Bureau flagellates itself in the best self-critical manner for harboring a stoolpigeon in their midst for four years. They admit they were guilty of "rotten liberalism" and "non-Bolshevik tolerance". Surely self-criticism could not go further than that! However our Bolshevik intolerance is somewhat weakened by the presence in the Party of Harry Wicks, author of the famous speech before the Chamber of Commerce of Gary, Indiana in 1920, in which he exposed the activities of the Communists among the steel workers and threatened to go on a lecture tour and write two hefty tomes exposing the Reds. The treachery of this man Wicks was brought to the attention of the Party in 1923 but he was let off with a reprimand, thanks to the defense of John Pepper. Wicks is today one of the leading figures in the Communist Party of the U. S. A., though sad to relate his defender Pepper now occupies a cage in the head offices of the Salt (Heh, Heh!) Trust in Moscow.

### THERE IS STILL SOME MONEY AT LARGE

It seems that some of the natives still have a little money to worry about. Just when we were definitely coming to the conclusion that the paper dollar and its silver and nickel offspring were strictly confined to the museums, up rises Melvin Traylor, potent money magnate of Chicago and gives us an excuse for being late at a Democratic meeting that there was a run on Chicago banks which necessitated his being at his post. Financial genius saved the situation and only ten banks closed their doors, among the number being the institution that carried the account of the local branch of the I. W. W. When the workers expropriate the bankers they will only be getting their money back.

—RIDEM.

## Vote for Foster-Ford

Support the Communist Candidates Against Bourgeois Parties!

With the nomination of Roosevelt and Garner as the Democratic party standard bearers in the elections, the presidential campaign is now fully under way. The machine-controlled Republican convention, dominated by the reactionary White House clique and its pork barrel appointees, had its replica at the Democratic convention, with its exhibition of corridor horse-trading and the nomination of the most prominent political trimmer in the country for president and a hard-shelled reactionary demagogue from the south for vice-president.

### Booze for Bread

While the million-headed army of the unemployed continues to increase its ranks, the outstanding issue at the Democratic convention was booze. The solution of the booze question in the approved Al Smith style is advanced now by the Democratic bosses as the salvation of the country from its ills. As for the unemployed themselves who are suffering so acutely—not to speak of the working class as a whole—the Democrats distinguished themselves from the Republican platform simply by the clever verbal sop thrown to the hungry and homeless. Their platform pledges state insurance, not federal, but nobody has yet detected a Democratic party-controlled state coming forward with any visible speed to provide even state insurance of the most meager sort. Wherever, in short, either the Democratic or Republican platforms grudgingly pledge themselves to carry out some "progressive measure", it can be confidently put into the category of that cynical hypocrisy with which American capitalist politicians, in particular, have been accustomed to feeding the masses in exchange for the votes which enable them to sink their snouts into the trough.

### Socialist Reformism

The patent bankruptcy of the two bourgeois parties—so clear that even the liberal press is compelled to acknowledge it—is making possible a spurt of energy on the part of the American socialists in the present campaign. This party of petty bourgeois reform, symbolically represented by the notorious Right winger, Norman Thomas, appears now as the true "friend of the people". But despite the fact that the American socialists have enjoyed too little governmental power in this country to enable the workers to test them in practice, the whole trend of socialist progress—more properly, decay—throughout the world is sufficient indication to the conscious worker that a pennyworth of support to the S. P. candidates and platform is tantamount to tightening a noose around the neck of the working class.

The Russian social democrats paved the way for the counter-revolution in the early years of successful Bolshevism. The Italian social democrats paralyzed the arms and brains of the working class until Mussolini had marched to Rome and power. The German social democracy, after 14 years of consistent treachery, has finally opened the doors wide to Fascism by restraining the proletariat and canalizing its protest into the reactionary channels of Hindenburg, chair-warmer for Hitler. In England, the

Labourists brought forth from their loins the present National government of reaction. There is not the slightest reason to believe that the American confreres of MacDonald, Turati, Dan, Wels and Scheidemann will turn out to be an improved edition of socialist politicianism. In fact what has been seen of Hillquit and Co. in action up to now—in all fields of working class endeavor in this country—is more than enough grounds to conclude that we have in the S. P. not a proletarian but a petty bourgeois reform party inimical to the interests of the working class.

### Vote Communist!

One party alone represents the interests of the proletariat in this election: the Communist party. The Left Opposition, as is known, does not agree with the present party leadership or its policies, which have only resulted in weakening the Communist movement. But the fact remains that it is the only proletarian party in the election field. The worker who casts his vote for the Communist ticket will know that he is not throwing it away, for he is indicating to his class and to ruling the class the growing temper of struggle among the masses. The Left Opposition in the coming period, and until November, will devote all its energies in a concentration on the election campaign on the side of Communism.

All workers: vote for Foster and Ford! Vote Communist!

### One Dead in Fascist Riot

Along with a hundred or more people killed on Independence Day by explosives, accidents, etc., a Fascist, Salvatore Arena, left this world with a bullet through his head. Both the Fascists and the Anti-Fascists arranged meetings on July 4th in Rosebank to commemorate the anniversary of Garibaldi at his shrine. The inevitable clash occurred. The police sided with the Fascists, slugged and drove off anti-Fascist organizations.

In the train after the meeting a gang of 40 or more black shirts attacked a half dozen anti-Fascists. In the scuffle that ensued the Mussolini supporter was shot dead. A worker is being held on homicide charges. The chances are that the bullet came from a Fascist gun.

## Stalinism in Straits; Opposition on Upsurge

By Leon Trotsky

In the development of the Comintern and, consequently, of the Left Opposition likewise, we are approaching a turn on a major scale. Great events reveal, once again, that false policies which are foisted by force upon the proletarian vanguard bring in their train cruel retaliation. There is not a single problem—literally not a single one!—wherein the insufficiency of the "general line" has not now exposed itself, in its stark, fatal clarity. Whenever a large concern is in straits, creditors from all sides swarm, and act all the more mercilessly the longer the settlement has been protracted.

The war danger in the East is the direct and immediate consequence of Stalin's ruinous policy in relation to the Chinese revolution. The militarists of Japan threaten the Soviet Union because Stalin helped his ally Chiang Kai-Shek to strangle the revolution.

Thereafter the Stalinists propounded that Soviet China could be built on the foundation of the partisan warfare of the peasantry without immediate revolutionary insurrections in the cities. Years of adventurism weakened still further the Chinese proletariat. The responsibility for the present weakness of revolutionary China lies on the shoulders of the politicians of the "Third Period".

For the last two or three years the Opposition never wearied of warning that the prize levers in the industrialization of U. S. S. R. carried with them the threat of a break with the village; that the technically and culturally unprepared-for, "all-embracing" collectivization carried with it the threat of a crisis in staples. At the present moment the warning has become a fact. The Stalinist bureaucracy, along this line also, has jammed itself into inexorable difficulties. Under the yoke of pressing necessity, it is now performing an economic about-turn of exceptional historical importance. But partly because it does not itself understand what it is doing, and partly because it is consciously fooling the party. In the name of prestige, it is disorienting and disarming the working class of the Soviet Union.

What further conditions are required in order to assure the revolutionary hegemony of the German proletariat within the nation; and of the Communist party within the proletariat? Herein too the Stalinist bureaucracy has contrived to doom the Communist party to a fraudulent passivity and a degrading impotence. From 1919 on, the German Social Democracy has worked unceasingly for Fascism. From 1923, the German Communist Party has worked unceasingly in the interests of the social democracy. Ignoring the lessons of the tragic experiences as well as our warnings, the Stalinist bureaucracy is at present driving the German proletariat in a bee line towards an abyss.

The unprecedented economic crisis has turned into the collapse of capitalist so-

## Smash Hitler Now!

The Fascist Danger: A Striking Paralle

### CAPITULATION

Messrs. Fascists do not frighten us, they will go to smash much faster than any other government. (Remmele, Reichstag speech on October 14, 1931.)

### THE MAIN ENEMY

The fact, for example, that in our revolutionary trade union activity proposals could be made from above to the reformist trade unions (Ruhr district), also shows that our theoretical struggle against the social democracy is not pursued with sufficient vigor to make such errors impossible. (Thaelmann, in Die Internationale, Nov.-Dec. 1931, page 489.)

### THE SHAME-FACED TURN

The party must establish the united front of the proletariat on the basis of the burning questions of the worker's life. In leading the struggle against wage reductions, against the diminution of allowances, of social insurance, against the persecutions of workers' organizations, the party calls the broad working masses to participate in the struggle and is ready to march with every organization willing to go along with this fighting front of the party. (Smolyansky, in the Communist International, June 1, 1932, page 468.)

The offer of a united front made by our organization in the Berlin district to all the workers and organizations, is finding an increasingly powerful echo. (Remmele, in l'Humanité, June 20, 1932, 8, 1931.)

### THE UNITED FRONT

If the Fascists try an insurrection, we Communists will fight against them to the last drop of blood—not in order to defend the Braun-Breuning government, but to preserve from strangulation and destruction the cream of the proletariat, the workers' organizations, not only the workers' press of the Communist organizations, but also yours, the social democratic. We are ready to defend with you any workers' home, any printshop of a workers' paper, against the attacks of the Fascists. And we ask of you to agree to come to our aid in case our organizations are threatened. We propose to you the united front of the working class against the Fascists. (L. Trotsky, August 25, 1931.)

### AGAINST FASCISM

It is necessary without any delay, finally to elaborate a practical system of measures—not with the aim of merely "exposing" the social democracy (before the Communists) but with the aim of actual struggle against Fascism. (L. Trotsky, December 8 1931.)

### STRIKE UNITEDLY

No common platform with the social democracy or with the leaders of the German trade unions, no common publications, banners, placards! March separately, but strike unitedly! Agree only on how to strike, whom to strike and when to strike! (L. Trotsky, December 8, 1931.)

### Franco-German Anti-Soviet Alliance Being Formed at Lausanne

The latest news from Germany shows that the tenacious struggle of the international Left Opposition to force a revolutionary front against the impending menace of Fascism has neither been incorrect nor in vain. After having first denied the Fascist danger, after having minimized and mocked at it, after having defied it with theatrically empty gestures, after having lulling the workers of Germany with the assurance that Bruening was equivalent to Fascism—the German Communist Party is now being compelled to steer the course in a different direction. The imminence of the black danger, the relentless progress it has made in the face of Stalinist passivity, the hammer-blows of our criticism, have penetrated now so deeply into the consciousness of the vanguard that a

turn is taking place in official Communist ranks which we can only welcome as a good beginning inadequate as yet, but a turn in the right direction.

### A Turn is Being Made

The stubborn, fatuous antagonism manifested by the Stalinist leaders to our proposal that a united front of Communists and social democrats be established to smash the Fascist advance, is slowly giving way to an acknowledgment of the correctness of our views. The Remmeles, Piecks and Thaelmanns are being compelled to sing a new song. When comrade Trotsky first drew his analogy between the present situation in Germany and the Bolshevik tactics in 1917 with regard to the danger of the Kornilov counter-revolutionary march—it was met with that vile abuse which has been the stereotyped reply of the bureaucrats to the ideas of Bolshevism that the Opposition has been advancing for nine years. Now, however, Remmele has admitted (Rote Fahne, June 17, 1932):

"The Russian working class fought through a similar situation in history. When the Kornilov uprising threatened, the Bolsheviks had themselves armed by the Kerensky government and Kornilov was smashed. Out of the victory over Kornilov grew the triumphant Red October and the Soviet power."

This elementary truth, the Opposition has tried for two years now to beat into the skulls of the bureaucrats who sought to ward off our blows with stupid chatter about "social fascism". Even now, the steps recommended by us for the

(Continued on page 4)

## Successful League Meet

400 Hear Opposition Speakers in Bronx Despite Stalin Gangs

On Saturday, June 25, a squad of party members and sympathizers disrupted a meeting of the New York Branch of the Communist League, on Wilkins and Intervale Ave., Bronx. Thereupon we wrote a letter to the District Committee of the C. P. requesting them to take a stand on these anti-working class tactics, and urging them to condemn the misguided actions of their followers. We received no reply to this letter. But in spite of the silence of the party leaders we proceeded to the same corner to insist upon the right of the Left Opposition to hold meetings on this or any corner, without brooking the interference of any group or organization.

On Wednesday, July 6th, the Opposition came to the corner and staged a meeting. Over 400 were present at the meeting and attentively listened to the speeches of comrades Glotzer, Oehler and Shachtman for more than three hours. Predominant in the crowd were party members and sympathizers. The N. Y. Branch of the Communist League was there in full force with a well-organized workers guard to maintain order at the meeting. A large quantity of militants and pamphlets were sold at the meeting.

The meeting was opened by comrade Glotzer who acted as chairman. He was followed by comrade Oehler, who gave a clear and comprehensive exposition of the election campaign from the Communist viewpoint. He urged support for the Communist party and its candidates, Foster and Ford, in the coming presiden-

tial election. The last speaker of the evening was comrade Shachtman. He stressed the importance of internationalism. In this connection, he understood a detailed analysis of the present situation in Germany, the role of the present government, the social democracy and the Communist parties, and the possible consequences of a Fascist victory for the world's working class and for the Soviet Union. He concluded with an able presentation of the position of the Left Opposition and an ardent appeal to all Communist workers to bring pressure on their organizations to force a change of policy.

The most interesting part of the meeting was the question period. The old slanders, accusations and epithets were hurled at Shachtman. That in all these years of education no real arguments have been produced, is indisputable proof of the bankruptcy of Stalinism. The two gems of the question period are noteworthy of mention. "Why don't you talk about Wilkins Ave., instead of the international situation?" And "Why don't you talk about rent instead of talking about the situation in Germany?"

The meeting ended in an orderly fashion after almost an hour of questioning. Whether this was due to the imposing workers guard at the meeting or to instructions from the party we cannot say. We are inclined to think that it is for the former reason. However it was a tremendous success for the Left Opposition and we intend to repeat it on the same corner in the near future.

## Geneva 'Peace' Swindles

Chain Formed by Hoover, Socialists, Litvinov, Barbusse & Co.

The next issue of the Militant will publish an extensive analysis by comrade Leon Trotsky on the so-called "International conference against war" which has been called for August 1, 1932 at Geneva by Henri Barbusse, Romain Rolland, H. G. Wells, Upton Sinclair, Sen Katayama and others. Some remarks on the subject will be found in the article below.

A monstrous swindle is being practised at Geneva. With all the solemnity of consummate hypocrisy the capitalist statesmen of all the big powers have been gathered there for months to discuss "disarmament". Not one of them is opposed—Heaven forbid!—to disarmament and peace, providing only that it is the other countries that do the disarming. The Geneva conference is not the first one at which this gross fraud has been perpetrated—laying down a thick screen of oratory in favor of peace while the world's armaments are multiplied.

Since the signing of the Versailles treaty, it has been estimated that more than fifty international conference have been held by the leading imperialist powers to "solve" one or another aspect of the problem of peace and security. While the war to end all wars and the post-war conferences went their dreary course, the bandit powers have been systematically increasing their expenditures for armaments and war materials. If a comparison is made between "defense

expenditures" in the year directly preceding the war, 1913, and those of 1930, it will be found that England has increased hers 42 percent, France 30 percent, Italy 44 percent, Japan 142 percent and the United States almost 200 percent. While the statesmen have been dripping with assurances at every conference that their anxiety for peace is firmer than the Gibraltar, the world's expenditures for "defense purposes" have increased from \$3,497,000,000 in 1925 to \$4,128,000,000 in 1930, without a let down in the progression for any single year.

### AMERICA'S SHREWD PACIFISM

While the war expenditures of the powers mount to unscaled heights, their external debts do not decline. On the contrary, the external debts of Britain, Germany, France, Belgium and Italy now total some 28 billions of dollars, to most of which the United States, as the world's great creditor, lays claim. When the American bourgeoisie, therefore, presents its proposals for "reductions in armaments", it gains doubly: first, it makes possible a larger repayment of the debts due to it from Europe, and secondly, it is able to buttress the myth of American pacifism which it has so sedulously cultivated in the minds of the masses. Moreover, the United States can easily afford to reduce its armaments to the lowest scale, proportionally with any other country, for, as the world's largest factory and bank combined in one, it can outstrip any other country in speedy

(Continued on page 2)



# Two «Peace» Swindles at Geneva

The Social Democrats Support Hoover; Hoover is Endorsed by Litvinov; Litvinov is Backed by Barbusse; Barbusse is Supported by the New Republic; the New Republic is Attacked by the Daily Worker; and the Daily Worker Flounders in the Swamp.

(Continued from page 1)  
arms production on the eve of any actual war hostilities.

It is precisely this combination of Yankee shrewdness and imperialist hypocrisy that characterizes the latest Hoover proposal made to the Geneva conference. Were it accepted, it would not merely reduce the standing armies of England and France to the German scale, but it would increase the American army from 140,000 to 200,000. With touching generosity, it proposes the abolition of French and British tanks—which are a formidable factor with them—as well as the abolition of the American army's . . . 25 tanks! It would put a crimp in the naval strength of its rivals, but would permit America to construct new cruisers and aircraft carriers "up to the treaty tonnage of navies."

The Nation ruefully reveals that "the proposals placed before the Geneva Disarmament Conference on June 22 by President Hoover amount to little more than a political trick. To the headline reader, Mr. Hoover has generously advocated a reduction in armies by one-third and a similar scaling down of navies. Studied in detail, however, the Hoover proposals amount to the brazen suggestion that the United States actually increase its armies and navy, leaving reduction to other nations . . . The Hoover disarmament plan would increase the military strength of the United States at the expense of other nations; it is a scheme for securing naval parity at a cheaper figure than that made necessary by the London treaty, and for nearly doubling the size of our army."

## SOCIALISTS RALLY TO HOOVER

When even the liberal Nation, which usually makes a habit of being taken in by the most superficial shams, is able to see through the Hoover hoax, it may be concluded that it is pretty transparent. But however cruel a capitalist deception may be, the social democracy is sure to hasten to its support and render it more palatable to the masses. In England, the executive committee of the Labour Party welcomed Hoover's proposals. In Holland, the Federation of Trade Unions appealed to the disarmament conference to accept the American plan. The French socialist leader, Leon Blum, called it "simple and direct in its outline and plainly worded and fearless in its conclusions". In the United States, the Jewish Daily Forward eulogized the Great Engineer with the observation that "Hoover's plan for a significant reduction not only of the land army but also of the navy, shows that the president is wholly sincere in the question of disarmament, although he does not go far enough." As we shall see in a moment, this despicable, "statesman's" servility before what even an intelligent liberal is not fooled by, is not confined entirely to the social democracy.

The official Communist organ, the Daily Worker does not appear to have any illusions about the significance of Hoover's proposals. On June 25, it polemizes violently against the Forward: facts shows that Hoover's 'disarmament' 'The slightest acquaintance with the proposal is a move in the imperialist struggle for world domination and is intended to weaken Wall Street's rivals, while maneuvering against the Soviet Union. But these Forward socialists pretend to know nothing of shod things. Are these socialists merely mistaken fools in hailing all of this quackery of the president? Or are they simply ignorant prophets that do not understand the ways of the capitalist world? No! The socialist party policy is consciously directed toward supporting the covering up of the war moves of the imperialists. It is their role to bind the toiling masses to the war chariots of the imperialist warmongers, and to represent all the pacifist swindles of the 'disarmament' conferences as genuine . . . The people who are misled by the workers to expect peace from the reactionary governments and their conferences are not simply fools. They are treacherous knaves seeking to betray the toiling masses into a new world slaughter." (Our emphasis).

Not bad, what? Stoutly spoken! Only, virtually every word of condemnation uttered against the Forward applies to the statement made by Litvinov, the Soviet spokesman at Geneva, and printed in the Daily Worker exactly 24 hours it published the quoted philippic against the Forward! Carefully compare what the Forward said about the Hoover proposals with the following quotation from a special officially cabled report in the Daily Worker of June 24:

## LITVINOV WELCOMES THE U. S. PLAN

"Referring to the American proposals he (Litvinov) declared he welcomed the essentials of the proposals made by the American delegation because in part they tend in the same direction as the Soviet proposals which were previously presented here without securing support. He welcomed the proposals, he said, because they contained several important principles put forward by the Soviet delegation in the preparatory disarmament commission and at the conference. These include the method of proportional reduction of armaments, while maintaining relative strength. The American proposals, however, contain points deviating from the Soviet proposals (even the Forward says Hoover does not go far enough! S.) and must be made the object of public discussion. He said he would deal with these points later in detail when the

discussion is opened. He added: 'For my part I would welcome a speedy beginning of discussion with a view of adopting attitude towards American proposals and thus getting the conference to begin work at last.' (Our emphasis.)

In this manner, we have the edifying spectacle of the Daily Worker, through the mouth of so authoritative a "Communist" spokesman as Litvinov, welcoming the essentials of the proposals on Friday which it denounces violently on Saturday, as a "move in the imperialist struggle for world domination." One day, it prints an enthusiastically, approbatory eight-column headline over Litvinov's announcement that Hoover's proposals "contained several important principles put forward by the Soviet delegation"; the next day it brands the same proposals as "intended to weaken Wall Street's rivals, while maneuvering against the Soviet Union." On Friday, the responsible voice of the Soviet Union, with all the prestige among the listening workers that goes with that prerogative, hopes that the adoption of the American proposals will get the "conference to begin work at last"; on Saturday, the Daily Worker warns its readers that those who mislead them to expect anything from such conferences are "not simply fools" but "treacherous knaves seeking to betray the toiling masses". And there is no doubt that the Daily Worker's characterization is correct; only, as both the Forward and Litvinov say about Hoover's proposals, it doesn't go far enough. . .

But those who think that the Worker's vehemence of Saturday wipes out the disgraceful conduct of Litvinov on Friday, show a greater faith than the situation warrants. For the Stalinists have barely dragged the second leg out of one swamp before the first, leg is thrust into another.

If there is anything on the scene today more pernicious—in face of the growing danger of war—than Litvinov's diplomatic antics at Geneva, it is the new plan which supplements these poisonous illusions, rounds them out: the plan for holding an "International Conference Against War", initiated by two petty bourgeois pacifists, Henri Barbusse and Romain Rolland. Here is the appeal sent out by the Barbusse-Roland "International Committee Against War" for the conference, printed in the Daily Worker of June 7, without a word of comment; the emphasis throughout is ours:

"We appeal to all men and women, irrespective of their political parties, trade unions, cultural, political or social organizations, to unite with us in a great international congress against war . . . We appeal to all men and women of good will to participate in our congress which

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)

The Daily Worker attacks the New Republic as "pacifist muddleheads . . . dangerous enemies of the struggle against imperialist war", but it takes care not to mention by a word the liberal endorsement of the Barbusse conference! Why should the New Republic be attacked? It belongs with Barbusse, properly speaking. But what business have the Communists in Geneva, unless they go there to blow up the Barbusse conference, as Lenin advised the Comintern to do with the Hague pacifist congress in 1922?

With the launching and endorsement of the Barbusse swindle, the Comintern is floundering in a treacherous swamp of its own creation. It is inserting itself as a link in a strangulating pacifist chain which includes the liberal phrase-mongers, the social patriots and Hoover. It is forcing the Communist movement to pass once more through the disastrous experience of the Kuo Min Tang policy, of the Anglo-Russian Committee debacle, of an enlarged, and all the more pernicious, edition of the Anti-Imperialist League of Muenzenberg, Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Ledebour, Maxton and Co. For yesterday's August of putschist adventurism, it is turning to an August 1 at Geneva, a masquerade of opportunism and—to use the exact term of the Daily Worker—betrayal.

This "new turn" to the Right in Stalinist policy, half-concealed though it is, reveals that the world crisis is bringing with it a new crisis in Centrism, far-reaching in its consequences. The Communist workers must prepare to deal with it in the Leninist way.—M. S.

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)

The Daily Worker attacks the New Republic as "pacifist muddleheads . . . dangerous enemies of the struggle against imperialist war", but it takes care not to mention by a word the liberal endorsement of the Barbusse conference! Why should the New Republic be attacked? It belongs with Barbusse, properly speaking. But what business have the Communists in Geneva, unless they go there to blow up the Barbusse conference, as Lenin advised the Comintern to do with the Hague pacifist congress in 1922?

With the launching and endorsement of the Barbusse swindle, the Comintern is floundering in a treacherous swamp of its own creation. It is inserting itself as a link in a strangulating pacifist chain which includes the liberal phrase-mongers, the social patriots and Hoover. It is forcing the Communist movement to pass once more through the disastrous experience of the Kuo Min Tang policy, of the Anglo-Russian Committee debacle, of an enlarged, and all the more pernicious, edition of the Anti-Imperialist League of Muenzenberg, Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Ledebour, Maxton and Co. For yesterday's August of putschist adventurism, it is turning to an August 1 at Geneva, a masquerade of opportunism and—to use the exact term of the Daily Worker—betrayal.

This "new turn" to the Right in Stalinist policy, half-concealed though it is, reveals that the world crisis is bringing with it a new crisis in Centrism, far-reaching in its consequences. The Communist workers must prepare to deal with it in the Leninist way.—M. S.

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)

The Daily Worker attacks the New Republic as "pacifist muddleheads . . . dangerous enemies of the struggle against imperialist war", but it takes care not to mention by a word the liberal endorsement of the Barbusse conference! Why should the New Republic be attacked? It belongs with Barbusse, properly speaking. But what business have the Communists in Geneva, unless they go there to blow up the Barbusse conference, as Lenin advised the Comintern to do with the Hague pacifist congress in 1922?

With the launching and endorsement of the Barbusse swindle, the Comintern is floundering in a treacherous swamp of its own creation. It is inserting itself as a link in a strangulating pacifist chain which includes the liberal phrase-mongers, the social patriots and Hoover. It is forcing the Communist movement to pass once more through the disastrous experience of the Kuo Min Tang policy, of the Anglo-Russian Committee debacle, of an enlarged, and all the more pernicious, edition of the Anti-Imperialist League of Muenzenberg, Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Ledebour, Maxton and Co. For yesterday's August of putschist adventurism, it is turning to an August 1 at Geneva, a masquerade of opportunism and—to use the exact term of the Daily Worker—betrayal.

This "new turn" to the Right in Stalinist policy, half-concealed though it is, reveals that the world crisis is bringing with it a new crisis in Centrism, far-reaching in its consequences. The Communist workers must prepare to deal with it in the Leninist way.—M. S.

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)

The Daily Worker attacks the New Republic as "pacifist muddleheads . . . dangerous enemies of the struggle against imperialist war", but it takes care not to mention by a word the liberal endorsement of the Barbusse conference! Why should the New Republic be attacked? It belongs with Barbusse, properly speaking. But what business have the Communists in Geneva, unless they go there to blow up the Barbusse conference, as Lenin advised the Comintern to do with the Hague pacifist congress in 1922?

With the launching and endorsement of the Barbusse swindle, the Comintern is floundering in a treacherous swamp of its own creation. It is inserting itself as a link in a strangulating pacifist chain which includes the liberal phrase-mongers, the social patriots and Hoover. It is forcing the Communist movement to pass once more through the disastrous experience of the Kuo Min Tang policy, of the Anglo-Russian Committee debacle, of an enlarged, and all the more pernicious, edition of the Anti-Imperialist League of Muenzenberg, Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Ledebour, Maxton and Co. For yesterday's August of putschist adventurism, it is turning to an August 1 at Geneva, a masquerade of opportunism and—to use the exact term of the Daily Worker—betrayal.

This "new turn" to the Right in Stalinist policy, half-concealed though it is, reveals that the world crisis is bringing with it a new crisis in Centrism, far-reaching in its consequences. The Communist workers must prepare to deal with it in the Leninist way.—M. S.

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)

The Daily Worker attacks the New Republic as "pacifist muddleheads . . . dangerous enemies of the struggle against imperialist war", but it takes care not to mention by a word the liberal endorsement of the Barbusse conference! Why should the New Republic be attacked? It belongs with Barbusse, properly speaking. But what business have the Communists in Geneva, unless they go there to blow up the Barbusse conference, as Lenin advised the Comintern to do with the Hague pacifist congress in 1922?

With the launching and endorsement of the Barbusse swindle, the Comintern is floundering in a treacherous swamp of its own creation. It is inserting itself as a link in a strangulating pacifist chain which includes the liberal phrase-mongers, the social patriots and Hoover. It is forcing the Communist movement to pass once more through the disastrous experience of the Kuo Min Tang policy, of the Anglo-Russian Committee debacle, of an enlarged, and all the more pernicious, edition of the Anti-Imperialist League of Muenzenberg, Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Ledebour, Maxton and Co. For yesterday's August of putschist adventurism, it is turning to an August 1 at Geneva, a masquerade of opportunism and—to use the exact term of the Daily Worker—betrayal.

This "new turn" to the Right in Stalinist policy, half-concealed though it is, reveals that the world crisis is bringing with it a new crisis in Centrism, far-reaching in its consequences. The Communist workers must prepare to deal with it in the Leninist way.—M. S.

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)

The Daily Worker attacks the New Republic as "pacifist muddleheads . . . dangerous enemies of the struggle against imperialist war", but it takes care not to mention by a word the liberal endorsement of the Barbusse conference! Why should the New Republic be attacked? It belongs with Barbusse, properly speaking. But what business have the Communists in Geneva, unless they go there to blow up the Barbusse conference, as Lenin advised the Comintern to do with the Hague pacifist congress in 1922?

With the launching and endorsement of the Barbusse swindle, the Comintern is floundering in a treacherous swamp of its own creation. It is inserting itself as a link in a strangulating pacifist chain which includes the liberal phrase-mongers, the social patriots and Hoover. It is forcing the Communist movement to pass once more through the disastrous experience of the Kuo Min Tang policy, of the Anglo-Russian Committee debacle, of an enlarged, and all the more pernicious, edition of the Anti-Imperialist League of Muenzenberg, Chiang Kai-Shek, Calles, Ledebour, Maxton and Co. For yesterday's August of putschist adventurism, it is turning to an August 1 at Geneva, a masquerade of opportunism and—to use the exact term of the Daily Worker—betrayal.

This "new turn" to the Right in Stalinist policy, half-concealed though it is, reveals that the world crisis is bringing with it a new crisis in Centrism, far-reaching in its consequences. The Communist workers must prepare to deal with it in the Leninist way.—M. S.

will take place on August 1, 1932, in Geneva, in order to make the congress a powerful international demonstration against the war criminals: Let us not run the risk of failing to understand, or of understanding too late! Let us awaken the conscience of the world in order to steel its will against war! Let us organize an iron resistance to war! Let us form a mighty wave of all those men and women who are unwilling to be the victims of the second world war!"

Who has concocted this mélange of pacifist confusion? We have no hesitation in saying that its real initiators live in the Comintern building and the Kremlin in Moscow! The central organs of the French Communist Party and of the Red trade unions in France have already given the conference a blanket endorsement, an inconceivable action unless it is taken for granted that official Stalinist sanction has been given to Barbusse and Co. On June 20, the Daily Worker announced that "the International Committee of the Friends of Soviet Russia has informed the Preparatory Committee organizing this congress that it welcomes this step most warmly and intends participating in the Congress". And on the same day that it prints Litvinov's scandalous remarks on page one, the Daily Worker observes in its editorial condemnation of the Hoover proposals that

"Against this international conference of disarmament swindlers, the working class must set up their own international united front and participate in the International Conference Against Imperialist War called at Geneva on August 1."

Isn't there something sinister about this whole business? The threat of imperialist war does hover darkly over the world now. In Manchuria, a state of war actually exists. A Fascist victory in Germany brings with it, almost automatically, a black crusade against the Soviets. But the Communist International and the Red International of Labor Unions have not uttered a single word on the matter, not a single manifesto, not a single appeal in their own names. In this crucial hour, the working class listens in vain for a word of guidance from the center of the organized world revolutionary movement. But behind the scenes, the Comintern does organize a masquerade under the names of confused and consequently dangerous pacifists and proclaims through its national sections as the working class united front against imperialism!

A MASQUERADE OF STALINISM

The Communist International does not take the initiative in mobilizing the workers against the war danger. No, it leaves that to Barbusse, the advocate of socialist-Communist fusion; to Rolland, as great a writer as he is a poor politician, or none at all; to Heinrich Mann, about whom the same may be said; to Albert Einstein, who is undoubtedly a great scientist; to H. G. Wells, the social chauvinist of 1914; and more of the same type. Is there any reason to doubt that such a conference will attract to itself all the politicians, adventurers, petty bourgeois socialists and semi-socialists who figured in the various congresses of the "Anti-Imperialist League" and the "Anglo-Russian Committee, who thereby refreshed their reputations at the springs of Stalinism, gained a new hold on the masses slipping out of their hands, and this mounted to the top again?

Is it any wonder that the organ of bewildered petty bourgeois liberalism, the New Republic, should hail such a conference? "It is heartening to learn that a peace movement is being started along new lines. An international committee headed by Henri Barbusse . . . will try to initiate nothing less than a general war against war, a campaign to be waged on all fronts by every appeal to public opinion. This is a time, moreover, when such an appeal might be decisive." (June 29, 1932.)



# The Spanish Opposition Conference

MADRID, SPAIN.—

A new stage in the life of the Spanish Communist Left Opposition (which has since adopted the name Spanish Communist Left) has begun with the Third National Conference. The decisions adopted envisage the going over of the organization from the stage of organic formation and propaganda, which obtained up to the date of the Conference, to a position of activity and direct intervention in the social and political struggles of the Spanish proletariat. For this purpose it was necessary to establish an organ of struggle in the form of El Soviet which has reappeared with redoubled combativity.

The intervention of the Communist Left Opposition in the workers' struggles of course drew in its wake, as was to be expected, an accentuation of the governmental reprisals against our best militants. The reprisals were not late in coming and have showed that the bourgeoisie has a clear idea as to what our organization is and represents and as to how dangerous the working class can become under the leadership of the authentic Bolsheviks.

## The Police and the Conference

The conference in itself had the great pleasure of mobilizing the police of the republic against itself. It was only natural that although our organization did not participate very actively and persistently as an organization in the various political movements (although its militants have always been in the front ranks of the revolutionary struggle) our Conference very seriously disturbed the police of the republic. They were afraid, no doubt that there would be a representative of Trotsky and they mobilized the whole guard to snoop him out and to arrest him. Fortunately, our comrades delegates from the International Secretariat are not Stalinists to preoccupy themselves more with the uproar that their arrests may produce than with the execution of the mission that the organization had entrusted to them. Our comrades came to our National Conference as representatives of the French Opposition and the International Secretariat and were interested in fulfilling their duties. And they accomplished their task, notwithstanding the strict vigilance of the Direction General de Seguridad (police). They participated in the sessions of the Conference whenever they considered it necessary. The vigilance of the police was a clear indication of the beginning of a chapter of reprisals against us. The police held watch, trying to find out the attitude of our organization. Up till a short time ago, we had in Spain a small nucleus of comrades who defended the ideas of Bolshevism with great vigor, criticizing the mistakes of the party, a matter which was of little consequence to the police. But since then we have started to transform ourselves into a serious force—and the Conference was proof of that. We have begun to take on the character of a formidable organization, we have laid the basis of the organization, which con-

stituted at the time of the Conference, about 1,000 militants, prepared and disciplined in the struggle. Our conference decided to mobilize this force, to set it in motion.

## Governmental Repression

The present governmental reprisals do not, therefore, take us by surprise. On the contrary, it was to be expected and it is logical that this should happen. The Stalinist bureaucrats can now, if they wish, bandy about accusations and calumnies of "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism". Neither the working class, nor the members of the party will believe them. The Communist Left Opposition is in the vanguard of the revolution, it functions as such and suffers the heaviest blows of the repression. Arrests follow one after the other. Our comrades pass incessantly through the mill of prisons and police stations in Spain. Our press is continually being censored and suppressed by the police. The case of our weekly El Soviet is symptomatic of this fact.

After the Conference, we succeeded in publishing four issues of our weekly and all four issues were censored and suppressed by the police. Thanks to the ability of our comrades and their preparation for illegal work, we have been able to save part of the copies, but we can see their determined intention in all this to destroy our organization by every possible means. Since our economic resources are very limited (something that the Spanish police is well aware of) they are trying to crush us with this method and adding to this the imprisonment of the responsible comrades of our organizations. The police knows very well what is going on. It is not for nothing that a Spanish policeman has recently written a book about Communism in Spain, a book that is recommended for all the Spanish police to read, to guide them in carrying out their functions, in which it says literally that the most capable and most dangerous militants (keep in mind what the word "dangerous" means for the police) belong to the Communist Left Opposition of Spain.

El Soviet is suppressed, arrests are made for merely selling it in the streets. Our comrades of Seville almost live in the fortress of Puerto de Santa Maria, to which they were sent only for selling our weekly. It is a case without precedent in Spain. Not even during the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera were prisoners transferred from prison to fortress, when arrested only on government orders, without a trial and without any justification by the police for the arrests. More than 60 comrades of our organization have gone through the jails of the republic since our National Conference alone, some of them had the "good fortune" to be arrested twice or three times.

## The Opposition's Growth

But our organization has been inured to hardships in the fight. It grows and develops in quality as well as in quantity. It is a hard test and purifies our ranks of accidental and cowardly elements, but brings to our side other elements, more combative, real fighters who formerly were somewhat misled by the calumnies of the Stalinist bureaucracy and had believed that we were really counter-revolutionists and insignificant. But in this respect, the congress of the official Communist party, held shortly before our National Conference could not be excelled by any better advertisement for us. Without "counter-revolutionary Trotskyism" the congress of the Stalinized Spanish party would not have had anything to discuss, or nothing was discussed there except calumnies against us. The honest Communist militants who did not know anything about "Trotskyism", who had heard only some fantastic and slanderous remarks about the "Trotskyists" began to think more seriously about us. Since then, they have been able to see in practice what we are

and how we work. They have understood us and have come to us. Elements who had attacked the Communist Left Opposition at the party congress without knowing what it stood for, now come to us. Police repression grows parallel with the adherence of new elements to our banner. And so, the reprisals, instead of destroying our organization, fortify it organically. There are examples to prove this. In Estremadura, at the time of the Conference, we had about a hundred comrades. Now we have more than three hundred. In Salamanca we had about fifty. Now we have more than a hundred in several groups. The same thing holds true for Galicia and other places.

Our organization has learned to stand the test, because it is composed of real Bolsheviks, many of them old militants, tested in the active struggle. Our organization now is a genuine Communist party, destined to play a highly impor-

tant role in the Spanish labor movement. While the other working class organizations are becoming demoralized and begin to disintegrate, while the depression in the labor movement is becoming accentuated and the C. N. T. is going through a sharp crisis and the Communist party witnesses defections from its ranks in great numbers—our organization continues to grow and to increase its activities. But we also are going through a crisis, an economic crisis which obstructs our action. The great majority of our comrades are unemployed. Our groups, in increasing their membership, also increase their local needs, and therefore their support of the Executive Committee from the economic point of view, is more feeble than before.

The Spanish Communist Left has before it a great revolutionary future of which it must not fail to take advantage. But it also has enormous responsibilities, a perspective of titanic struggle with all its consequences. As the proletarian vanguard, it will know how to fulfill its duty.

—HENRI LACROIX.

## Spanish Opposition Youth Makes Appeal

The National Youth Committee has considered the letter of our Spanish youth comrades and decided to appeal for funds to aid them in the publication of the contemplated magazine, *Joven Espartaco*. We pledge ourselves to raise twenty-five dollars for the drive and are therefore appealing to our comrades and sympathizers to aid the Spanish comrades in their valiant efforts to establish a Left Communist youth paper in Spain. Now is the time to display a bit of real internationalism. Make your donations as soon as possible. Every little bit will help. Send all contributions to:

Albert Glotzer, Secretary,  
The National Youth Committee,  
84 East 10th Street,  
New York, N. Y.

To the National Youth Committee,  
Communist League of America (O.):  
Dear Comrades:

We have started to organize the youth sections of the Left Opposition. At the present time we have numerous groups in Madrid, Barcelona, Cadiz, Sevilla, Salónica, Asilero, Sama de Lango, Lugo, Gijón, Oviedo, Magullá (Bodajoz) etc. In the organ of the Left Opposition starting with the next issue, we will begin to publish our page, *The Young Soviet*. But the big progress achieved in the organization of youth sections of the Left Opposition obliges us to break with the small and narrow frame of a monthly page and to widen our sphere of activities with the publication of a 16-page magazine. The publication of the magazine which will be a monthly, will permit us to come in more close contact with the working youth in general and the young communists in particular. But this imposes big economic sacrifices upon us. The situation of the young workers, due to the deep crisis that Spain is going through, is desperate. For the publication of our magazine we need 300 pesetas. We are counting upon your help and for this we are sending a subscription list. In assuring the first issue, for which we need to collect 300 pesetas, the magazine will be able to live on its own account and its publication for the future will also be assured.

We await material that you will send for publication in the magazine which will be called *Joven Espartaco* (Young Spartacus), not only informative articles about the life of the working youth in America and of the young communists, but also articles of collaboration. We will do likewise; for which purpose the National Committee of the youth delegate comrade Eugenio F. Granell. We await also the names of three or four comrades to be included in our list of collaborators.

It had to be expelled, waited only a few brief weeks before the whole Soviet Union was shaken to its base by a demonstration of the tremendous power which the Kulak had amassed all the while that Bukharin-Stalin-Molotov-Rykov had been covering him up from Trotsky's criticisms. In January 1928, right after the congress and emboldened, as we have said, by their success in having the Left wing cut off from the party, the Kulaks rose in what came to be known as their "bloodless uprising". Powerful and confident, they refused to turn over their hoarded stocks of grain and, in effect, declared: Unless the Soviet power yields to our demands for prices above those fixed by the proletarian state we shall keep our stores and starve the cities the working class centers, into submission!

So effective and alarming was their resistance that for the first time in many long years, the Soviets were compelled to requisition the villages' grain by armed force. All the official philosophy of "Enrich yourselves!", the vicious self-consolation about the insignificance of the Kulak, the rabid hounding of the Opposition for its timely warnings, were now whipped to tatters by the sharpness of the visible realities.

On February 15, 1928, the leading editorial of Pravda was compelled to hang its head and acknowledge: "The village proved to be perverted in a whole, has grown and become rich. The kulak, above all, has grown and become rich. . . . The line of our party in the villages of districts . . . in our organizations, certain elements alien to the party have grown up in recent times, which do not understand the foundations of our class policy, which strive to carry out the work in such a manner that nobody in the village is alienated, so that they live in peace with the Kulak, so that,

# With the Food Workers

In a recent issue of *The Militant* we pointed out that the maneuver of the Trade Union Unity Council to take the co-op camps out of the hands of the union was a scheme to force a wage cut. Events have fully confirmed our forecast.

About two months ago a proposal was made to the leading food workers fraction of the Communist party by the T. U. U. C. that the work at the Co-op camps this year would be on a voluntary basis. The leading fraction, however, emphatically, rejected the proposal and appointed a committee to interview Browder, the secretary of the party and explain to him the disastrous consequences that would result to the Food Workers Industrial Union from the decision.

## A Bureaucratic Reply

Bureaucrat Browder replied to the committee's arguments with an attack on the food workers. He charged the union with ruining the camps by insisting on a union wage scale; that the food workers were as bad as the printers who were sucking the life-blood out of the *Daily Worker*. Browder was merely repeating the arguments of the camp managers who for years have agitated for the open shop, while the managers were drawing over \$50 a week in salaries along with board and room for their families.

After the tussle with Browder, the Central Committee of the party handed down another decree to the union in the form of a wage cut. And what a slash!

Chefs and cooks whose wages were from \$50 to \$75 a week were reduced to \$12 a week and unskilled help from \$22 to \$10.

## The Party Workers Hit Back

The general fraction unanimously rejected this decision and elected another committee to take up the question with the Central Committee. The fraction condemned Browder's attitude, pointing out that he and the Central Committee were subordinating the interests of the union and the industrial line of the Party to the making of profits.

Joseph Zack, Lenin School graduate, who is in charge of the Co-op activities of the T. U. U. C., was not present at the general fraction meeting, due, it is believed, to an unpleasant experience he had some time ago with the Co-Op employees in the Bronx when he locked out the union workers because of their refusal to accept a wage cut. Zack made a "united front from above" with the managers and was bitterly denounced by the workers. So he assigned Sam Weissman, former secretary of the Food Workers Union to the task of braving the wrath of the general fraction meeting of the food workers. Weissman was unable to control the members so the meeting was adjourned until the following evening when the committee was scheduled to report on how it fared with the Central Committee.

The committee reported that the Central Committee refused to grant an interview, so they decided to call on Israel Amter, New York district organizer. Amter greeted the committee with threats of reprisal for daring to disagree with the decree handed down to them from the C. E. C. He also expressed his indignation over their impudence in criticizing Browder, evidently acting on the theory that whatever quarrels bureaucrats may have with one another they must present a united front against the worker-Communists.

Pointing an index finger at the door, Amter told the committee to scram. "If you don't like the decision," he roared, "get out. There is the door."

When the committee made its report, the members of the General Fraction were vigorous in protesting against the bureaucrats' treatment accorded them by the party functionaries and renewed their criticisms of Browder. Then George Siskind appeared on the scene as a party representative and took the members for a trimming. He denounced them as enemies of the party and trotted out the well-known formula that sooner or later they would find themselves in the camp of the enemy.

## The Managers Sit Pretty

Here we might as well insert the fact that while the C. E. C. was engaged in the "revolutionary" task of reducing the wages of the Co-op employees to the starvation point, there were two managers in Camp Nitgedagiet alone drawing forty dollars a week each with room and board for their families thrown in, while the number of guests in the camp did not total more than twenty-five, it being early in the season.

On June 25, a special membership meeting of the cafeteria department of the Food Workers Union was called to vote on the wage cut decision. The party fraction was mobilized and forced under threats of discipline to put over a decision that is a disgrace to the Communist movement and a heavy blow at the task of organizing the workers into industrial unions under the leadership of the party. As pointed out in a previous article in *The Militant* this decision and others of the same kind strengthen the anarchist and syndicalist elements who hold that the Communists are not interested in organizing unions to help the workers better their living conditions but use them as milch cows for the party. Fourteen Party members voted against the wage cut in defiance of the bureaucracy and a considerable number abstained from voting. Now for an interesting postscript to this wage cutting decision. After the wage cut went through, the C. E. C. notified the union that its members would be employed at the camps for one week only, that is the week of July 4, at \$18 a week. After which date bungalows would be rented to the guests and they could prepare their own meals.

This sounds fishy to the members of the union. They wonder if this is a subtle maneuver to get rid of the union and return the camps to the open shop conditions that existed prior to the organization of the industrial union. We urge the comrades to insist on maintaining union conditions in the camps whether they remain in the hands of the party or are turned over to private enterprise.

The whole time of the union leadership and a good part of the party's time is occupied with the co-operatives despite the optimistic statement made by John Steuben at the close of 1931 when he told the delegates to the convention that the union had made such an advance that it was now necessary for the convention to devote only a small part of its time to a discussion of the union problems in the co-operative institutions of the party.

The serious situation that exists in the Food Workers Union demands the attention of all militants. The policy of organizing workers into unions so that they may be exploited to maintain their bureaucracy, must be thrown in the garbage can.

—FOODWORKER.

Young Spartacus, official organ of the young comrades of the Communist League of America (Opposition) is out and ready for distribution. All those interested in the paper should communicate with the YOUNG SPARTACUS, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.

## PICNIC

to be held at  
**TIBBETS BROOK PARK**  
**NEW YORK — PLOT 2**  
**JULY 10th, 1932 from 10:00 A.M.**  
**till Dusk**  
for the benefit of  
**Spanish Left Communist Youth**  
Auspices: Spartacus Youth Club  
of New York  
Directions: Take Lexington Avenue  
I. R. T. Subway Woodlawn-Jerome  
to last stop, Woodlawn. Take  
trolley, bus or walk to park,  
Plot 2.

## Nine Years of the Struggle of the Left Opposition

## The Break in the Right-Center Bloc and the Left Zig-zag of Stalinism

(Continued from last issue)

With that Marxian penetration and foresight that marks out the whole course of the Left Opposition, it had forecast this very struggle long before it broke out. A good three years before, in September 1928, Trotsky had written with prophetic exactitude in the Opposition document "On the Unity of the Party":

"The aim of all these discussions and conclusions leading to displacements in the organization, is the annihilation of the nucleus which, up to very recently, was called the old Leninist guard, and the substitution for it of the personal leadership of Stalin, leaning on a group of comrades who always agree with him. Only a blockhead or a hopelessly hardened bureaucrat can believe that the Stalinist struggle for 'the unity of the party' can guarantee this unity, even if it were only at the price of the annihilation of the former leading group and, in general, of the whole present Opposition. The closer Stalin appears to be to this aim the farther away, in reality, he will be from it. A party leadership reduced to a single individual, which is what Stalin and his group of intimates call 'the unity of the party', requires for its establishment not only the destruction, the elimination and the decapitation of the present united Opposition, but also the gradual removal from the leadership of the most authoritative and influential representatives of the faction now in power. It is quite clear that neither Tomsy, Bukharin nor Rykov, by

reason of their past, their moral authority, etc., are capable of playing the role, under Stalin's rule which devolves upon Uglanov, Kaganovitch, Petrovsky and consorts. To cut off the present Opposition would mean, in fact the inevitable transformation into an opposition of the remnants of the old group in the Central Committee. A new discussion would rise upon the agenda, during which Kaganovitch would expose Rykov, Uglanov would do as much with Tomsy, while the Slepovs, Stalin and Co. would lash out at Bukharin. Only a blockhead can fall to see how inevitable this forecast is. In the meantime, the more openly opportunist elements in the party would begin to fight Stalin as too contaminated by the 'Leftist' prejudices and for preventing too rapid and public a downsiding."

With the transposition of one or two names, this "Trotskyist calumny" was borne out some three years later with almost mathematical precision. The three leaders of the Right wing were presented by Stalin to the Russian party and the whole world as the banner-bearers of the Communist International, the head of the Soviet government, and the leader of the Soviet trade unions, were depicted by Stalin as the agents of the Thermidorian counter-revolution! But it is precisely this "trio" with whom Stalin had for five-six years been in the most intimate "indissoluble" alliance against the Left wing of the party. If Stalin's indictment of the Right wing had

any meaning at all—and it did—it was at the same time a murderous arraignment of the Centrist faction itself. For what pretense could it make to Bolshevism when it had admittedly been in distinguishable solidarity for half a decade with restorationists? Where in all history could an instance be found of the genuine revolutionary tendency having been in an inseparable bloc with another tendency which, within virtually twenty-four hours, proved to be the champion of black reaction?

Given the fact that both sections of the leadership had a common principle basis, given the fact that to cut off the Right wing Stalin had to borrow conspicuously from the ideological arsenal of the Left Opposition (the Right wing did not hesitate to accuse him of "Trotskyism" just as Trotsky foretold in 1926!) Stalin's campaign against the Right wing served at the same time as a deadly self-revelation of Centrism, and an involuntary tribute to the justice of the whole Opposition struggle.

## The Kulak Uprising

Let us return to the Fifteenth Congress. All its proceedings were conducted under the flag of denouncing the Opposition as panic-mongers for warning against the growing Kulak danger. Just as Rykov before him had taunted the Opposition with the question: If the Kulak is so dangerous why hasn't he played us some bad tricks?—So Molotov cried impatiently in December 1927 that the Kulak was nothing new, that there was no need of alarm or of special measures beyond those already in force. Everybody "agrees" argued Molotov, who, together with the other Stalinists, insistently minimized the magnitude of the exploiting farmers, "it exists, and there is no need to speak about it."

This bureaucratic self-contentment, turned to fury when the Opposition which did find a "need to speak about

it", had to be expelled, waited only a few brief weeks before the whole Soviet Union was shaken to its base by a demonstration of the tremendous power which the Kulak had amassed all the while that Bukharin-Stalin-Molotov-Rykov had been covering him up from Trotsky's criticisms. In January 1928, right after the congress and emboldened, as we have said, by their success in having the Left wing cut off from the party, the Kulaks rose in what came to be known as their "bloodless uprising".

Powerful and confident, they refused to turn over their hoarded stocks of grain and, in effect, declared: Unless the Soviet power yields to our demands for prices above those fixed by the proletarian state we shall keep our stores and starve the cities the working class centers, into submission!

So effective and alarming was their resistance that for the first time in many long years, the Soviets were compelled to requisition the villages' grain by armed force. All the official philosophy of "Enrich yourselves!", the vicious self-consolation about the insignificance of the Kulak, the rabid hounding of the Opposition for its timely warnings, were now whipped to tatters by the sharpness of the visible realities.

On February 15, 1928, the leading editorial of Pravda was compelled to hang its head and acknowledge: "The village proved to be perverted in a whole, has grown and become rich. The kulak, above all, has grown and become rich. . . . The line of our party in the villages of districts . . . in our organizations, certain elements alien to the party have grown up in recent times, which do not understand the foundations of our class policy, which strive to carry out the work in such a manner that nobody in the village is alienated, so that they live in peace with the Kulak, so that,

—SHACHTMAN.



## An Admission of Bankruptcy

Several weeks ago, when we carried an article in *The Militant* entitled "The Right Wing International on the Verge of Collapse", the Lovestone sheet waxed indignant, confounded us together with the genuine liars from the Stalinist camp and in a feigned gesture of contemptuous pride, stuck out its chest—upon which, alas, blows are soon to pound in loud repentance. . . .

### A Damaging Admission

Three weeks later—we can hardly believe our eyes—the columns of the *Workers' Age* itself carry statements to this effect: "The International Communist Opposition (read: the international Right wing—Ed.), considered as a political unity, as a cohesive, smoothly functioning international faction in the C. I. has failed to measure up to the tasks which the situation in the world labor movement and in the Comintern has placed before it. The International Communist Opposition (read: the Right wing—Ed.) today is in a serious crisis, political as well as organizational" (*Workers' Age*, June 25.)

But even more damning than these admissions, which the Right wing leaders are forced to make before their alarmed and awakening rank and file, is their confession that there never actually was anything like an organized international Right wing. The "Resolution on the International Conference", from which the above passage was quoted, tells us that "except for the transmission of correspondence between the various groups, the international center has hardly functioned." (1) That this was the case all along we have never doubted and we have more than once pointed out that the Right wing were merely drawing thereby the logical practical conclusions flowing from the theory of socialism in one country.

The "Resolution on the International Conference" is Lovestone's Declaration of Bankruptcy. Seen in the light of recent developments, it represents an attempt of Lovestone to square himself with his taskmasters of tomorrow by cutting himself away from his allies of today.

"The chief manifestations of this crisis . . .", the resolution says, "is the fact that the substantial unanimity in principles (?) upon which it (the Right wing international—Ed.) was built up has now to a considerable extent been reduced to merely agreement on tactical questions".

Here we have, then, on black and white, an avowal from the lips of Lovestone himself that his international alliance has no principle basis. But—there remains the basis of agreements on tactical questions. What tactical questions? Is it the tactical question of reform of the Communist International or the establishment of a new International? His resolution itself tells us that "There are some (Swedish Opposition) who regard the present crisis in the world Communist movement as essentially incurable on the basis of the rehabilitation of the existing Communist International. . . ."

Is it the tactical question on how to negotiate for readmission into the Communist International? Let us see. While Lovestone carries on negotiations with Comintern representatives in America, his erstwhile allies in Germany, the Brandlerites, write in their resolution:

### Brandler's View

"The International Communist Opposition (Right wing—Ed.) and the organizations belonging to it reject the maneuvers of the officials of the C. I. and their sections in approaching individual national organizations, local groups or individual members for the purpose of rejoining, so far as to play them off against one another". (Gegen den Strom, June 18, 1932). This declaration on the part of the Brandlerites gives the lie, by the way, to the Lovestone contention, in their "answer" to us referred to above, that "the unity moves . . . which the C. P. Majority Group (Lovestoneites) have made, have been made with the full knowledge and approval of the German Opposition (Brandlerites) . . ."

*Workers' Age*, May 21). But this is just

another typical trick of the Lovestone fakers and does not surprise anyone who knows them. Lovestone pulled his followers into the Brandlerist camp in the dark of night. There is no reason why he should be expected to pull them out of it by any different methods.

Is it perhaps, we ask ourselves in exhaustion, the tactical question of the attitude towards the Left Opposition that the Right wingers agree on. Even there, no agreement exists. The Lovestone resolution tells us:

"In general, only a few of the Opposition groups have worked out a definite viewpoint on the question of Trotskyism". But it does admit that "in the now-expelled minority of the German Opposition and in the group around Neurath in the Czech Opposition, definite and avowed Trotskyist tendencies have become manifest". He merely forgets to mention that the reason why "only a few of the Opposition groups have worked out a definite viewpoint on the question of Trotskyism" is that they are not quite safe with their rank and file on this point.

Finally, the resolution informs us, "There is not sufficient agreement, on the question of Centrism (the Left wing reformists) and the relations of the Opposition towards it . . .". In the discussion which arose in the International Communist Opposition (Right wing), the existence of certain unclarity on a number of Opposition groups become visible."

The fact that Centrism has been tolerated in a number of groups with which he has been associated for nearly two years does not, however, restrain Lovestone from giving the following, altogether baseless, estimate of the relationship between the Left Opposition and Centrism.

### A Right Wing Lie

" . . . Trotsky himself has initiated a deliberate policy of political rapprochement (sic) with the Centrist organizations, a move generally welcomed by the latter. It is not an altogether unfamiliar role for Trotsky to play as the crystallizing force for various Centrist tendencies as a grouping. The political platform of this new Trotskyist alliance can be clearly seen from recent developments (which developments?): Trotsky lends the Centrists the much needed mantle of revolutionary integrity, while they agree to operate as the West European supporters of the Trotsky faction in the C. P. S. U." Truly conceived according the traditional Lovestoneite horse-trade criterion. But comrade Trotsky and the Russian Opposition will thank Lovestone very kindly for this very Lovestonish "political platform" and remind him that we—the Left Opposition have got an International Center and that it does function and not only "for the transmission of correspondence between the various groups."

The only thing that stands out clearly in this confused, equivocal, characteristically opportunist "Resolution on the International Conference" is the resumption by Lovestone of the fight with all the necessary flourishes, against—"counter-revolutionary Trotskyism", in this document, still—the "counter-revolutionary phase of Trotskyism". The hazy charges of "Thermidorian accusations of Trotskyism against the Soviet State and the C. P. S. U.", with which the Right wing fishermen hope to hook their rank and file bait. The talk about our "scepticism as to the possibilities of socialist construction (!)" in the U. S. S. R.—is beneath reply. And so on.

Lovestone must ingratiate himself once more with the top sergeants of the Stalin faction. There is no better way for him to do this, there is nothing more palatable of flattery for these subalterns in the cloaks of generals than sustenance in the fight against Trotskyism. And Lovestone is an expert in this.

The negotiations for the re-establishment of the Right-Center bloc are going on full blast. The Right wing is toppling over. No time must be lost.

And so Lovestone makes haste, digs up his old clothes—"principles" and "tactics"—rushes over to the pawnshop of Uncle Stalin, gets the pure coin of a new assignment in the fight against "Trotskyism" and a new lease of political life for himself. But these are hard times. And who knows how long this coin will last?

—SAM GORDON.

## Smash Hitler Now

(Continued from page 1)

united front of the Communist party with the Social Democratic Party and the reformist trade unions, are still being taken half-heartedly and in a distorted manner. But a start has been made.

### A Complete Revision Needed

If matters are to rest with this "start" the danger will remain in all its force. We already have more than an inkling of what Hitler's victory would mean. The increasing arrogance of the Fascists, the daily assassination of radical workers in the streets, is a foretaste of what the Brown-Shirts would give the workers if they gained power. The negotiations at Lausanne between von Papen and Herriot for the establishment of an alliance which can be directed only against the Soviet Union, is another indication of what Hitler will aim at—for von Papen is only warming the seat of power for the Austrian adventurer. After babbling for years their abstract slogans of "Defend the Soviet Union!" the bureaucrats averred themselves to be incompetent to deal with the most actual threat to the existence of the workers' republic. The best defense of it at the present stage is a smashing defeat of Hitlerism. The latter can only be accomplished by a fundamental, open, serious revision of the criminal policy thus far pursued by Stalinism.

Days count now. The time to fight Hitlerism is not after it has conquered power, but before. The way to fight it is to throw overboard the vapors about "social fascism" and to set up a genuine united front for the extra-parliamentary mass struggle against Fascism. The Bolshevik pointed the way in 1917. The German Bolsheviks must tread the same path, and do it without delay.

### EXTRA! EXTRA! FINK DISCOVERED IN S. L. P.?

It is hard to believe it. We simply refuse to believe it. Even the *Weekly People* is in doubt, though the story appeared on the front page of a recent issue of the official organ of the Socialist Labor Party. The story is that the section organizer of the South Bend section of the S. L. P. was arrested and charged with making bombs in co-operation with an individual alleged to be a stool-pigeon for the Bendix corporation. Of course the scoundrel was immediately expelled from the S. L. P. and the figurative tin can tied to his coat tail. But what bothers the *Weekly People* and indeed ourselves is how in hades did he manage to be elected section organizer in the S. L. P. and what the hell was he doing there anyhow? As the *W. P.* truly observes, the S. L. P. is down on anarchists, wobbles and Communists and repeatedly warns the government and all detective agencies that when an S. L. P. member is mistaken for a character dangerous to the existing order he is confused with a couple of other fellows.

### THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 54 East 10th St., N. Y.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern James P. Cannon  
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector  
Arne Swabeck  
Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879.

Vol. 5, No. 28 (Whole No. 124)  
Saturday, JULY 9, 1932  
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy.

## Stalinism's Straits; Opposition's Rise

(Continued from page 1)

ship is decomposing the Communist ranks, destroying the will of some, causing aversion in others.

### Redoubled Blows at the Opposition

The settlement for the sins of several periods of epigone errors and crimes is face to face with us. Doomed by history, the Centrist bureaucracy with redoubled efforts clutches after tried methods. Having fallen into a vice between its classes enemies and the consequences of its own crimes, it redoubles, trebles its blows against the Left Opposition.

Seemingly everything has been tried already: vilifications, arrests, exiles, and firing squads. But no! In the Stalinist kitchen new dishes are being prepared from the decoctions and dregs of hatred and perfidy. Not so very long ago, *Pravda* reproduced photographic facsimiles of articles by Polish Fascists, passing out falsifications for the sacred truth. It was only yesterday that *Izvestia* reprinted with raptures the canards of a German Fascist sheet on the boardings regarding the conspiracy of the Left Opposition with the social democracy. The matter did not rest here. A certain Buechner is writing, on instructions from the Stalinist bureau, a German book in which he attempts to link the Left Opposition with the police. Everything that was written and said in 1917 by the Mensheviks, the Social Revolutionists and the Kadets is here surpassed not only in stupidity but also in villainess.

When demonstrating the inner depravity of Bolshevism, the Mensheviks clutched at least at facts: they cited Malinovsky, a member of the C. E. C. who was put by the police into the State Duma. They cited that the police department assigned its secret agents to sustain that course, which was directed toward a split of the Bolsheviks with the Mensheviks. And finally, they cited that Ludendorff "patronized" Lenin, by bringing him through in a sealed train. The Bolsheviks replied with contempt to the scoundrels who attempted to turn the plots of the police, against the most revolutionary party, into a polemical weapon against that same party. Today Stalin completely repeats the tactics of Millukov, Kerensky, Tseretelli, and Dan. With the sole difference that Stalin lacks even a vestige of facts. He manufactures them. The shady personage who writes under the name Buechner, relates that it seems that Trotsky's "Autobiography" is published in Warsaw by the political police. And this canard is published in all languages; on this they desire to educate the Communist youth.

A certain Hungarian Fascist "dedicates" his book to Trotsky, and expresses his ironical "thanks", in which hatred masquerades as wit. What conclusions could one draw from this episode? Did not revolutionists apply, only with greater success, that same method against their class enemies? Did not Lenin print his thanks to the English paper "Times" for some articles, or other, which he utilized in his own way? But there is a scoundrel to be found who in the columns of *Pravda* speaks out on this foundation of a union between Trotsky and the Fascists.

In an article I expressed myself to the effect that Japanese imperialism would hardly dare to throw an open challenge to the Soviet Union before it intrenches itself in Manchuria. In this connection the central organ of the American Communist (!!!) Party writes that Trotsky acts in the interests of the Japanese. To explain this away by stupidity would be too superficial; after all, stupidity has its limits. Here we have to deal with a corrupt functionary who will stop at nothing in order to earn his salary. The purport of my article was to the effect that a struggle with the Red Army is too hard a nut for the teeth of Japanese militarism. The General Staff in Tokio has reasons to believe that I am better able to evaluate the strength of the Red Army than the New York yawpers who are under

orders to snap at my calves. It is self-evident, of course, that great world problems are not resolved by isolated articles. But if one was to weigh the influence of articles, then my evaluation of the Red Army and the perspectives of the Soviet-Japanese War could serve in Japan only those elements that desire to hinder the war. But is it possible to answer barking and howling with arguments?

### The "United Front": Who with Whom?

These gentlemen depict Rakovsky as an enemy of the Soviet Union. For that, they seek a champion in Barbusse who in turn wants to lean on Vandervelde. With its hat in hand the Stalinist bureaucracy is now begging alms from the petty bourgeois pacifists. And inflexible warriors such as Sosnovsky, heroes of the Civil War, such as Muralov and Gruenstein, such as hundreds and thousands of Bolshevik-Leninists, are in isolation and confinement, bound hand and foot.

Giving us over into the hands of the bourgeois police, the Stalinists declaim about our united front with the bourgeois counter-revolution. But in the eyes of the working class the capitalist governments of the world are aiding Stalin to surround the Oppositionists with a circle of barbed wire. No matter how Stalin's agents lie, this single fact exposes to the ultimate the actual groupings of forces.

They wish to tie us with the Japanese staff and the Polish police. Kerensky in his time tried already to tie up the Bolsheviks with the German staff and the Czarist police. Kerensky proceeded with this all the more licentiously the hotter the ground under his feet became. Today he has found imitators. And of what sort? These people shot down Blumkins and sent out in their stead Agabekovs. We brand the name Agabekov on your foreheads. With this brand you shall walk about to the end of your days.

What does Stalin want? He wants to utilize the war danger for a new and if possible, physical annihilation of Bolshevik-Leninists. Letters from the U. S. S. R., that have reached us lately bear witness to the fact that the Left Opposition is achieving now throughout the entire land a second enrollment. In the industrial centers, in plants, factories and mines a new generation of Bolshevik-Leninists has appeared. Creative ideas do not die. Political facts teach. The Left Opposition has demonstrated that it is unconquerable.

Stalin on the contrary has compromised himself on all sides. During the XVII conference he disgracefully kept silent on all problems. Not a word about the problems of Soviet economy! Not a word about the problems of Soviet economy! Not a word about the situation in Germany! "The Chief" who in the most responsible situations recognizes himself that he had best keep quiet, is a complete political bankrupt. Already

### THE BOOK ON CHINA

Revolutionary, Marxist dynamite. That's what *Problems of the Chinese Revolution* is! No one who is not a case-hardened, irredeemable bureaucrat can read it and remain unaffected by it. Its argument, supported by documents, is conclusive, unanswerable.

The story of how the documents came into our hands reads like a piece of detective fiction. Suppressed speeches, documents smuggled out of the U. S. S. R., the proceedings of a whole plenum suppressed, articles written for *Pravda* and circulated illegally, all these are contained for the first time in their entirety—in any language—in *Problems of the Chinese Revolution*.

Its publication is a significant achievement from the point of view of revolutionary publications. No publishing house to our knowledge has ever put out a work of this size at this price. Its low price is no accident. The book is priced so low because of the absolute necessity of spreading it far and wide in the shortest possible time.

in the circles closest to Stalin—we are written from Moscow—the functionaries are ironically whispering "Hadn't we better ask for instructions from Rakovsky or Trotsky?" Out of this bureaucratic impotence has been born the most recent international campaign against the Left Opposition.

The work done by the Bolshevik-Leninists has not been done in vain. The fundamental documents and works of the Left Opposition have been issued in all languages of the civilized and semi-civilized world. In tens of countries there exist Oppositionist cadres that are to the marrow of their bones saturated with conviction in their correctness and in their historic right to victory. A great and an ineradicable conquest!

Unable to answer our criticism, enmeshed in contradictions, convicted by events, forced to keep quiet on the basic problems of politics, the Stalinist clique is making a final attempt to separate us from the official Communist parties by a criminal-political novel, the ineptitude of which in no wise palliates its villainess.

The Stalinists by their persecutions would like to push us on the road of a second party and the Fourth International. They understand that a fatal error of this type on the part of the Opposition, if it would not nullify altogether all its successes, would for years slow up its ascent. To counterpose oneself inimically to the Communist parties would mean under the given conditions to fulfill the program of the centrist bureaucracy. No, that is not our road! The intrigues of Stalin, his Buechners and his Agabekovs, exposed and unexposed, will not force us to change our course. We stand on the soil of the first four Congresses of the Comintern, and the doctrines and traditions of Bolshevism. The lessons of the October revolution, we and only we are applying to all the tasks of the world proletariat. Over our heads waves the banner of the Third International. We lay all claim to its historical inheritance.

### The Opposition is Inevitable!

Proletarian politics knows neither the feeling of chagrin nor the feeling of revenge. It is directed by revolutionary expediency. Before the working masses of the U. S. S. R. and of the entire world the Bolshevik-Leninists repeat, "Today, as on the day when we first raised the voice of warning against the epigone bureaucracy, we are ready to a man to place ourselves at the disposal of the Comintern and of the Soviet state for the most common, the most onerous, and the most dangerous work. We are bound thereby to preserve steadfastly the discipline of action. Our condition is this alone: within the framework of the Comintern we must have the possibility of defending our ideas, i. e., the ideas of Marxism, in conformance with the elementary principles of party democracy."

We know that the Stalinists will not accept our proposal: they lack the guts for it. In order to agree to it, they must not be afraid of us. But therein is the whole business, it is the fear of the Left Opposition that is at present one of the most important springs of activity of the utterly compromised apparatus.

We seek not friendship with the bureaucracy but a fighting collaboration with the proletarian vanguard. In reply to provocations and the abject plots of the Stalinists, the Bolshevik-Leninists will come more closely to the Communist mass. As before, so now, our adherents will not limit themselves to exposing political mistakes and the crimes of leadership. Hand in hand with the rank and file of the party members they will fight for the banner of Communism—in the strike, in the street demonstration, in the election campaign, and in the more decisive battles when their hour shall strike.

Stalin may be able to make short shrift of individual Bolsheviks. But he will not strangle Bolshevism. The victory of the Left Opposition is assured by history. Prinkipo, June 16, 1932.

—L. TROTSKY.

## STALIN'S POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY

By Leon Trotsky

(Continued from last issue)

17. Forcing his way through from abroad at last, Lenin rends and fulminates against the "Kautskianist" *Pravda* (Lenin's own expression). Stalin steps aside. At the time when Kamenev defends himself, Stalin remains silent. Gradually, he enters on the new official line laid down by Lenin. But we cannot find one independent thought, one generalization over which it is worth stopping. When circumstances permit, Stalin stands between Kamenev and Lenin. Thus, four days before the October overturn, when Lenin demanded the expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev, Stalin declared in *Pravda* that he didn't see any principle difference (See in the same issue the article, "An Awl in a Sack").

18. Stalin did not occupy an independent position during the period of the Brest negotiations. He wavered, waited and remained silent. At the last moment he voted for Lenin's proposals. Stalin's confused and helpless position at that period is sufficiently clearly, though not fully characterized by even

the officially dressed up report of the C. C. (See "An Awl in a Sack").

19. In the period of the civil war, Stalin was against the principles laid down as a basis for the creation of the Red Army, and behind the scenes, inspired the so-called "military" opposition against Lenin and Trotsky. Facts bearing on this are partly set forth in Trotsky's "Autobiography" (Vol. 2, page 167, "Military Opposition"). See also Markin's article in No. 12-13, *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*, page 36.

20. In 1922, during Lenin's illness and Trotsky's leave of absence, Stalin, under the influence of Sokolnikov, carries a resolution undermining the monopoly of foreign trade. Thanks to the vigorous protests of Lenin and Trotsky this resolution was withdrawn (see "A Letter to the Bureau of Party History" by Trotsky).

21. In the same period, on the national question, Stalin occupies a position which Lenin accuses of bureaucratic and chauvinistic tendencies. Stalin, on his part, accuses Lenin of national liberalism (see "A Letter to the Bureau

of Party History" by Trotsky).

22. What was Stalin's conduct on the question of the German revolution in 1923? Here again, as in March 1917, he had to orient himself independently in a question on a large scale: Lenin was ill, a struggle was being waged against Trotsky. Here is what Stalin wrote to Zinoviev and Bucharin in August 1923 about the situation in Germany: "Should the Communists (at the present stage) strive to seize power without the social democracy—are they ripe for this already,—this in my opinion is the question. On seizing the power we had in Russia such reserves as: (a) peace, (b) land to the peasants, (c) the support of the great majority of the working class, (d) the sympathy of the peasantry. The German Communists have nothing like this now. True, they have the Soviet Union as a neighbor which we didn't have, but what can we give them at this moment? If now in Germany the power, so to say, will fall and the Communists will seize it, they will fall through with a crash. This is the 'best' case. And in the worst—they'll be smashed to bits and thrown back. The thing is not in this, that Brandler wants to teach the masses, but that the bourgeoisies plus the Right social democracy would surely turn this teaching demonstration into a general slaughter (at present they have all the chances for it) and would destroy them. Certainly the Fascists are not napping, but it is more advantageous to us for the Fascists to attack first: this will rally the whole working class around the Communists. (Germany is not Bulgaria). Besides, the Fascists in Germany, according to the data we have, are

weak. In my estimation the Germans must be restrained, not spurred on."

In this manner, in August 1923, when the German revolution was knocking at all doors, Stalin reckoned that Brandler had to be restrained, not spurred on. For missing the revolutionary situation in Germany Stalin carries the weightiest share of the responsibility. He supported the procrastinators, the sceptics, the delayers in Germany. In a question of world-wide historical importance he not accidentally took an opportunist position: in reality he only continued that policy which in March 1917 he conducted in Russia.

23. After the revolutionary situation was ruined by passivity and indecision, Stalin for a long time defended the Brandlerist C. C. against Trotsky, in this way defending himself. Thus December 17, 1924—a year after the wreck in Germany!—Stalin wrote: "This peculiarity must not be forgotten for a moment. It particularly has to be remembered in analyzing the events in the fall of 1923. First of all it has to be remembered by comrade Trotsky who indiscriminately (!) traces an analogy (!!) between the October revolution and the revolution in Germany, and unceasingly lays the German Communist party." (Questions of Leninism, 1928 edition, Page 171.)

In this manner Trotsky was guilty in those days of faying Brandlerism and not patronizing it. From this it is clearly seen how fit are Stalin and his Molotov for the struggle against the Rights in Germany.

24. The year 1924—a year of great turn. In the spring of this year Stalin

still repeats the old formulas about the impossibility of building socialism in one country, and a backward one at that. In the fall of the same year he breaks with Marx and Lenin in the fundamental question of the proletarian revolution and constructs his theory of socialism in a single country. Properly speaking this theory was nowhere unfolded or even expounded in a positive form by Stalin. It is based on two deliberately falsified quotations from Lenin. To not one refutation of it has Stalin responded. The theory of socialism in one country has an administrative not a theoretical basis.

25. In the same year Stalin creates a theory of a dual composition, i. e., a two class party of workers and peasants for the East. This is a break with Marxism and the entire history of Bolshevism in the fundamental question of the class character of the party. Even the Comintern in 1928 was compelled to retreat from a theory that for a long time ruined the Communist parties of the East. But the great discovery continues to figure even today in Stalin's "Questions of Leninism".

26. In the same year, Stalin conducts the subordination of Chinese Communism to the bourgeois party, the Kuo Min Tang, designating the latter as the "worker's and peasants' party" according to the model invented by himself. The Chinese workers and peasants are politically enslaved to the bourgeoisie by the authority of the Comintern. Stalin organized in China that division of labor which Lenin prevented him from organizing in Russia in 1917: Chinese workers and peasants are "conquerors" . . .

Kai Shek is "consolidated". Stalin's policy was the direct and immediate cause of the wreck of the Chinese revolution.

27. Stalin's position—his zig zags—on the questions of Soviet economy are too fresh in the memory of our readers and we therefore do not stop to comment on them here.

28. In conclusion we recall Lenin's Testament. It is not a question of a polemical article or speech in which one can justifiably surmise unavoidable exaggerations flowing from the heated struggle. No, in the Testament Lenin, calmly weighing each word, gives his last advice to the party, appraising each of his co-workers on the basis of the entire experience of their work together. What does he say about Stalin? (a) "rude", (b) "disloyal", (c) inclined to "misuse of power". Deduction: "to be removed from the post of general secretary".

A few weeks later Lenin dictated a note to Stalin in which he declared his intention of "breaking off all personal and comradely relations" with him. This was one of the last expressions of Lenin's will. All these facts are established in the records of the July plenum of the C. C. of 1927.

Such are some of the landmarks of Stalin's political biography. They give a sufficiently complete picture in which energy, will and determination are combined with empiricism, near-sightedness, organic inclination to opportunist decisions in big questions, personal rudeness, disloyalty and a readiness to abuse power . . .