

WORKERS  
OF THE  
WORLD.  
UNITE

# THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1923 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.  
VOLUME V, NO. 44, [WHOLE NO. 140] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1932 PRICE 5 CENTS

## Miners Face Big Tasks

Progressive Miners of America Must Be Class Union

From the day the Progressive Miners of America began to take on organized form it was clear that the real tests of its existence as a union, and particularly as a militant union, were still ahead. These tests, of course, could not be expected to be easy ones. It could not be merely a matter of going out to line up the membership and collecting dues. No, the job is a far more serious one. The existence of the new union will be conditioned upon its ability to give battle and its ability to fight to win. That also presupposes a much greater degree of clarity of views as to what really constitutes a militant union—one which can actually win over the combined enemy forces, the Lewis-Walker clique and the operators.

Only a few weeks have passed since the day of formation of the union, and the test is already beginning. The operators have extended their line of the battle front against the new union. In this they have obtained some measures of success, at least temporarily. That this could be possible, there need be no doubt, is due to some of the weaknesses displayed by the new union leadership at the Gillespie convention and since.

### Carrying the Offensive to the Miners

In Franklin County, it will be remembered, the powerful Peabody company had, at the time of the convention, with the help of the Lewis-Walker clique, plus the terror of unheard of proportions, succeeded in preventing the strike and compelling the miners to submit to the \$5.00 scale and with it to submit to the UMWA. These efforts had been extended to Taylorville, but there the miners were still fighting on the picket lines and solidly with the new union. U. S. soldiers were on guard at the Peabody mines there. U. S. soldiers also invaded Canton, in the Peoria territory, to break the strike. And now the mass picket lines appear to have been given up entirely by the new union.

This question of the picket lines is, of course, not the only point at issue. That itself is merely a part of the general strategy pursued. But for a new union, for a progressive union, which has to meet the enormous obstacles of all the enemy forces combined and merged into one, the question of strategy becomes a real problem. The rank and file will and readiness to fight can be depended upon but the strategy of the fight must be a superior one. It must be one which will outwit the combined enemy forces.

In this respect it is necessary to note the very first weakness represented by the acceptance of the \$5.00 scale at the Gillespie convention. For this those leaders who advocated its acceptance are fully responsible. The weakness lies not merely in the sense of its immediate effect but more so in the fact that the operators jointly with the Lewis-Walker clique are bound to take advantage of it. They will use it in this situation to strengthen the Lewis regime. They will be on the offensive, further extend the attacks to new territories and prepare for new and additional wage cuts. Naturally we are not unmindful of the fact that the logic of these measures inevitably brings their own conclusion in new and greater contradictions, new and greater antagonisms between the miners and the operators. But in this respect also the direction and the leadership

given by the new union becomes the decisive question.

### Organization of the New Union

The new union starts out with the disadvantage of the retreat to the \$5.00 scale. This part of the basis is thus equal for both unions. Which one will prevail? That question is more fundamental than the wage scale. It is now an open direct struggle between the two. But the strategy to be pursued must take into account the conditions existing in the various localities. It is not a matter of a direct head-on collision everywhere. It is clear that in Franklin Co. the process of winning the rank and file for the new union is by no means completed. Their strike was broken, they are still in the UMWA. For the Progressive Miners of America the task is therefore the one of working from within to strengthen its foothold, to regain what is lost and to prepare for the complete break with the Lewis-Walker regime.

The Taylorville and Canton territories, on the other hand, present a different picture. The new union is solidly rooted there and has already replaced the U. M. W. The issues can be settled to its advantage, its interests can be maintained, only in the direct collision with the enemy forces. Any relenting in this respect will surely react by the latter gaining ground, if not gaining the upper hand. This will surely hold true wherever the operators extend the battle front into the new union territory.

The Left wing must particularly make this clear to the mines. It is a part of the process of building a militant union. The issues, the conflicts can find their solution only through struggle against the enemy forces and not at all through collaboration with them. From the opposite direction the Peabody interests, which are the dominant interests in Illinois, have assumed this kind of an approach and are attempting to advance in head-on collision everywhere. This company is the main controlling factor in machine mining. As such it represents the crux of the problem of job control and union control. The Progressive Miners will in this respect have to meet the Peabody company face to face on its own ground.

(Continued on page 2)

## OPEN FORUM

FIFTEEN YEARS OF THE  
RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Speaker:

JAMES P. CANNON

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4th

126 East 16 Street,  
near Irving Place

ADMISSION: 15c

Auspices:

N. Y. Br. Communist League of America  
(Opposition)

### Protest Meeting

What is Happening in China

Chen Du-Hsiu, founder of the Chinese Communist Party and member of the Left Opposition, and six co-workers were arrested. Unless action is taken at once they will be executed!

What are the effects of Japanese invasion? What is the role of American imperialism? Hear about the Peasant Wars and the Soviets.

Speaker:

MAX SHACHTMAN

Sunday, October 30, 8 P. M.

126 East 16 St.

Auspices:

N. Y. Br. Communist League of America  
(Opposition)

## VOTE COMMUNIST!

# Vote Communist!

Against the Party of Petty Bourgeois Reformism

As the elections come to a close, the cold indifference of the two big capitalist parties and their leading spokesmen with regard to the burning problems and interests of the masses of the people stands out in glaring evidence of the fact that even in the wealth-saturated United States, the ruling class is not in a position to relieve the intense sufferings brought on by the crisis. The hollow promises, the spread-eagle oratory, the mutual recriminations and self-exposures of the capitalist candidates do not hold out the least prospect for a working class which is now in the fourth year of the crisis.

The ever-present liberals, in a quandary as to which of the two parties to support, are taking refuge in great numbers under the tent of the socialist messiah, Norman Thomas. The arch-Bourbon Hoover—they cannot endorse. As for Roosevelt, he has played the artful dodger so openly—even the bourgeois newspapers cannot refrain from pointing out this trait as his chief characteristic—that the muddlehead liberals for whom he winked a flirtatious eye have not been able to muster around him.

Regardless of the handful of intellectual and scientific lights who have endorsed the Communist candidates, the fact remains that the overwhelming majority of the so-called "protest voters" out of the ranks of the more conscious petty bourgeois elements, have swung into line behind the American edition of the social democracy.

And there is no barrier in their path. Particularly since the war, the American Socialist Party and its leadership have moved in a virtually unbroken line to the Right, doing everything conceivable to deserve the designation of the third capitalist party, which properly belongs to the bourgeoisie by deleting from its constitution the disciplinary warnings against those voting credits for military and naval purposes, is not calculated to

arouse the fear of a mobilized proletariat in the hearts of the ruling class. The party which erased from its banner, in deep actuality as well as formally, the recognition of the class struggle, aimed at shifting its base from the working class masses which at one time gave it their confidence, to the petty bourgeois strata bewildered by the crisis, crushed between the upper and nether millstones of capitalist society, and looking for a way out which is smooth and not lined with thorns or boulders.

The present campaign of the Socialist party, perfectly typified by its standard bearer, must look for its equal in opportunism to the days of 1917 when Morris Hillquit ran for Mayor of New York with an agitation centering chiefly around the issue of... five cent milk. "We offer," the official social handbook for 1932 hastens to assure all timid peanut-stand owners, "not only the one true hope for reorganizing our economic life, but also immediate plans for making things better. We are aware that masses of men will not vote for deeper purgatory now in the dubious hope of paradise hereafter. (Beware the Bolsheviks!) Hence we are concerned with programs to keep the peace now to relieve unemployed now; to help the farmers now. We ask you to examine our platform from this point of view. Are not our demands 'practical' as no other proposals are; practical, that is, for all those who are not trying above all things to hang on to the wealth and power which a comparatively small owning class controls?" (Page 30.)

And elsewhere (Page 64), the handbook soothes the apprehensions of the small property-holders, to whom Thomas and Thomasism make such a warm appeal, that "Socialists would not urge that all industry be run by the community. They would encourage many consumers and producers, voluntary cooperative organizations, particularly on the farm, in retail distribution and in education, journalistic and artistic ventures.

"There would likewise remain under the socialist commonwealth a certain small amount of private ownership in new industries, in handicrafts, in agriculture and in intellectual production."

Grocers, traveling salesmen, tourist home managers of the world, unite, and vote Socialist! Your future is guaranteed!

In word and deed, the socialist party is a petty bourgeois party, masquerading with yesterday's tattered garments of a working class movement. The class-conscious worker, who does not want to throw his vote away in a futile attempt to register it until Norman Thomas is elected president and 51 percent of the Congressmen and Senators are members of the Socialist party—will register his protest against the capitalist regime of starvation, exploitation, misery, and war by voting for the Communist ticket all along the line. Our differences with the party's policy, which isolates it from the masses and impedes the development of the revolutionary movement in this and other countries, cannot eliminate the fact that the Communist party is the only working class party in the field, the only revolutionary party, the only party which stands for the interests of the working class today and tomorrow.

The Left Opposition therefore ranges itself alongside its party and calls upon every worker to cast his vote for his party, the Communist party!

### Good Meetings in Boston

Two successful meetings were held in Boston and Lynn by the Communist League of America (Opposition), with Max Shachtman of New York speaking on the situation in Germany. In Boston, Otisfield Hall had between 60 and 70 Boston workers listening to the standpoint of the Opposition on the German question, ending in a number of questions put to the speaker from the floor revealing a keen interest in the importance of the events. Significantly enough, this is the first meeting held in Boston on Germany, for the official party has not displayed sufficient interest in this crucial problem for the world revolutionary movement to organize one single meeting on it. As a result of the Boston lecture, the branch expects to announce shortly the addition of several new members, who are not new to the movement, having been active in the Communist and labor movements for years.

The meeting in Lynn exceeded all our expectations, for it was arranged by one comrade alone, Celia Cooperstein, one of the well known militants in the shoe industry there. Some twenty-five workers gathered in the cooperative center to hear Shachtman, including several party members. A warm discussion took place. In Lynn also this is the first meeting ever held on the German events.

Indicative of the increasing influence of the Opposition is the invitation extended to our comrades to organize a meeting in Chelsea shortly for the purpose of discussing the standpoint of the Left Opposition. We are marching forward!

## New Militant Forces Join the Ranks of the Left Opposition

### Papcun's Statement

To the Rock Island Section Committee of the Communist Party  
To all Communist Party members and Young Communist League

Dear Comrades:

Greetings. With the greatest joy do I greet the proposal of the Section Organizer for the purpose of discussing my reinstatement into the Communist party. The thought that the invitation for my re-entry was made in all sincerity is especially heartening since it refutes the obviously absurd and altogether unfounded charges made by Jack Wilson at the conclusion of the debate on Friday, September 30, 1932.

I take it that you have realized the injustice of those slanders and the invitation extended by the Section Committee by your Organizer Jack Wilson

We print here extracts from a number of declarations which have been made by well-known militants in the Communist movement, associating themselves with the Communist League of America (Opposition). It is with great joy that we

to rejoin the party is proof of that.

Now, as at all times since my expulsion, I am eager to rejoin the party. I want to re-enter the Communist party because I believe that it is the only real party of the working class... I stand ready to participate in all party activities and abide by Communist discipline—by the Leninist first principle of organization—by the principle of democratic centralism.

The reason for my being out of the party is, I believe, well known to you. I am not out of the party by my own free will. Briefly stated, at the present time I am out of the movement because I was rudely and bureaucratically expelled by the Stalinist leadership for my refusal to condemn the position of the Left Opposition and of comrade Trotsky as counter-revolutionary. My expulsion is due to my refusal to subordinate Communist principle to the bureaucratic leadership, for not condemning the views which I hold to be Marxian and for not belly-crawling before a leadership whose course runs counter to Marxism—Leninism.

The leadership that expelled me is part of the same Stalinist leadership which is responsible for driving out the best fighters from the Communist International, for expelling comrade Trotsky, for imprisoning comrade Rakovsky, and thousands of our Russian Bolsheviks who had the courage of conviction to fight for Leninist policies....

Comrades, at this moment it is not only my readmission which is in question. It is the re-entry of all the thousands of Bolshevik-Leninists who have become the victims of the bureaucratic regime of Stalin and Stalinism. If you desire my return, you must also strive for theirs. The Communist movement stands in need of these comrades. It is only the Left Opposition which is capable of returning the party and the Communist International to a Marxian course and thereby placing it at the head of the working class.

The demand of the Left Opposition has always been that we want to return to

welcome these fighters into the ranks of the Bolshevik-Leninists, confident that they are only one small section of the numerous Communist workers who will continue to swell the ranks of our movement.

the ranks of the Communist International, carrying on activity and abiding by Communist discipline. In re-entering we do not demand that the party accepts our views but that we merely be free to exercise the rights guaranteed by democratic centralism—the right of presenting our stand before the membership at convention time, and having the membership judge the correctness of our position. After the judgment is passed by the membership we shall abide by its decisions, be they what they may....

Comrades, you have invited me to rejoin the party. My answer is that I stand ready. But if you ask me to repudiate the Marxian principles of the Left Opposition I refuse. For me as for every real Communist, Marxian principle stands supreme. In spite of my differences with the present leadership I am ready to take my place in the ranks. Davenport, Iowa.

—GEORGE J. PAPCUN.

### Declaration by Pappas

To the Communist League of America  
(Left Opposition)

Dear Comrades:

In connection with the menace of Fascism in Germany and the ruinous policy of the German Communist Party and the ECCI—especially on the question of the united front as the most effective weapon with which to combat and sweep away the Fascist reaction—I addressed on August 8, a lengthy statement to my party unit and to the District and Central Executive Committees of the C. P. U. S. A. In it, I pointed out that no conscientious Communist can keep silent any longer on the crimes of the Comintern leadership. I criticized the silence of our central organ, the *Daily Worker*, and brought out the necessity of opening up a discussion to come to the aid of our German brother party.

For doing this, I was summarily expelled from the party by the District Secretariat without any hearing or trial. In the statement of expulsion appearing

in the *Daily Worker* of August 18, the District Secretariat of Dist. 2 avoided the entire issue raised in my document, substituting for arguments, lies and slanders (calling me a disruptive element, charging that I refused to appear when called to trial, etc., etc.). I immediately appealed the action of the District Secretariat to the highest body of the party, the Central Executive Committee. The Central Committee answered my appeal with contemptuous silence. I can readily understand that all this is not accidental, that it is, in fact, the fullest and highest expression of Stalinist bureaucratism in our party.

Since the Fall of 1927, that is since the wholesale expulsion of the Opposition in Russia and the vicious campaign of the party leadership against Trotsky was in full swing, I, time and again,

(Continued on page 2)

## Dead Hand at I. L. D. Meet

Feature of Convention is Absence of Discussion by Members

BOSTON.—

With the national convention of the I. L. D. in Cleveland, came to a close a most important event in the life of our organization. And when we term a national convention of the I. L. D. a most important event we are not exaggerating, for the sharpening economic crisis and intensified persecution of the workers by the exploiting class, have unquestionably broadened the field of activity for the defense organization of the working class. Under these conditions, with a clear-headed leadership, correct policies and tactics, much can be gained for the International Labor Defense. A survey of our successes and failures affords us many lessons for the future.

### Lack of Discussion

Yet at this stage in the existence of the I. L. D. when a balance sheet should be drawn up of the past and the basis laid for the future, the material to work with was left behind. This material was nothing less important than the conclusions, recommendations and proposals of the entire organization after a thorough pre-convention discussion by the membership. But there was no pre-convention discussion in the I. L. D. despite the constant protests and demands on the part of members! Since this is the case, it can hardly be said that ours was a convention reflecting the views of the membership. It is a small wonder therefore that the reports given us were so lifeless. It was important to know the number of delegates who attended, the number of branches "represented" and the enthusiasm displayed. From all this something can be learned.

But where are the conclusions drawn? What about our past activity and our plans for the future? That we did not hear, for there was no time at the convention to deal with the several resolutions introduced at the last moment. It is true that certain achievements have been made and important battles have been and are being fought by us. We are justified in taking pride. But to spend a whole convention priding ourselves on our achievements, however small or great, criticizing the membership to the extent that we forget to learn from the past and consider the future, is false and detrimental. We must be able to give ourselves an accounting of the masses we approached in our struggles. Have we organized these masses? How well are we able to retain the recruits we make? The complete turnover in our membership during the first seven months of this year (see October 1932 Labor Defender), is no accident but speaks for something significant.

In the face of this, it was indeed painful to hear that the point stressed most at the convention was that the membership is not sufficiently active, hence the stagnation in our organization. But what else could be expected since the voice of the membership was not heard? Could we expect our leaders to come down and tell us that they bear the greatest responsibility for the existing situation in the I. L. D. and are ready to assume it? Not as long as they can dish out criticism to the rank and file and make them swallow it.

(Continued on page 3)

### 15th Russian Revolution Anniversary Celebration

ENTERTAINMENT  
DANCE  
REFRESHMENTS

Saturday Night, November 5th.  
126 East 16 Street

Keep this date open for a good time at the International Workers School Hall, with comrades and friends  
ADMISSION 25 CENTS

Auspices:

N. Y. Br. Communist League of America

## Bankruptcy at 12th Plenum

Theses Fail to Give a Reply to the Burning Questions of the Day

The thesis of the 12th Plenum of the ECCI, published in the *Daily Worker* of October 20th (City Edition) once more gives us an inside picture of the bankruptcy of Stalinism. A resolution with more mistakes and with a greater number of meaningless revolutionary phrases is difficult to conceive of. A thesis of the vanguard of the revolution must present the determining factors of the world situation. The C. I. thesis gives more space to secondary questions, leaves out some determining factors and does not deal correctly with the important factors which are taken up.

A Communist thesis for 1932 even though it leaves out the fact the Communist International is itself going through a profound crisis under the Latin leadership must at least give an answer to the following problems: (1) the world crisis and the perspective. (2) the danger of Fascism in Germany. (3) the role of American imperialism in the present period. (4) the invasion of China by Japanese imperialism (5) the position of the USSR after 15 years and the relation of its contradictions to the imperialist contradictions. From this analysis, directives for the sections of the C. I. must be formulated. The C. I. thesis does not take up these points in their proper relationship.

The third year of the world crisis has long ago passed beyond the economic stage, and has reached a stage of open conflict between the imperialists, in China, in South America; and in Spain and Germany where revolutionary situations developed out of the crisis. The C. I. thesis says that the crisis is moving

ing to new low levels. It says the end of capitalist stabilization is at hand.

In 1928 the C. I. introduced the "Third Period", as the end of stabilization and the beginning of a period of revolutionary upsurge. In 1930 the C. I. swung to the Right. That is, the theoreticians of the C. I. moved to the Right as the crisis was moving the workers to the Left. Now in 1932, the C. I. in the 12th Plenum informs us that "the end of capitalist stabilization" is at hand. Compared to the Right zig-zag of 1930 (which dropped the form of the "Third period" but which retained the kernel of the Left zig-zag) this seems to be a return to the 1928 Left zig-zag. However, facts prove the opposite: that the Left shell of the present move is a cloak for a new Rightward shift in the Soviet Union by Stalinism presented by the recent bureaucratic decrees, the expulsions of the 12th Plenum and the growth of the reactionary element.

If, as the thesis says, we are confronted with the end of the period of capitalist stabilization, we would like to know: was capitalism in a condition of stabilization for the last three years of the world crisis? A crisis itself is a condition of the shaking of the economic equilibrium. It is the economic explosion of the accumulation of the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production. Further, if the "Third Period" of 1928 ushered in the end of stabilization and in 1932 we again have the end of stabilization, then it follows that stabilization existed in between. This is a contradiction the Stalinists do not ex-

(Continued on page 3)



# Letters from Militants

## Jobless United Front in Chicago

CHICAGO.—

For the first time in many years there was achieved in Chicago last night a genuine working-class united front, consisting of the three largest organized unemployed groups in Chicago; the Unemployed Councils of Cook County controlled by the official Communists, the Workers Leagues of America controlled by the United Workers Party and the Chicago Committee of Unemployed controlled by the Socialists. Despite the obvious packing of the hall by the Communist party with delegates from all sorts of paper organizations, among the other representations were A F of L trade union organizations, and fraternal working class groups. The bulk of representatives, however, came from the branch organizations of the three unemployed bodies, signatories to the call. Among the political organizations directly represented were the Communist party and Y. C. L., Socialist Party and YPSL Proletarian Party and Farmer-Labor Party. The Left Opposition was represented by three delegates.

The fact that the conference was held and able to organize itself for the tasks set out, namely, the organization of a joint march to the City Hall, energetic fight against the 50% cut in relief and other practical immediate measures, is a living vindication of the correct united front policy that the Left Opposition has so persistently advocated. The party can no longer say in Chicago that it refuses to sit in the same hall with the leaders of the "social-fascists" and even the Left Opposition.

It is a most complete reversal of the "united front from below", so-called; the whole conference was a very dramatic one with frequent outbursts and tense moments. From the moment that the conference elected Weber as chairman by an overwhelming majority, there was no doubt in anybody's mind that the Communist party representatives came with full intentions of "capturing" organizational control of it.

The first order of business was the report of the secretary of the joint committee, Lockner. He read the demands agreed upon by the joint committee of the three organizations. He was followed by additional reporters of the three organizations, Karl Borders, Givens and Lemson. They each stressed the point that despite political differences, unity must be preserved on the question of relief, and against the system that breeds hunger. Following these three a representative of the T U U L, Mike Zalisko, took the floor and launched into a tirade against the A. F. of L. Delegate McVey, representing the Farmer-Labor Party immediately started to heckle the speaker throwing the conference into pandemonium. He objected to the correct characterizations that Zalisko made against the A. F. of L. After quiet was restored, the speaker was permitted to go on.

The sensation of the whole conference, however, came when John Williamson, Communist party leader, secured the floor, reading a carefully prepared speech in which he, correctly enough, criticized the Socialist party and the other reactionary organizations. However, the manner in which his expressions were formulated coupled with the usual Stalinist name-calling angered the representatives of these organizations and disorder broke out anew. For a moment it looked as if the united front was all over. It was due to the consummate cleverness of the reactionaries that the whole maneuver of the party was turned to the discredit of the party, and instead of strengthening the position of the Communists put them in the light of splitters. Most of the non-partisan workers present saw the party in this bad light and openly gave expression to their feelings.

After Williamson's speech, Borders, McVey and the others took the floor and, in substance, pointed to the attempted disruption on the part of the party, stating, however, that despite all this, no one was going to force them to leave the united front and that they would fight just as strongly as ever for the achievement of the aims of the conference. McVey's speech given in the typical trade union style won the applause of many present. At this point chairman Weber pulled a masterpiece of Stalinist imbecility. He said, "Do you know whom you just have applauded, a man who is splitting away from the conference?" McVey vehemently shouted that this was not so and that he would remain in the conference. The chairman got the horse laugh from all sections of the hall.

Comrade John Edwards, representing the Left Opposition, was the first to rise to ask for the floor in the discussion. However, the chairman simply could not see him, as he called upon delegate after delegate of all other groups. It was

after his insistent effort, together with the demands coming from all sections of the hall, that he was finally given the floor. Comrade Edwards presented the line of the Left Opposition, hailing the first genuine united front conference held in Chicago since the Stalinist regime has been in existence. He pointed to the persistent advocacy of such a correct Leninist united front on the part of the Left Opposition over the period of years. He pledged the support of his organization to the conference and warned the Stalinists, as representatives of Communism, that they must carry through the United Front on the specific issues at hand.

Attorney Goldman who was given the floor to make a collection speech made one of the finest Communist speeches heard in these parts from a Stalinist. His viewpoint on the united front was so close to that of the Left Opposition that he even used the exact words of comrade Trotsky when he stated that, in order to carry out our aims, we can make a united front "even with the devil himself." He continued, "We will criticize each other but we will have a united front because we have to have united mass action. The struggle alone will prove the correctness of the program of the different political lines. But this I know that a Socialist worker haled before a capitalist judge for participating in the class struggle suffers exactly the same fate as a Communist worker would under the same circumstances. On the other hand, a Communist in bed is as safe as a Socialist in bed. Personally I am convinced that if the workers' struggle is to be successful, the only path is the path of the Communist struggle." Later on when the names of the organizations who gave in the collection were announced he did not shy from mentioning the name of the Communist League of America (Opposition) along with the rest.

One of the most provocative speeches made at the end of the conference was that of Herbert Newton, party Negro leader. He delivered himself of some pure pieces of Stalinist ultimatum, of practically inviting the Socialists, the Farmer-Laborites to leave the conference.

The conference was not without its humorous moments. For example, after the report of the credentials committee, comrade Satir, another delegate of the Left Opposition, arose to ask why the name of our organization was not included in the list of those read. The reporter, Miss Thompson, was evidently not well versed in the intricacies of tendencies in the Communist movement. She took the Communist League to be part of the Communist party organizations and stated so in her answer. The Left Opposition delegates profusely shouted their thanks, stating that that was where they belonged anyway.

The conference adjourned with the singing of the International started by the Left Opposition delegates.

It is the opinion of the comrades here that this united front has far-reaching possibilities. A good deal depends upon the tactics pursued by the Stalinists from now on. It was obvious at the conference that the hang-overs of Stalinism are yet too strong to permit the official party's participation along genuine Leninist lines. Undoubtedly mistakes will be made. We hope that the party will not place itself in such a position as to appear to the workers as splitters and thereby continue to drag the banner of Communism in the mud. The Chicago Left Opposition will very shortly issue a statement on the conference.

—JOSEPH GIGANTI.

## Miners Face Big Tasks

(Continued from page 1)

The Lewis-Walker clique is perfectly aware that the danger to their regime regarding its former position does not come from the conservative elements in the new union leadership but from the Left wing. In the Illinois Miner, the sorry sheet which functions as their official organ there is a constant barrage against the Communists. Formerly it was directed against the official party, now the main guns are trained against the Left Opposition. This sheet, while attempting to define, as it puts it, the Right wing Communists, the official party, and the Left wing Communists, the League, warns against our "flirting with the Progressive Miners of America" and against our "doing the best to get control of it." This sheet further concentrates its attacks upon Gerry Allard attempting to reduce his position purely to the one of holding down a job. Of course, to this kind of scribbler no other motive is understandable than the one of holding down a soft job. They complain that Gerry was first with the National Miners Union, then with the UMWA and now with the Progressive Miners.

Such efforts to discredit a Left wing leader will not get very far with the miners, however. To them Allard's position as a militant and as a revolutionist gaining in the ability of pursuing a correct class policy is becoming increasingly clear. Nor will the rank and file miners be much disturbed over their warnings against the Communist League of America. We have taken our position squarely with the new union, as is the duty of all revolutionists, not at all in the sense of supporting the direction which the reactionary careerist elements attempt to impose upon it; but on the contrary, to help the rebellion against the enemy facing the miners in combined force and to help develop it into becoming truly a militant class union. That is the direction which our comrades and supporters in the field pursue.

—A. S.

## Our Eight Page Double Anniversary Issue

### 15 Years of the Russian Revolution—4 Yrs. of the Militant

The fifteenth anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik revolution will be celebrated in the next issue of the **Militant**. At the same time our fighting paper will mark the fourth anniversary of its existence. With the two dates coinciding almost to the day, we are making the next issue a joint anniversary number with twice as many pages as usual.

The eight-page issue will contain a good deal of material on the Russian revolution which is not available to the average militant in this country. Some of it has never appeared in the English language; other documents are known to comparatively few readers. Among them, the readers of the next issue of the **Militant** will find:

The first proclamation of the Revolutionary Military Committee of Petrograd announcing the deposition of the Provisional Government.

The minutes of the Extraordinary Session of the Petrograd Soviet after the Bolshevik insurrection, including speeches by Trotsky and by Lenin who had just come out of enforced concealment.

The minutes of the famous November session of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolshevik party at which Lenin and Trotsky jointly defended their standpoint against the conciliators. These minutes suppressed by Stalin we shall print for the first time.

Lenin's last speech to the Communist International in 1922, at the Fourth Congress, on Five Years of the Russian Revolution, a brilliant summary of its achievements and problems and an advance refutation of the national socialist epigones.

In addition to these and other historical documents, the **Militant** will contain many other timely articles, including one on the Russian revolution and the American Communist movement, another on the birthday of comrade Leon Trotsky, which falls on the same day as the anniversary of the Russian revolution, etc., etc.

While a special edition will be printed, it will nevertheless still be limited, and we urge that all special orders be sent in immediately and without fail.

## New Forces Join the Left Opposition

(Continued from page 1)

raised the question in party meetings as to why the C. I. did not publish Trotsky's arguments. In this way, I pointed out, the party leaders would enlighten the membership. For this the district leadership looked upon me (and many other comrades who also raised this question) with distrust and suspicion. (At this point, I may be permitted to point out that even many of the present lieutenants of Stalinism, at that time, also objected to such expulsions—though in private conversations, under cover.)

The criticisms of the Left Opposition on the fundamental questions and their proposals put forward convinced me of its correctness. I, therefore, unconditionally declare myself in full agreement with the views of the Left Opposition. In my struggle against the district and TUUL bureaucracy through the fraction of the Food Workers Industrial Union, (which I shall deal with on another occasion) the proposals I put forward there, were, in the main guided by the policies of the Left Opposition.

Under the theory of the "third period", the party split the Left wing forces away from the A. F. of L., thus resulting in giving the yellow traitors a free hand for their betrayals and sell-outs. Even small, insignificant Left wing groups were also split away from the various A. F. of L. unions in order to build revolutionary unions. (Hundreds of these groups compose today the various leagues and unions of the TUUL). For, according to the theory that the A. F. of L. is a Fascist and company union, the Left wing could not possibly afford to "lose time" working within these unions. Guided by the theory of "social-fascism", the party also split independent unions like the Amalgamated Food Workers that for years supported the revolutionary movement. This same notorious theory prevented the party from accepting the united front in the Illinois miners' strike, even when it was proposed by the unions influenced by the Muste group.

The united front question today is one of the most important weapons of the working class against the brutal, vicious attacks of the employers to reduce the already miserable standard of living. On this question the party, due to its ruinous theory of "Fascism" and "social-fascism" confuses this question by proposing a united front from below which is concretized as follows:

Sympathizers, who are members of the A F of L or other unions, are called to a united front conference "from below" organized by the TUUL. These members represent in reality no organization, since they were not elected by any. When the conference is ended, the members cannot report the results of the conference to their respective local union for, as mentioned above, they were not elected by it. Even if the dare make a report, the yellow leaders of the union locals, according to the law of the constitution where no member has the right to represent a local on his own initiative, could demand their expulsion. The united front conference of the FWIU held here last winter and lasting but two days, was typical of the nature of such conferences....

In spite of the slanders and calumnies of the party against the views of the Left Opposition, and the bureaucratic suppression of the party membership by forbidding them to read even the literature of the Left Opposition, and attending their lectures, the party members begin to see and realize the true Leninist role of the Left Opposition. The blind belief in the party leadership falls aside. I know of a number of party members who are in secret sympathy with the tactical and organizational program of the Left Opposition. It is only a hair's breadth that separates these members organizationally from the Left Opposition.

Long live the views of the Left Opposition and its great international leaders, Trotsky and Rakovsky, and the thou-

sands of imprisoned and exiled Left Oppositionists! Long live the World Revolution!

For the regeneration of Lenin's third International!

Comradely,  
—SEBASTIAN PAPPAS.

## Help the Illinois Miners

The heroic battle which the Illinois miners have been fighting for months against the greatest odds is in itself an appeal to every worker in the country to come to their aid. The long period of unemployment through which most of them have gone has left them in no position to conduct a struggle without assistance from the outside. Relief is now urgently required by the men and their families, and the miners' union is now making a great effort to supply the coal diggers with a minimum of assistance. The **Militant** therefore urges all its readers to do their utmost in coming to the aid of the men in Illinois. In your union, your fraternal organization, in whatever movement you may have a voice, raise the question of relief for the Illinois miners, and then contribute all that you yourself can raise among your friends and comrades.

All aid should be forwarded to the Progressive Miners of America, Gillespie, Illinois.

USE THE CLUB PLAN. GET SUBS FOR THE MINERS.

HAVE YOU SENT IN YOUR GREETING TO THE ANNIVERSARY ISSUE?

## Left Opposition Movement Growing in Canada

The period following the last plenum of the Communist League has marked the definite expansion of the Left Opposition in Toronto. Indices of this political and organizational progress are manifest in the several fields of education and agitation, trade union contacts, literature sales, youth work, and branch recruiting, all of which strengthens the premises for a more comprehensive program of action. In appraising this activity it must not be forgotten that the Communist movement in Ontario has been declared by the courts to be illegal, and the revolutionary organizations are subjected to the most rigorous police persecution.

### Educational Work

One of the outstanding undertakings of the branch has been the organization of a class in Marxism, under the direction of comrade Maurice Spector. The importance of theoretical training of cadres of the younger generation, cannot be overestimated. Reference to this urgent need was among the most conspicuous points in L. D.'s letter of greeting to the first (Chicago) Conference of the Opposition. Continuity of revolutionary Marxist thought must be maintained—never more so than in the present period of Stalinist falsification of Bolshevik history and corruption of theory in the Comintern.

The class was launched in the hottest season of the year but drew an attendance of between thirty-five to forty, throughout, although as a matter of policy (in the interests of a selection that would be stable) no effort was made to recruit in the highways and byways. The predominant element was naturally the youth, but there was also an adult proletarian element with trade union experience and connections. The first part of the course dealt with the theoretical system of Marx, the next with the strategy of the proletariat in the struggle for power, and the concluding part is to take up the problems of socialist-Soviet construction. The lectures were supplemented by mimeographed readings from the revolutionary classics, and the organization of a lending library.

It may be stated without exaggeration that as a result, the revolutionary movement has gained a number of keen, energetic and loyal militants, who have accepted the full implication of the

### COMPLETING THE CIRCUIT

Since last week's report two more cities have stepped up to the firing line and sent in club plan subs. They are Philadelphia and Toronto. Philadelphia makes an occasional appearance in these lists but the name of Toronto is almost a newcomer. Greetings! Salute us often in like manner.

### PITTSBURGH

Last week we heard from comrades Vomyas and Sifakis again. This puts them away out in front. You can judge from what they say whether this is a sudden burst or the beginning of a powerful and sustained drive. We think it is the latter and we urge all comrades to read attentively and follow suit: "with a depression like this it is very hard to approach the workers and ask them to subscribe for the **Militant** or to donate the sum of fifty cents for a miner's sub. As we know, very many workers not only can't afford to pay fifty cents but are in great need of money and it is a problem to them how to make their living. So far as we could go we succeeded in collecting 8 subs given by workers, of which 4 are of the miners and 4 for the names below. 2 have been collected by comrade Sifakis and six by comrade Vomyas.

The names of the workers who donated for the miners' subs are: Al. Vassiliadis 50c; D. Babarin—50c; P. G. M.—50c; Bill Theoharis—50c. The sub of George Cephalos has been donated by two workers who can't read English and who knew that George could but couldn't afford to pay 50c; so they gave 25c each. Is any comment needed on this really inspiring news from our comrades in Pittsburgh?

### MINERS' SUBS

In response to our appeals for subs for miners we have received \$3.50 which, according to the club plan rate, is 11 subs. 11 miners are now entered on the **Militant** mailing list who were not there before. The comrades who sent them in are as follows: J. Sifakis—\$2; P. Vomyas—\$2; J. Hamilton—\$1; H. Nash—\$0.50. This is only a small beginning. On the preliminary lists which comrade Angelo has sent us there are sixty more names. And there are other lists coming. The procedure is to transfer these names to the **Militant** list as fast as we get subs for them.

### HOW TO GET SUBS FOR MINERS

The club plan drive should be pointed in this direction. There are two pivotal points. The first is to get outright

donations for this purpose from comrades, sympathizers and workers' organizations. Remittances should be made on the club plan basis. The minimum remittance should be \$2 for which we will shoot out four half-year subs. This does not mean that the \$2 must be raised from one comrade or sympathizer. No. It can be collected from three or four or half a dozen. But the remittances should be made in units of \$2.

A second way of raising money for miners' subs is to get half-year subs from workers at the old rate of \$1 and include it in a club plan of four. In this case you need send in only two names on the club plan blank and \$2, explaining that the other two names are to be filled in by us with miners' names. But be sure to explain to the subscriber that he is asked to subscribe, in effect, for himself and a miner for a half year each at the rate of \$1 for both. Explain that we are able to do this because you will include his sub with another on a club plan sub and that thereby the minimum of \$2 will be realized enabling us to fill in two miners' names.

### \$30 DOES THE TRICK

\$30 will transfer the whole of comrade Angelo's list to the **Militant** mailing list. But more than that it will mean 60 miners who will read the **Militant** regularly. So let's get going. Who will be the first to knock this \$30 down a peg or two? Have no hesitation. Step right up.

### THE STAFF RECORD

It looks as if comrade Vomyas is going to win that copy of the "Proletarian Revolution in Russia" by Lenin and Trotsky we are offering to the comrade who heads the staff in the anniversary issue on November 5.

P. Vomyas	\$4
H. Nash	3
W. Krehm	3
B. Morgenstern	2
A. Konikow	2
O. Coover	2
H. A.	2
Chicago Friends of the Militant Club	2
J. Hamilton	1
And the record by cities:	
Chicago	\$6
Pittsburgh	8
Montreal	3.50
Toronto	3
Philadelphia	2
Boston	2
Minneapolis	2
It's going up!	

## MILITANT BUILDERS CLUB PLAN BLANK

A \$1 HALF YEAR SUB OF 26 ISSUES for 50c in CLUBS of FOUR or MORE. THE MILITANT, 84 E. 10th Street, New York City.

Enclosed find \$2 for which send the **MILITANT** for 26 weeks to the following:

NAMES	ADDRESSES	CITY	STATE

MILITANT BUILDER ..... Address .....  
City ..... State .....  
Help Circulate a Marxian Paper for Class Conscious Workers

dictum that Marxism is no dogma but a guide to action.

It has been decided to continue the class throughout the winter and to draw in fresh elements.

### Trade Union Activity

The events in the Montreal needle trades which precipitated the revolt of the rank and file in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union against the Hillman bureaucracy, also revealed the sterility of the "third period-social-fascist" trade union strategy of Stalinism. The leadership of the "Industrial Union" (RIU) was so thoroughly satisfied with itself and the structure and objectives of the union as the final word in revolutionary engineering, that it remained blissfully unaware of the actual ferment that was going on among the "backward" masses in the Amalgamated. As a result, despite the fact that the Industrial Union had been in existence for three years it was isolated from the discontented mass in the older union, and the workers anxious to throw off the chains of the Hillman machine, set up a new union. Instead of striving for relations of close and comradely solidarity with a movement that was genuinely of the masses, the officialdom of the Industrial Union adopted a truculent, ultimatum position of antagonism. Their attitude was one of "Caesar or nothing! Join us or we will smash you." The strength of the Industrial Union did not suffice to prevent the new union from consolidating itself in Montreal but it did suffice to retard the organization of a similar mass movement of revolt under Left wing leadership against Hillmanism in Toronto. The Hillman officialdom have for the time being got the situation in hand and are busily quoting the articles of the "Industrial Union" strategists to prove that it is hardly worth while to break away from the Amalgamated for a union that is not as unqualifiedly revolutionary as the RIU.

The "third period" trade union tactics did however meet with resistance from a sector of the Left wing which rejected the ultimatum attitude. With these comrades the Left Opposition established contact and embarked on a course of friendly collaboration. The basis of this collaboration was clearly defined from the very beginning. This group of Left

wing trade unionists most of whom have passed through all the experiences of the TUUL reject the Stalinist slander about the Opposition. They agreed that an organized Left wing, its policies proceeding from the recognition of the class struggle, is the prerequisite to any militant program of action.

### Literature—The Militant—Unser Kampf

The sales of the **Militant**, which had slumped prior to the plenum, have tripled. There is a growing demand for our pamphlet literature, with the satisfaction of which the rigid censorship interferes. The Customs confiscates our material and the **Militant** is prohibited entry in the West, as being Bolshevik propaganda. Apparently the capitalist authorities are not convinced by Stalin's assurances to the contrary. The sale of **Unser Kampf** is similarly increasing and the branch has taken steps to knit the sympathizers of this paper into a stable organization.

### Organization and Agitation

The branch has been increasing its membership steadily. We put into effect the principle "from each according to his abilities." No merely passive allegiance is allowed. No one is permitted to wear the badge of the Opposition by merely giving verbal adherence to its principles. Our comrades are active in defense work, trade union work, literature distribution, etc. Comrades MacDonald and Spector, to the great distress of the Stalin officials, have been called upon to speak to the various Workers Associations, forums, etc. The Stalin organ has consequently become more venomous in its falsifications. Rumors are circulated that "MacDonald opposed a demonstration in Queens Park" (in connection with a deputation from Workers and Producers Conference to place its demands before Premier Henry). Or in connection with a previous deputation for the repeal of section 98 "Spector was afraid to address the Premier". But such lies out of the whole cloth are punctured as soon as the workers read our press and see us in action.

### A Canadian Organ of the Opposition

To deal more effectively with the problems of the class struggle in the Dominion, we are preparing to publish the first number of a monthly organ of the Opposition to coincide with the celebration of the October anniversary. Toronto.

—S.

## THE MILITANT

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.

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern James P. Cannon  
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector

Arne Swabeck

Vol. V, No. 44 (Whole No. 140)

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1932

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year, Foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.



# The Stalinists at the Twelfth Plenum

(Continued from page 1)

To pose the question in the fourth year of the crisis as the end of the period of stabilization is to use phrases instead of analysis unless the "analysis" means that after three years of crisis the condition is to become worse for capitalism, that the semi-open conflicts are to break out into open imperialist wars and revolutions. However, we will show that the thesis speaks differently on this point. We will take this phase up later.

If we are now at the end of stabilization what would you call the period of the crisis just before, where we have had the invasion of China by Japan, the revolutions "between" the United States and Great Britain in South America, the Spanish revolution, the Indian situation and above all the danger of Fascism in Germany? Was this the characterization of stabilization?

To draw an analogy we can say that the "Third Period" designed the second period as a period of stabilization, from 1923 or 1921 to 1928. In this period of stabilization we had the British General strike, the Vienna uprising and the Chinese revolution. Following this second period came the third period of revolutionary upsurges. The C. I.'s guess was a miserable failure. But history does not repeat itself. We are on safer ground, not due to Stalinism, but due to the Left Opposition.

**Ebbs and Flows in the Decay Stage**  
To talk constantly about the end of stabilization and revolutionary upsurge is to replace Marxian analysis with Stalinist phrases. The "beginning" of stabilization is just as dangerous for capitalism as the "end" of stabilization. Because this mechanical schema does not fit the facts of the dialectic stages and its cycle. Because the cycle of capitalism has reached the decay stage. The whole period is a period of wars and revolutions, but within this period there are ebbs and flows.

In this decay stage, favorable situations for the seizure of power will exist and have existed in the periods of ebbs as well as flows. A Marxist must present strategy for the party and the class in the decay stage, but this can only be done providing the ebbs and flows, that is, the general direction of the whole in the downward curve of decay capitalism, as well as the parts to the whole, are presented. In other words, the whole period is a period of revolutionary possibilities and in either periods of ebbs and flows within the whole period these revolutionary possibilities are transformed into realities. To take advantage of these realities means to know the direction, the ebb or flow, so that proper tactic can be formulated. This the Stalinists are failing to do and have failed to do.

## What Is the Perspective?

After three years of crisis and depression what is the perspective? Are there still possibilities for ebbs and flows in the economy of capitalism, or will the whole future from now on be downward? On the contrary, ebbs and flows are

ahead, but different kinds of ebbs and flows than we had in the growth stage of capitalism.

The reorganization and readjustments are proceeding not only in the United States but in other important links at the expense of the working class, the peasantry and the weaker section of the exploiters. The failure of the Stalinist leadership to take advantage of the favorable revolutionary situations since the 1923 German revolution as well as the present German situation has not only enabled the capitalist class to obtain a worthwhile breathing spell, but has weakened our forces.

Considering all these factors together, one cannot at this stage lay down a definite perspective of a worse condition as the only variant ahead, as the C. I. does. On the contrary, one possible variant, far from excluded, is the possibility of a short upturn. Not a return to prosperity or the end of capitalist stabilization, which was not stable for the last three years. It will be one of the brief flows in the downward curve of decay capitalism. This holds the upturn within definite limitations. Every process as well as every major stage, of birth, growth and decay has within it its ebbs and flows. Growth has its dynamic flows and difficult ebbs but decay has its turbulent flows and prolonged spasmodic ebbs.

A short upturn solves nothing for the workers—the way towards which the social reformer is looking and hoping. For the capitalist, it prepares the way for greater explosions or greater accumulations of contradictions.

Crisis and depressions, unless transformed to deeper levels of revolutionary situations, always put the workers on the defense, drive them to lower standards and scatter their organized forces. Upturns have the opposite effects upon our class. Upturns release a certain economic pressure but at the same time usher in the workers into the new conditions with no economic gains, which means relatively worse conditions. The released pressure and worse conditions creates a contradiction, this time for the capitalists which drives the workers into the counter-offensive. Signs of this are already at hand in isolated examples especially the miners' strike in Belgium and the miners' strike in Illinois, embryonic signs but nevertheless signs.

## Did Stalinism Forget America?

In considering the role of American imperialism this thesis seems to think that such an imperialism is of little importance in world politics. The proper elevation of the role of American imperialism, in a C. I. resolution today, must place it as the leading imperialist power of world capitalism, as the dominating economic power that has in the past and continues in the present to take the determining role in the struggle against the extension of the October revolution. The role of American imperialism, in Europe, in Asia, in South America as well as its relations to the Soviet Union must be an elementary consideration for

a thesis that makes up the world problems of the vanguard.

## The Main Danger in Germany

The danger of Fascism in Germany is not posed in its proper relationship. The resolution uses enough ink in speaking of Fascism and Germany but does not pull out the determining factor—THE DANGER OF FASCISM IN GERMANY. Instead, the thesis turns the problem upside down and tells us that the main enemy is the social democrats. It says, "Only by directing our main blows against social democracy, this social mainstay of the bourgeoisie."

The thesis clings to the theory of "social-Fascism" and tells us most learned and wanted wisdom—that the bourgeoisie is the main enemy of the proletariat in Germany. This is not told to school children but to the vanguard of the proletariat. Abstract thinking is essential but there are times when abstract thinking and presentations become the worst enemy for advancing the workers' cause. Or more often it is a cheap substitute for lack of knowledge as to what to do. The latter is the case with the Stalinists. The danger of Fascism in Germany and its international historical importance is brushed over with meaningless phrases.

## The Far East Conflict

The Manchurian situation is treated in an equal bankrupt fashion. The thesis says, "The chief hot-bed for breeding a new imperialist war is the Pacific." "Japanese imperialism in alliance with France and with the actual support of England, is converting Manchuria into its colony and has thus put the armed struggle for the partition of China and intervention against the USSR on the order of the day." In this sentence the United States, which the thesis correctly says, "is pursuing its imperialist aims in the Far East" is put on the basis as struggling against a line-up of Japan "in alliance with France" and "actually supported by England." This is not the line up in the Far East, even though interests ran parallel for a time.

All facts point to a much more complicated imperialist as well as Soviet Union problem. To pass this problem off in such a "simple" way and at the same time fail to show its relations to the danger of Fascism in Germany is to fail to present the contradictions of world capitalism in their proper relationship.

## The Position of the Soviet Union

The question of the position of the Soviet Union is the most disgraceful part. To cover up our weak points, to hide from the world proletariat our true conditions, when the whole capitalist world knows these difficulties, is to lull to sleep the only class that will defend the Soviet Union, disarming them and helping the enemy. The thesis says referring to the Soviet Union, "That country has completely established itself in the position of socialism; the second five year plan provides for the final abolition of classes and the conversion of the whole toiling population of the country into active and

conscious builders of a classless society."

The internal difficulties due to objective conditions of a backward country industrializing the country, with world capitalism fighting this industrialization, and the subjective difficulties of the wrong theory of socialism in one country, combined with the effects of the world crisis upon the Soviet Union, have placed our fatherland in a most difficult position. The policy of Stalinism is accelerating the difficulties.

## Directives for the United States

The resolution ends by giving such directives in the coming period. With the end of capitalist stabilization the thesis gives the following directives for the United States. Even though we grant that the tempo toward revolutionary upsurge in the United States will be slower than the other countries the directives are inadequate and wrong for this period, for any period. They say, "For social insurance, against wage cuts, for immediate assistance for the unemployed. For equal rights for the Negroes and self-determination in the Black Belts. For assistance for the ruined farmers. For the defense of the Chinese people and the Soviet Union."

The thesis, you will remember speaks of "the end of capitalist stabilization", and "the development of the revolutionary upsurge and preparation for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat." Not that the upsurge will be even, or everywhere at once, but that in the present period the general direction for the whole, is toward revolutionary upsurge. No sooner do they tell us this, when we are ready to prepare for action to fit this, that is action to fit the end of capitalist stabilization and revolutionary upsurge, than the fifth section of the thesis presents the directives. And here they are:

"The general task of the Comintern and its sections in the present period is to wage a concrete struggle: (1) Against the capitalist offensive. (2) Against Fascism and reaction. (3) Against the impending war and intervention in the Soviet Union." The directives contradict the first part of the thesis. The directives are DEFENSIVE struggles against the capitalists. If the first part is true: "the end of capitalist stabilization and revolutionary upsurge are ahead", then the "general tasks" are not correct. And if the general tasks are correct for the coming period, defensive struggles, then the first part of the thesis is incorrect. There will be defensive struggles in the period of preparation for revolutionary upsurge, that is sure, but the general tasks, means to point to the main line of march and preparations.

The economic analysis of the Left Opposition of world capitalism, on the contrary, points to a period ahead where we must now inform the party and the class to prepare the battle-lines to transform the present and past several years of defensive struggles into offensive struggles of the proletariat against the capitalist. First for immediate demands to be developed with the tempo and to conform to the strength or weakness of the link to a higher stage of an offensive for the overthrow of the capitalist rule.

—HUGO OEHLER.

## Archives of the Opposition

# The Legend of Brest-Litovsk

The new generation in the Comintern knows nothing about how the Chinese revolution was slain, or how the Left wing Minority Movement in the British trade unions was strangled; but for that it is educated on secondary episodes of the past of the type of the "August bloc" (1912), or the Brest-Litovsk differences which are presented as two irreconcilable entities: Leninism and Trotskyism.

The decision on the Brest-Litovsk differences was adopted by the Seventh Congress of the party in March 1918. The discussions at this Congress were of a heated character. But to characterize the relations of the party to the participants in the dispute, the results of the party elections are more telling than anything else. It was a question of the Central Committee. Bucharin's group, in protest, refused to participate in the elections of the Central Committee. Thirty-four delegates actually did participate. The chairman reported the results (we quote from the official published minutes of the Seventh Congress, page 177):

"A commission including Avanesov, Soloviev and Shelavik served as tellers. Permit us to announce the results. Altogether, 39 ballots were cast. Five comrades abstained from voting. They cast blank ballots. The rest are divided as follows: Lenin—34, Trotsky—34, Sverdlov—33, Zinoviev—33, Bucharin—

32, Sokolnikov—32, Stalin—32, Krestinsky—32, Smilga—29, Stassova—28, Lashkevich—27, Schmidt—26, Dzherzhinsky—26, Vladimirovsky—24, Sergeev—23."

The same Congress elected a commission to elaborate the party program. The significance of this commission requires no explanation. Let us present here, word for word, the brief discussion on the question of the make-up of the commission and the results of the voting:

"**Uritsky**—I, at least, am unaware of any programmatic articles by Stalin or Zinoviev, but Radek's are well known. I therefore propose to include Radek instead of Stalin.

"**Chairman**—Stalin has written on the national question, whoever read them—knows. This is not the question. Since objections have been raised, I will put the names to a vote.

"The voting takes place.  
"For Lenin—37, Bucharin—36, Sokolnikov—25, Trotsky—37, Zinoviev—30, Stalin—21, Smirnov—32, Radek—19, Obolensky—7.

"Elected: Lenin, Trotsky, Bucharin, Smirnov, Sokolnikov, Stalin, Zinoviev." (Minutes of the Congresses and Conferences of the Communist party of the Soviet Union (13), pages 169-170.)

Literally every document of the party's past bears deadly witness against the regime of falsifications!

## Two Press Comments on Russia

### AS IT IS TODAY

"As to the prospects (of world revolution.—Ed.) one might think this state of affairs offers to Soviet diplomats, who are alert and experienced in social upheaval, the Moscow press says nothing. Indeed, it is immensely significant that in the countless articles devoted to foreign affairs in the past two months, anything to indicate the Soviet attitude or bias has been scrupulously repressed.

"What is more, during the celebrations of Maxim Gorky's jubilee, which occupied the pages of the Soviet press, there was scarcely a line in the speeches and articles to show that the Soviet Union was interested in world revolution. So much so, that a suggestion of the French radical writer, Henri Barbusse, that the time was approaching for the proletariat to throw off its chains struck a jarring note.

"The Soviet press holds true to the Kremlin policy that world revolution will be a product of circumstances and not propaganda, and that it is the Russians' business to cultivate their own garden and set the example of a successful Socialist State."

—Wireless dispatch from Moscow to the New York Times (10-2-1932) by Walter Duranty.

### AS IT ONCE WAS

"Before the review commenced, a group of speakers from the Communist International ascended the tribune to greet them in the name of their own proletariat. The Russian leaders, who have never for a moment forgotten the international character of the struggle they are conducting, invariably include the representatives of the fighting proletariat of other lands in every celebration of the Red Republic. The broader issues of the contest now being waged on Russian soil, are constantly held before the people: the Red Army, on its fourth anniversary, must not forget that it is serving first and foremost as the vanguard of the world proletariat in its advancing march towards freedom; while the members of the Communist International know that on halting the triumphant forces of Russia, they can rejoice at the closer approach of the world revolution.

"... The reviewers stood on one side of the square, Trotsky in their midst ... It was a magnificent spectacle, dedicated to the cause of world revolution."

—Report from Moscow on the Red Army Anniversary to the Communist Review (June 1922) by E. Roy.

# How the Stalinists Ran the I.L.D. Convention

(Continued from page 1)

Had we been given the opportunity to avail ourselves of our constitutional right of pre-convention discussion, there is no doubt that the entire picture would be changed. For the most important task is not to dismiss the whole matter of the very existence of the organization simply by laying it to the passivity of the membership, but rather for all of us to determine the cause of this passivity of the membership, passivity and to remedy it. Are our leaders certain that the past policies of the I. L. D. have been correct, beyond criticism? Is there no possibility that there is something that the members are not fully in agreement with? To assume that the rank and file who not only follow but also think, after a thorough discussion, would have nothing to say in opposition to the role played by the

profits ranging from 38 to 120%. While the Narikin, the newly rich, lived riotously, the workers and peasants felt the pangs of hunger gnawing ever more fiercely. A period of growing strikes and tenant outbursts culminated finally in the nation-wide rice riots of 1918.

The post-war period brought an even more severe crisis in Japan than in the other capitalist countries. Once more Japan's imports exceeded her exports so that the first five post-war years showed a greater deficit than the enormous surplus of the four war years. Unemployment became general and took on unprecedented proportions for the first time in Japan's history. The mushroom companies of the war period, the over-expanded industries, experienced widespread failures. In 1923 the Great Earthquake added its ghastly burden to the suffering of the masses. On the land the War accelerated the process of concentration of ownership. The number of peasants owing their own land had fallen by 38,000 during the six years before the War but in the five years following the War this class decreased by 450,000.

I. L. D. in the Morgenstern-Goodman case and in the case of the New York Marine Workers, is to underestimate the class conscious and thinking ability of the workers. A serious consideration of these points would lead us to some conclusions.

## Conclusions to Draw

1. The I. L. D. must become the true mass organization for the defense, the organization and training for self-defense of the working class.  
2. The I. L. D. must truly defend all workers regardless of political views and affiliations. The position taken by the I. L. D. officials in the Morgenstern-Goodman case and towards the marine workers, left a stain on the forehead of our organization which can be eradicated only by proof that such basic errors will not be repeated in the future. Only in this way will the I. L. D. prove itself the "shield of the working class".

3. The I. L. D. must go deeper into the masses. It has suffered more than it can stand through its sectarian and isolationist policy.

4. Our united front conferences in the future must be a complete turn from the past. A united front from below is meaningless since the bulk of the workers are still under the influence of and follow the reactionary and reformist leaders.

5. Educational work and discussion within the organization to raise the level of understanding of the rank and file, to avoid turning the I. L. D. into a collection agency and every member a collector. It would be absurd to say that the I. L. D. can exist without funds. No one makes such an assertion. However, the raising of funds and other questions like it will be more successful when they are bound up with and a result of a thorough understanding of the class struggle by our membership, and by pursuing a policy which will extend the influence and following of the I. L. D. Only then will the worker become a valuable element in the I. L. D. and in the revolutionary movement as a whole.

—CHARLOTTE SCHECHET.

# JAPAN

## Its Rise from Feudalism to Capitalist Imperialism and the Development of the Proletariat

By Jack Weber

(Continued from last issue)

### Rise of Japan, Decline of England

The rise of English capitalism caused the ruin of the handicraft cotton industries of India, China and Japan. But not forever could England guard and keep secret the machines that gave her power. To-day nemesis stalks the British Empire and the East ousts England from her greatest markets for cotton manufactures. Naturally England will use every weapon of resistance to fend off the inevitable, the British Empire will not vanish without gigantic struggles, death-throes one might well call them. The tariff, imperial preference, the capitalist onslaught on wages, particularly in the Lancashire mills,—these are symbols of the decline of British capitalism, of the precarious position she occupies in world markets, of the depletion of her natural resources (coal), of the rising costs of manufacturing. The rise of Japan as a manufacturing nation is an added force tending towards accelerating the decline of English capitalism.

### The Rhythm of Cotton Technology

The more advanced the technology, the finer the yarns and piece-goods it can produce. The Lancashire mills, the oldest in the world, are still pre-eminent in the making of fine goods, the kind used in the more advanced countries. But the East—India, China, Japan—with its teeming millions, uses coarse yarn and goods, the type first developed by a new technology. The mastery of cotton manufacturing has followed the same rhythm in every country, Japan being quite typical. At first Japan was a market for coarse piece-goods and the heavier, coarser yarns of English make. Gradually the yarns of coarse size were produced at home until they ceased to be imports and became exports. In this stage Japan ousted England from India and China for this type of yarn. Still later the coarse yarn was used in domestic weaving to produce coarse piece-goods which thus became the export. At this stage Japan captured the Asian market outside of India almost completely away from England. Japan encroached rapidly even on the Indian market with the results already outlined, the closing of India to Japan by England. In this process not only has Japan imported greater and greater amounts of raw cotton but latterly she has been

importing additional yarn (made in China) for her factories.

### Limited Possibility for Japanese Growth

The entire development of Japanese capitalism is conditioned by the epoch in which it arose, the era of imperialism. Forced to follow in the wake of the imperialist powers, Japan's normal growth was stunted. Imperialism signifies the decay of democracy and the militarizing of the imperialist power in its desperate struggle for larger and larger markets. This fact helps to account for the omission of the bourgeois revolution with its democratic phase in Japan's development and for the ease with which the feudal lords were able to direct Japan's course. If to-day, before the achievement of any "real" democracy in Japanese government, we witness movements calling themselves Fascist, the reason is that developments are foreshortened in Japan so that the so-called Fascism, the outgrowth of the military oligarchy, tends to strangle democracy in its very birth.

On the economic field imperialism gives occasion to the peculiar phenomenon of the export of finance capital by Japan to China for the setting-up of cotton mills there even before Japan has saturated her own home market. Practically 40% of all Chinese cotton spindles are owned by Japanese capitalists. In the developments of Chinese and Indian cotton manufacturing, we see however the same fate meted out to Japan that she meted out to England,—the loss of markets. Already China has ousted Japan from her market for the sale of yarns and India already has more spindles than Japan. Japanese capitalism rests on cheaper labor than that of England but both India and China rely on labor still cheaper than that of Japan. A girl spinner in Japan gets 50 to 60 cents for 10 hours of work. A male spinner in India gets from 34 to 43 cents for 10 hours.

Japan's development in the last 70 years, looked at closely, has been slow rather than fast, much slower than that of England even during its experimental stage. Her home market is not a strong one; for example, in the cotton industry, on the basis of yarn consumed Japan does not produce nearly as much goods as England, the U. S. or even India, and yet Japan exports more cotton cloth than any other country except England,—because she sells less at home due to

the lower per capita consumption of her poverty-stricken population. It is a foregone conclusion that Japan will never attain the height of development reached by England in the cotton industry which, nevertheless, is Japan's greatest industry.

## "The Big Five"

A striking phenomenon illustrating Japan's uneven capitalist development under the imperialist forces shaping her institutions, is the growth of tremendous empires of monopoly capitalism side-by-side with her backward industrial forms. The Japanese government has consistently encouraged combinations of capital. During periods of crisis when capitalists find themselves on the verge of bankruptcy, the government intervenes directly to bring about amalgamations and greater monopolistic concentrations of industry, banking, etc. The "Big Five" of Japan are the very heart of Japanese imperialism. They are banks in the same sense as the National City Bank in the U. S. and the Midland Bank of England; that is to say, they are the sources of finance capital. No big undertaking can be started in Japan without the aid of one or more of these banks.

To enumerate the companies controlled by the Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Dai-ichi, Sumitomo and Yasuda banks would be to catalog every great Japanese enterprise. The Mitsui Co. alone controls 25% of the entire export trade of Japan and handles coal, copper, sulphur, lumber, cotton, silk, sugar, etc. It imports ships, locomotives, steel bridges, opium, machine tools, paper pulp. It is the largest owner of coal mines in the East. It handles the millions of tons of the soy bean crop of Manchuria and practically owns the forests of Hokkaido besides having the monopoly of camphor in Formosa. The Mitsubishi Bank controls the shipping industry and all the large shipping companies of Japan. It has vast interests in the engineering industries. It is vitally concerned in the South Manchuria Railroad. These banks, the "Big Five", are gigantic combines,

vertically and horizontally, with tremendous and cynically recognized power in government. Japanese papers refer to a Mitsui cabinet or a Mitsubishi ministry since the Mitsui's "own" the Selyuaki Party and the Mitsubishis subsidize the Minseito Party.

## Effects of the War on Japan

The World War gave Japanese capitalism so tremendous an impetus that it can be said to have reached maturity with this period. The war freed Japan temporarily from the strangling fetters of competition. After a year of painful readjustment, Japanese capitalism seized its opportunity to invade all the markets of the East as well as Africa, the South Sea Islands and Australia. No better measure can be given of the extent of its new trade than the relation of exports to imports. From the Sino-Jap war up to the World War, imports exceeded exports each year, leaving a total excess of imports of 928,803,000 yen at the beginning of the War. The first three years of the War cancelled this deficit so that by 1918 there was an actual surplus of exports amounting to 467,000,000 yen.

Before the War England controlled 53% of the imports of cotton piece-goods to China, Japan sending only 20%. By 1925 Japan had 51% of this business, England only 38%. The present Japanese steel industry is the product of the War. The number of factory workers increased almost half a million from the outbreak of War to Oct. 1917.

Of far greater importance however, are not these figures, but the changed social conditions, the enriching of the few and the utter pauperizing of the masses. The same process of inflation occurred in Japan as elsewhere. Prices doubled, then tripled and went skyrocketing. Wages remained stationary or lagged far behind the rising cost of living. Food became scarce. The profits made by the capitalists were simply enormous. Certain mushroom steel companies, sugar manufacturers, shipping concerns, showed

# BOOKS BY TROTSKY

## PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

450 pages Cloth cover \$1.50  
paper cover 1.00

## THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

158 pages paper cover 50c  
cloth cover \$1.00

## HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Vol. 1

522 pages \$4

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

48 pages paper cover 15c

## COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM

64 pages paper cover 15c

## STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION\*

Part 2 of the Draft Program 86 pages 25c

## THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER

64 pages paper cover 15c

## WHITHER ENGLAND

178 pages Paper .75

## PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th Street,

## WHAT NEXT—Vital Questions

for the German Proletariat

192 Pages Cloth \$.65  
Paper .35

## THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA\*

364 pages cloth cover \$1.00

New York, N. Y.



# What They Say in Prague About the United Front

From the Series of Articles in the Forthcoming Book 'The Only Road' -- by Leon Trotsky

(Continued from last issue)

The united front on the international scale, as we have said above, contains the greatest difficulties and dangers, for there the formulation of the practical tasks and the organization of mass control is harder. That is how matters stand above all in the question of the struggle against war. The prospects of joint actions are far slighter here, the possibilities of subterfuge and deception by the reformists and pacifists are far greater. By this, of course, we do not contend that the united front in this field is out of the question. On the contrary, we demanded that the Comintern should turn directly and immediately to the Second and the Amsterdam Internationals with the proposal for a joint anti-war congress. It would then have been the task of the Comintern to work out the most concrete possible obligations, applicable to the various countries and differing circumstances. Were the social democracy compelled to agree to such a congress, the problem of war, providing there were a correct policy on our side, could be driven into its ranks like a sharp wedge.

The first premise for this: utmost clarity, political as well as organizational. There is involved an agreement of proletarian, million-membered organizations, which are today still divided by deep antagonisms in principle. No ambiguous intermediaries, no diplomatic masqueradings and hollow pacifist formulae!

The Comintern, however, found it proper this time also to act counter to the A B C of Marxism: while it refused to enter into open negotiations with the reformist Internationals, it opened up negotiations behind the scenes with Friedrich Adler through the medium... of the pacifist literary gentleman and first class muddlehead, Henri Barbusse. As a result of this policy, Barbusse gathered together in Amsterdam half-masked Communist or "related", "sympathizing" organizations and groups, together with the pacifist free lancers of all countries. The most honest and sincere among the latter—and they are the minority—can each say for himself: "I and my confusion." Who needed this masquerade, this bazaar of intellectualistic conceit, this Münzenbergerie, which converges into downright political charlatany?\*

But let us return to Prague. Five months after the appearance of the article discussed above, the same journal printed the article of one of the party leaders, Kl. Gottwald, which bears the character of an appeal to the Czechoslovakian workers of the different tendencies to make fighting agreements. The Fascist danger menaces all of Central Europe: the onslaught of the reaction can be beaten off only by the unity of the proletariat; no time should be lost, it is already "five minutes to twelve". The appeal is very passionately written. In vain, however, does Gottwald swear, following Seydewitz and Thälmann, that he is not pursuing the interests of the party but the interests of the class: such a contrast is absolutely improper in the mouth of a Marxist. Gottwald stigmatizes the sabotage of the social democratic leaders. It is needless to say that the truth here is entirely on his side. Unfortunately, the author says nothing direct about the policy of the Central Committee of the German Communist Party: evidently he is not resolved upon defending it, but does not yet dare to criticize it. Gottwald himself, nevertheless, goes into the grievous question, not resolutely, it is true, but still fairly correctly. After he has called upon the workers of the various tendencies to come to an agreement in the factories, Gottwald writes: "Many of you may perhaps say: Unite there 'at the top', we 'below' will get together pretty easily." At the top, we 'below' will get together pretty easily." We believe, continues the author, "that the most important thing is for the workers to agree 'below'. And as for the leaders: we have already said that we combine even with the devil if only it is directed against the rulers and in the interests of the workers. And we say to you openly: if your leaders give up their alliance with the bourgeoisie for even a single instant, proceed in reality against the rulers even in one question—we will greet it and support them in it."

Almost everything necessary is said here, and almost the way it should be said. Gottwald did not even forget to mention the devil, whose name the editorial board of RUDE PRAVO printed five months before in pious indignation. Gottwald did indeed omit the devil's grandmother. But God be with her: for the sake of the united front we are ready to sacrifice her. Perhaps Gottwald would be prepared, for his part to console the offended old dame by turning over to her disposal the article from RUDE PRAVO of February 27, together with the inkwell—"worker correspondent".

Gottwald's political considerations, let us hope, are applicable not only to Czechoslovakia but also to Germany. And that's just how it should have been said. On the other hand, neither in Berlin nor in Prague can the party leadership confine itself to the bald declaration:

\*The fact that the Brandlerites (see their Stuttgart Tribune of August 27, carefully separated itself from us in this question too, and supported the masquerade of Stalin, Manuilsky, Losovsky, Muenzenberg, surprises us least of all. After supplying the model of their united front policy in Saxony in 1923, Brandler-Thälheimer thereupon supported the Stalinist policy towards the Kuo Min Tang and the Anglo-Russian Committee. How can they deprive themselves of the opportunity to enlist under Barbusse's banner? If they didn't, their political physiognomy would not be rounded out.

tion of its readiness for a united front with the social democracy, but must demonstrate this readiness in deeds, enterprisingly, in a Bolshevik manner, by means of quite definite practical proposals and actions. That is just what we demand.

Gottwald's article, thanks to the fact that it rings with a realistic and not an ultimatum tone, instantly found an echo among the social democratic workers: On July 31 there appeared in RUDE PRAVO a letter, among others, from an unemployed printer who had recently returned from a visit to Germany. The letter bears the imprint of a worker-democrat who is undoubtedly afflicted with the prejudices of reformism. All the more important is it to pay attention to how the policy of the German Communist Party reflects itself in his consciousness. "When in the spring of last year," thus writes the printer, "comrade Breitscheid directed to the Communist party the appeal to begin joint actions with the social democracy, he evoked in the ROTE FAHNE a veritable storm of indignation. So the social democratic workers said to themselves: 'Now we know how serious are the intentions of the Communists on the united front!'"

Here you have the genuine voice of a worker. Such a voice contributes more to the solution of the question than dozens of articles by unprincipled pen-pushers. As a matter of fact, Breitscheid didn't propose any united front. He only frightened the bourgeoisie with the possibility of joint actions with the Communists... Had the Central Committee of the Communist party promptly put the question right on the edge of the knife, the social democratic party leadership would have been pushed into a difficult position. But the Central Committee of the Communist party hastened, as always, to put itself into a difficult position.

In the brochure *What Next?*, I happened to write on Breitscheid's speech: "Isn't it self-evident that Breitscheid's diplomatic and equivocal offer should have been grabbed with both hands; and that from one's own side, one should have submitted a concrete, carefully detailed and practical program for a joint struggle against Fascism; and have demanded joint sessions of the executives of both parties, with the participation of the executives of the independent trade unions? Simultaneously, one should have carried energetically this same program down through all the layers of both parties and of the masses." (Page 56.)

By spurning the trial balloon of the reformist leaders, the Central Committee of the Communist party transformed in the minds of the workers the ambiguous assertion of Breitscheid into a direct united front proposal and prompted the social democratic workers to the conclusion: "Our people want joint actions, but the Communists are sabotaging." Can you imagine a more inappropriate and stupider policy? Could Breitscheid's maneuver be better supported? The letter from the Prague printer demonstrates with remarkable plainness that, with Thälmann's aid, Breitscheid completely attained his goal.

RUDE PRAVO endeavors to perceive contradiction and confusion in the fact that in one case we reject an agreement, but in another, we acknowledge it and deem it necessary to determine anew each time the scope, the slogans and the methods of the agreement. RUDE PRAVO does not understand that in politics, as in all other serious fields, one must know well: *what, when, where and how*. Also it cannot hurt to understand: *why*.

In our *Criticism of the Program of the Comintern* four years ago, we set down a few elementary rules for the united front policy. We consider it worth while to recall them here:

"The possibility of betrayal is always imbedded in reformism. That does not mean, of course, that reformism and betrayal are one and the same thing at every moment. Temporary agreements may be made with the reformists, if they take a step forward. But to maintain a bloc with them when they commit treason shortly before the development of a movement, signifies a criminal carelessness towards the traitors and a veiling of betrayal." (*The Strategy of the World Revolution*, page 51.)

"The most important, best established and most unalterable rule of every maneuver says: One's own party organization should never be diluted, united or combined with another, no matter how 'friendly' the latter may still be today. Such a step should never be undertaken which leads, directly or indirectly, openly or maskedly, to the subordination of the party to other parties or to organizations of other classes and therewith limits the freedom of one's own agitation, or a step through which one is made responsible, even if only in part, for the political line of other parties. You shall not mix up the banners, nor to speak of kneeling before another banner." (Ibid, pp. 60-61.)

Today, after the experience with the Barbusse Congress, we would add still another rule:

"Agreements should be reached only openly, before the eyes of the masses, from party to party, from organization to organization. You shall not avail yourself of equivocal middlemen. You shall not palm off diplomatic affairs with bourgeois pacifists as a proletarian united front."

PRINKIPO, September 2, 1932.

L. TROTSKY.

# Browder on the Chinese Revolution

Now that the *Daily Worker* has "corrected its mistake" in appealing to the workers to protest against the arrest and possible execution of comrade Chen Du-Hsiu in Shanghai, the leader of the party, Earl Browder, endeavors in the issue of October 21 to explain to his readers that comrade Chen betrayed the Chinese revolution and that the arrest of this "Trotskyist" is no concern of the working class. At the same time, Browder, smarting under the Opposition's criticisms of his leadership of the party and our exposure of his role in China during the 1927 events, takes occasion to defend himself in particular and Stalinism in general in the question of the great tragedy of the Chinese revolution of 1925-1927.

"During a part of the crucial period of 1927," writes Browder, "the writer of this article was in Hankow—when the decisive issues of armament or disarmament of the workers and peasants first became a sharp issue within the Communist party. In view of the fact that the Trotskyites in America have systematically spread slanders about myself in relation to that period, attempting with all their power to create the legend that the Chinese party and the Communist International, including the American Stalinist, Browder, failed to carry on a resolute struggle against Chiang Kai-Shek, it may not be out of place to take this occasion to call attention to the records."

And what are the "records" which disprove the "legend" that the Communist International (i. e., the Browders of all shapes and magnitudes) failed to carry on a resolute struggle against Chiang Kai-Shek? We read on:

## BROWDER'S RECORDS

"These show that in April, in the period when Chen Tuh-siu was actively and bitterly fighting for the disarmament of the workers and peasants, I wrote a statement for the All-China Federation of Labor energetically calling for the further armament of the workers and peasants and the development of seizure of the land. This statement was printed in English in the magazine 'Chinese Correspondence', published at that time in Hankow."

First, what Browder wrote in his statement at that time, we do not know. It would be interesting to read it, of that we have no doubt. But it is not needed for an estimation of Browder's position in China during that period, for we have at our disposal fairly adequate material on that score. More important than that, is the even more damning record of the whole official policy of the Stalin-Bucharin faction in the Chinese revolution, which Browder's latest indiscretion in even speaking of himself in this connection permits us to review once more.

Second, as to comrade Chen Du-Hsiu, the principal founder of the Chinese Communist movement and one of the leaders of the Chinese Left Opposition, there is this to be said: With a spirit of revolutionary responsibility and candor of which Browder is totally incapable, comrade Chen some three years ago, issued an open letter to the Chinese Communists in which he took his full share of the responsibility for the catastrophic course followed by the Comintern in China. What puts him forever beyond the pale of forgiveness of the Stalinists is the fact that he revealed with indisputable facts that the source of the great defeat was to be found in the policy imposed upon the Chinese Communists by Stalin and Co., that his own mistake consisted in following it out to the letter. The structures now directed at him by the apparatus scribblers are simply part of the notorious Stalinist system of manufacturing scapegoats.

And now, back to Browder and his "resolute struggle" of the Comintern. For the moment, we shall quote from a responsible source, the *Daily Worker* of the time, which merely echoed faithfully the official policy of the international leadership (all emphasis is ours).

## DAILY WORKER AND CHIANG KAI-SHEK

On April 4, 1927, with the whole bourgeois press talking about Chiang's preparations for counter-revolution, the *Daily Worker* lulled its readers to sleep, put them off their guard, and assured all and sundry that there was no danger from Chiang Kai-Shek or of a crisis breaking out in the Kuo Min Tang. In its front page dispatch from Hankow, it announced: "Now that the crisis is past the Nationalist revolutionary movement is in a position to move on unhampered by the slightest suspicion of inner conflict."

And in its penetrating editorial comment in the same issue: "There is going to be no split in the Kuo Min Tang, Chiang Kai-Shek remains in command of the drive on Peking, he accepts the authority of the Political Committee of the party, and the cleavage between the Left and Right wings of the party upon which the imperialists have been building great hopes will not materialize at present. The Chinese liberation movement is a unit against imperialism."

Isn't it clear how "resolute" was Stalin's struggle against Chiang Kai-Shek? For, we repeat, the *Daily Worker* merely echoed the rest of the official press. When Chiang "pledged" himself to be "loyal", in order to gain time for his coup d'Etat, Pravda hailed him in these terms:

"Chiang Kai-Shek's declarations relative to his faithfulness toward the revolution, toward Sun-Yat-Senism and loyalty to the Kuo Min Tang, are distinguished from his former statements and testify to the pressure of the revolutionary rank and file." (March 16, 1927.)

No more than eleven days after our

## The Arrest of Chen Du-Hsiu and the Apologist of Stalin

first quotation which guarantees not "the slightest suspicion of inner conflict", the *Daily Worker* announced on page two, April 15, 1927, under a Moscow date line that "grave fears are felt here that General Chiang Kai-Shek, the Chinese Nationalist Commander, may turn counter-revolutionary and join forces with Chang Tso Lin and the Northernners", while on page one, the editors who, as we see, foresaw and warned and fought resolutely, printed a belated Shanghai report that "General Chiang Kai-Shek has gone over to the side of the imperialist powers conspiring to crush the revolutionary Nationalist movement."

## "WE" AND FENG YU-HSIANG

Chiang's "defection" was promptly explained away as a mere episode: "We" still had... Hankow and... Feng Yu-Hsiang. Bucharin, Browder's boss of yesterday, declared according to a Moscow dispatch in the *Daily Worker* of April 21, 1927: "We must remember that we (Ahem!!) have the army of Feng Yu-Hsiang, which, as yet, has not been brought into the fight. It is necessary to avoid forms and organizations that will give the imperialists cause to yell about the Sovietization of China" (read: that will mobilize the workers and peasants).

## PROTEST!

The leading militants of the Chinese Left Opposition have been arrested in Shanghai, with comrade Chen Du-Hsiu, former secretary of the party, at their head. The sanguinary record of Chiang Kai-Shek leaves no doubt as to his intentions. The lives of our seven comrades are in real danger. The party leaders are displaying a cynical indifference to the case. The I. L. D. leaders are doing likewise. The principle of international proletarian solidarity demands that we raise our voices in unmistakable protest against the imprisonment of these comrades. Militants, party members! Demand a change of front from the party and the I. L. D.! Demand a campaign for the release of the seven Bolshevik fighters of Shanghai!

ants for a real struggle against the traitors and vacillators!—M. S.). The Communists must not leave the Kuo Min Tang, but must push out the Right wing elements instead. Workers must enter the K. M. T. and bore from within, never forgetting for a moment that Hankow is a Left government and a considerable part of the national army favors it and that Hankow will become more and more the center for the workers and the masses."

Thus Browder's boss of yesterday concerning the Wuhan government and Feng, the successors to Chiang Kai-Shek in the bureaucrats' list of white hopes! And here is what was said by Browder's boss of today, Stalin, the renowned "best disciple of Lenin": "The revolutionary Kuo Min Tang in Wuhan will be transformed into an organ of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry by a decisive struggle against imperialism." (*Daily Worker*, May 13, 1927.)

Following this guidance with exemplary fidelity, the *Daily Worker* editorial of May 19, 1927 told its readers that "the Hankow government, the genuine expression of the Chinese liberation movement, is growing stronger each day."

## BROWDER'S GREETINGS IN HANKOW

And Browder? Did he, on the spot, "knowing" the situation—did he perhaps express some skepticism about Hankow, about Wang Chin Wei and Co., did he give some warning to the Chinese masses? Here, if you please, is the record, taken from Browder's pamphlet of 1927, "Civil War in Nationalist China", on page 32, which quotes an authentic report of his speech in Hankow on April 2: "Earl Browder, delegate from America, spoke next... greeting the gathering as the highest organ of the Chinese revolution". What gathering? The Enlarged Political Council of the Kuo Min Tang Central Executive Committee—the, at that time, still combined treacherous cliques of Wang Chin Wei and Chiang Kai-Shek!

Let us resume the thread: On July 7, 1927, a week after Feng Yu-Hsiang's open treachery, the *Daily Worker* editorial blandly observed that "the defection of Feng Yu-Hsiang (was) an eventuality easily to have been perceived". Let us see how easily our Stalinists "perceived" it. While Feng was already negotiating the terms of the betrayal with Chiang Kai-Shek, the D. W. editors again "fought resolutely" by reassuring their readers that "it is unlikely that after having been sent to conclude a military alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek against the northern militarists, under the instructions of the K. M. T. Central Committee, that Feng has done anything else than carry out his instructions". This was in the issue of June 20, 1927. TWO DAYS LATER, the *Daily Worker*, which perceived, which warned, which fought resolutely, announced in a Moscow dispatch: "Branding Feng's alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek as a betrayal of the Chinese revolution, N. Bucharin in an article in Pravda points out... Feng Yu-Hsiang has passed into the camp of the enemies of the people's revolution" (July 1, 1927). This is the same Bucharin who smugly boasted a few weeks before that "we must remember that we have the army of Feng Yu-Hsiang!"

## THE STALINIST DEFENSE OF WUHAN

But Wuhan! Oh, yes, there was still something for the sinking Stalinists to grab hold of! "Wuhan has not yet fallen", "in spite of the predictions of the imperialists... the present crisis of the liberation movement is not decisive."

The rest can really be guessed! A brief eleven days later, the *Daily Worker* of July 16, 1927 bore a headline: "Denounce Wuhan Government As Workers' Enemy. Third International Demands Action." But action is difficult to get from workers and peasants bleeding to death under the ax of every bourgeois nationalist scoundrel in whom the Comintern leaders taught the Chinese masses to put their trust.

This horrible record could be prolonged indefinitely. But enough has been printed to show what the "resolute struggle" looked like in reality, and precisely who it is that, trusting to the short memories of his readers, is creating legends about the Chinese revolution.

A final word. Browder pretends to an honest indignation which the caloused bureaucrat is really incapable of experiencing. Let us therefore reprint the glowing letter of introduction signed on June 3, 1927 in Hankow by Pang Chek-min, head of the Oversea Department of the C. E. C. of the Hankow Kuo Min Tang, and addressed to the "Dear Comrades" of the reactionary Kuo Min Tang gang in Oakland, Calif.:

"I have the honor to introduce to you Mr. Browder, the American delegation of Pan-Pacific Labor Conference. He now returns to America from China where he has given a great deal of help to the Kuo Min Tang and the Nationalist Government. I hope you and all of the branches welcome him and introduce him to the branches of Kuo Min Tang in America."

## BROWDER EARNS HIS PRAISE

We do not know the exact nature of the "great deal of help" which the Chinese bourgeoisie appreciated so warmly in Hankow. But we have not the slightest doubt that Browder richly earned the hearty introduction and appreciation of Messrs. Wang Chin Wei and Co. In any case, such a letter, if it was written because of what Browder calls his "resolute struggle", was obtained from the Hankow bourgeoisie under false pretences.

Browder now loftily informs his readers that our comrade Chen Du-Hsiu's arrest is nothing for workers to worry over, that "he is much closer to the group of Wang Chin Wei, with which he has worked for many years." The man who slanders the Chinese revolutionist and winks to the Chinese counter-revolution that the Stalinists will not interfere with the execution of the prisoner, has hidden in his trunk the letter of Wang Chin Wei and Co., which forever stigmatizes the role Browder played in China in his time. If his latest intervention in the Chinese situation is less perilous in its effects, it is no less reactionary and base. Every man to his part.

As for us, we shall fight to prevent the assassination of comrade Chen and the other Oppositionists, for it is a fight for the victory of what the Stalinists did their utmost to destroy in its infancy, the victory of Chinese Bolshevism.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

# MEETINGS

## Philadelphia

Comrade B. Morgenstern will speak at 4035 Girard Avenue, Philadelphia, on Saturday, October 20, 8 P. M., on the subject of "Why All Young Workers Should Vote Communist". The meeting is under the auspices of the Philly branch of the Communist League of America and is one of a series which is to be held. Admission to this meeting is ten cents and all workers, particularly the young, are cordially invited.

The next evening, on October 30, comrade Morgenstern will speak at the Liberal Forum, 911 W. Girard Avenue, on "The Significance of the Recent Expulsions in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union". This timely subject should arouse considerable interest and bring many workers to attend. Admission is free and questions will be arranged for at the end of the lecture.

On November 12, Max Shachtman, editor of the *Militant*, will speak in Philadelphia on the outcome of the German elections. Watch for future announcement.

## Minneapolis

The Minneapolis branch of the Communist League is inviting all workers to take part in the regular open forum meetings to be conducted throughout the winter months at 1530 E. Franklin Ave., 3 P. M. every Sunday afternoon. The following subjects are scheduled:

October 30: "The Community Fund Drive", with Sara Avrin speaking.  
November 6: "City Relief, Political Parties and the Tax Amendment" with Clem Forsen as speaker.  
November 13: "The Move for New Wage Cuts in the Railroad Industry" with C. R. Hedlund speaking.

Other meetings will be announced regularly. Admission is free and all are urged to attend.

A HALF-YEAR SUB TO THE MILITANT IS \$1; WITH THREE OTHERS ON A CLUB PLAN BLANK IT IS ONLY \$50.

## October Young Spartacus Now OUT

The October issue of the *Young Spartacus* has been off the press for several weeks. It contains articles on the presidential elections, the German situation, Illinois miners' convention, Youth and

the Anti-War Congress, the activities of the Spartacus Youth Clubs. The special educational features consist of an article on John Reed and a review of the History of the First International by G. Steklov.

Comrades should hasten the distribution of the issue. The November number which will be devoted primarily to the

commemoration of the anniversary of the Russian Revolution is planned for the first week of November. This issue will be an eight page—regular size of subsequent numbers of the *Young Spartacus*.

Readers of *The Militant* should subscribe to the *Young Spartacus* (fifty cents a year).