

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 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879
VOLUME VI, NO. 1 [WHOLE NO. 148] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1933 PRICE 5 CENTS

LEON TROTSKY

Open Letter to Vandervelde

Citizen Vandervelde,

A few years ago you addressed yourself to me with an open letter concerning, if I am not mistaken, the repression against the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionists. Generally and invariably, you stood up against the Bolsheviks in the name of the principles of democracy. It is your right. If your criticism did not obtain the intended result, it is because we Bolsheviks proceed from the principles of the revolutionary dictatorship.

The Russian Social Revolutionists, your co-religionists in democracy, opened up, in their time, the terrorist struggle against us. They wounded Lenin and sought to blow up my military train. Turned over to the Soviet tribunal, they found in you one of their most rabid defenders. The government to which I belonged authorized you not only to come to Soviet Russia, but to come before the tribunal as the attorney for those who tried to kill the head of the first workers' state. In your plea, which we reproduced in our press, you invariably appealed to the principles of democracy. It was your right.

On December 4, 1932, I stopped in transit with my traveling companions in the port of Antwerp. I had no intention either of propagandizing for the dictatorship of the proletariat or of coming forward as the defender of the Communists and strikers arrested by the Belgian government who, so far as I know, committed no assaults upon the members of the Brussels government. A few of my companions, and my wife with them, wished to visit Antwerp. One of them, for the purposes of his voyage, needed to get in touch with a consulate in the town. All of them were categorically prohibited from touching the soil of Belgium, even under escort. That part of the port where our boat was located, was carefully encircled. On both sides of the boat stood police sentries. From the deck we were able to pass under review the policemen of democracy, military as well as civil. It was an imposing spectacle.

The number of dicks and cops—you will permit me this familiar designation for the sake of conciseness—exceeded the number of sailors and dockers. The boat looked like a temporary prison; the adjacent section of the port, like a prison courtyard. The police chief took a copy of our papers—even though we were not entering Belgium and had not been authorized to disembark at Antwerp. He asked to receive my explanations for the fact that my passport is made out to the name of Sedoff. I declined to engage in any discussion with the Belgian police, with whom I had nothing to do.

The police officer tried to act with threats: he declared that he had the right to arrest anybody whom the boat's sailing route chanced to conduct into Belgian waters. I must, however, acknowledge that there were no arrests.

I request you not to find in my words any complaint. It would be ridiculous to complain about such a trifle in the face of what the toiling masses and especially the Communists are made to undergo throughout the world at the present time. But the Antwerp episode seems to me to be enough of a pretext for returning to your old "Open Letter", to which I did not reply at that time.

I hope I am not mistaken in counting Belgium among the democracies. The war which you carried on was—Isn't that so?—the war for democracy. After the war, you were at the head of Belgium as minister and even as Prime Minister. What more is necessary to bring democracy to its complete unfoldment? On that score, I think, there can be no discussion between us. Why then does this democracy nevertheless reek so much of the police spirit of old Russia? And can one believe that the democracy which experiences such nervous convulsions at the chance approach of a Bolshevik, will prove capable of neutralizing the class struggle and of guaranteeing the peaceful transformation of capitalism into socialism?

In reply you will undoubtedly call to my mind the Ve-Cheka, the GPU, the deportation of Rakovsky and my own expulsion from the Soviet Union. That argument is beyond the point. The Soviet regime does not adorn itself with the bedraggled plumes of democracy. If the passage to socialism were possible within the state forms created by liberalism, the revolutionary dictatorship would not be necessary. For the Soviet regime, the question can and should be put of knowing if it is capable of teaching the workers the struggle against capitalism. But it is absurd to demand that the proletarian dictatorship should observe the forms and the rites of liberal democracy. The dictatorship has its rigorous methods and logic. The blows

(Continued on page 4)

A HALF-YEAR SUB TO THE MILITANT IS \$1; WITH THREE OTHERS ON A CLUB PLAN BLANK IT IS ONLY 65c.

Bridgeman Red Cases Revived

Supreme Court Ruling Opens Attack on American Communist Movement

A concerted attack upon the whole Communist movement is presaged by the decision of the Michigan Supreme Court, just handed down, which rules that all those involved in the famous Michigan Communist cases of 1923, must stand trial on charges of criminal syndicalism.

The scores of those arrested or indicted, date from a convention in Bridgeman of the underground Communist party some ten years ago. The first trial, that of William Z. Foster, resulted in a hung jury. The second trial, that of C. E. Ruthenberg, resulted in a conviction which was upheld by the State Supreme Court. The death of comrade Ruthenberg occurred during his appeal to the U. S. Supreme Court.

The revival of the Bridgeman cases is not merely an attack upon the Communist movement, upon the party and the Left Opposition, several of whose

members are also involved, but on the working class as a whole, which the bourgeoisie seeks to weaken by cutting off and imprisoning its most conscious vanguard. When the arrests were first made years ago, it was clear that the cases were directly connected with the numerous labor struggles of that period. The same holds true today. The fear of the growing discontentment of the masses is impelling the ruling class to revive an ancient case in the hope of depriving the proletariat of its leadership.

Against this vicious attack, it is necessary to mobilize the maximum strength of the whole labor movement. The Communist party, the leader of the proletariat, must be defended by every worker! A united front of solidarity must be erected around the militants involved, through which the bourgeoisie, its police and its courts, will be unable to break.

WE ARE COUNTING ON YOU FOR AID

The danger that we may be compelled to suspend the publication of the MILITANT as a weekly, must arouse the deepest concern of every friend of the Left Opposition in this country and impel him to prompt action. We have thus far been able to maintain the MILITANT by means of the most strenuous sacrifices. And that was the only way, because while the world crisis has laid bare the bankruptcy of the present social order and given a great impulsion to the revolutionary progress of the working class, it has also deprived it of the financial means with which to sustain it. We are not threatened with this retreat because the Left Opposition is losing ground in the United States. Quite the contrary. Our influence and prestige are greater at the present time than ever before; our views, stubbornly advocated for years in the face of countless obstacles, are verified by the events of every new day. The threat comes from the fact that the ravages of unemployment have so drastically affected our own comrades that those upon whom we could once rely for substantial and systematic contributions are far less, or not at all, able to make them today.

This does not mean for one moment that the situation is hopeless. It only means that the task of preserving the weekly MILITANT must be shouldered by a much greater number of comrades and friends. When we make the appeal for speedy assistance, it should be borne in mind that the MILITANT is our principal mouthpiece on a national scale, and not merely on a national scale, for it has been of signal aid to the young and sturdy Bolshevik-Leninist movements in Canada, in England, in South Africa and China. It is our main organizer, for where the weakness of our movement prevents us from sending a suitable comrade for work, we know that the MILITANT can

be relied upon to present the Opposition standpoint to the most distant localities. It is our main educational center, for its columns teach those great historical principles of revolutionary Marxism which have been so dramatically verified by the history of the last two decades, and it teaches them not only in the light of the past, but in connection with the living unfoldment of events week by week. Moreover, the MILITANT constitutes that hub from which radiate the spokes of our other activities and enterprises: the organ of the Opposition youth, YOUNG SPARTACUS; the organ of the Yiddish-speaking Oppositionists, UNSER KAMF; the organ of our Greek-speaking comrades, KOMMUNISTIS. Should the hub be smashed, the spokes would be left hanging limply in the air just as surely as the hub would fail to turn the wheel without well-connected spokes.

We have not been derelict in our efforts to maintain the weekly at all costs, because we are aware of the heavy blow that our movement would be struck by its collapse. We are confident that the same knowledge and spirit will animate all our friends to exert themselves to the utmost, to contribute generously in our present drive to save the MILITANT. The drive is Point One on the order of the day until the danger to the MILITANT is overcome. An early contribution is a double contribution, and we are anxious not to protract the campaign. The work that demands doing well will not permit it.

Therefore, every shoulder to the wheel, every comrade to his post. We are counting on our friends to carry us over the hump, to save the weekly MILITANT from collapse!

—MAX SHACHTMAN, Editor.

Send funds immediately to the MILITANT, 126 E. 16th St., N. Y. C.

MOSCOW LETTER

Stalin Banishes Zinoviev

The editorial board of the Bulletin of the Russian Opposition reports the following important news from Moscow.

"On November 24 and 25, 1932, the People's Commissar for Food Supplies of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, Elismont, the director of Soviet transportation, Tolmachev, the former People's Commissar for Agriculture, A. Smirnov, Dossier and various others, were arrested. Smirnov, Elismont and Tolmachev were accused of allegedly having formed a trinity with the aim of creating an organization for the overthrow of Stalin. Elismont is supposed to have refused a confession and to have proved that Rykov and Tomsky knew nothing of the 'trinity'."

Another group, Nemchenko, Ginsburg and others, were also arrested on the same accusation.

"Kamenev has been banished to Minussinsk (Siberia) Zinoviev to Kustanay (in Kazakhstan); Sten to Akmolinsk; Slepikov to Tarn. Riutin has been confined in the Cheliabinsk solitary prison. To Smilga, it was proposed that he quit Moscow."

As we learn further, the work of the Russian Left Opposition is increasing and its contacts are growing. The report above characterizes the internal situation in the CPSU as well as the social processes in Soviet Russia. The next stage of the inner-Russian development contains great dangers. It is our task to follow the events with the closest attention and draw upon our resources to the full for the defense of the line of Lenin and Trotsky, as well as for the support of the work of the Russian Left Opposition.

Left Wing Victory In The I.L.G.W.U.

The thorough victory of the Left wing in the elections for officers of Local 9, International Ladies Garment Workers Union (New York), is of tremendous significance for the movement. The victory was gained not only against the slate of the reactionary Right wing, but also against the joint slate of the anarchist clique and the Lovestone group. Local 9 is the second largest local of the union in the country, and the triumph of the Left wing gains additional significance from the fact that two weeks previously, it swept the ruling clique out of office in the largest local, Local 1, and secured the election of its own slate. The impending elections in Dressmakers' Local 22, where the Left wing is also presenting its slate, will most likely show similar, if not such decisive, results.

The gratifying results in these elections reveal a number of important points to consider. But its persistent blunders of the "third period" stripe, the Stalinist leadership of the Left wing gave sign (Continued on page 2)

Two Killed in New Illinois Mine War

Lewis and Operators Renew Terror Drive Against Miners

The Illinois mine struggle, which has been in progress since the latter part of last summer, has flared up anew in Taylorville. According to press reports a bloody gun battle such as has not been seen since the march to Franklin County has taken place in Kincaid six miles from Taylorville. A miner's wife and a scab lost their lives in the course of this conflict. Eleven strikebreakers were wounded as a reward for their endeavor to work the mine under the scab outfit of Lewis and company.

Taylorville, the scene of the affray, has been the center of the most violent struggle of the Progressive Miners Union to organize the coal diggers in a union controlled by the rank and file. Similarly it has been the focal point of resistance by the boss-controlled UMW of A and the vicious labor-hating Peabody Coal Company. The Peabody Coal Company has refused to sign up with the new union even though the wage scale they offer is no different from the UMW of A. They fear the militancy and the rebel spirit of the Progressive Miners union. They have enlisted gunmen, gangsters, and the National Guard to break the backbone of the new union. But all their intimidation, tear gas, bayonets and military terrorism has not budged the Taylorville miners a single inch.

Displaying the most intransigent courage and the most indomitable persistence, the Taylorville miners have remained on strike through these long months when starvation and brutality has become a normal occurrence. They have refused to be driven back to work under a union which has betrayed them every time they have given battle to the starvation program of the operators. By an overwhelming majority, the Illinois miners dispensed with the Judas services of Lewis, Walker and their ilk. But the defiant and decrepit UMW has continued its faithful services to the coal barons. Where their ability to persuade the miners to return to their company union has miserably failed, they have resorted to bullets and black-

jacks in earnest cooperation with the National Guard.

This latest occurrence in Taylorville is the result of the scab-herding activities of these discredited flunkies. At the summons of Peabody they have hunted out strikebreakers from the four corners of the United States and thrown them into the Taylorville mines. The scabs have worked under the protection of an army of armed "deputy sheriffs". Picket lines of Progressive miners were dispersed, thousands of miners were arrested, and several shot in cold blood. Due to this overwhelming force the picketers were temporarily forced to retreat. This picket line at which the shooting occurred has been the first effort at renewed activity on the part of the Taylorville strikers. The picketers were met at the mine gates by 150 deputy sheriffs who unquestionably opened fire. It appears that the picketers shot back in self-defense although the local Taylorville tyrant of the coal company says that the miners "were reported to have guns".

In spite of this very reliable testimony, five companies of the National Guard have again been brought on the scene to "enforce peace". "Enforce peace" means to assure the coal company and the Lewis union the right to work the mines with scab labor. But if experience proves anything it demonstrates that these flunkies are going to have a hard time of it so long as the miners preserve their solidarity.

Opposition Youth at Chicago Conference

CHICAGO.—Some five to six hundred delegates, representing colleges and universities from every part of the country, including representatives from the Students League of Canada, Cuba, and South America, responded to the call of the National Committee for the Student Congress against War (initiated through the efforts of the National Students League) held at Mandel Hall, University of Chicago on December 28 and 29, to resolve upon a program of student struggle against the scourge of war and militarism. The Congress was made up of the widest variety of political views ranging from the socialists, pacifists, liberals, to the Communists (including the Left wing of the Communist party, the Left Opposition). Upon such a political background, dominated by an overwhelming number of delegates from the National Students League, and within that representation a majority of Communists, the Congress passed through stormy sessions, bordering at the close, upon split and disruption, and finally arriving at a working basis.

Rival Positions Presented

The first day of the Congress was limited entirely to speeches of a general character. The Congress was led off by Edmund Stevens, a member of the National Students League and Chairman of the National Committee for the Student Congress against War. He was followed by Joseph Cohen, also a member of the NSL and student delegate to Amsterdam Congress, who made the keynote address. The election of the conference committee were then completed. To conclude the morning sessions the symposium on "Imperialism and War" took place. The speakers at this symposium were Upton Close and Earl Browder. The former presented the position of pacifism. Browder followed with an exposition of the Communist position. In the discussion the sharp differences between the Communists and pacifists were signally displayed and gave evidence that the ensuing deliberations would be characterized by a similar sharpness.

The afternoon session was taken up with another symposium: "Anti-war Movements", discussed jointly, although from divergent points of view, by J. B. Matthews, secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, Jane Addams, and Scott Nearing. Quite naturally, the highlight of the discussion was the speech of Jane Addams. In calling attention to a banner stretched across the hall, inscribed: "Fight Against Imperialist War", this grandmother of "pure pacifism" expressed her sorrow in no uncertain terms about rash students who wanted to carry on a fight "that was already won". "There are no more imperialist wars" because Great Britain, the last Empire, was already dissolved and is now a "commonwealth of nations"! We must struggle against other wars, this sage of pacifism made sure to point out, and then showed that the real danger lay in a future of class wars. Her speech served only to stir the mili-

(Continued on page 2)

Japanese Resume Chinese Offensive

The military clique in control of the political fortunes of Japan has embarked upon the second phase of its military adventure of conquest in Northern China. Under some flimsy pretext the Japanese army, navy, marines and air force has laid waste to the city of Shanhaikwan. After a ferocious assault the Japanese forces with the use of armored cars, bombs thrown from airplanes, cannonades, and all together paraphernalia that goes with a bombardment, the Japanese succeeded in repeating their raid on Shanghai a year ago. The whole Chinese garrison of more than 500 soldiers and about as many civilians, men, women and children were annihilated, and the city reduced to smoldering ruins by this terrific assault. The Japanese entered the city triumphantly. Then with the typical insolence that characterizes the Japanese militarists they demanded an apology from Chang Hsiao Liang the commander of the garrison. (Presumably because there weren't more residents of Shanhaikwan they could slaughter).

The Japanese invasion will not stop with the capture of this northern city. It is but another step in the campaign of Japanese imperialists to carve a colonial empire out of Northern China. Grave international complications will no doubt ensue from this latest venture, with the ever-present threat of an attack on the Soviet Union looming in the distance. It is the duty of every worker to stand on guard against the outbreak of a new imperialist war and to protest the horrible slaughter of the oppressed Chinese people.

OPEN FORUM

Liebknecht-Luxemburg Memorial

Speakers:
MAX SHACHTMAN—JOSEPH CARTER

Friday, January 13, 1933

126 East 16 Street,
ADMISSION: 15c

Auspices:
N. Y. Br. Communist League of America (Opposition)
SPARTACUS YOUTH CLUB OF N. Y.

"With Both Hands"

Stalin Bureaucracy and the U. S. A.

STALIN'S DENIAL

Months after the appearance of the book by Thomas D. Campbell which is referred to in the statement on it which we reprint here from an editorial in the latest issue of the Bulletin of the Russian Opposition, Stalin has found it advisable to publish a "denial" of the interview with himself which Campbell prints in "Russia, Market or Menace?" After the Opposition press in this country and in Europe had been filled with comments on this significant conversation between Stalin and the American bourgeois specialist, Stalin finally found it necessary to make some statement on the matter in order to extricate himself from an embarrassing position. The Stalin "denial", which successfully avoids refuting the essential passages of the interview as published by Campbell, was made for the theoretical organ of the Russian party and cabled to the Daily Worker several days ago. As will be seen, the comments made upon the whole question in the editorial of the Russian Bulletin still retain their pointedness and effect.

To "drive" the duped, lulled and half-stified party, unnoticed, upon a path it does not want to take—that is the tactical method of Stalin. The transition from the "dry" system to the "wet" in alcoholic beverages, was never decided by the party: on the quiet, the bureaucracy simply continued to raise the alcoholic content of light beverages in the interests of the state revenues, and in this way it brought the country from four to forty percent. The same method is applied by Stalin in every field. All the more necessary is it now to pay sharp attention to the maneuvers of the bureaucracy which is silently preparing a new "surprise" for the working masses. The symptoms of a secondary order must also be checked up attentively and distrustfully: by taking the whole situation into consideration, they might contribute to cornering the bureaucratic leaders long before they have brought the new turn, which it may no longer be possible to make good again, up to forty percent.

The eminent American specialist for the construction of agricultural machines, Thomas Campbell, worked for a period of time as a technical adviser of the Soviet Union. After his return to the United States of America, he published a book: "Russia, Market or Menace?" The high point of this book, at least politically speaking, is the report of an extensive conversation of the author with Stalin. This conversation, the authentic reproduction of which permits no doubts, as we shall see, deserves not only to be reprinted, but must also be submitted to an attentive consideration.

As soon as we were seated I explained to Mr. Stalin through the interpreter that before we entered into any business negotiations I wanted to speak to him frankly and without offense in regard to my trip to Russia and several other matters which were on my mind. He immediately agreed to this and with one motion of his arm pointed towards the door, upon which his secretary left the room in about three steps. I then said to Mr. Stalin, "I am very anxious, Mr. Stalin, that you should know that I am here without any intent of giving you any false impressions. I am not a Communist; I am not a disciple of Bill Haywood or Emma Goldman, and I resent many of the things which I hear about your government. Nevertheless, I am much interested in your agricultural development, as I am an agricultural mechanical engineer and have spent most of my life trying to develop mechanized agriculture in the United States. We had a poor crop in Montana this year, and the work which your government has offered me is interesting. I will not, however, make any kind of working agreement with your Government if it cannot be done absolutely independently of my political beliefs and strictly on a business basis." Whereupon Stalin rose alertly from his chair, crossed to my side of the table, took my hand in both of his, looked me straight in the eye, and said, "Thank you for that, Mr. Campbell. Now I know that I can believe you. Now I know that we can respect each other and perhaps we can be friends."

"He then motioned me to sit down, and asked me to continue. I went on to explain that we in the United States resented many things which we had heard about the Soviet Government, such as (Continued on page 3)

Opposition at Chicago

C. L. A. Delegates Defend Lenin View at Anti-War Meet

(Continued from page 1)
tant pacifist minority who were determined from the outset that the congress set forth as its principle line and perspective, the struggle against ALL war and to prevent it from adopting a clear, distinct class position. The bulk of the congress received with smiles and tolerance the remarks of an old woman who neither felt nor understood the historic epoch in which she lives. In the evening the congress split into study groups to discuss the various phases of war and militarism.

Thus ended the first day, without actually having discussed or acted upon the really important questions of how the students shall fight against war and under what kind of a program this struggle should be carried on. This phase of the work remained for the second and final day of the Congress. Particularly here, was expressed a weak point of the Congress. Obviously, the questions of how the struggle should be carried on, under what program, the question of permanent organization, the adoption of resolutions, when crowded into one day would make impossible a thorough and clear discussion. The weakness was even more pronounced since prior to the congress no statements or resolutions were presented by the Committee, upon the basis of which the discussion could proceed. The procedure allowed for the presentation of resolutions by the Resolutions Committee their immediate discussion and adoption.

Left Opposition Issues Statement

On the morning of the first day, the Spartacus Youth Clubs of the Communist League of America distributed a statement to the delegates with an exposition of its views on the Congress and its program (the statement appears in this issue of the *Militant*). This was the only expression of the Communist position presented to the delegates prior to the Congress. As it turned out, this statement proved to be decisive in the decisions of the Congress. It warned the students of the impermissibility of individual action of the student body and proposed united action with the working youth under the leadership of the working class. The statement continued to point out that war was the product of the social system and that its elimination would come about with the abolition of capitalism. "This congress," the statement read, "must renounce all hopes in the League of Nations, of capitalist 'disarmament' and of all pacifist illusions. It must denounce the humbug of national defense as propounded by pacifists since this serves to oppress and divide the smaller nations. It must announce its support of wars of national liberation of colonial peoples. It must unequivocally declare its support and defense of the Soviet Union and call for economic collaboration with the Worker's Land. This Congress must establish that the only solution to the problem of militarism and war is the revolutionary one."

The statement made a profound impression on the revolutionary elements present. It struck the first militant chord in the initial stage of the congress that was characterized by vagueness and confusion. It was only after the report of Donald Henderson on "How Shall Students Fight War" that the congress began to arrive at a program and resolutions. In the afternoon of the second day the reports of the Resolutions Committee opened up the vital part of the congress. The initial resolution on the endorsement of the pledge of the Amsterdam Congress brought the first real discord in the Congress. The pacifists and the Socialists protested that such a resolution could not be accepted by them if the resolution implied support of all the deliberations of Amsterdam. Upon being assured that this was not implied in the resolution, that to vote for it meant only to endorse the anti-war pledge, the resolution was carried!

The resolution on the fight against the ROTC witnessed a second conflict. An amendment by Henderson called for "loving from within" policy and found the pacifists again in protest on the basis that it was unethical to join an organization in order to destroy it, particularly when it is proposed to fight it openly. Here again Henderson explained that his amendment implied such a tactic only where compulsory military drill in the schools existed. With this explanation, the pacifists finally agreed not to block the progress of the congress, in spite of their disagreement. The resolution on the recognition of the Soviet Union likewise witnessed a sharp discussion because of the clause calling for defense of the USSR, but it was nevertheless carried unanimously.

The significance of these struggles indicated that the congress would face ever greater difficulty with the pacifists and socialists as the reports of the Resolutions Committee progressed. A resolution on students rights was carried unanimously. Shorter resolutions; against the anti-Semitic pogroms in Poland, endorsement of the Anti-War Congress in Montevideo, and protest to the Chicago School Board for the expulsion of Milton Glitsky on account of his fight against the ROTC were carried unanimously.

Left Wing Pressure Effective

The main resolution then followed. It was around this "Draft Resolution" that the political basis for the later threatened split, was laid. The delegates of the Left Opposition introduced a resolution to the Resolutions Committee for adoption as the main resolution of the congress. This resolution contained the essential political points of the statement issued by the Spartacus Youth Clubs. Attached to the resolution was

another one on the "Defense of the Soviet Union", which called for unconditional defense, to campaign for economic collaboration, the extension of long-term credits, and recognition. The resolution signed by sixteen student delegates and four alternate delegates was not accepted by the committee. Instead the congress was presented with a committee resolution. The resolution of the Committee, drawn up hurriedly, contained in essence the main points of the Opposition resolution.

What came as a distinct surprise, was that the resolution adopted a revolutionary approach in contradistinction to the prevailing attitude prior to the congress. Even at the congress it was difficult to ascertain the character of the resolutions. It was clear that the pressure of the Opposition, plus the fact that the Communist representation was overwhelming, forced the adoption of a revolutionary resolution. Had the organizers felt no pressure from the Opposition delegates, and had the strength of the pacifists and socialist been greater, the resolution would have been an extremely watery and opportunist one. As it was, the Opposition delegates found it possible to accept the resolution.

Ityerson, one of the Canadian delegates and a member of the YCL proposed a lengthy amendment to the main resolution on the causes of war, that was unanimously accepted. This amendment was taken from the Opposition resolution. Another amendment calling for unconditional defense of the Soviet Union was introduced by comrade Caplan, also from Canada. This amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by the mass of delegates, through the leadership of the Y. C. L. and N. S. L. delegates, who under pressure of the pacifists and socialists, contended that it was sufficient to call for the defense of the Soviet Union. To introduce the clause calling for unconditional defense would make impossible unity on the resolution, was the argument introduced by the Stalinists.

The points of the resolution of the Committee were accepted one by one without apparent objection from the Right wing in the congress. It was quite clear that the pacifists and socialists, were willing to concede the resolutions because of the overwhelming number of Left wing delegates and were awaiting only the practical program of action. In fact, their leaders stated openly on the floor, that they felt that any objections on their part to the resolutions, would be of no avail and they were willing to let them by with the hopes of working out a common agreement in a fight on the campus against war (each in his own way—A.). But the peace was abruptly ended. An amendment was introduced calling attention to the betrayals of the Socialist International during the last war, and to prevent any future betrayals of a similar nature. Upon the introduction of this amendment the Socialist delegation, under the leadership of Amicus Most,

Leon Trotsky

History of the Russian Revolution



PUBLISHERS PRICE

Vol. One	Vol. Two	Vol. Three
\$4.00	\$3.50	\$3.50

OUR PRICE

\$3 per Volume
\$9 the Boxed Set

POSTAGE ON ALL ORDERS: Extra

Send All Orders Immediately To

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th Street, New York

representing the Rand School, warned the congress that if this amendment was carried the Socialist delegation could not continue in the united front. The pacifists joined in the cry. Once more the Communists, through their spokesman, Henderson, had to explain that calling attention to the past betrayal was not an attack on the Socialist party! The amendment was carried with an addition that too in all who betrayed the working class during the war. (The Socialists made a pointed reference to

William Z. Foster, for selling Liberty Bonds.)

Split Threatens

In voting upon the section of the resolution containing the tasks of the congress, the socialists raised strenuous objections to point B which read: "To support the American Committee for the Struggle Against War which in response to the Amsterdam Congress is leading an effective movement of workers and intellectuals against war." The Socialists tried to read into this point the thought that it meant acceptance of Amsterdam and its decisions, and warned the conference that it should delete this point or else the socialists could no longer cooperate with the congress and would bolt. For a time it appeared that the Socialists, with the aid of the pacifists would split the conference. The proposal to delete was not accepted.

The elections of the resident executive committee brought out once more the tenseness of the situation. The pacifists would not accept on the committee unless the Socialists participated. Their attitude was predicated on the idea that a united front without the socialists would mean Communist domination and they would not participate in such a movement. It was here that the socialists announced their intention to split the conference. The reason given was the adoption of point B in the resolution. Under these conditions it appeared that the conference would break-up.

A motion introduced by a member of the NSL called for rescinding the disputed point B in the draft resolution. This motion was made with the aim of preventing the socialists from splitting the conference and to gain their adherence to it. The motion to withdraw this section witnessed an intense discussion in which the Communists split their vote. Henderson opposed the motion, but to no avail. The pacifists pleaded for the passage of the motion in order to maintain the unity of the congress. The socialists demanded that the motion be passed, holding the threat of split over the congress. Under these conditions point B was withdrawn from the resolution by above majority vote.

The congress closed with the election of the executive committee and a delegate to the Anti-war congress in Montevideo. Among those elected to the executive committee were, Joe Cohen and Edmund Stevens, of the National Students League, Manny Geltman, NSL and Left Oppositionist, Monroe Sweetland of the League for Industrial Democracy and member of the Socialist Party, and Morris Skop, a pacifist. Carl Geiser was elected delegate to the Montevideo congress.

Thus the congress ended. Its future is extremely dubious. What success can an "independent" movement of the student have in the struggle against war? What will be the relation of this movement to the revolutionary struggle of the workers who alone form only class capable of carrying through and directing a correct struggle against war? How will the pacifists reconcile themselves to a congress which adopted the political position of opposition to imperialist war and support of the class war of the proletariat? These questions remain to be answered.

—ADERAHBE.

Wall Street Rulers Force Wage Cut On the Teachers of New York City

The teachers are going to have their pay cut. Wall Street decided that. The City of New York which spends from twenty-five to thirty-three percent of its budget on interest on loans made to it by Wall Street, recently applied again to the bankers for additional financial assistance. The men who overthrew Herriot and the Belgian ministry told our city moguls to economize to the tune of forty million. Twenty million, they said, must come out of the wages of the policemen, the firemen, the city employees and the teachers.

The city employees did nothing about it. The policemen and firemen took it lying down. But the teachers showed active resentment. A number of organizations representing the more advanced minority attempted to fight. They called conferences, sent delegations to Albany to plead their case with the state legislature and the chief executive of the state. Their fight ran a short course and ended in defeat. The poor showing they made was due to the fact that the overwhelming majority of the teachers are full of illusions about society and the state they teach their pupils. The *Times* quoted one of their spokesmen as saying that the teachers had no faith in the city politicians but trusted the state legislature. Such political naivete made the teachers easy prey for the experienced sharks in Albany. After much fruitless rushing to and fro the teachers' delegations (except the small teachers' Committee to protect salaries) decided not to oppose the wage cut but to "compromise" by "protecting" the legislation reserving to the state legislature the right to cut their wages; their pension rights, and other such fol-de-rol which will go by the board under the next assault by Wall Street. A third item in their "compromise" was the attempt to limit the reduction to two years.

Just before the special session of the legislature got around to this particular item on the agenda of the bankers' instructions a delegation of teachers went up to Albany to see Roosevelt, Lehman et al, about this compromise. When they broached this ultimatum to Roosevelt he told them that he would relay it to New York. Dejectedly but still hopefully the delegation filed into an anteroom. Here they cooled their heels for two hours while the wires hummed between Albany and New York. Finally, Roosevelt told them that the bankers were opposed to the time limit. Meekly they accepted the decision. That was the inevitable conclusion of their fight under the circumstances of their lack of class consciousness, lack of organization and their poor fighting method.

Further attacks on the living conditions of the teachers are foreshadowed. Roosevelt recently announced that the state will be about \$100,000,000 short by the middle of 1933. He suggests that a large share of this deficit will be made up by a drastic cut in the appropriations for education.

The attacks on their standards will compel the teachers to resist. To make their resistance effective they must make clear to themselves what they are resisting. The bankers, of course, are the

people who initiate these attacks. But they are routed through the state apparatus. In defense of their interests the teachers are brought into conflict with the state bureaucracy.

Against its crushing weight they cannot contend alone. They must seek support among the classes whose economic and social interests impel them to struggle against the capitalist state. They can find allies among the petty bourgeoisie. They can enlist the aid of the taxpayers' associations; social service organizations; women's clubs, etc. Their support, in the long run, will amount to paper resolutions passed at conferences in expensive hotels; futile appeals to the state legislature the Board of Estimate and every board which will allow steam to be let off in its presence; and "moral support" in the press. But when it comes to a showdown these doughty knights of democracy, good-will and what not will leave them in the lurch. The class which lives in eternal hope of becoming big bourgeois and in everlasting fear of being pushed into the proletariat by the bourgeoisie cannot be counted on to risk its stakes in a fight against the stronghold of world reaction.

The teachers will have to seek and find allies in their own class, the working class. This raises the question of the relation of the teachers to the working class movement. The relation must be the central axis of their program. On this point they must strive to attain the greatest possible clarity. They must formulate their relation to the working class movement on class lines. To do this they must slough off their illusions. They must become clear on their class position in society, the class nature of their conflict with the capitalist state, their need of fighting support against it. In a word they must develop class consciousness.

The problem of which current-reactionary, socialist or Communist—to ally themselves with has already sought the teachers out and is pressing for solution. The Communists have begun to penetrate their ranks. They are not alone in the effort to win influence among the teachers. Others groups and interests are attempting the same thing in the interest of patriotism and payoffs, of reform and milk-and-water protest. If the Communists pursue a correct policy they can win the teachers for Communism.

These are the basic considerations which the teachers must take into account in formulating their program. According to the answer they give to these questions will depend the organizations they build. The question of organization is a very complicated one. At the present time there are about seventy organizations among the approximately 40,000 teachers in New York City. They range all the way from a Teachers' Welfare League through the Teachers Union of the American Federation of Teachers in the AF of L to the Teachers Committee to Protect Salaries organized by the Educational Workers League of the TUUL. We will return to this aspect of the situation in an early issue.

—T. STAMM

The Left Wing Victory in the I. L. G. W. U.

nal assistance from the Left to the process of restoring the Right wing union to a considerable extent, a process which was furthered from the Right by the combined efforts of the police and the bosses. The Industrial Union, which started out with such great promise, was reduced by the erroneous course of its leadership, to a sect embracing little more than the Communist elements. The advent of this new situation, this new relationship of forces, was first ignored entirely by the official Left wing. Then it was ignored, despite the fact that we of the Left Opposition did not cease to call attention to the need of orienting the Left wing's policy on the basis of it. When it was finally given a grudging half-recognition, the Stalinists advocated that infantile "radical" course of boycotting the Right wing union and isolating themselves from the workers by a categorical refusal to participate in what they called the "company union". At one time, this sectarian madness reached the point where the Left wing workers were kept from going out on strike after a call for one had been issued by the Right wing union. This surrender of the workers to the mercies of the Right wing-Forwards skates, afforded the Lovestoneites their opportunity to act for a time as a sort of rallying ground for those militants in the Right wing union who would not reconcile themselves to the policies and leadership of their organization.

Defeat For Lovestoneites

The Lovestone liquidators, however, in whose direction the Stalinist policy drove scores of workers, did not require very much time in which to discredit themselves. Their panic-mongering, their demands for a disorganized, every-man-for-himself dissolution of the Left wing, alienated from them the more advanced Left wingers. Others who supported them for a longer period of time, dropped away after the collapse of the notorious united front with Levy and Co. whom the Lovestoneites lifted into the saddle (as should have been foreseen) the minute these petty bourgeois labor politicians arrived in power. At the first serious test, as the Lovestoneites later lamented, Mr. Levy joined hands with the reactionary union priesthood against the progressive and Left wing forces. The discredit of the Lovestoneites, an inevitable product of their whole course, is revealed in their crushing defeat at the recent elections. For the

party to reduce them to impotence, it was enough to borrow a little from the Lovestone platform, and more from the Left Opposition, and make a half-turn away from yesterday's sectarianism. The fact that the Lovestoneites supported the reactionary Right wing as against the Left in such a key question as the choosing of the Election Objections committee, did not help raise their prestige in the eyes of the serious progressive and Left wing forces. Unprincipledness and the opportunist game of hide-and-seek between the Right wing and the Left which the Lovestone group has played, has received a well-merited punishment. It should now be clear to all that the Left wing will progress in the needle trades, as in every other field, only in the process of liquidating the liquidators, of relentlessly combating the Lovestone group and nullifying its influence.

The majority of the workers in the Right wing union voted for the Left state in spite of the fact that the Left wing presented no concrete program, unless one can dignify with that designation the general phrases concerning a "fight to improve conditions". This fact speaks eloquently for the tremendous resources available to the Left wing in the reactionary unions, resources which it has only begun to tap. That it is an annihilating refutation of all the marble-headed theories and practices of "social Fascism", goes without saying. The workers in the Right wing union, suffering bitterly in the present crisis without their leaders taking a single step to improve their conditions have turned, and rightly so, to the Left wing movement for guidance and leadership.

But it is precisely on this score that the Left wing is defective. To retire on its laurels, to become intoxicated with its victories, would mean that the Left wing has learned nothing from the instructive experience of the last four years or more. What will the Left wing propose to do in those locals of the ILGWU which have entrusted them with the leadership? It is essential to put the official Left wing either has no clear the point squarely, for it is plain that perspective, or else has a false perspective about which it keeps quiet now and which it plans to unfold in a series of accomplished facts.

What Will Left Wing Do Now?

Does it intend to utilize its leading positions in the Right wing union for the purpose of breaking away little

splinters to be added to the Left wing Industrial Union? Such a course would not only restore the Left wing to yesterday's isolation and gain for it the resentment and disillusionment of the workers, but would make the future progress of the movement increasingly difficult. The masses will tolerate a blunder here and a blunder there; they will forget or overlook a great deal; but they will not stand for a policy of permanent blundering.

Or will the Left wing utilize its victories for the purpose of carrying on a genuine fight for the unity of the needle trades workers in one union, an aim which corresponds to the needs and aspirations of the harshly exploited, be-deviled and split-up workers? If it carries on a petty sectarian game of victories behind the backs of the masses, if it does not carry on the fight for unity as the Left Opposition has outlined it, then the recent triumphs will fade away like a plucked flower at night. The new leaders of Locals 1 and 9 must immediately make use of their advantageous positions to demand the unification of all the organized needle trades workers. That is now the key question, directly connected with the problem of organizing the resistance of the needle trades workers to the violent encroachments that have been made on their standards of living. It is to this question that we shall return in an early issue. —S.

SILENT CAL SILENT

Calvin Coolidge, who came into national notoriety by claiming to have broken the Boston police strike, and then presided for six years over the most mediocre administration in modern times, has just died. He was the author of: "Profits and civilization go hand in hand." He was said to be a very civilized man. With his death, his claim to silence has become irrefutably established.

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 126 East 16th St., N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1933
Vol. 6, No. 1 Whole No. 148

«Unser Kampf» Tour Concludes with the Launching of Worker's Clubs

On our return trip to N. Y. we made short stops in Chicago, Cleveland, Youngstown and New Castle. The Chicago Unser Kampf Club had in the meantime, since its organization a few weeks earlier, arranged a lecture for us at which we spoke to about fifty workers on the Program of the Left Opposition. The discussion lasted till the early hours of the morning and four workers joined up with the club at this lecture.

We also had lectures on the same topic in Cleveland and Youngstown. In New Castle we met, informally, with the members of our branch and sympathizers. We discussed many problems facing the revolutionary movement today. We were very much impressed with this type of workers from the mills who are utilizing this plague of unemployment for the broadening of their Marxian arsenal. Our comrades in New Castle are a promise for the development of future struggles among the steel workers.

In Pittsburgh we established connections among the Jewish workers for the first time. The newly formed branch arranged a lecture for us at which we had an attendance of over forty workers who heard for the first time what the program of the Left Opposition was. We succeeded in getting some subs for

the Unser Kampf and we now have a comrade in charge of the work in this locality.

From Pittsburgh we proceeded to Philadelphia which we made preparations for a lecture to be held at a future date. We also stopped off in Trenton, making arrangements for a lecture on the program of the Left Opposition to be held on the fourth of January.

On the whole we visited over twenty cities on this tour, holding about the same number of public meetings at which we addressed close to a thousand workers—an element who in their bulk had not been reached hitherto by the ideas of the Left Opposition. This was our first tour of the kind where we made an effort to reach the Jewish speaking worker. As a result of this tour, we now have three functioning Unser Kampf Clubs outside of New York (Toronto, Chicago, Minneapolis) with one in the process of formation in St. Louis, with small groups or individuals doing the work of Unser Kampf in sixteen cities. With this organized base we feel confident that we will now be able to proceed with the regular issuance of *Unser Kampf*, building up the existing clubs and preparing the grounds for new ones.

—MORRIS LEWIT.

—SYLVIA BLEEKER.

BOUND VOLUMES of the MILITANT

OLD FORMAT

from Vol. 1, No. 1 to Vol. 4, No. 12
Nov. 15, 1928—June 15, 1931
71 Issues

\$10

NEW FORMAT

from Vol. 4, No. 13 to Vol. 5, No. 51
July 4, 1931—Dec' 31, 1932
76 Issues

\$5

Order from
THE MILITANT
126 East 16th Street,
New York City

«With Both Hands»

The Stalin Bureaucracy and the United States of America

(Continued from page 1)

as the confiscation of property, elimination of personal rights, nationalization of women and children, repudiation of debts and religion, and above all, what we thought was an attempt to interfere with our own Government. I told him that neither he nor his Government could expect the friendship, cooperation and recognition of our Government if they ever did try to interfere with our affairs.

"Mr. Stalin immediately replied that he realized this and he too wanted to speak with the same frankness and without offense. He said that he knew there were such unfavorable reports in our country, and took considerable time to explain the true conditions in Russia. He unhesitatingly admitted, with disarming frankness, that under Trotsky there had been an attempt to spread Communism throughout the world. He said that was the primary cause of the break between himself and Trotsky. That Trotsky believed in Universal Communism while he wanted to confine his efforts to his own country. He explained that they had neither the time nor the money to try to Communize the world, even should they wish to do so, and that his own chief interest was to improve the conditions of the people in Russia, without any interference whatsoever in the government of other countries.

"We discussed the Third International and other reports of Soviet propaganda and I must admit that Mr. Stalin convinced me there is no attempt now on his part, or on the part of officials of the Soviet Government, to interfere with the Government of the United States. We discussed politics, economics, banking, business, trade with the United States, transportation, agriculture and education. I was amazed at Mr. Stalin's knowledge of general affairs. He reminded me of many of our big industrial leaders who must have a general knowledge of practically all affairs to hold their positions. His words, as they were transferred to me through the interpreter, were carefully chosen, and I was particularly surprised at his knowledge of the Constitution of the United States. In fact, my own lack of knowledge of this same Constitution caused me considerable embarrassment, and the first thing I did, upon reaching London, was to find a bookstore to buy a copy.

"The conference lasted well after dark, as the sun sets early in the northern country. Upon leaving, he told me that the interpreter would prepare a typewritten copy of our conversation, which I received two weeks later in London, signed 'J. Stalin', and with this note—'Keep this record, it may be a very historical document some day.'"

The correctness of the interview, as is clear from the circumstances described, is beyond any doubt. Campbell is no light minded journalist hunting after sensations, but an energetic Yankee business man, an important American man of wealth and machine builder. He is quite kindly disposed in his relations to Stalin. In reporting the interview, Campbell did not rely merely on his memory, but also upon the official report supplied to him. Finally, Campbell's reports have nowhere and never been denied. These circumstances sufficiently clarify the correctness of the interview from the formal side. But much more important is the inner political power of conviction of the conversation, its concordance with the spirit of their participants and their circumstances. No journalist, moreover, could

have thought up that double handshake, that excellent description of the true essence of the differences of opinion between Stalin and Trotsky.

The Yankee remains true to himself to the very end in this conversation. The solid bourgeois, who has had a bad harvest this year and is therefore all the more inclined to do a stroke of business with the godless nationalizers of women, sticks his leg upon the Soviet table, and slaps the leader of the Bolsheviks on the shoulder half patronizingly, half warningly.

Nobody will want to reproach Stalin for endeavoring to utilize the meeting with Campbell for facilitating an agreement with the American government and the American market. Yet, why this "sudden" rise to his feet, this gripping of Campbell's hand with both of his and this proposal not only of "mutual respect" but also of "friendship"? Does that resemble the conduct of a representative of the workers' state, who is carrying on business negotiations with the representative of the capitalist world? Alas and alack, no resemblance at all! But it does resemble the crawling conduct of a petty bourgeois before a big bourgeois. This little occurrence which, to put it frankly, nauseates one in the reading, is very characteristic: it affords the possibility to discern the true political consciousness of Stalin, who is so resolute and relentless in the struggle against the Opposition Communists and the dissatisfied workers.

Fifteen years after the October revolution, Stalin speaks with the American capitalist in virtually the same tone in which Milukov and Kerensky once spoke with Buchanan in the not very glorious days of the impotent coalition. The resemblance lies not only in the tone, but also in the contents. "The necessity is openly preached amongst you in the press and in public for concluding the war," Buchanan cuttingly reproached the February powers-that-be. "Not we," Milukov, Teleschenko, Kerensky defended themselves, "only the Bolsheviks. But we'll finish them off right enough." "Just look," Kerensky then assured Buchanan, holding his hand with both his own because he did not have a third hand—"just look, Lenin is already driven into illegality again and Trotsky is in the Kresty prison."

Naturally, Stalin's position is essentially different, for the October revolution is an historical fact, and the "apparatus" bases itself upon its social consequences. But the political task of the bureaucracy does not consist in the spreading of the October revolution throughout the world: it is for this program that Trotsky was exiled from the USSR, Stalin respectfully reports to the American bourgeois. His, Stalin's, task—consisted in improving the position of the Russian people by means of "friendship" with American capital. Unfortunately, however, it is precisely Stalin's policy on the field of "improving the position of the people" that leads to constantly sadder results.

Perhaps a sage will be found to contend: By his assertions about the international revolution, etc., Stalin simply aimed at deceiving the American as to his real opinions. What is wrong with that? Is it worth while hanging on to such a point? Yet, only a completely hopeless idiot could possibly believe such an explanation.

Before anything else: Is it permitted to seek to deceive an adversary by such declarations which must inevitably confuse and demoralize friends? For what Stalin simply declared before the whole

world was that in contradistinction from the Left Opposition, his faction has renounced the theory and practice of the international revolution. Should one play with such things in the interests of diplomacy? Even in the limits of diplomacy such a game would be condemned to a miserable fiasco. A private conversation, even when it lasts till sunrise, is not enough to exercise any influence upon the ruling class of the U. S. A. The Yankees—were serious business men: they will not buy a pig in a poke. Assertions must stand on facts and lead to facts. The declaration of Stalin is no maneuver and no trick; taken at bottom it is the consequence of the theory of socialism in a single country. It was prepared for by the whole policy of recent years. In the near future too, it may become the doctrine of the new course, into which the bureaucracy is entering more directly every day, thanks to its blindness and its failures.

Can it really be forgotten that the Soviet government, unexpected by all, supported the Kellogg Pact? The motivation dictated by Stalin and intended only for home consumption, said: Even if the Kellogg Pact does not go far enough, it is nevertheless a step forward. Soviet diplomacy is of course under no obligation to say out loud everything it is thinking. It must not, without undermining the ground beneath its feet, make any steps of declarations which help the enemy to deceive the workers and weaken their vigilance. The Kellogg Pact is no step forward to peace, but the diplomatic cover for the mightiest and most dangerous of all the imperialist bandits. The matter is not merely confined to the Pact. Litvinov recently supported the American proposal for "partial disarmament". In that connection the Soviet press did not expose Hoover's demand, but only those imperialists who did not want to join hands with it. Meanwhile, Hoover's proposal, just like the Kellogg Pact, has as its aim neither disarmament nor the averting of war, but the concentration of the control over war and peace in the hands of the U. S. A. The preparation of favorable moral and material points of departure for the coming war—that is the only task of the American imperialists. If it is assumed that Soviet diplomacy could not express itself openly—that is not our opinion—then the press should have spoken for it. But when the Stalin-inspired diplomacy clings to the proposals of Hoover and Kellogg "with both hands", it is deceiving the world proletariat and weakening the Soviet state. If the Centrists in Amsterdam places themselves entirely upon the basis of petty bourgeois pacifism, which is honestly meant for the most part and is at all events still rooted in the masses, then in Geneva, they join hands at the "Left" with imperialist pseudo-pacifism, whose roots are to be sought in banks and trusts. In the question of war, the epigones break openly and demonstratively with the revolutionary tradition of Leninism. Their immediate objective is to win the trust of American capital. The nocturnal conversation in the Kremlin constitutes irreplaceable commentary to the speeches of the Soviet delegates at Geneva.

Yet, diplomacy does not exhaust the question, and on this field it can lay no claim to first place. Where does the Communist International fit in? For four and a half years now no Congress of the Comintern has been called and nobody knows when it will be called, if ever. Stalin does not so much as find the time to appear at the ECCI Plenum and leaves the leadership to people who for the most part need leading themselves. Is it not a deliberate demonstration of disrespect for the Comintern? Does it not signify and in actuality and

not only in conversation with the American bourgeois, Stalin has given up completely the policy of the international revolution? No, he did not deceive Campbell. He only described, with rare frankness, the situation as it actually is. Still another question, and that the most essential of all, was brightly illuminated in the Stalin-Campbell dialogue: the question of socialism in one country. In spite of all the half-baked prophecies, the Five Year Plan did not increase the economic "independence" of the Soviet Union. On the contrary, the advances of the industrialization extended and deepened the relations of Soviet economy to world economy, consequently, also, their mutual dependency.

The double hand-shake of Stalin and his respectful indication of the Left Opposition to American capital is, in the last analysis, nothing but the political expression of the economic dependency of the Soviet Union upon the world market. The humiliating character of this "expression" is determined by the psychology of a very highly situated but notwithstanding that, a petty bourgeois bureaucrat, whom the great events always find unprepared.

The more the Stalin faction turns its back upon the international revolution, the more it will feel its dependency upon world capital, the more convulsively it will cling to it "with both hands". Stalin's hand-shake is not only a symbolical act—it is almost a program. Whereas he thoughtlessly and flatly accuses the Opposition of endeavoring to turn over Soviet industry to foreign capital, Stalin is obviously preparing for a change in the international as well as the internal political course.

Struck in a vise, the bureaucracy is capable of engaging in any adventure, including treacherous ones. To trust it blindly, means to be an accessory to treason. Today more than ever are we duty-bound to watch over Stalin's conduct in the field of foreign political relations not only with tireless attention but also with sharp distrust.

On guard! Be prepared!

WHERE THE MILITANT IS SOLD

The Militant can be bought at the following news stands:

Minneapolis, Minn.:
Engelson News Co., 234-2nd Ave. S.;
Schindler Book Store, 6th and Hennepin Sts.

Chicago, Ill.
General Book Store, 2009 W. Division St.; Post Office News Co. 37 Monroe St.; Carillon Book Shop, 7001 Coles Ave.; Horsley's Book Store, 633 W. Madison St.; Cheshin's Book Store, 2720 W. Division St.

Pittsburgh, Pa.
Ross' Book Shop, 1330-5th Ave.; P. and H. News Co., 220 Federal St. N. S.; Hirsch's Book Shop, 1623 Center Ave.

Los Angeles, Calif.:
Belmont News Co., Arcade St.; Smith News Co., 613 S. Hill St.

St. Louis, Mo.:
Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Ave.

San Francisco, Calif.:
McDonald's Book Store, 65 Sixth St.

Boston, Mass.:
Shapiro's Book Store, 7 Beach St.; Adelmann's Book Store, 284 Tremont St.; Cantor's Store, 49 Howard St.; Newsstand at 38 Causeway St.

Roxbury, Mass.:
Stein's Book Store, 536 Warren St.

Announcing Classes for 1933
International Workers School
COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF AMERICA
(Left Opposition)

Registration one dollar per course
J. WEBER, Administrator
126 East 16th Street
New York City

The Crisis in the Food Workers Industrial Union in New York

The Food Workers Industrial Union is in a very bad situation. The enthusiasm and strength of its membership and its strike struggles, which struck terror in the past in the hearts of the bosses' associations and their gangsters, has given place for a long time to pessimism and discontent. This is very often denied and only occasionally admitted by the leadership of the union and the Trade Union Unity Council. But they always cautiously avoid any explanation of the causes that brought about the present situation.

During the party's pre-convention discussion in the summer of 1930, I wrote an article on the union, pointing out that unless the union changes its policy and corrects its errors, the union would continue to head toward destruction. This article never appeared. The excuse was that it was handed in too late, though it was given to them during the first week of the opening of the discussion. Again, a year ago, the convention of the union took place. The discussion for the delegates to the convention was limited by the fraction (headed by Joseph Zack) to ten minutes and later to 5. I strenuously protested against this decision and insisted that the past errors ought to be brought out into the open and a chance to discuss these errors be given to the delegates. In this way, some of the confidence lost by the members in the fraction, might be regained. This proposal was rejected by Zack on the ground that such a discussion would tend to demoralize the convention.

On November 16, 1932, the elections of the officials in the Cafeteria Section took place. General secretary Rubin made a long and "satisfactory" report on the union. He defended the general policy of the TUUL and said that if some sort of crisis existed in the union, it was because we had failed to carry out correctly the "general line". Then three minutes was set as the limit to the discussion, which was not to last over an hour. Some party members who had chanced to be misunderstood by the party bureaucrats, took advantage of the opportunity, to smooth over their bad standing by defending the "general line". Then the slate of the fraction for the officials was presented and steam-rolled without difficulty—to the glory of the general line.

The Open Letter

Let us take the open letter of the Executive Committee of the TUUC signed by the General Secretary Joseph Zack, addressed to the organization and published in the September issue of the **Food Worker**. In it the crisis is analyzed as follows:

"It is necessary to emphasize at this time that the inner situation in the Food Workers Union is such that the union can hardly attract and hold workers ready for organization." The letter attributes the cause of the present conditions in the union to the following reasons: anarcho-syndicalist traditions of the union; constant changes in the leadership; lack of persistent, steady line of policy in the industry; infantile Leftist tendencies when the union is on the upgrade; rank opportunism when faced with severe difficulties; lack of inner democracy; cliquism of Beal and Teitelbaum, etc.; and above all, the failure to carry on the "general line" of the TUUL.

So read the letter. But when we examine closely the actual results of Zack's letter we see that the general line carried out in full in the union (which entirely reflects the general line which the Stalinist bureaucracy has imposed upon the party) is what brought about the present conditions in the union.

It is discouraging, however, that with the exception of Kleron's mild criticism in the following issue of the **Food**

Worker, the fraction said nothing about the merits or lack of merits of this disgraceful document.

Is it possible for us to believe that the fraction forgot the past so soon and allowed itself to be made the scapegoat—of the "general line"? Has it been forgotten that in every instance, all the policies and tactics in the union were made with the endorsement of Zack and Johnstone, whether they were "ultra-Leftist" or "rank opportunist"? For instance in May 1930, when the Executive Committee after a three day discussion decided to change the structure of the union, Johnstone over-ruled the proposals of the Executive Committee of the union, stating that it was an A F of L policy. Only a year and a half later, this "A F of L policy" was accepted by them as the "correct TUUL policy." The above example is an indication of that "lack of persistence" in the union's line. Was I not condemned time and again by Johnstone and other bureaucrats for proposing in the leading fraction the abolition of the general shop delegates council, the establishment of section executives, etc., etc.?

To conceal these facts which are very well known at least to some members of the union can only bring injury to the TUUL in particular and Communism in general.

In his letter, Zack speaks for democracy against bureaucracy. What a pity! Didn't Zack, over the heads of the union leadership, come down to the Concoopers' workers, demanding a ten percent tax on their wages for the TUUC and stating that those who refuse to pay the tax are enemies of the working class? When the majority of the members refused to submit to this categorical and arbitrary demand, Zack came back a few weeks later with an alleged decision by the National Committee of the Trade Union Unity League and the party, stating that for the "benefit of the Concoopers", they were ordered to leave their jobs. When the workers elected a committee to see comrade Foster and find out the reasons for this decision, he (Foster) in the presence of the National Committee, said that the Committee knew nothing of this decision and, turning to Zack, he condemned him for such bureaucratic action.

The Kornelios Case

Another example is the Kornelios case. Because Kornelios dared to criticize the inefficiency of the Concoopers' management, he was fired from his job by Zack's assistant, John Steuben. When the membership of the union condemned this action and voted that Kornelios return to work, Zack said, "Nothing doing. The membership is not always right," and rejected its decision.

As to anarcho-syndicalism, the cliquism of Beal, Teitelbaum and the others, we shall deal with these aspects of the question in our next article.

In conclusion, Zack proposed several good points for the union. But these points were proposed dozens of times in the past. They never materialized due to the fact that the party members did not function as a genuine Communist fraction.

Only recently, the party bureaucrats arbitrarily excluded more than thirty comrades from fraction meetings, considering them as "unhealthy and disruptive elements". Only those with special invitations from the fraction secretary are now allowed to attend meetings. This action has nothing in common with Leninism. If comrades are not qualified for the fraction, they must first be called to account before the Control Commission and action taken there. Such procedures indicate that no healthy measures are being taken to remedy the ills within the union.

—SEBASTIAN PAPPAS.

JAPAN

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

By Jack Weber

The turn-over of labor in industry is a vital index of workers' living conditions. In Japan this index is artificially lowered by the method of involving workers in debt at the beginning of employment so as to keep them in bondage, and by the virtual imprisonment of labor in dormitories. Factory workers are allowed but two rest days a month by law and those in dormitories can only leave two to four times a month by special permission. Even so the turn-over in "normal" times is extremely high, official figures setting it at from 60 to 100 percent before the present crisis. The costliness of this turn-over may be gauged by the fact that it takes a year in silk mills to bring a recruit's productivity up to average, yet the average term of work is but slightly more than one year. Nor do the girls who represent more than half of all factory workers (and 80 percent of all textile workers) transfer to other factories. They prefer to return home to marry—or they are forced into prostitution.

Trade Union Movement

The first attempts at organizing trade unions were ruthlessly suppressed by the government. The anti-union Act of 1900 remained in force with but minor changes up to 1926 when, following the English models of opportunist "harmony" unions designed with the aid of the ruling class to blunt and render harmless the weapons of working class organization, the Japanese government decided to foster and encourage company unionism by a new act recommending arbitration in labor disputes. This act has remained a dead letter on the statute books although company unions have spread. Trade unions still possess no legal status, the government cautiously tolerating re-

formist unions but ever ready to suppress "dangerous tendencies" without warning.

The Outburst of 1918 and After

As the cost of living rose to dizzy heights during the War, the workers were driven more and more by need to strike for higher wages. Whereas in 1914 there were only 50 strikes involving 7900 workers, the number of strikes rose to 398 in 1917 and to 417 in 1918 involving, in the latter year 66,000 workers. The existing scarcity of food was aggravated by the Siberian adventure which necessitated the buying-up and diversion from the market of large stocks of rice. The pinch of hunger was felt everywhere by the masses.

Suddenly, without previous warning, the storm broke and there came the thunderclap of the spontaneous uprising of 1918. Starting in the obscure fisher village of Toyama where some fishermen's wives stormed the rice shops for food for their starving children, the movement spread like wildfire among workers and peasants. The agrarian movement revealed its elemental power by the burning of the homes of large landowners in forty-two provinces, and the looting of granaries. In the space of a few days the workers in practically every large town and city poured out into the streets, banded together and, where they did not loot the shops directly, forced the sale of rice to pre-war prices. Troops were called out in every large city. The workers faced the troops and called on them not to fire on their brothers and sisters. The government, realizing the ultimate possibilities of the situation, threw the troops into the shops to sell food over the counters at low prices, yes, and to give free rice

to the poor. Only when the movement began to recede were the troops used for shootings and brutal suppression, many of those who had bought rice at the lowered prices being thrown into prison for indeterminate periods.

Had there been the barest kernel of a Bolshevik party in Japan at this time, the year 1918 might well have been hailed as the "1905" of the Japanese working class. But no such organization existed, ready to place itself consciously at the head of the masses in action and to formulate the necessary political slogans in the light of the existing situation and the relation of forces. The masses were not aware of developments in Russia, the censorship acting as a "cordon sanitaire" to prevent the infecting of the Japanese workers. Whatever leadership did exist was under the influence of anarcho-syndicalism than under that of Communism. Hence the complete lack of preparation for events, the sporadic character of the outburst and the lack of political demands that could have served as a focal point for later organization. Soviets were out of the question but demands to end the war, to grant universal suffrage, to recognize the right of the workers to organize—under the circumstances the democratic slogans could have been linked up with the more elemental demand for bread and peace.

Nevertheless the rice riots of 1918 form a turning-point in Japanese history. The masses learned their own power and the utter helplessness of the ruling class in the face of a mass outpouring into the streets. The seed was planted for making the workers conscious of their historic role. Conscious or not, the first step had been taken on the road to the conquest of power. Immediately the riots resulted in a great impetus to unionization. The unions became a force to be reckoned with, one that could no longer be safely suppressed by the ruling class. Instead the government and the "enlightened" capitalists were impelled to resort to the new methods of "boring from within" the unions, helping to create organiza-

tions for "harmony" and the "mutual interests" of capital and labor.

Anarcho-Syndicalism and the Unions

In 1906 the worker-intellectual Kotoku returned to Japan from the U. S. where he had been active in the ranks of the IWW. Kotoku brought to Japan the best traditions of this movement, an insufficiently grounded but revolutionary precursor of Communism. The movement thus founded was ruthlessly hounded by the police until temporarily suppressed after the discovery of a bomb plot against the Emperor in 1911 for which eleven men and one woman were executed. Despite this inevitable result of individualist terror, the basic ideas of syndicalism, direct mass action and industrial unionism, penetrated deeply into some of the unions, particularly those organized in the newly-built docks, destined soon to closure under the blight of the after-war crisis of 1920. Encouraged by the uprising of 1918 in which they had taken a leading part, the syndicalists led several great dockyard strikes during the years 1919 and 1921. In the Kawasaki and Mitsubishi dockyard strikes of 1921 there was exhibited the inspiring heroic solidarity of thousands of workers. To combat the rapid spread of unemployment now engulfing the working masses, the strikers set up the slogan of workers' (syndicate) control and management of the shops. Many strikers felt that the proletarian revolution was at hand.

These strikes were the high point of syndicalist influence in Japan. They illustrate the splendid fighting qualities of the syndicalists but also the inevitable downfall of a workers' movement that attempts to ignore the state with its special armed forces prepared to crush any revolt. These strike struggles and the political consequences form an object lesson of the absolute need of a revolutionary vanguard in the form of the Communist party armed with the Marxian theory of the state, analyzing every new situation by means of its dialectic class approach and thus prepared to put forward correct tactics based on correct policies.

Our Club Plan

MILITANT BUILDERS

Since December 24th there has been no change in the rate at which subs are coming in. The record for December 24—January 4 is not a good one. Perhaps the reason is the year end holiday slack. Be that as it may we must now make up for lost time. To make this campaign a success, every branch must participate and there should be no let up in the work.

New York should be taken as an example of what splendid work can be done by taking advantage of our club plan. New York is in the lead again. In New York more comrades are participating in the campaign than anywhere else, and they are doing the work consistently.

Here is the record of the campaign from the beginning up to date by cities:

THE RECORD BY CITIES

New York	48
Chicago	32
Minneapolis	22
Pittsburgh	16
Philadelphia	15
Montreal	13
Toronto	10
Boston	10
New Castle, Pa.	8
St. Louis	4
Des Moines	4
Lynn, Mass.	4
South Bend, Ind.	4

THE STAFF

Chicago Friends of the Militant Club	12
H. Capelis	12
P. Vomvas	12
H. Nash	11
B. Morgenstern	8
V. R. Dunne	8
W. Krehm	6

A. Joel	6
J. Ross	6
H. A.	4
M. Hudson	4
F. Rayburn	4
M. Gottlieb	4
J. Hamilton	4
W. Konikow	4
O. Coover	4
S. Lessin	4
J. Sifakis	4
E. McMillen	4
A. Miller	4
J. Weber	4
L. Basky	4
G. Drucker	4
C. Ingram	4
J. Ritz	4

The New York Branch is represented on this list by five members. That is the reason New York stands at the head of the list of cities. Mobilize the membership for the campaign!

THE NEW YORK CLASS IN THE HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Due to the holidays at the end of the year, the course of lectures on "The History of the Communist International" being conducted by Max Shachtman at the International Workers School, 126 E. 16th Street, was postponed for two sessions. The course will be resumed this Sunday, January 8, 1933, with the "Fourth Congress of the Comintern" as the topic. All comrades are invited to attend.

LEON TROTSKY

Soviet Economy in Danger

The Situation on the Eve of the Second Five Year Plan

The official press now prints from issue to issue an uninterrupted list of accusations against the workers, the directors, the technicians, managers, co-operative personnel, and the trade unionists: all guilty of not fulfilling the plans, the instructions and "the six conditions". But where are the causes for this? Objective causes do not obtain. To blame for it all is the ill will of those entrusted with the fulfilling. And that is just what *Pravda* writes, "Do there obtain any objective causes whatever for this deterioration in the work? None whatever!" (October 2, 1932). People simply do not want to work as they should—and that's all there is to it. The October plenum of the CEC has ascertained that "there is unsatisfactory management in every link down the line." Except, of course, that link which is called the Central Executive Committee.

But are there really no objective causes for the poor quality of the workmanship? A specified amount of time is required not only for the ripening of wheat but also for the familiarization with the complex technological processes. Psychological processes, it is true, are more pliable than those of vegetation, but this pliability has its limits. One cannot skip over them. And in addition—and this is no less important—one cannot demand the maximum of intensity under minimum of nourishment.

The resolution of the October plenum of the CEC accuses the workers and the administrators of their inability "to clinch" their highest achievements, and of their continual falling below the marks they had set. In reality, the breakdowns were ingrained in the character of the achievements themselves. By virtue of an exceptional effort a man can lift a weight that is far above his "average" strength. But he cannot long sustain such a load over his head. It is absurd to accuse him of his inability "to clinch" his effort.

Soviet economy is in danger! It is not difficult to determine its ailment. It springs from the nature of the successes themselves. From an excessive and poorly calculated strain the economy has suffered a rupture. One must proceed to cure, painstakingly and perseveringly. *Rakovsky* warned us as early as 1930, "We are entering an entire epoch, which will pass under the heading of payment in full for the entire past."

The Second Five-Year Plan

The second Five Year Plan was fashioned in the scales of "gigantism".* It is difficult, to be more correct, it is impossible to judge "by sight" the extent to which the final indices of the second Five Year Plan are exaggerated. But the question now touches not the balance of the Second Five Year Plan, but its points of departure, the line of its juncture with the first Five Year Plan. The first year of the second Five Year Plan has received an onerous inheritance from the last year of the first Five Year Plan.

The second plan, according to the design, is the spiral continuation of the first plan. But the first plan has not been brought to completion. The second plan from the very beginning is left suspended in mid-air. If one leaves things to go on as they have been, then the second Five Year Plan will begin by patching up the holes of the first under the administrative whip. This means that the crisis will be aggravated. In this manner one can bring matters to a catastrophe.

There is only one way out: the inauguration of the Second Five Year Plan must be put off for one year. 1933 must be made a buffer between the first Five Year Plan and the second. In the course of this period it is necessary on the one hand, to verify the inheritance left by the first Five Year Plan, to fill in the most yawning gaps, to mitigate the unbearable disproportions and to straighten out the economic front; and on the other hand, to reconstruct the Second Five Year Plan, so calculating it as to make its points of departure about flush to the actual and not imaginary results of the first Five Year Plan.

Doesn't this simply mean that the period for the completion of the first plan will be prolonged another year? No, unfortunately that is not the case. The material consequences of the four years of hue and cry cannot be stricken out from reality by one stroke of a pen. A careful checking over is necessary, a regulation, and a determination of the coefficients of growth actually achieved. The present condition of economy excludes in general any possibility of planned work. 1933 cannot be a supplementary year of the first Five Year Plan, nor the first year of the second. It must occupy an independent position between the two, in order to assure the mitigation of the consequences of adventurism and the preparation of the material and moral prerequisites for planned expansion.

The Left Opposition in its own time was the first to demand the inauguration of the Five Year Plan. Now it is duty bound to say: It is necessary to put off the second Five Year Plan. Away with shrieking enthusiasm! Away with stock jobbing! There is no reconciling them with planned activity. Then, you are for retreat? Yes, for a temporary

* The hostility, an outright hatred, toward "gigantism" is rapidly growing in Soviet circles, as a natural and an inevitable reaction against the adventurism of the last period. There is no need, however, to explain to what extent this reaction, from which the petty bourgeois skinfint spirit derives satisfaction, may in the future become dangerous to the socialist construction.

retreat. And what about the prestige of the infallible leadership? The fate of the dictatorship of the proletariat is more important than blown-up prestige.

The Year of Capital Reconstruction

Having been knocked off balance, Soviet economy is in need of serious reconstruction. Under capitalism the broken equilibrium is restored by the blind forces of the crisis. The Socialist republic allows of applying conscious and rational cures.

It is impossible, of course, to halt production in the whole country as it is halted during repairs in a factory or in an enterprise. But there is also no need whatever for it. It is enough to lower the tempos. The current productive labor for 1933 cannot be carried on without a plan, but this plan must be one for a single year, worked out on the basis of moderate quality quotas.

Attainments in quality must be given first place. Inopportune constructions should be liquidated; all forces and resources must be concentrated upon constructions of the first rank; the interrelations between the various branches of industry must be balanced on the basis of experience; factories must be put in order; equipment must be restored.

Let there be an end to driving, and spurring, and establishing records, but let the productivity of each enterprise be subjected to its technological rhythm. Return to the laboratories whatever has been taken too soon from out of the laboratories. Finish building whatever still remains unfinished. Put in order the interrelations between the departments in factories. Straighten out whatever has been bent. Repair that which has been damaged. Prepare the factory for a transition to the highest stage. Quality quotas must be given a character both supple and conditional in order that they may not interfere with achievements in quantity.

1933 must gain complete mastery over the labor turn-over, by bettering the conditions of the workers; that's where the beginning must be made, for herein is to be found the key to everything else. Workers and their families must be assured of food, shelter and clothing. No matter what the price!

The management and the proletarian cadres of factories should be freed of supplementary burdens, such as the planting of potatoes, breeding rabbits, etc. All questions relating to supplying factories with necessities must be regulated as independent and not supplementary tasks.

Order must be brought into the production of objects for mass consumption. Commodities must be adapted to human needs and not to the raw by-products of the heavy industry.

The process of inflation must be stopped with an iron hand and the stable monetary unit must be restored. This difficult and painful operation cannot be undertaken without boldly curtailing capital investments, without sacrificing many hundred millions that have been inexpediently or inopportunistically sunk in new constructions, in order that thus losses into billions may be forestalled in the future.

A temporary retreat is exigent both in industry and in rural economy. The hitherto line of the retreat cannot be determined beforehand. It will be revealed only in the experience of capital reconstruction.

The managing organs must control, assist, and pick out everything that is capable of living and functioning but they should desist from driving enterprises to their doom, as is the case now. The economy and the human beings need a breathing spell from administrative violence and adventurism.

Many managers, as is shown by the papers, have independently arrived at the conclusion that 1933 must differ in some essential manner from the elapsing year. But they do not draw their ideas to their conclusion, in order not to expose themselves to danger.

As touches the rail transport, *Economic Life* writes, "One of the most important tasks of 1933 must be the task of a full and final liquidation of each and every imperfection, non-completion, poor tie-up and disproportion in the functioning of the different integral parts of the transport mechanism." Well spoken! This formula should be accepted in full, and be expanded to apply to the entire economy, as a whole.

As touches the tractor plant in Stalingrad, *Pravda* writes, "We must decisively dispense with defective methods of workmanship, we must put an end to fever along the conveyor in order to guarantee a regulated output of production." That is absolutely correct! Planned economy, taken as a whole, represents, in its type, a conveyor on a state scale. The method of stuffing up holes is incompatible with planned production. 1933 must "put an end to fever along the conveyor", or at least we must considerably lower the temperature.

The Soviet government itself has announced by proclamation a "turn" from quantity to quality in the sphere of rural economy. That is correct, but the question must be approached on a much wider scale. The matter touches not only the quality of the cultivation of the soil, but the entire kolkhoz and sovkhos policy and praxis. The turn from quantity to quality must be carried over into the functioning of the administration itself.

First of all, a retreat is inevitable in the sphere of collectivization. Here

USE THE CLUB PLAN. GET SUBS FOR THE MINERS.

more than anywhere else the administration is the captive of its own mistakes. While superficially continuing to automatically command, and to specify under the signature of Molotov and Stalin the precise number of acres for grain tillage, the bureaucracy, in reality, is now floating with the current.

Concurrently, in the villages there has appeared a new stratum of the so-called "retired" i. e., former kolkhoz members. Their number is growing. It is out and out insanity to keep by force within the collectives peasants who pilfer the crops, who sell the seed in bazaars and subsequently demand it from the government for sowing. However, it is no less criminal to leave the process of integration to its own course. The tendency to place a cross, just now, over the collectivization movement is now evidently raising its head even within party ranks. To allow this would be to throw out the child from the tub along with the soap suds.

1933 must serve to bring the collective rural economy into alignment with the technical, economic and cultural resources. This means—the selection of the most viable collectives, their reorganization in correspondence with experience and the wishes of the basic peasant mass, first of all the peasant poor. And, at the same time—the formulation of such conditions for leaving the kolkhozes as would reduce to a minimum the disruption of rural economy, to say nothing of the direct dangers of civil war.

The policy of mechanically "liquidating the kulak" is now factually discarded. A cross should be placed over it officially. And simultaneously it is necessary to establish the policy of severely restricting the exploiting tendencies of the kulak. With this goal in mind the lowest strata of the villages must be welded together into a union of the peasant poor.

In 1933 the moujiks will till the land, the textile workers will produce calico, the blast furnaces will smelt metal, and the railroads will transport people and the products of labor. But the highest criterion of this year will lie not in producing as much as one possibly can and as fast as possible but in putting economy in order; in checking over the inventories, separating the healthful from the diseased, and the good from the bad; in clearing away the rubbish and mud, in building the lacking houses and dining rooms, in finishing the roofs, in installing sanitary ventilation. For, in order that they may work well, people must first of all live like human beings, and consequently satisfy their human needs.

To set aside a special year of capital reconstruction is a measure which by itself solves nothing whatever of course. It can attain its major significance only under a change in the very approach to economy, and, first of all, to its living protagonists, the workers and peasants. The approach to economy pertains to the domain of politics. The weapon of politics is the party.

Our task of tasks is to resurrect the party. Here as well we must take an inventory of the onerous inheritance of the post-Lenin period, we must separate the healthy from the ailing, the good from the bad, we must clear away the rubbish and the mud, we must air and disinfect all the offices of the bureaucracy. After the party there follow the Soviets and the trade unions. The capital reconstruction of all Soviet organizations is the most important and the most urgent task of 1933.

—L. TROTSKY.

Prinkipo, October 22, 1932.

THE END.

Open Letter to Vandervelde

(Continued from page 1)

of this logic often enough fall upon proletarian revolutionists who took part in the establishment of the regime of the dictatorship. Yes, in the development of an isolated workers' state, betrayed by the international social democracy, the bureaucratic apparatus has acquired a potency which is dangerous for the socialist revolution. I have no need of this being called to my mind. But before the class enemy, I assume full responsibility not only for the October revolution which produced the regime of the dictatorship, but also for the Soviet republic as it is today, with its government which exiled me to a foreign land and deprived me of my Soviet citizenship rights.

We have destroyed democracy in order to master capitalism. You are defending capitalism allegedly in the name of democracy. But where is it hidden, this democracy?

Not in the port of Anvers, in any case. There were dicks, cops, gendarmes equipped with rifles. But not even the shadow of the democratic right of asylum was to be found there.

And in spite of everything, I quit the waters of Anvers without the slightest pessimism. During the midday pause, dockers gathered on the deck, emerging from the hold or coming from port. There were two or three dozens of them, of these strong and serene Flemish proletarians, blackened for the most part by coal dust. A cordon of detectives separated them from us. The dockers contemplated the tableau in silence, taking the measure of everyone present with their eyes. There is a solid docker winking his eye in the direction of the flatfeet. Our deck replies with smiles; a movement surges through the workers. They have recognized their own. I do not say that the Anvers dockers are Bolsheviks. But by a sound instinct they took their place. In resuming their work, they smiled amicably at us and many of them brought their gnarled fingers to

The Death of the Father of Revisionism

(Continued from last issue)

It is interesting to note that at the outset, the party fathers and the official theorists—Liebknecht the elder, Kautsky, Schoenland and others included—attached no fundamental significance to Bernstein's views. The party press even wrote at the outset that there is something healthy in the idea to submit the party program to periodic revision on the basis of new developments. That the socialist movement would split on this rock which Bernstein threw into its midst, did not occur to most of the leaders at the beginning.

The credit for the first shot in the counter-offensive seems to go to Parvus (Dr. Helphand), the brilliant Russian Marxist who was then active in the German movement. He was promptly followed by Rosa Luxemburg, whose comparative youth in the German movement did not diminish the effectiveness of the blows she continued to strike for the Left wing throughout her life, down to the very day when she was assassinated in Berlin by Bernstein's comrades-in-arms. Fighting on their side were also Clara Zetkin, Franz Mehring, Karl Kautsky—always a little belatedly, appearing on the battleground at the very end, as Rosa put it, like the Napoleonic Old Guard!—and the father of Russian Marxism Plechanov.

Defeats on Paper

With such an array of intellectual giants massed against him, it is no wonder that Bernstein suffered defeat after defeat. But these defeats were of a formal nature and left him and his movement unimpaired. In 1890, at the Hanover party congress, the party adopted Bebel's resolution against the revisionists: "The party stands as before on the foundation of the class struggle... there is no reason for the party to change either its fundamental principles and demands, its tactics, or its name, that is, to become a democratic-socialist reform party in place of a social democratic party..."

In Dresden, four years later, the radical wing gained another paper triumph when the revisionist attempts to change the class struggle tactic of the party were condemned. Only 11 delegates voted against this resolution; some were Left wingers, not wholly satisfied with it, the rest were at the extreme Right. As for most of the revisionists, they mockingly voted for the resolution amidst considerable merriment. They knew better than most of the radicals that the resolution would remain on paper, whereas the practice of the party was swinging more definitely in their direction. So prominent a party father as Auer, who carefully refrained from voting for Bernstein at the party congress, is said to have written him: "Lieber Ede, so was tut man, aber man sagt es nicht!"—"My dear Eddie, that's the sort of thing you do, but you don't talk about it!" This classic formula contains more than cynicism; it sums up the ideas of the party leaders, on the road to their August 4, 1914 but prudent enough to conceal the fact under the old watchwords and banners.

The genuine Marxist wing of the movement was even then in favor of expelling Bernstein from the party. In 1901, Plechanov wrote: "In Bernstein's views there are now left only feeble traces of socialism. In reality he stands much closer to the petty bourgeois adherents of 'social reform' than to the revolutionary social democracy. Yet he is still called 'party comrade' and he is not requested to leave the party!"

Eduard Bernstein's 'Triumph' Over Militant Marxism

Rosa Luxemburg also presented a proposal for his expulsion, but the very idea of such a ruthless measure horrified the party leaders and, for that matter most of the Left wingers. It was never even taken up by the party congress. Kautsky, at that time still engaged in polemizing against Bernstein in that dry, pedantic, lifeless manner which proved to be no obstacle to their eventual reconciliation, opposed his expulsion. He stood for preserving that peculiar sort of "freedom of opinion in the party" which has always served to shield the Right wing from the attacks of the Left.

The discussion around Bernstein's views was not, of course, confined to the German movement. His writings not only gave a decisive impetus to a whole series of revisionist attacks upon the body of Marxist doctrine by petty bourgeois economists and sociologists, but formed the line of demarcation between the two principal tendencies in the international socialist movement.

In practice, and not infrequently in theory, the whole Second International was dominated by the revisionist school, as was shown most strikingly and fatally at the crucial moment when the world war broke out. The rise of imperialism in the most important countries of the two continents had reared a labor aristocracy that merged or almost merged with the lower middle class which was being attracted everywhere to the socialist movement. Their interests became bound up with the destinies of their respective imperialist fatherlands. Allegiance to socialism became a "practical ideal" which was reconciled without great difficulty with the frightful exploitation of those tens of millions of black, brown and yellow colonial peoples who never figured in the Bernsteinian scheme, and for good cause.

The upper strata of the working class, swelled by an influx of the petty bourgeoisie from town and country, fortified by a powerful trade union and party bureaucracy, bolstered up by well-established institutions and interests, recoiled from the prospect of social revolution. With the gradual improvement of their own conditions, and with every apparent prospect of steadily "growing into" socialism by the parliamentary process (the German socialist vote in 1912 reached 4,250,000; elsewhere it rose correspondingly), the criticism of the Left wing lost much of its vigor and effectiveness and the standpoint of Bernstein appeared to be justified by the facts of social evolution.

The Kautskyans and Bernstein

Added to this was the fact that the official Marxist school, represented by Kautsky with whom Luxemburg broke long before the war, did not exclude the Bernsteinian conception; it rather supplemented it much in the manner that a left peg-leg assists a still vigorous right foot. While the official program of the German social democracy, adopted in Erfurt towards the end of the last century, was formally Marxist, it had wide gaps in it through which opportunistic practice could enter with ease. The central criticism by Marx of the dictatorship of the proletariat—was ignored at Erfurt too. At all events, the

Kautskyan formulation was open to interpretations from both sides.

Plechanov, however, when the program of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party was being elaborated, did not fail to denounce the omission of a clear reference to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Erfurt program as theoretically incorrect and, in practice, a cowardly concession to the opportunists. Cowardly concessions of this sort, screened by formal adherence to the terminology of the class struggle, proved to be the essence of Kautsky's fight against Bernstein. Plechanov's aphorism in his "Open Letter to Karl Kautsky" that "Either the social democracy will be buried by Bernstein or Bernstein by the social democracy", was verified with cruel exactitude at the decisive hour.

The world war was the catalytic agent which precipitated the "theoretical dispute" into two clearly defined sides of the class struggle. What started out as an "abstract discussion" ended by splitting the socialist movement wide open, with the representatives of the proletarian revolution on one side of the barricades and the social-patriots, agents of imperialism, on the other. By and large, these two class camps were made up of the same elements who divided on the questions raised by Bernstein. The anti-Bernsteinians took their stand against the imperialist war; the revisionists supported the imperialist fatherland.

There were exceptions, it is true. Plechanov turned patriot; Lenach, who had played the radical before the war, volunteered for the front; Hyndman, with his arid pre-war orthodoxy, became a Jingo. Bernstein on the other hand, turned Centrist and pacifist for the moment, and effected a touching reconciliation with his old friendly-enemy, Kautsky. But as a rule, the old pre-war divisions remained and became more rigid.

Bernstein had sowed the seed which yielded the fruits of social patriotism. One of his most insistent arguments had been directed against the Marxist idea that the workers have no fatherland. This may have been justified in an agitational sense, he argued, in 1847 when the workers had no rights and unlimited absolutism reigned throughout Europe. Now that the workers had won universal suffrage, had partaken of the cultural achievements of society, had invaded the legislative bodies—the workers did have a fatherland. This idea became the theoretical basis for all the outspoken social-chauvinists from whom Bernstein separated himself for a short time during the war.

A Short-Lived Centrist

It goes without saying that he found no place at the side of Lenin and the Bolsheviks during the war, any more than they were at his side in the two decades before the war. He did not stand with Liebknecht and his revolutionary opposition; nor did he ever reconcile himself with the other Spartacists—Luxemburg, Mehring, Zetkin—who continued their struggle against him with even greater vigor during the war. His anti-war position had almost everything in common with pacifism and, as in the past, nothing in common with socialism. He belonged to that group of 29 Reichstag deputies, led by Haase and Ledebour, who finally summoned up enough small courage to break the decision of the social democratic fraction and, on August 20, 1915, to leave the session during the vote on war credits. Seven months later, 18 of the deputies formed a fraction of their own which later became the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany. In the Centrist USPD, he shared leadership jointly with Kautsky, as a symbol of their essential reconciliability.

He did not wait for the split at the Halle Congress of the party where the majority of the membership joined the ranks of the Communist International. Just as he had pioneered the revisionist movement, he pioneered the most bitter anti-Bolshevik current in the social democracy of post-war Europe, the bosom of Scheidemann, Noske and Ebert, who were realizing in sanguinary practice the class collaboration theories of Bernstein. Here too he had not long to wait for Kautsky: both of them were active agents in re-cementing the ranks of the Majority socialists with the prodigal sons who had left it for a while under the pressure of discontented workers. Except for the very last years of his life, when old age would no longer permit it, he was drawn into all the special conferences of that particular faction which rules the party and regulates the autogonisms and ambitions of all the other factions: the group of Wells-Severing - Breitschied - Stamper - Loebel-Hellmann.

Last Triumph

At the Heidelberg party congress in 1925, his signal services to reformism were generously acknowledged by the whole party in the formal programmatic repudiation of the class struggle. His coronation was also his vindication; but even more was it a vindication of Plechanov's prediction. Bernstein had buried the social democracy. But by that time it could no longer be reincarnated into the democratic-socialist reform party of his early dreams. It already functioned not only as a bulwark against revolution, but also as an obstacle to social reform. It had betrayed the present of the movement as well as its future.

Bernstein triumphed not only over the Left wing in the social democracy (and that only formally, because the Left wing is today restored on a grander scale in the revolutionary Communist movement), but over the Centrist morass. His life's work is a lesson and a warning which the Communist movement, split into three wings as was the social democracy a generation ago, will profit by heeding.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

their caps in sign of greetings. There it was, our democracy.

When the boat descended the Scheldt, in the misty fog, all along the quays, with their cranes paralyzed by the crisis, cries of farewell resounded from

the port from unknown but faithful friends.

In finishing these lines between Anvers and Vlissingen, I send the workers of Belgium a fraternal greeting. December 5, 1932.

Pioneer Publishers Notes

The following letter is a response to last week's announcement of our plans and difficulties by one of our friends and sympathizers who has himself raised twenty-five dollars for the publication of our pamphlets. We hope that it will be the signal for our friends to follow his example.

"The ideas of the Left Opposition are gradually penetrating into the ranks of the party members. The more honest party members and sympathizers are turning to the Left Opposition for true information on and a Marxist interpretation of the burning problems of the Chinese, German, Russian situations, the world economic crisis, unemployment and the trade union movement.

"The Stalinist leadership of the Comintern and the American party have done everything to confuse the proletarian vanguard. The Left Opposition is the only Communist current that has a Marxist position on revolutionary problems. The ideas of the Left Opposition are expounded in its press. But this is not sufficient. Pamphlets and books have to be published too. During the year 1932 books of extraordinary importance on the Chinese and German questions were published by the League. Events, however, move with great rapidity in Germany, the Soviet Union and in other countries. New questions arise and new solutions are needed.

"As announced in the last issue of the *Militant* the League has on hand a few timely pamphlets by comrade Trotsky and other comrades dealing with the crisis in Soviet economy, the situation in Germany, unemployment in this country, the role of the Left Opposition, etc. These pamphlets, a great need of the hour are, unfortunately, still in manuscript. Their publication is delayed be-

cause of lack of funds. Such a situation cannot be tolerated. These pamphlets should come out immediately.

"How can it be done? Very easily. Through the establishment of a Publishing Loan Fund. Comrades and sympathizers who are anxious to see the ideas of the Left Opposition propagated without undue delay should lend the League as much as they can afford for a definite period of time. This money will be used for the publication of books and pamphlets. The 'debt' will be paid back as rapidly as the pamphlets sell. There is no risk in making these loans and they don't require great sacrifices (and no sacrifices are too great for revolutionists).

"Comrades and sympathizers! Help realize this plan! Take out a few dollars from the bank and 'invest' them in the ideas of revolutionary internationalism! If you have no savings of your own persuade your friends to make a loan to the League. We must get these pamphlets out. Let us try and success will be on our side.

"Comradely,
"D. MARCUS"

Work is already under way on Unemployment and the American Working Class by Arne Swabeck. We will keep our movement informed of the progress we are making. But this does not mean that the idea put forth by comrade Marcus is not as absolutely necessary as he puts it. It is. There are many obstacles to overcome before we can finally say that this pamphlet, not to speak of the others, is off the press.

And those are the magic words we are anxiously awaiting the opportunity to announce. So let us have action on comrade Marcus' suggestion. Who will match his loan of 25 dollars?