

1 CENT  
A  
COPY

THE

MILITANT

Published 3 times a week, Monday,  
Wednesday and Friday

Official Organ of The Communist League of America (Opposition)

Workers of the World,  
Unite!

Published three weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 25, 1925 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 4, 1879.

VOLUME VI, NO. 15 [WHOLE NO. 162]

NEW YORK, FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1933

PRICE 1 CENT

## No Retreat! Struggle or Annihilation!

Every day brings the report of a new blow dealt the German working class movement by the Hitler regime. No half-sane person above the age of six has put the slightest credence in the Fascist charge that the Communists set fire to the Reichstag building. The American bourgeois press has, almost unanimously, openly expressed its skepticism. "France," the Paris correspondent of the New York Times (3-2-1933) informs his paper, judging by today's press, even seems distinctly inclined to blame the Nazis themselves for the fire that wrecked the Reichstag building, and sees in it simply a crude excuse on Herr Hitler's part to crush the Opposition just before the elections. From the conservative London Times to the Laborite Herald, the British press is similarly unambiguous about the despicable fraud of the Austrian adventurer.

But while nobody takes the charge seriously, it has sufficed the Nazis to launch their reign of terror and to extend it more widely with the passage of every day. The Times reports that "Communist arrests included the entire executive committee of the party in Berlin and Reichstag deputies and party executives elsewhere." In Berlin alone there are more than 300 Communists held, 120 in raids for the apprehension of Communist militants and officials are now the order of the day. The Communist and socialist press—more than one hundred papers in all—remains

suppressed and the Fascist swastika still waves from the Karl Liebknecht House. New decrees signed by "comrade" von Hindenburg, erstwhile presidential candidate of the Social Democracy, provide for the most rigorous penalties against revolutionary or militant working class activity.

In addition, the Hitler regime has struck the first overt blow at the Soviet Union. The man who aims to be the "super-Wrangel" of world imperialism ordered an insolent raid upon the suburban Berlin school for the children of Soviet citizens, where literature was seized; a raid upon a Soviet citizens' boarding house, from which two employees of the Soviet trade delegation were arrested and later released; and a raid upon the quarters of the Berlin correspondent of the central Soviet organ, Izvestia, which was carried out not by the police but by armed Nazi storm troops.

But the protest, immediately deposited with the foreign minister by the official Soviet representatives, far from exhausts the question of the relationships between the Soviet Union and the Fascist regime in Germany. There is an unilluminated side to this question upon which considerable light needs to be shed.

The silence of the Communist International on the German situation, its criminal failure to speak out plainly, has become a notorious international scandal of dreadful

significance. The world movement of the proletariat is at stake in Germany; the fate of the Soviet Union is involved. Between Fascism in Germany and the workers' State there can exist only an irreconcilable antagonism which, in the long run, will be settled only by force of arms. This antagonism must not only not be concealed—it must be openly proclaimed to the workers of the world so that they may know how the situation stands and what the attitude of the Soviet Union really is. Instead of such a clear proclamation, we see disquieting signs of the contrary. Walter Duranty, the Moscow correspondent of the New York Times now in Berlin, cables his paper as follows (3-2-1933):

"While it doubtless would be an exaggeration to say as some of Chancellor Hitler's close associates do, that 'the Soviet Union wants a Hitlerite Germany because the Soviet Union knows that would be a strong Germany, which the Soviet Union wants,' it is beyond question that Moscow would welcome even a 100 percent Hitler regime on the grounds that it would conjure away the nightmare that has harassed the sleep of Soviet statesmen for the past five years—namely, an anti-Bolshevik European coalition or a 'holy war against the Red peril.' Moscow already has reason to be gratified over the effect of Herr Hitler's rise to power on France and Poland. But that is only one aspect of the case. Of

greater practical interest is the recent agreement concluded by the Deutsche Bank and Disconto-Gesellschaft and the Dresdner Bank to provide \$50,000,000 in new credits to the Soviet Union."

The continuation of "normal business relations" with Germany under Hitler, right at the moment when the decisive battle is imminent—a battle on whose outcome depends the next decade or more of the world's development—as if nothing unusual was happening, as if the Soviet Union were not concerned with what government was established in Germany—means little short of leaving the German proletariat to fend for himself, leaving it in the lurch, without the moral—and when necessary—the material assistance of the workers' state. When Duranty points out further that "only recently the official Soviet Government organ, the Izvestia, took occasion to condemn with a speech by Foreign Commissar Litvinov to assure Germany that the Soviet Union would not intervene in the affairs of other countries, even in the event of a Communist revolution"—it smacks not merely of "national-Bolshevik" degeneration in general, but of the preparation for treacherous nationalist indifference to the fate of the German and world proletariat in the concrete! The sharpness of our terms is justified by the criminal deadly silence of the C. I. and by the broad hints of Duranty who, experience has taught us is an

authoritative backstairs spokesman of the upper stratum of the apparatus.

While this unbelievable indifference is being manifested by the upper layers of the Stalinist bureaucracy, matters do not improve in the German Communist Party. The Daily Worker (3-2-1933) prints the Imprecor cable from Berlin reporting that the German party "has again approached the Socialist Party, the A. D. G. B. (reformist trade unions), the Reichsbanner, etc., with a proposal for joint action against the murderous Fascist terror." The headline given to this story by the Freiheit is even "plainer." "Central Committee of the Communist Party Turns Once More to the Social Democratic and Trade Union Leaders." If the headline is correct, it would undoubtedly mark a turn in the right direction by the Stalinists. But our bitter experiences in the past cause us to voice our reservations in advance.

Up to yesterday, the Molotovs, Manuilsksys, Kuznetsins, Thaelmanns, Bedachts and Olgins inveighed abusively against the Left Opposition precisely because we proposed that the united front be set into motion by an open proposal to the social democracy and its trade unions—from top to bottom, leaders and masses. "Counter-revolutionary"; "assistance to the old democracy"; and similar bright if not original terms were applied to us on this score. How is it

that what was counter-revolutionary on Tuesday is good Bolshevism on Wednesday? Unfortunately, the situation is not as clear as it should be. The "Once More" in the Freiheit headline gives away the Stalinist stratagem. The appeal for a united front "with the social democratic party and the trade unions" in the past has meant an appeal by the Stalinists to the "party" and the "trade unions" to join with the Communists in a common struggle... against their leaders! In other words, it has been the old ultimatum dressed up to make it sound better. At bottom, there has been no change.

Nevertheless, the change is imperative now. Unless the workers up to now still demoralized passive and divided, unite their forces, Fascism will bathe the country in the blood of the proletariat.

To this moment, the world remains unaware of the program of action of the Communist party. We put the question again: Does the Communist party and its leadership really intend to organize the resistance of the proletariat to Fascism, or does it intend to capitulate without a struggle, on the half-formed or fully conscious theory that it is hopeless to fight, or that Fascism will soon collapse and give way to Bolshevism? Are the party leaders preparing for the final struggle or giving up the situation as hopeless? The Left Opposition does not consider the situation hopeless. It knows very

well—and the newspaper reports to the humiliation of the Communist movement, confirm it—that the Austrian and Scandinavian borders are being passed by an increasing number of Communist officials and leaders from Germany. For such capitulators, who are saving their hides, a revolutionist can have nothing but contempt and hatred. Of them, Trotsky wrote more than a year ago: "Without a victory over the social democracy, we cannot battle against Fascism." say such terrible revolutionists, and for this reason... they get their passports ready. Worker-Communists, you are hundreds of thousands, millions; you cannot leave for any place; there are not enough passports for you. Should Fascism come to power, it will ride over our skulls and spines like a terrific tank. Your salvation lies in merciless struggle. And only a fighting unity with the social democratic workers can bring victory. Make haste, worker-Communists, you have very little time left!"

Very little time left! Every hour counts! The socialist leaders, the traitors to the proletariat, will not act of their own accord. The Communist leaders must be forced out of their criminal passivity. They must be forced to put an end to this lightened juggling with the fate of the German proletariat. There is no retreat: All that is left is mortal combat—or annihilation!

Thursday, March 2, 1933. —M. S.

LEON TROTSKY

## "Soviet Economy in Danger"

The following letter was addressed to the editorial board of the "Sozialistische Arbeiterzeitung" (central organ of the German Socialist Workers' Party. After the press of the S. W. P. reprinted the deliberate falsification of the "Solidation of the Trotskyists", comrade Trotsky was obliged to refrain from sending the letter. As the letter nevertheless retains its importance, we publish it here.—Ed.)

Dear comrades:

In the two numbers of your paper, January 11 and 12, there appeared an article on my brochure "Soviet Economy in Danger". As it deals with an extremely important question, about which every revolutionary worker must form a clear opinion, if not today then tomorrow, I request you to afford me the possibility to elucidate to your readers by the present letter, in the shortest possible terms, those sides of the question which in my opinion were submitted to a false interpretation in your paper.

1. In the article it says a number of times that you are "not in agreement with everything" and "far from agreeing with everything" in Trotsky's conceptions on Soviet economy. Differences of opinion between us are all the more natural as we belong to different organizations. Nevertheless I cannot suppress my regret that—with one single exception, dealt with below—you did not indicate which conceptions you are not in agreement with. Let us recall how Marx, Engels and Lenin censured and condemned evasiveness in fundamental questions, which finds expression mostly in the empty formula "far from agreeing with everything". What every revolutionary worker can demand of his organization and of his paper is a definite and clear attitude towards the questions of socialist construction in the U. S. S. R.

2. In only one point does your article endeavor to delimit itself more concretely from my conceptions. "We believe," you write, "that Trotsky considers matters somewhat onesidedly when he ascribes the main blame for these conditions to the Stalinist bureaucracy" (1). Further on the article sets out that the main blame does not lie in the bureaucracy but in the circumstance that tasks of too great dimensions are put before economy, for the fulfillment of which the necessary qualified forces are lacking. But who was it that set up these exaggerated tasks if not the bureaucracy? And who was it that warned in proper time against their exaggerated dimensions if not the Left Opposition? Thus it results that precisely your article "ascribes" the whole blame to the bureaucracy.

Your reproach to me is wrong also for a deeper reason. To shift the responsibility for all the difficulties and for all the phenomena of crisis upon the ruling faction, could be done only by one who believes in the possibility of a planned development of the socialist society within national boundaries. But this is not my standpoint. The main difficulties for the U. S. S. R. arise out of: (a) the economic and cultural backwardness which forces the Soviet state to solve many of the tasks which capitalism has solved in advanced countries; (b) the isolation of the workers' state in an epoch in which the division of labor between the states of the whole world has become the most important postulate of the national productive forces.

3. We do not charge the Stalinist faction with the blame for the objective difficulties, but for its lack of understanding of the nature of these difficulties, of inability to foresee the dialectic of their development and unimpaired mistakes of leadership springing therefrom.

(Continued on Page 2)

Arrest Soviet  
"Trotskyists"

We are reliably informed from the U. S. S. R.:

In the course of the month of January, a large number of arrests were made in Moscow and Leningrad. In addition to Preobrazhensky, L. N. Smirnov, Ufimtsev, more than one hundred former Left Oppositionists were apprehended. They were accused of carrying on illegal "Trotskyist" factional work. It will be remembered that almost four years ago, some of those named above renounced the Opposition and capitulated to the Stalinist regime, claiming that it had adopted most if not all of the essential planks in the Opposition platform. The arrest of those who previously capitulated, following as it does right on the heels of the arrest and exile of Zinoviev, Kamenev and many others, is a fact of the greatest symptomatic significance.

In the huge Moscow automobile plant "Amo", approximately one hundred workers were arrested, because an Opposition leaflet had been distributed there. The same occurred in other plants and factories. Similar reports emanate from Leningrad.

Comintern and World Revolution at  
Decisive Historical Turning Point

When comrade Trotsky, in his writing "Germany: The Key to the International Situation", issued the urgent warning to the proletarians of all countries, to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the danger of Hitler, of the Fascist counter-revolution in Central Europe, this writing took on the significance for the most conscious proletarians as that of Lenin on October 7, 1917: "The Impending Crisis". Two undoubtedly different situations; two palpably different epochs. In 1917 it was the eve of the proletarian revolution; in 1933, the eve of the Fascist counter-revolution in Germany. But in the first warning as in the second, in Lenin's of 1917 as in Trotsky's of 1933, in spite of the difference between the two epochs, one encounters the same revolutionary and internationalist spirit, the same clairvoyance, the same strength.

Now, it can no longer be a question of foreseeing; now it is a question of seeing. Hitler is in power. And how the task of leading his open struggle for the crushing of the organizations, of all the organizations of the working class has been facilitated for him! The battle which the social democrats and the Stalinists thought could be evaded by submission and docility is at the present time inevitable. Otherwise, it will be annihilation without the struggle—an

eventuality which only traitors to the cause of the proletariat can envisage and surrender.

The German proletariat is far from having exhausted its revolutionary energy. Even though it has been enormously weakened by the multitudinous treacheries of the social democratic leaders and the constantly increasing blunders of the Stalinist leaderships, the German proletariat preserves a capacity and a possibility of struggle still susceptible to barring the road to triumph of the Hitler regime and of rendering it finally impossible. But this possibility depends upon the policy of the Communist Party of Germany and the Communist International.

A Turning Point  
We have undeniable arrived at a turning point of the international revolution. This truth should not be concealed from oneself nor from the proletariat of all countries. The Communist International, on the contrary, is silent; it remains mute out of fear of being forced to draw the terrible balance of this last decade. But in its silence, in stubbornly sealing its lips, in "patiently" supporting the forward march of the Hitlerist troops, it is only marching to ruin, drawing in its train the ruin of the German

(Continued on Page 2)

Jap Advance  
Hits U.S.S.R.LEAGUE PRICE FOR SUPPORT  
OF JAPAN IS ASSAULT ON  
FATHERLAND OF WORKERS

With laudable thoughtfulness, the Japanese imperialists lay their plans in advance and then follow their schedule carefully. Many moons ago, a Japanese "surveyor", engaged in political surveying in Inner Mongolia for the followers of Baron Tanaka, discovered an obscure prince, the "direct descendant of the great Genghis Khan". This Mongolian prince could never have dreamed how fortunate was his fateful meeting with the awe-struck Jap. For lo and behold, the press already hints at the Japanese desire to restore this scion to his rightful place at the head of a new Mongolian state to be called Tayu-ankuo.

Thus the Japanese militarists continue to build a foundation for the ultimate struggle with the Soviet Union. Inner Mongolia will follow the road of Manchuria and Jehol, possibly after the conquest of North China. If the powers continue to jockey for position in the present situation, each hoping to reap the benefits while the other pays the piper; if there is no real pressure applied to Japan to halt her march into China, it is because they expect Japan to pay the price, military intervention in Siberia. Of course America and England are careful to establish the record that will be relied upon in the more distant future to solve their internal conflicts. But as yet, that is merely a record.

Russia and Japan  
What is the order in which capitalist powers place their enemies? Read the careful, restrained press accounts of the Japanese advance into Asia, note the gentlemanly manner in which reference is made to their astute campaigning. Then recall the violent, almost insane, attacks made periodically in the decade after the October revolution on the Soviets and their leaders. The vituperation carried on by Hitler against the German Communists is tame compared to the vicious campaign of slander recorded in the capitalist press of the entire world against the Russian Bolsheviks. In the light of that experience, one can easily pigeon-hole the present quarrel with Japan as a family affair. Despite all the failures and blunders of the Stalin bureaucracy, the Soviets still remain the nightmare of capitalism, spelling the twilight of imperialism.

At bottom that is the explanation of the Stimson note to the League accepting its invitation to express accord in view. For Stimson refuses to be solidly linked with Geneva and while agreeing blandly

(Continued on Page 2)

To Union Sq. on  
Saturday

The Unemployed Councils of Greater N. Y. have issued a call for a demonstration on Saturday, March 4 at 11 A. M. on Union Square. This demonstration is timed with the inauguration of Roosevelt which takes place in Washington on the same day.

The Left Opposition endorses the demonstration on Union Square and will be there in full force. The demands of the demonstration, however, can and must be broadened to include the demand for long-term credits to the Soviets and to draw attention to the German crisis.

The demonstration meets at a crucial moment for the working class of the entire world. While the unemployed are dying of starvation in this country the bloody Fascist regime of Hitler in Germany is murdering the flower of the revolutionary proletariat and destroying their organization.

All out on Union Square on March 4th!

For Unemployment Insurance and Relief!

For Recognition and Long Term Credits to the Soviet Union!

For the United Front to crush the Hitler Gangs!

Anti-United Front Policy Plays Into  
Hands of Socialist Party Bureaucrats

The conference on unemployment held under the auspices of the "Labor Committee" of the Socialist party of New York last week, offers a number of aspects deserving of examination.

The brutal attacks of the socialist gangsters upon the Left wing delegates who came to present their credentials, the atmosphere of terrorism which pervaded the whole session, are a natural accompaniment of Socialist bureaucracy—weapons borrowed from the class enemy and first introduced by the Right wing into the labor movement in the days when the Left wing first raised the banner of internationalism during and after the war. The socialist patrons, allies and

OPEN FORUM  
BONAPARTISM & THERMIDOR  
IN THE SOVIET UNION

DOES THE DANGER THREATEN?

Speaker:  
MAX SHACHTMAN  
Friday, March 3, 1933

126 East 16th Street,  
ADMISSION: 15c  
N. Y. Br. Communist League of America (Opposition)

brothers of the Lewises, Schlesingers, Kaufmans and their ilk in the labor movement, revealed at this conference how seriously are to be taken their plausibly hypocritical protestations against violence and their preachments of the pacific methods of "democracy".

Socialist "United Fronts"  
The fervid claims that they are against the splitting of the labor movement and for the "united front", did not stand up so well in the conference. The united front of the socialist bureaucracy is directed against the Left wing, which they fear and hate, from whose militancy and boldness in putting all questions from the class standpoint, they recoil right into the arms of the worst reactionaries in the labor movement or into the embraces of the petty bourgeois liberal politicians. Confronted with the choice between the "united front" with Wm. Green and his kin and the united front with the Left wing and Communist movement, the socialist bureaucrats will always choose the former—unless the Communists are able to arouse the socialist rank and file to force their party and their party leadership to a reluctant choice of the latter. Confronted with a choice between relying upon treacherous and servile attempts to ingratiate

(Continued on Page 2)

recognition is being treated on the

basis of the interests of the Soviet state and those of the bourgeois American state. The voice of the proletariat of America, whose class interests are indissolubly connected with those of the Soviet workers' state, has not made itself heard so far, with its own distinctive slogans and demands which are not those of the American capitalists.

Soviet Economy in Critical State  
Yet Soviet economy is in a critical state, which have been fully analyzed by comrade Rakovsky in his famous letter from Barnaul and by comrade Trotsky in his recent brochure, "Soviet Economy in Danger". The utopian theory of Socialism in one country, of an interruptedly developing socialism in a backward country going on from triumph to triumph in an ever faster tempo, has been refuted by the facts. Increasingly sharp internal contradictions and disproportions, the failure of such important branches of industry as coal and steel to meet the planned figures, and, most dangerous of all, the serious food shortage—these and a host of similar facts characterize the situation in the Soviet Union today. The weakening of the bond between workers and peasants, the concessions to "private initiative", and the growing danger of Thermidorian reaction, have their basis in this economic situation.

The basis of the crisis in the Soviet Union is the necessity of laying a socialist basis in one land and a backward one at that. This necessity is falsely idealized in the revisionist theory of "socialism in one country". In the second place, the Stalinist bureaucracy, through its adventurist as well as its opportunistic methods, has aggravated the disproportions and contradictions of Soviet economy, including those carried over from Czarist days such as the contradiction between a highly concentrated industry and a primitive agriculture. In the third place, the world crisis, which according to the Stalinist bureaucrats could be kept out of Soviet Russia through the State monopoly of foreign trade and foreign banking, has swept over the boundary lines and convincingly proved that, whether it likes it or not, the Soviet Union is indissolubly bound up with the world situation economically as well as politically.

Soviet Trade "Strictly Business"  
The methods of Stalinist bureaucracy operating on the basis of reduced the role of Communist

(Continued on Page 2)

BROWNSVILLE  
MASS MEETING

"The CRISIS IN GERMANY"

Sponsors: Communist League of America (Opposition)

Speaker:

MAX SHACHTMAN

Editor of The Militant

Brownsville Labor Lyceum

SUNDAY, MARCH 5, 2 P. M.  
219 SACKMAN ST., Bklyn N. Y.  
Between Glenmore & Liberty Aves.  
ADMISSION 15 Cents



## Trotsky Replies to S.W.P. Editors On Opposition's View of Soviet Economy

(Continued from Page 1)

from. We are far from the idea, naturally, of explaining this "lack of understanding" and this "inability" by the personal qualities of the individual leaders. It is a question of the system of thinking, of the political tendency, of the factions which have grown out of old Bolshevism. We observe one and the same methodology in the economic leadership of Stalin as in the political leadership of Thaelmann. One cannot fight successfully against the zigzags of Thaelmann without having understood that it is a question not of Thaelmann but of the nature of bureaucratic Centrism.

4. Elsewhere your article calls to mind that the Left Opposition, especially and primarily Rakovsky, warned against the over-stretched tempos of construction in good time. But right next to this you write of allegedly analogous warnings of Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky. Your article refers twice to the perspicacity of the latter with regard to the latter with a single word the irreconcilable antagonisms between the Right and the Left Opposition. I deem it all the more necessary to clarify this point because it is precisely the Stalin faction which recoils from no attempt to cover up or to wipe out the deep antagonisms between the opportunist and the Marxian wings in the camp of Bolshevism.

Since 1922, the Left Opposition, more correctly its future staff, conducted a campaign for the working out of a five year plan, the axis of which was to be the industrialization of the country. As far back as that time, we proved that the tempo of the development of the nationalized industry could, in the very next years, exceed the tempo of Russian capitalism (6 percent annual increase) "two-, three-, and more fold." Our opponents called this program nothing but an industrial phantasy. If Bucharin, Tomsky, Rykov distinguished themselves in any respect from Stalin-Molotov, it was only in the fact that they fought even more resolutely against our "super-industrialism." The struggle against "Trotskyism" was theoretically nurtured almost exclusively by Bucharin. His criticism of "Trotskyism" later on also served as the platform of the Right wing.

### Bucharin's Stand

In the course of a series of years Bucharin was, to employ his own expression, the preacher of "toroise-pace" industrialization. So he remained, at that time, when the Left Opposition demanded going over to the five year plan and to higher tempos of industrialization (in 1923-1928) as well as in the years of the era-Let zigzags of the Stalinists, when the Left Opposition warned against the transformation of the five year plan into a four year plan and especially against the adventurist collectivization in 1930-1932). From Bucharin's mouth spoke not the dialectical appraisal of Soviet economy in its contradictory development, but an opportunistic attitude from the very beginning, an economic minimalism.

5. How unfortunately your article mixes up Bucharin's criticism with the criticism of Rakovsky, is perceptible from the following circumstance: In the same days that your paper called attention to the apparent perspicacity of Bucharin in the past, Bucharin himself categorically and completely renounced all his former criticism at the Plenum of the Central Committee, and all his former prognoses, as fundamentally false (Pravda, January 14, 1933). Rakovsky, however, renounced nothing at the Plenum, not because he is chained to Barnaul as an exile, but because he has no need of renouncing anything.

6. Right after the appearance of my brochure "Soviet Economy in Danger", a turn-about-face took place in Soviet economic policy which throws a bright light upon the problem engaging us and makes possible an infallible check upon all the prognoses of the various factions. The story of the turn-about-face—in two words—is the following:

The XVII Conference of the C. P. S. U. approved in January 1932 the principles of the second five year plan. The tempo of growth of industry was established at approximately 25 percent, with Stalin declaring at the conference that this is only the minimum limit, and that in the working out of the plan this percentage must and will be raised.

### The Second Plan

The Left Opposition characterized this whole perspective as a fruit of bureaucratic adventurism. It was, as it is to be understood, accused of striving for the counter-revolution, for the intervention of Japan and for the capitalist if not the feudal restoration.

Exactly one year has passed. At the last Plenum of the Central Committee Stalin brought forward a new project for the second five

year plan. But not a single word did he mention of the tempos approved the year before as the minimum. Nobody decided to remind him of it. Now Stalin proposed for the second five year plan a 13 percent annual increase. We do not at all conclude from this that Stalin calculates upon engendering a Japanese intervention and the restoration of capitalism. But we draw the conclusion that the bureaucracy arrived at a moderation of the tempos not on the grounds

## The C. I. At a Turning Point

(Continued from Page 1)

proletariat. "For," as Lenin said, "internationalism does not consist in phrases, declarations of solidarity or resolutions, but in action." Now, no illusion is possible on the international consequences which the final victory of Hitler in Germany would have, that is, the consequences of the crushing of the German proletariat.

"The whole future of the Russian revolution is at stake. The whole future of the international workers' revolution is at stake." These words of Lenin in 1917 are terribly timely. The same historical problem is posed today as in 1917. In 1917, in Russia, it was a question of preventing the repression of the peasant insurrection, which would have sounded the "knell of the revolution" and have signified "the final triumph of the Kornilov regime"; in saving the Russian revolution, the first fortress of the "world-wide proletarian revolution" was being saved. At the present moment, it is the victory of the Fascist counter-revolution in Germany which puts "the whole future of the international workers' revolution" at stake. This fact alone proves how pernicious and erroneous is the Stalinist theory of "socialism in a single country", which has reduced proletarian internationalism to abstract declarations of solidarity, theory which has weakened, atomized, disarmed the working class in every country by creating the illusion of a "neutralization" of the world bourgeoisie towards the first workers' State, by regarding the international revolution, the European revolution primarily, as a fact which is of no interest to the building up of socialism in the U. S. S. R.

### The Decisive Question

Now it is clear to every Communist worker what was meant and what is meant by the policy of "socialism in a single country". The Communist International itself, with all the conquests of the October revolution, is in danger. And it is in Germany that the most important section is deciding today: the Hitlerist counter-revolution is taking the lead of the international counter-revolution; the German proletariat is representing in this moment the most vital interests of the world revolution. It must be decided in one direction or the other: and upon this victory of the counter-revolution or of the revolution will depend whether the "Holy Alliance" of all the big powers will return, or the road will be taken to that which is demanded by the modern epoch, the road to the Soviet United States of Europe.

Germany, by itself exhausts the problem of the "permanent revolution". The truth of Marx that no truce, no respite is possible for the forces of the revolution (for the working class), "before it has destroyed, annihilated the power by which the old society asserts itself", is fully confirmed. "After the revolution, the permanent counter-revolution becomes (for the forces of the old society) a question of daily existence." The German bourgeoisie, after having utilized the social democracy to strangle the revolution of 1918, is today driven to risk the Fascist counter-revolution, by arming the discontented petty bourgeois masses in order to fling them against the working class with the aim of extorting from it the last concessions, in order to preserve its profits at the price of the most ferocious repression and the starvation of the toiling people.

So also on the international scale. "No truce between the two societies (bourgeois and proletarian). Their material interests, their needs, demand a mortal struggle: one of the two must triumph; the other must succumb"—there, according to Marx, is the "only entente that can be established between them".

Not a doubt, therefore, that we are at the present moment before a decisive turn in the revolutionary period opened up by the victory of the Bolsheviks in October 1917. Not a doubt that Hitler seeks to gain for German imperialism the favors of the Communist League of America (Opposition), the Versailles powers by making himself the butcher of the proletariat of the Russian Commune. Is all this to be stood for without re-

of Marxian foresight but behind-handedly, after its head had collided against the disastrous consequences of its own economic adventurism. That's just what we accuse it of. And that's just why we think that its new emergency zigzag contains no guarantees at all for the future.

Even more glaring do the distinctions in the three conceptions (the Right, the Centrist and the Marxian) appear on the field of agriculture. But this problem is too complex to be touched upon even fleetingly within the limits of a letter to the editorial board. In the course of the next few weeks I hope to issue a new brochure on the perspectives of Soviet economy. Prinkipo, January 26, 1933.

sisting at all?

In 1917, Lenin asserted: "There is no doubt that if the Bolsheviks allow themselves to be trapped by constitutional illusions, by 'faith' in the convocation of the Constituent, by waiting for the Congress of the Soviets, etc., they would only be miserable traitors to the cause of the proletariat." With Lenin, we can repeat today: "To allow oneself to be trapped by illusions about 'non-aggression pacts, by the building of socialism in a single country', to leave the road of the international revolution, to close one's eyes to the Fascist counter-revolution which threatens the German proletariat, the U. S. S. R., the whole world proletariat—is to betray the cause of the proletariat."

### What Is Demanded?

The only means of making the supreme effort to exorcise this catastrophe, to deal with this crisis which is striking at the heart of world Communism—is a decisive turn on the part of the Communist International, with the recall, at this moment so heavy with responsibility and danger, to the posts of struggle and of leadership which rightfully belong to them of all the comrades of the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists), and primarily the comrades of the Russian Opposition who have been thrown into the places of exile and deportation: comrade Trotsky, comrade Rakovsky, the hundreds upon hundreds of other old warriors of the October revolution.

The immediate convocation of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, demanded by the pre-conference of the Left Opposition, thus acquires an urgent and exigent character. This Congress, with the participation of the International Left Opposition, must prove to the proletarians of all countries that the Communist International does not intend to succumb; that the Communist International is on the contrary capable of regenerating itself to fight and to triumph. What is the Communist International doing, what does it intend to do? There is the question which every conscious proletarian puts anxiously to himself and looks for a reply. Let the Communist International regain itself its initiative and its proletarian internationalism, and it will see all the healthy and honest forces, ready to struggle, of the world proletariat, docking to its side.

Paris, Feb. 16, 1933. —FEROCI.

## For the German Opposition

The international pre-conferences of the Left Opposition, which recently concluded its sessions in Paris, adopted a decision to raise an international fund for the work of our German brother-section. It was decided that in every country where the Left Opposition has its national section, each member shall contribute a day's pay to the fund for our German section. The last meeting of the National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) decided to endorse this campaign and to open a subscription in the columns of the Militant.

Our German section is laboring at the present time under the greatest difficulties and the fund collected will not only be the greatest aid financially, but it will also serve as a magnificent display of the international solidarity of the Left Opposition and all its friends and sympathizers with the Marxian wing of the German revolution. Despite the financial difficulties we are ourselves experiencing at the present moment, we gladly and enthusiastically appeal to all our readers to make a generous donation to the international fund for the Left Opposition in Germany. All contributions sent to the office for this purpose will be carefully set aside and forwarded in toto immediately to their proper destination. Moneys sent should therefore be designated for this specific purpose. The contributions should be sent to the Communist League of America (Opposition), 126 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

## LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

### Another «Friend» of the Soviet Union

Cleveland—On Saturday, February 11, another "Friend of the Soviet Union"—a lawyer by the name of Maurice Sugar, from Detroit—spoke before the Cleveland workers under the auspices of the FSU, at Engineers Auditorium.

After the customary, uncritical and rosy-pink picture of the state of affairs in the Soviet Union under the Stalinist regime, a question period followed. From all over the hall came questions regarding the burning problem of the new Hitler government in Germany will affect Soviet Russia.

The speaker in the generally lukewarm spirit that can be expected of any liberal, replied jestingly that he did not think that the Soviet government was quite satisfied with this turn of events and in general waved the question aside with a gesture of unimportance and light-mindedness.

There were also some questions about Trotsky, as usual. What Mr. Sugar failed to do in the German situation, he made up for in his own inimitable way—with the usual slanders and brazen lies about our comrade. Comrade Keller, of the local group of the Left Opposition, arose to reply, castigating the speaker for his criminal cynicism with regard to the Hitler danger and pointing to Trotsky's warning of an attack by a victorious Hitlerism in Germany against the Russian workers' state. The comrade concluded by stressing the necessity of the return of comrade Trotsky and the Bolshevik-Leninists from exile to take their place in the ranks of the proletarian army in this dangerous situation.

Mr. Sugar, unabashed, answered with more of his pink-hued cynicism and the meeting was ended. After the meeting, however, numerous workers crowded about the few comrades of the League who were present, expressing their agreement with them that the liberal hysteria had treated the serious question of the fate of the German workers, contemptuously. They asked all sorts of questions and eagerly grasped at copies of the Militant, which were distributed in good number.

At the Socialist Party Forum.—At the S. P. forum, that same evening, comrade Gordon took the floor to bring the attention of the workers to the critical situation in Germany and to call for solidarity of all American workers with the oppressed German proletarians. He was cut short by the Socialist bureaucrats present and forced off the floor, because "the speech was

not in line with the subject under discussion". A few C. P. comrades present could not restrain themselves and shouted "social-Fascists!" at the bureaucrats. After the meeting, the Militant was distributed among those present.

A Party Meeting on Germany in Semi-Secession.—Some time ago, the party called for united front efforts in the organization of an Anti-Hitler Meeting on the West Side. A small "conference" convened and there the party representative, a certain A. Landy, explained, after he discovered that a representative of the Left Opposition was present, that it was not really a united front; the party was just asking for some aid, unofficially. Some of these present protested and the Stalinist representative had to explain that the first call was a "mistake".

Nevertheless, comrade Gordon of the League, offered our cooperation in the party's undertaking. But the party representative immediately restricted all his action in making arrangements with individual persons. No definite date, nor place, nor plan of preparation was decided upon.

Several days later, on Sunday last, the meeting came off quite unexpectedly. B. D. Amis and Landy made the usual speeches for the party. In the discussion a German comrade made a lengthy address, calling for a united front in Germany in the same sense as that proposed by the Left Opposition. It was this speech that was greeted with the greatest applause by the workers present.

Before a German Workers' Society.—On Tuesday, comrade Gordon was given the floor at a meeting of the German Mutual Aid and Benefit Society (Krankenkasse), Franklin Avenue Branch. He spoke of the need for the active participation of the workers in this country in solidarity with their German comrades under the Fascist government and of the necessity of establishing the united front against Fascism in Germany by a bloc of the C. P. G., the S. P. G., the trade unions and other workers organizations. At this conclusion he invited the members of the organization, to come to our Anti-Hitler meeting in Painters' Hall, on Wednesday, February 22.

A short discussion on the matter at hand followed and a resolution, expressing solidarity with the German proletariat and calling for the establishment of the united front in the sense presented by the comrade from the L. O. was adopted. Similar resolutions have been adopted by numerous German organizations in this city and sent to the central organs of the socialist and Communist parties in Berlin.

## The Socialist Party Conference

(Continued from Page 1)

themselves with the bourgeois politicians, upon preserving a respectable, unshakable, and relying upon the organized proletarian movement and its militant mass action, its demonstrative pressure, the socialist fakery will always choose the former again unless their rank and file is afforded the possibility of choosing the alternative of a united front with the Left wing.

This brings us to the question of the tactics which the official Communist party leadership pursued. In the left wing conference for Unemployment Insurance, the representatives of the Communist League of America (Opposition) proposed that the conference shall make a direct appeal to the S. P. for a united front of both movements for the merger of the two organizations represented by the two conferences so that the action of the New York workers for this specific goal might be successfully coordinated. Towards this end, our comrades proposed that the Left wing send a delegation to the S. P. conference (and call upon its affiliated bodies to do likewise) for the purpose of challenging the Right wing leaders in their own citadel, so to speak. That is, the Left wing delegates should have been present at the Rand School conference to demand of its organizers and patrons that they declare themselves publicly on the question of the united front. Had the Left wing adopted this proposal, and at the same time carried on an agitation among the socialist and reformist workers in the ranks for this united front offer, it would not only have strengthened its position immeasurably, but would have been able to mobilize a movement among the socialist rank and file demanding of their leaders that favorable action be taken on the Left wing proposal.

### Stalinist Blundering

As it was, the official Left wing decided on a policy which could not but yield the outcome that it did. It decided to go to the socialist conference with the ultimatum demand that the delegates denounce the organizers of the conference and follow the lead of the Communists, that is, of the Left wing unemployment conference. With such a policy, the S. P. leaders were easily able to strengthen their bonds with their following and weaken any sympathy that the latter might have for the Left wing. The Left wing was put in the position of claiming that its conference alone was "legal", so to speak, that it alone was entitled to the monopoly of leadership—which everybody must acknowledge in advance and on its say-so. Instead of gaining the indispensably necessary support of the socialist and reformist workers, the left wing

succeeded only in isolating itself by alienating the latter.

Not merely this is of importance, but another circumstance, which does not, it is true, conflict with the other. The socialist workers—to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands and millions of unemployed—are not interested primarily (most of them are not interested in it at all, as yet) in whether or not the Communists have or fight for the leadership of the unemployed movement. What they are interested in is to set in motion a genuine united movement, powerful enough to extract some immediate concessions from the plutocracy and its government. They look with a certain suspicion upon those who, to their minds, seek to "exploit" the unemployed and their struggles for purely "party" reasons. The policy pursued by the party—"our leadership" or nothing—"our conference" or no united front at all—only strengthens these suspicions in the minds of the mass. There is not, in our view, the slightest necessary conflict between building the strongest and widest possible movement of the masses, and establishing the claim of the Communists to leadership of this movement. Quite the contrary. The Communists, by denouncing in practice and in the simplest, most understandable, least ambiguous way that they have no interests separate and apart from the interests of the class as a whole, will gain the support of the masses not only for the movement in general, but for revolutionary leadership within it in particular. That is what the united front intelligently understood and correctly practiced, signifies, in essence. The Stalinist rejection of the united front and their substitution for it of the ultimatum "united front from below", has brought it to its present position in the unemployed movement, and more specifically, it led directly to the inexcusable blunder made with relation to the socialist conference.—S.

### LECTURE ON GERMANY

The crisis in Germany and the program of the Left Opposition will be the subject of the lecture by comrade Morris Lewit this Sunday, March 5. The lecture will be held at the Free Workers Center, 219 Second Avenue, between 13 and 14 St., under the auspices of Unser Kampf Workers Club, at 8 p. m.

On Sunday, March 5 at 2:15 p. m., a debate will be held between the Left Opposition and the Industrial Union League on the subject, "Can the program and tactics of the Communist League of America bring about working class emancipation in the United States?" George Clarke will speak for the affirmative and Adolph Silver the negative. The debate will take place at the Burnside Manor, Burnside and Harrison Aves., Bronx.

## Roosevelt Regime Reopens Question of Soviet Recognition and Credits

(Continued from Page 1)

"Socialism in one country" have parties outside of Russia to that of a watchman, whose purpose is to help ward off foreign intervention and particularly war. The economic relations of the Soviet Union with the capitalist world have been kept outside of the domain of revolutionary strategy. On the contrary, Stalinism has attempted to reassure world capitalism (note the Stalin interview with Campbell) that its foreign trade is "strictly business".

The Stalinists have assumed that capitalist economy would be both willing and able to absorb the exportable surpluses of the Soviet Union without such declines in prices as would upset the import program which is an essential part of the Five-Year Plan.

This assumption has been knocked to pieces by living experience. England after the Conservative victory renounced the trade treaty with Soviet Russia some months ago; Germany has imposed a quota on its imports from the Soviet Union; political as well as "strictly business" factors entered into these steps. In any case, the crisis makes it advantageous for capitalism to restrict all its operations, including foreign trade.

But the immediate as well as the ultimate interests of the working class call for a different line of action. The revolutionary answer is to rally the working masses around the struggle for economic collaboration with the Soviet Union. It provides more jobs; it strengthens the workers' state; it brings to their feet masses of workers who are not Communists but who sympathize with the Soviet Union; it tends to break down the isolation of the Soviet state from the workers of the capitalist countries; and it leads over, in a certain stage of maturity of the revolutionary development of the struggle, into the demand for workers' control of production.

It is admittedly impossible, by mass pressure, to force private interests in a capitalist state to buy and sell where it is not profitable for them to do so under given conditions. But these conditions themselves depend upon state laws in a large measure—tariffs, tariffs, credits, guarantees, restrictions on imports, etc. The influence of the masses on state laws in such matters may be powerful. In a struggle on such issues, which concern also matters like the cost of living, the proletariat can even sweep along behind it masses of the petty bourgeoisie.

### Trading with Soviets and Workers' Control

The question of a more systematic influence of the masses on the external commerce of a capitalist state is intimately bound up with the question of workers' control of production. Beginning with questions of wages and profit, the control of production expands over all the other functions of the enterprise, then of the group of enterprise, over whole branches of industry and the entire national economy.

Workers' control of production would compel capitalism to collaborate in the work of economic construction in the Soviet Union beyond the limits which are set by the possibilities of profit, particularly under the present conditions

### Japan and U.S.S.R.

(Continued from Page 1)

"in general" and "in principle" with the League's position, he will permit America to be pushed into war at this time. London will not reap the harvest if Washington can help it.

London again reveals her backing of Japan by declaring an arms embargo, whose patent fraud is recognized in the bourgeois press here and abroad. Present contracts are inviolable. And pray for how many years do the contracts run? How much has been allotted to Japan by Vickers-Armstrong? In the debate on the embargo that inimitable pool-bah, Lansbury, reveals the inner hollowness of the social democracy. He states that it is impossible to exclude the possibility of war between Japan and Russia. But, he adds, it is not true that Japan is holding back the forces of Communism. No, says Lansbury, do not give Japan credit for that. The credit should doubtless go to the insipid Lansburys and the social democratic betrayers, Lansbury expresses faith that the U. S. will "act right". Indeed she will! One hundred percent "right", for American imperialism.

The attitude of Soviet Russia on the present situation is still being awaited, not only by the bourgeoisie but by the Communists of the world. Russian diplomacy under the blind, opportunist "guidance" of Litvinov, has tasted all the fruits of that shriveled tree, socialism in one country. Again and again, the lasting interests of the world proletariat have been sacrificed to the desire for immediate "benefits" for the Soviet Union. Russian diplomacy is again placed in the dilemma of deciding which road to follow. If the Soviets were to denounce the entire fraud being perpetrated by the League of Nations, the Russian "diplomats" feel that the chances for recognition by America will be jeopardized. If the Soviet Union agrees to "cooperate" with the League, then in the immediate situation, Russia again renounces her leadership of the proletariat. Can we hope for any change of policy? Or will we witness a new compromise?

—JACK WEBER.

of world crisis. Carried beyond a certain point, this struggle could raise the whole question of state power, put the world revolution again on the order of the day, and transform the whole question of economic collaboration between Soviet Russia and one or more countries which are now capitalist, into the question of the creation of an international planning board.

In Germany the political prerequisites for such a situation have reached a higher stage of development than in any other country; if the working class can develop the power and cohesion needed to defeat Hitler, it will be in a position to present and press forward its own demands, political and economic, in which the demand for workers' control of production, intimately linked up with the demand for economic collaboration with the Soviet Union, unlimited by consideration for the profits of this or that group of capitalists or of capitalism as a whole, would develop all its revolutionary logic.

### Credits for the Soviet Union and American Working-Class Demand

In the United States, development of the workers' forces and of the revolutionary situation has not gone so far as in Germany. On the other hand, American imperialism has a powerful financial basis while that of German imperialism is weak.

The approach to economic collaboration with the Soviet Union in this country might well be through the question of credits. In many European countries (Germany, England, Italy, Holland, etc.) export credits to the Soviet Union are guaranteed to the amount of 60-80 percent by the government. This greatly reduces the cost of credit, and consequently the cost of imports, to the Soviet Union. Certainly the very least that the American working class has a right to demand is that the American bourgeois government go as far as the bourgeois governments of Europe in supporting exports to the Soviet Union by a guarantee of a large part of the exporters' credits.

But the interests of the American worker and of the Soviet Union demand that the American government go further. It must extend substantial credits to the Soviet Union, instead of having Soviet imports limited by the extent to which individual American capitalists are willing to do business with the Soviets.

The main reliance for the financing of Soviet imports in the past has been placed on its export trade. It has had access to but little credit, and that only at exorbitant rates, about 30 to 40 percent a year. The average increase from year to year in the Soviet's outstanding credits has been only 10 percent of its best year's exports. Obviously this is only a slight reinforcement to the buying power of the Soviet Union, and consequently to its construction program. Recently there has been some talk about the Soviet Union floating a ten-year loan in the United States, but the figure mentioned was about 40 million roubles, a drop in the bucket.

The financial blockade of the Soviet Union continues to be effective, in spite of the high interest rates which it offers. The Stalinist policy, of relying on the "strictly business" self-interest of capitalism to serve as the basis of economic collaboration which is indispensable to the work of economic construction in Soviet Russia, has been an utter failure.

### Credits for the Soviet Union as a Political Question

The energy of the international Communist party, the sympathies of the masses, even the direct interest of the petty bourgeoisie, must be mobilized in a political manner in the various capitalist countries for the benefit of the Soviet Union. This involves a break with the theory and practice of "socialism in one country"—but it has the little advantage that it directly ties up the immediate needs of the broadest masses in capitalist countries with the problem of economic construction in the Soviet Union, in spite of the capitalist denial by Stalinism that the building-up of Socialism in Russia has any connection with the workers' movement elsewhere.

In America, where the whole question of recognition is to be raised shortly, the working class and particularly the Communist party as its spearhead must put forth its demands for the extension of adequate credits to the Soviet Union.

The demand of credits for the Soviet Union can, no doubt, be considered as an isolated practical slogan. Such a way of posing the question would have a reformist character, and as such would not give serious practical results; for the international economic operations of capitalism are determined by considerations of profit, and the political interests of the capitalist class, not by the "pressure" of the working class.

The slogan of economic collaboration with the Soviet Union, credits, recognition, etc., must be introduced into a system of transitional slogans of the struggling proletariat. The slogan of economic collaboration with the Soviet Union, credits, recognition, etc., must be introduced into a system of transitional slogans of the struggling proletariat. The slogan of economic collaboration with the Soviet Union, credits, recognition, etc., must be introduced into a system of transitional slogans of the struggling proletariat. The slogan of economic collaboration with the Soviet Union, credits, recognition, etc., must be introduced into a system of transitional slogans of the struggling proletariat.

But the main achievement would be the fact that the workers would be concretely and practically confronted with the problems of planned economy—that is, the problems of socialism.

—B. J. FELD.

## THE MILITANT

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

Published three times a week by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th Street, New York.

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Martha Aberr James P. Cannon  
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector  
Arne Swabeck

Friday, March 3, 1933

Vol. VI, No. 15 (Whole No. 162)

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year, Foreign \$2.50. One cent a copy.

### OFF THE PRESS!

Two New Pamphlets By

LEON TROTSKY

Soviet Economy

In Danger

72 Pages

3 for twenty-five cents

In Defense of the

Russian Revolution

48 Pages

5 cents

Postage 1c extra per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th Street, New York