

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 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879  
VOLUME VI, NO. 16 [WHOLE NO. 163] NEW YORK, MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1933 PRICE 1 CENT

## National Banking Crisis Fascist Elections Show Stalinist Bankruptcy

STAGE IN GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM IN THIS  
COUNTRY THROWS BOURGEOISIE INTO PANIC; ITS  
'WAY OUT' TO BE SOUGHT ON BACKS OF WORKERS

The present cyclical crisis began in 1929 with a financial crisis, in the form of a crash on the stock market; now, after nearly 3 1/2 years, it is marked by a nationwide banking crisis. What does this mean? Is it what the Stalinists call "the end of the stabilization of capitalism" or the terrified bourgeois still more simply call "the end of the world?"

Crisis, as we know, are not accidents under capitalism, but an intrinsic part of the mechanism; they have a definite role, which Marx has described as follows, "Crisis are only violent and temporary solutions of existing contradictions, violent eruptions which reestablish for a time the equilibrium which has been destroyed."

These contradictions involve the overproduction of goods in the face of the poverty and underconsumption of the masses; the creation of artificial and exaggerated symbols of value through the expansion of credit and stock speculation, and a sharp rise in money rates and commodity prices, all constituting what we call inflation, or a contradiction between real values and the paper representatives of such values.

The role of the crisis is to get rid of overproduction by forcing the capitalist to reduce his production, to get rid of inflation by forcing down prices, money rates and outstanding credit. Ultimately it creates a situation in which prices are low, money rates are low, capital is abundant, the "growths and swellings" as Trotsky calls them, such as insul and Kreuger, are removed, and the pre-conditions are created for a turn in the crisis into a depression, and ultimately perhaps even into a period of stabilization or a boom.

## Crisis and the Class Struggle

But the crisis is also an arena of the class struggle, and not only economic but also certain social and political conditions are required for the ending of a crisis period, and the preparation of a period of stabilization. If the working class, well organized through its own party, puts itself at the head of the masses, and resists all the measures by which the bourgeoisie attempts to throw the burden of the crisis off to other classes; if it is able to put up effective and generalized resistance to wage cuts, to force demands for unemployment insurance at the expense of the capitalists, to compel the governments to tax the rich instead of the masses, and its other immediate demands in time of crisis, the capitalist will be a long time in restoring the margin of profit in his production on which the restoration of business activity and with it, the turn in the crisis, depend.

These struggles are in their most important aspects non-parliamentary they tend to mobilize the masses for broader aims, and as the crisis becomes deeper and sharper, they may easily take on a highly political and revolutionary character. The German crisis of 1929-32, based on the steady inflation of the mark, culminated in the revolutionary crisis of October 1923, followed by an abortive Nazi putsch a month later. When the bourgeois German state had proven its ability to stave off the revolution even without the aid of the Nazis, it was able to invite the Dawes committee to discuss currency reform, and begin its way out of the crisis.

At the present moment in the United States, whether or not the turn in the crisis has already arrived, unquestionably most of the work of the crisis is violently and brutally solving, for the moment, the contradictions developed during the boom, has been accomplished. Commodity prices are low, many enterprises have gone out of business, capital has been rendered more liquid, money rates are low, production is down to 50% of "normal".

The violent crisis in the banking field has not therefore the character of the prelude to a period of deflation and liquidation; that period is largely or entirely behind us. Has it the character of the beginning of a final collapse of capitalism?

## No Automatic Collapse of Capitalism

That seems most unlikely. It would mean that capitalism could be finally defeated on one sector of the economic front alone, and by the automatic working of the market, at that. The forces of the working class, poorly organized, divided and without the class leadership of a determined and clear-sighted Communist party, have had

many more defeats than victories in the class struggle under crisis conditions—not only in strikes against wage cuts, in the question of adequate unemployment relief and insurance, but politically they have not been able to mobilize the masses against the bourgeoisie. There is no use in recapitulating the chapter of defeats and mistakes; we have pointed out the responsibility of the Communist party as the record has developed, its failure to assemble the proletariat around its banner and assume the leadership of the broadest masses.

This failure constitutes the political pre-condition for the capitalist solution of the present crisis, internationally as well as on the national scale. With a correct line of policy executed in a Bolshevik manner, Hitler would stand every chance of being defeated, and one of the weakest links in the capitalist chain might be definitely broken; the masses in other capitalist countries might be torn away from bourgeois and petty bourgeois influence and mobilized behind the Communist party, and capitalism find ever-increasing difficulty in

(Continued on Page 2)

## Limestone Group and the Opposition

## A Political Swindle Exposed

The current issue of the Workers Age, organ of the Lovestone Right wing, contains the following attack upon the Opposition which we quote in full:

"But the most pitiful figure is out by the Trotskyites. They, who not so long ago (Militant, July 25, 1931) insisted that it is 'absurd' to think that the imperialists will welcome a Fascist dictatorship in Germany', who sagely informed us that 'on the contrary, they (the imperialists) have every reason to reinforce and support the social democracy and parliamentary forms', who were so sure (in 1931) that 'it has never yet been demonstrated that Fascism can have a stable endurance in such a highly industrialized country as Germany', these people, who later (Militant, Nov. 12, 1932) saw the 'Nazi social reservoir of voting strength well nigh exhausted' so that the Hitlerites 'must strive to fulfill their aims by violent seizure of power', these people who branded as 'opportunism' the first calls of the Communist Opposition for a united anti-Fascist front, these people who even today (Militant, Feb. 24, 1933) regard Hitler as the 'savior' for Hugenburg, who can hopefully assert that 'the chief instruments of power are not in Hitler's hands', who echo the official Communist party that 'the social democracy is the most important prop of bourgeois domination', under all circumstances all the time, these same people now have the audacity to declare (Militant, Feb. 4, 1933) that 'the Left Opposition was the first to sound the alarm signal that Fascism was threatened (?) that it had to be met by a united front of all workers organizations!' Is this merely shabby self-deception or is it outright political swindling?"

Not bad, what? More exactly, it might be bad if it were all true. But when the Lovestone press "quotes" the Left Opposition, the very first thing to do is to take it for granted that it is deliberately misquoting us, distorting our point of view, or resorting to slight forgery. The present instance is a case in point. Let us examine from the files of the Militant the sections presumably quoted by Lovestone, so that one may judge who is engaged in "outright political swindling."

It was in what the Militant of July 25, 1931 really said: "At the present time, the main prop of capitalism in Germany is the social democracy functioning through 'democratic' forms. Its strength derives from the illusions of millions of workers in the democratic deceptions. It is absurd to think that the imperialists will discard this mighty bulwark against revolution as long as it serves its purpose. Only when the majority of the workers turn away from the social democracy to the Communists will the capitalists turn to the last resort—naked force expressed through Fascism. A Fascist dictatorship, by its ruthless abolition of democratic forms, would thereby turn away millions of workers from

in an atmosphere of unprecedented terrorism, intimidation and the suppression of Communist, socialist and even Centrist publications and meetings, the German Nazis have gained a distinct election victory which, together with the vote rolled up by the Hugenburg Nationalists, gives them a parliamentary majority in a Reichstag which has now lost particularly all importance.

The election victory of the Hitler-Hugenburg regime is due almost exclusively to the rise in the Nazi vote, which not only exceeded the vote in November 1932, but even passed beyond the number they had at their apex, in July 1932. Forty-four percent of the voting population cast its ballot for Hitler. In Catholic Bavaria, the Nazis made a huge sweep, ousting the Centrist party from control—an accomplishment which they all but attained in the Catholic capital of Germany, Cologne.

The figures thus far available are not yet complete as we go to press, but they are more than adequate for a summary of the results. The usual stay-at-home vote was apparently thought out by the millions in the largest vote yet cast in Germany, and it is mainly from this source that the increase in the Hitlerite vote was obtained. The Catholic Center appears to have

held its own, but with the shifts in other parties, and with the increased vote cast, it is no longer in a position to affect the parliamentary situation as a balance of power—a situation it has enjoyed for years. The Social Democratic Party did a little better than hold its own. The Communist vote, however, was drastically reduced by some twenty percent, to a total of less than 5,000,000, losing heavily in Berlin where the Nazis, and not the Communists, are now the largest party, with 1,000,000 votes as compared with 720,000 votes last November.

National Socialists	288	196
Social Democrats	125	123
Communists	81	100
Centrists	73	69
Bavarians	19	19
Nationalists	52	51
Scattered	9	24
	647	582

The Hitler regime—based on the Nazi-Nationalist coalition—thus has an absolute parliamentary majority with which to operate "legally" in the carrying out of its murderous policy of exterminating the organizations and institutions of the working class. More than that: the Nazi threat that the Communist deputation in the Reichstag will not be seated is constantly kept in reserve. If the Com-

munist party is outlawed, or if its representatives are excluded from the Reichstag, the Nazis would then have an absolute majority on the parliamentary plane even without the support of their present Nationalist colleagues in the cabinet! The uneasiness of the Hugenburg camarilla at the prospect of the Communists being unseated, is one of those paradoxes of politics which is quite comprehensible in the present circumstances.

But the parliamentary field is the least decisive of all in the present German situation. The just concluded election was purely and simply a plebiscite, the present Reichstag is a plebiscitary Reichstag, and the Hitler regime a plebiscitary regime. The principal opposition parties, from the Communists through the social democrats as far to the Right as the Catholic Center, were bound and gagged for weeks before the election took place. Not a single Communist publication appeared for days before the votes were cast. The two solitary social democratic papers allowed to appear before the elections in Thuringia, were compelled to reproduce Hitler's attack on the "Marxists" in their columns. Several Catholic periodicals were confiscated or suspended. No meetings of the social democrats or the Communists were permitted.

The election posters of both these parties were ripped off the billboards. The possibilities for election propaganda and agitation by these two parties were reduced to a tiny minimum.

In spite of the terrorism of the Fascists, the Communists managed to retain some eighty percent of their previous votes, and the social democrats even increased their halting strength. But there is little consolation in this for the Communist party. As soon as the March 5, 1933 elections were announced, the Militant proclaimed them to be a Fascist trap, designed to concentrate the attention of the working class exclusively on the parliamentary field and to distract them from mobilizing their efforts for the extra-parliamentary struggle—the only kind of struggle which can effectively deal with the now overwhelming threat of Fascism. The outcome of the elections bear out this contention. The elections settled nothing fundamental, nor could they have settled anything. At most, the voting gave the Fascists a convenient "parliamentary basis" for destroying "democratic parliamentarism".

But the elections nevertheless have a considerable symptomatic significance. The increase in the Fascist vote came predominantly from the petty bourgeois and con-

servative elements of the population. Their vote for Hitler was essentially an expression of their fear of a bloody civil war with its attendant convulsions. By giving Hitler a "parliamentary majority", they hoped to avoid the costs of a civil war. Only, it cannot and will not be averted.

Of even greater significance, is the vote cast for the Communist and social democratic parties. The Communist vote declined, and the importance of this fact, even though it is far from decisive, cannot be ignored. The social democratic masses continued to give their support to the social democratic party. By this act, they gave a decisive reply to the empty boasts of the Stalinists that their policy was succeeding in breaking the socialist masses away from their leadership. And precisely herein lies the most significant aspect of the March elections!

It was claimed that the "united front from below" was winning the socialist masses to the Communist party. The Left Opposition replied that the socialist masses will be won over to a militant united front when the Communist party makes an open and sincere offer to their organizations, when it sits down with the leadership of the social democratic party and the trade unions to discuss a concrete program of action against the menace of Fascism. The elections are one of the numerous proofs that the "united front from below" has not only not succeeded in breaking the allegiance of the socialist masses to their organizations and leaders, but that it has served the Wells-Stamper-Hilferding crew perfectly.

The results of the elections which are not, we repeat, of decisive importance, but are highly symptomatic, must give every Communist worker food for thought. It is essential, that the course of the party be steered now towards the Leninist united front. The Fascist triumph in the elections will only result in greater arrogance, more brutal measures against the proletariat and its movement, more violent suppressions and attacks. There is but one way to meet this attack—the mobilization of the German working class in a united front. There is only one way in which to establish the united front at the present time—the appeal from organization to organization.

In its appeal, just published in the socialist New Leader, the Bureau of the Labor and Socialist International (Second International) has declared: "The Labor and Socialist International has always been ready to negotiate with the Communist International with a view to common action as soon as this body is also ready." Our opinion of the desire for "action" of the Socialist bureaucracy, is quite well known; so is their own treacherous record which has paved the road to the triumph of Hitler. But it is precisely with such statements as the one quoted that the statesmen of the Second International retain their hold upon the socialist workers. The Communist International, which should have been the one to initiate such a movement, must pick up the challenge, must break its criminal silence, and declare:

The Communist International is prepared to negotiate with the Second International for the elaboration of a concrete program of action against Fascism. The German Communist Party is prepared to sit down for a joint discussion of the problem with the Executive Committee of the German social democracy and its party. We can under no circumstances agree to the social democratic party's proposal for a "non-aggression pact" where we are supposed to refrain from criticism and an independent policy; such an agreement would be capitulation and treachery to the revolution. But we will enter into a united front on a minimum program of action, with each organization to retain its independence, its freedom of policy and criticism. We enter into it not out of love for the social democratic leaders, not with any illusions about them, but because of the burning need of the hour is the united working class front to smash Fascism.

The Communist International, together with the German Communist Party, must take this step. If they fail to act in this manner, they will bear their share of the direct responsibility for the murderous bloodbath and catastrophe which the Fascist bands are preparing for the German proletariat.

—M. S.

Oppositionists  
Attacked

Last Friday night at Pitkin and Rockaway Avenue, members of the Left Opposition were again treated to a wholesale exposure of Stalinism in action. For the third or fourth time in a year, the aspiring bureaucrats of the American Youth Club saw fit to stir up hysteria for a physical attack on us. Though outnumbered at least two to one, our comrades halted this "hard guy" display that has taken the place of Leninist education. After this failure, we were invited to participate in putting back the furniture of an unemployed worker in a house at which a rent strike was going on! We accepted and the ironic picture was afforded to all the workers present—who had not been engaged in the melee—of the common bond of unity between us despite slander and despite terrorism. However, after we had arrived at the house (the furniture we were then told was in the cellar), waiting for some of the cops to clear out, a functionary arrived who saw fit to suspend operations. ("Trotskyists cannot fraternize, and they have no right to move furniture with us—they are Left social Fascists"). We said we were always ready to cooperate with the unemployed councils and had done so in the past. It could be seen that many of them changed their attitude toward us. We invited them down to the Sunday meeting and the proof of the beginning of their education was that they came.

—R.

Chinese Bourgeoisie Is Impotent  
Before Advancing Japanese Armies

The democratic phase of the Chinese revolution included as its major task the ousting of the foreign imperialists and the national unification of China. This task could only have been accomplished with the aid of the wide masses of workers and peasants. The revolution swept towards the goal of its first phase only as long as the Chinese masses were drawn irresistibly and on an ever grander scale into the movement for liberation. It was inevitable, however, that the oppressed classes, on whom rested the actual burden of carrying on the armed struggle, under the ferment of revolutionary activity, should come into conflict not only with the foreign oppressors but with their own native exploiters. This phase of the Chinese revolution did not wait upon the successful achievement of the program of unification common to all classes, bourgeois, worker and peasant, participating in the first stage. The irrepressible class struggle broke out before the imperialists had been swept into the sea and in the conflict that followed the vanguard of the working class, the Communists, on whom depended the continuation of the revolution, was all but exterminated.

## Failure to Unify China

The Chinese bourgeoisie preferred far rather the continued stranglehold of China by the imperialist powers, so long as they were permitted to continue their own exploitation, than their own overthrow and their disappearance as a class through the dictatorship of the proletariat. But with the bloody suppression of the revolutionary workers and peasants, the native bourgeoisie, with the willing assistance of foreign imperialism, became the spear-head of counter-revolution in China. The revolution ebbed and the aim of unification failed of accomplishment because the masses did not succeed in marching forward, under the leadership of the Communists, beyond the narrower first aim of the revolution, to the conquest of power under working class dictatorship. Thus the Chinese revolution is a negative example (one hesitates to call it a "living" example) of the theory of the permanent revolution.

The lessons of the second phase of the Revolution remain as its aiding memory in the minds of the present bourgeois rulers of China. If today they are completely impotent in the defense of China against Japanese imperialism, it is because they fear above everything else to arouse the masses and arm them for a real struggle. For that would mean the resurrection of the Revolution which, they clearly see, could only result in their own downfall ultimately. Chiang Kai-Shek, instead of sending a single soldier to Jehol for the defense of China against imperialist invasion, continues to battle with the peasant Soviets in his effort to establish his hegemony, if only in a few provinces. T. V. Soong, reactionary banker—the richest man in China—can only say at this juncture that the Japanese aggression is a good thing, for "in the long run" it will result in the "real" unification of China. Meantime he impotently offers, not any attempt at effective resistance, but the lives of one hundred million Chinamen to the Japs. These Chinamen "will know how to die". All the mercenary, thieving bandits, rulers and bourgeois compradors are sending their wealth, that ill-gotten wealth coined out of the blood of the Chinese masses, out of the country and are "disappearing" themselves. "Governor" Tang Yu-lin of Jehol, that great opium druggist of China, carefully evacuated his gold and his wives and has now left Jehol himself for destinations unknown.

## The Japanese Continue Advance

Thus the Japanese conquer with almost no resistance because China under the rule of the Chiang Kai-Sheks has failed to unify and has failed to build up its industries rapidly enough to supply a modern army. Having met no real obstacles, the Japanese will continue to seize more and more Chinese territory. The press repeats statements that the Japanese have demanded the withdrawal of Chinese troops from Tientsin, the next objective of the invasion.

—J. WEBER.

## Newark Meeting

at the Hungarian Workers Home  
87-16th Ave.,  
Newark, N. J.

Saturday Evening, March 11th,  
8 P. M.

THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT  
AND FASCISM

Speaker:  
JAMES P. CANNON  
EVERYBODY WELCOME!  
Communist League of America  
(Opposition) Newark branch

Speakers:

JAMES P. CANNON  
MAX SHACHTMAN  
MARTIN ABERN, Chairman

## LABOR TEMPLE

FRIDAY, MARCH 10th, 8 P. M.  
14th Street and Second Avenue  
LARGE HALL  
ADMISSION 15 CENTS

MANHATTAN  
MASS MEETING

## After the German Elections- What Now?

Auspices: Communist League of America (Opposition)



## LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

### Stalinists Sabotage United Front

St. Louis.—The Unity Conference held in St. Louis by the Unemployed Councils unanimously passed the demand of the Left Opposition for a standing committee of each organization to compose a United Front. Unemployed Conference Committee. And from this committee trade union and organizational committees were to be elected to work for the Permanent United Front movement and the calling of the second conference.

The bureaucrats did not dare to come before the workers with any opposition to this. The committee was supposed to hold its first meeting at the Labor Lyceum on Tuesday, Feb. 21st. The Opposition and its auxiliary organizations sent three delegates to this meeting. The opportunities for sabotaging the committee were made up for at the Labor Lyceum. As soon as the Left Opposition showed up the bureaucrats hanging around the lobby became nervous and there was much running to and fro and much whispering. Our efforts, to find out in what room in the three-story building of the Labor Lyceum the Committee was to meet, were in vain. We were finally led into a room on the second floor where we sat twiddling our thumbs for about a half an hour when we were informed that this was an S. L. P. section meeting and asked what our business was there.

With the exception of the delegates of the Left Opposition and two delegates from the Socialist party no one else showed up. The last named delegates however, did not suffer the same fate as those of the Left Oppositionists outlined in the preceding paragraph. It is significant that the only one of the Stalinist organizations represented was the Unemployed Councils whose delegate was Stone. Comrade Goldberg, who came late and by the merest chance stumbled into the committee meeting, informed us of this fact and also that not only was no regular meeting held but no definite date was set for the next meeting of the committee.

In the course of our search of the committee meeting we found guards downstairs in front of the auditorium where an "open" meeting of the Unemployed Council was in session. Thinking that we desired to enter these faithful keepers of the gate informed us that it was a private meeting and no one would be allowed to go in. With this we took our departure.

—G. ROBERTS.

### Two Unemployment Conferences

Philadelphia. Last week saw two "United Front" conferences in Philadelphia on unemployment. One was sponsored by the Communist Unemployed Councils; the other by the Socialists. To both the local branches of the C. L. A. (O.) sent delegates, to present our program and to participate in the work. At the Left wing conference our delegation was seated. At the socialist conference they were, in common with all other radical organizations, not even admitted to the hall.

Last Sunday, February 19, the Unemployed Council's "Conference Against the State Commissionary Relief Plan meeting, 260 delegates representing about 150 organizations, and many visitors enthusiastically greeted the first marked turn in Phila. of the Official C. P. organizations toward a broader united front. The week previously the Socialist party was forced by the calling of this conference, to send out their own call for a separate conference in conjunction with their Unemployed Citizens' League organization and the Hosiery Workers (A F of L) Union which they dominate. The U. C. provisional committee, over the signature of comrade E. Bender, copied with it, in the form of an open letter addressed, to and below, not to the rank and file below, but to the organizer of the S. P. conference, Franz Daniels.

The various reporters and speakers at the conference recognized correctly enough the splitting tactic of the local socialists, but there they stopped. The united front did not extend to an offer of joint work.

Comrade Lecomte presented our resolution on program and tactics before the conference body; urged the necessity of offers of common action with the Socialists on the immediate demands outlined by us—as a true method to either force the hand of Daniels, etc. or to further expose their claim to any desire for united action. He offered the full cooperation of the League in the furtherance of the work of the conference.

What the conference lacked was a broader representation of each working class and a broad and

far reaching enough program to cope with the unemployment problem. It narrowed its aims down to the State Hunger March and Demonstration. No organizational report was discussed by the delegates. Our resolution was unreported by the committee and comrade Roberts had to force the issue from the floor. The bureaucratic steering committee was able to prevent it from being taken to a vote.

The final action that the conference took is indeed significant. The S. P. conference was called to meet the following Saturday. In New York you recall, party leaders attacked our comrade's proposal to send delegates to a similar meeting, because we would increase the prestige of the fakers. But now! the meeting decided (1) to elect an official committee of ten and have it represent this conference, to the socialist conference on Saturday. And (2) urged; nay insisted, that all delegates present be delegated by their organizations to the Socialist confab to fight for the adoption of the program of this conference.

That the party leadership, just breaking out of their long third period stage had no intention of a real Leninist United Front and prepare to jointly work and fight for their program to the extent of offering proportional representation is I think undeniable. But what a vindication of our propaganda! That many of those present recognized it cannot be doubted. The conference accepted our delegate Roberts as one of its committee of ten. After the meeting individual Party comrades speaking to us said, "Well, you got your kind of a United Front at last; I think it's o. k."

The Socialist "Conference on Unemployment" (Saturday, Feb. 25), resembled even in many of its details what the reports bring us of the similar conference of the S. P. in New York City. Almost none of the Left wing-Red organizations received or could get the official invitation and so they made out credentials of their own. Lacking the official o. k. of the Socialist party organizer, Daniels, a "Militant", they were refused admittance. Even organizations which had obtained the official paper, but being radical were rejected. We were all "illegitimate organizations."

I am told the Yipsels had a difficult time to get in! Comrade Kornfeld who came representing the Hosiery Workers' Union, and a few others who did get in, demanded our admittance to no avail. The upshot of the whole affair was this—Inside the S. P. together with the IWW made a united front to keep the Communists out of their united front. Outside, in the ante-room milled about the party organization delegates and ourselves; enough of them by far to swamp the socialist conference if admitted. No wonder the S. P. fakers who called their meeting only after the Communists called one were in fear of being "captured."

What shall we do—the resolution we had—calling for joint sessions was not admitted. The task remains, to prove our sincerity for united action of the working class against hunger—our willingness to show our program in action—for approval of the working class; to propose this must be done by the Executive Committee of our Conference—a joint meeting of both committees and the calling of a conference with proportional representation. This will remove the rejoinder of the fakers that the Communists want to capture them. It will give us a mass to appeal to which from the outside we can't meet. It can well start in Philadelphia and in the State a broad united front knitting together the employed and the unemployed, the organized and the unorganized in a common struggle for the needs today, of the workers. In such a united front of action our program will demand its adoption and prove its correctness.

—L. G.

### I.L.D. Expels St. Louis Oppositionist

St. Louis.—Although the Beezy branch of the I.L.D. has an average attendance of about ten, the last meeting was filled to overflowing with the tense and heated faces of the South Side branch of the Communist party—not five of whom carry membership cards in the I.L.D.

The first order on the agenda was the report of the I.L.D. delegates to the Unity Conference. In his report Payer outlined the general program adopted by the United Front Unemployed Conference. This included demands of immediate relief, unemployment insurance, six-hour day and Long Term credits to the Soviet Union; the formation of a permanent U. F. U. C. consisting of one delegate from each organization to carry out the fol-

lowing activities; arrange March 4th joint demonstration for immediate relief; send speakers to all working class organization in the city asking for a speaker from each tendency; issue 20,000 popular leaflets explaining the aims of the U. F. U. C. program; make arrangements for the calling of a second conference; organize a trade union committee to concentrate on getting union support. Payer pointed out that the entire program adopted was our "Trotskyist" program. This is the very same program which we had been urging the C. P. to adopt and for which we had been called "counter-revolutionists."

He also report upon the sabotaging of the conference work by the central committee of the Unemployed Councils—by the failure to hold the agreed upon Tuesday (Feb. 21) committee meeting.

Payer introduced the motion that "the Beezy branch, I. L. D. re-quests the C. C. of the Unemployed Councils to carry out the decisions of the united front unemployed conference by immediately calling the proposed meeting of the U. F. U. C. committee consisting of one delegate from each organization represented at the conference." The vote was 4 affirmative and 20 negative, three abstained—all the Stalinists naturally voted against.

Then a Stalinist motion—"To accept the report of all delegates to the conference with the exception of Payer's." On the question (by Casano) as to what was wrong with Payer's report none of the Stalinists could give a reason. However they replied by voting—22 affirmative, 5 negative.

Then another Stalinist motion "to get down to business" to expel Payer from the branch because of being a "disrupter." In the discussion that followed Payer endeavored to show that it was the Stalinists who were "disrupting" the organization and not he. I.L.D. pointed out his record in the I.L.D. branch since organized; showed how all committees, all delegations to which he was elected were sabotaged by the higher S. E. C. Due to interruptions from the Stalinists he was not allowed to continue. "He spoke too long already" was the substance of what about a dozen Stalinists were saying at the same time. The vote was 19 affirmative, 5 negative with three abstentions.

Payer was then ordered to leave the hall. After Payer left, one of the newer Stalinists, Horrur, thinking to further expose "Trotskyism" made a motion for an open discussion on the "Trotskyists" with speakers from both sides. Pandemonium broke loose. The Stalinists themselves split on the question. The voting was 10 negative and 8 affirmative with 8 abstaining. The motion lost, but only by a small margin.

At the very same time Payer was being expelled at the South Side I. L. D. the following motion was made and vigorously defended on the floor at the North Side Mooney branch of the I.L.D. by George Roberts and Harry Goldberg. The Mooney branch protests to the National Committee, I. L. D., against the expulsions of workers from I.L.D. branches because of their political affiliations. In particular, members of the Communist League of America (Opposition) called "Trotskyists". We demand their immediate reinstatement in order to maintain the I.L.D. as a broad defense organization of all workers". The motion was lost but also by a narrow margin; 7 negative, 5 affirmative with 7 abstentions.

## International Pre-Conference of the Left Opposition Presents Thesis

(We begin today with the publication of the most important of the theses adopted at the international Pre-Conference of the International Left Opposition which concluded its sessions last month in Paris. Representatives were sent from the Russian, Greek, Swiss, American and other sections of the Opposition. The theses which we reprint here is now up for discussion in the membership of the Opposition, for final adoption at the regular international conference which is planned for convocation later in the year.—Ed.)

The task of the coming Conference of the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists) consists of accepting a clear and precisely-formulated platform and organizational statutes, as well as of selecting the leading bodies. The preceding theoretical, political and organizational work of the Left Opposition in various countries, especially in the last four years, has created sufficiently prerequisites for the solution of this task.

The fundamental programmatic and political documents of the Left Opposition are issued in no less than 15 languages. The Left Opposition disposes of 32 periodical publications in 16 countries. It has reorganized and strengthened its sections in 9 countries and in the past three years created new sections in 7 countries. But the most important and most valuable achievement is the undeniable raising of the theoretical level of the International Left Opposition, the growth of its ideological solidity and of its revolutionary initiative. The Organ of the Left Opposition in the U. S. S. R.

The Left Opposition arose in 1923, ten years ago, in the land of the October revolution, in the ruling Party of the first workers' state. The delay in the development of the October revolution had necessarily called forth a political reaction in the land of the October

More will be heard from St. Louis later. Already the Stalinist bureaucratic have pointed (publicly) to other members of the L. O. and to sympathizers and stated that they were next. We will naturally fight against the expulsions with all our forces by relentlessly exposing the absolute bankruptcy of the Stalinist bureaucrats—who whose hands the working class defense movement has actually lost in membership (10,000 members in 1929—only 8,500 in 1932!) despite the most favorable objective circumstances.

—MARTIN PAYER.

Communist workers: Why is the Communist International silent about the crisis in Germany? Why is Stalin silent?

## A Political Swindle Exposed

(Continued from Page 1)

obliterated by the collapse of the proletarian movement—as happened in October 1923—the bourgeoisie saves itself the expense of the inevitable ensuing sanguinary conflict, a period of "stabilization" sets in, and the Fascist movement begins to decompose. And with it, the revolutionary proletarian party. From this it does not follow that the Fascist danger to the German proletariat is now eliminated, or even definitively on the decline. Such a conclusion can be drawn only by those for whom the class struggle begins at the ballot box and ends with the parliamentary mandate." (Our emphasis.)

Now, finally, for the Militant, of Feb. 24, 1933, containing the article by comrade Trotsky:

"Hugenberg's government represents the quintessence of social parasitism. But just because of this, when it became necessary, in its pure state, it became impossible. Hugenberg requires a screen. As yet today, he cannot hide behind the mantle of a Kaiser, and he is forced to resort to the brown shirt of the Nazi. If one cannot obtain the sanction of the highest heavenly powers through the monarchy for the property owners, there remains the sanction of the reactionary and unbridled rabble. The investiture of Hitler with power served a twofold purpose: first, to decorate the camarilla of property owners with the leaders of a 'national movement'; and secondly, to place the fighting forces of Fascism at the direct disposal of the proprietors."

Further on in the same article: "When the official Communist party states that the social democracy is the most important prop of bourgeois domination, it repeats only that idea which served as the point of departure for the organization of the Third International. When the bourgeoisie invites it to power, the social democracy casts its vote for the capitalist regime. The social democracy tolerates (suffers) any bourgeois government that tolerates the social democracy. But even when completely discarded from power, the social democracy continues to support bourgeois society, recommending to the workers that they conserve their forces for battles, for which it is prepared never to issue a call. By paralyzing the revolutionary energy of the proletariat, the social democracy provides bourgeois society with an opportunity to remain alive under conditions when it is no longer capable of living, thus turning Fascism into a political necessity."

As for branding the Brandlerist theory and practice of the "united front" opportunist, the Left

## An End to Stalinist Confusion -- For the United Front!

In the Daily Worker of Monday, February 20, Max Bedacht, member of the Central Committee of the Communist party writes: "They, too, (the Left Opposition and others) come with the proposals of united fronts between the Communists and the Social-Democratic parties and accuse the Communist party of splitting the workers because it insists on addressing its call for a united front not to the Noske, the Scheidemanns and the Wels, but to the masses of social democratic workers." (Our emphasis—G. R.)

Thus it is clear, according to Bedacht, that the German Communist Party is opposed to addressing

a united front proposal to the Social Democratic party. It stands for the so-called united front from below. Since such, according to Bedacht, is the position of the German Communist Party perhaps he can explain the following incident reported in the Daily Worker, Feb. 15, 1933. We quote directly from the Inprecor cable to the Daily Worker:

"The Central Committee of the Reichstag met today under the chairmanship of the Socialist Deputy Loebe, whereupon the Fascist deputies repeated their tactics of howling down Loebe and preventing a session of the Committee. He therefore, again declared the session adjourned; whereupon the Fascists pushed him from the chairman's table. The Communists, Socialists and other oppositional members then left the room....

"In the afternoon the members of the oppositional parties met to discuss the situation. The Socialists declared the Constitution had been violated and proposed that protests be made to the Fascist president of the Reichstag, Goering, and to President Hindenburg. The Communists declared such protests were useless, and proposed a new meeting of the Control Committee to be defended by detachments of the Anti-Fascist League and the Reichsbanner." (Our emphasis—G. R., Daily Worker, 2-15-33.)

Therefore, we would like to know, and let Bedacht or any other member of the Central Committee answer:

Making proposals to the leaders of the Social Democratic party, why did they propose common action to the Reichstag leaders of the Social Democratic party to defend the Reichstag Control Committee from the disruptive actions of the Fascists?

Was this proposal in line with the party policy of only the united front from below?

Why are the Stalinists for a parliamentary united front, with the leaders of the Social Democratic party in the Reichstag, which is a united front purely from the top, and opposed to a united front with the Social Democratic party on the basis of a common minimum program of struggle against Fascism, which will draw the masses into action?

If the Stalinists can propose a united front of the Anti-Fascist League (controlled by the Com-

munist party) and the Reichsbanner (controlled by the Social Democratic party) to defend a parliamentary meeting, why not a united front of the Anti-Fascist League and the Reichsbanner, the Communist party, the Social Democratic party, and the trade unions, to defend workers' meetings from the assaults of the murderous Fascists?

Let the Stalinists cease their policy of confusion! A clear-cut policy of the united front tactic of Lenin and Trotsky before it is too late.

—G. R.

### 'Trotsky's Genius Denied'

With this headline, today's World Telegram prints a United Press dispatch from Moscow which reads as follows:

"Leon Trotsky's leadership of the Red Army during the Civil War period is bitterly attacked in a speech delivered by Climent Voroshilov, present commissar of war, made public today. Voroshilov denied the world-wide belief that Trotsky, now in exile, possesses great military genius. He claims that Joseph Stalin really saved the situation of all endangered fronts, and that the Red Army was built up to an imposing strength in spite of Trotsky's inefficiency."

Voroshilov is spitting in the wind. Better men than he have tried in the last ten years to re-write the history of the party and the Red army as it never happened. The "world-wide belief" was not founded on myth and falsification, as is the fable manufactured by Stalin and his clique. To take but one quotation out of hundreds in those days, we cite from Gorky's memoirs of Lenin, written in 1924:

"Yes, I have often heard him (Lenin) praise his comrades. And he knew how to do justice to the energies of even those with whom he was supposed to be personally unsympathetic. Surprised by the flattering appreciation he showed for one of them, I remarked that a good many people might be amazed by it. 'Yes, yes, I know. They tell a lot of lies about my relations with him. Yes, they tell a lot of lies—and especially about me and Trotsky.'"

"Pounding on the table, he declared: 'Show me another man who could organize in a year an almost model army and win the respect of military experts besides. We've got that man. We've got everything. And so we'll do wonders.'"

Comment superfluous!

## Nation-wide Bank Crisis Breaks Out

(Continued from Page 1)

carrying through its own solution of the crisis.

### Party and Crisis

Under such conditions, a banking crisis like the present would have the profoundest social results. It would be part of a general retreat in struggle of a demoralized, organized, well-staffed and victorious army of the proletariat.

As things stand, we cannot assign it any such importance. It becomes one of a series of episodes in the development of the crisis, like the heavy gold withdrawals of September-October 1931 and April-June 1932, which were met by temporary financial manipulations on the one hand, and increas-

ed pressure on the workers and the masses in general on the other. Just what manipulations will be invoked in this particular case is not of great consequence; it may be the issue of Clearing House scrip, or a tax on gold, or an embargo on gold exports, or a guarantee of deposits by the government of a banking pool, etc. That increased exploitation of the masses will be the next step to be attempted is the one thing sure.

The main point is that the bourgeoisie, panicky and demoralized as it is, can and will find its way out of such immediate predicaments as the present banking crisis, on the backs of the proletariat and the working masses, unless the masses are organized for struggle under the leadership of a powerful Communist party. The rearming and development of the Party to a scale commensurate with its tasks is the basic function of the Left Opposition.

—B. J. FIELD.

## 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 18th Street, New York.

EDITORIAL BOARD  
Martin A. Bern James P. Cannon  
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector  
Arne Swabeck

Monday MARCH 6, 1933  
Vol. VI, No. 16 (Whole No 163)  
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year, Foreign \$2.50. One cent a copy.

led at the beginning of this year to a new turn to the Right.

According to the conditions of its privileged situation and its habits of thinking, the Soviet bureaucracy has many features in common with the reformist bureaucracy of capitalist countries. It is far more inclined to trust in the "revolutionary" Kuo Min Tang, the "Left" bureaucracy of the British trade unions, the petty bourgeois "Friends of the Soviet Union", the liberal and radical fascists, than in the independent revolutionary initiative of the proletariat. But, through the necessity of defending its position in the workers' state, the Soviet bureaucracy is forced every time into sharp collisions with the reformist hand-maiden of capital. In this way under unique historical conditions a fraction of bureaucratic Centrism has separated out of proletarian Bolshevism, and has laid a heavy hand on a whole epoch of development of the Soviet Republic and of the world proletariat.

Bureaucratic Centrism is the worst degeneration of the workers' state. But even in its bureaucratically degenerated form, the Soviet Union remains a workers' state. To transform the struggle against the centrism bureaucracy into a struggle against the Soviet state, would be to place oneself on the same level as the Stalinist clique, which declares, "The State—is I". The unserved defense of the Soviet Union against world imperialism is such an elementary task of every revolutionary proletarian that the Left Opposition tolerates in its midst no vacillations or doubts on this question. As before, it will break ruthlessly with all groups and elements which attempt to occupy a "neutral" role between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world (Monatte-Louzon in France, Urbahns group in Germany).

The Left Opposition in Imperialist Countries

The Third International arose as the immediate result of the experience of the advanced workers in the imperialist war, in the epoch of post-war upheavals, and particularly in the October revolution. This determined the leading role of Russian Bolshevism in the Third International, and therefore also

the influence of its internal struggles on the development of the other national sections. Still, it is absolutely false to regard the evolution of the Comintern during the last ten years as a mere reflection of the fractional struggle within the world Communist party. In the development of the international labor movement there were internal reasons of its own which drove the young Communist sections to the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The first post-war years were everywhere, particularly in Europe, a period of expectancy of the near-by overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie. But at the moment when the internal crisis of the Party broke out, most of the European sections had suffered their first great defeats and disappointments. Particularly depressing was the powerless retreat of the German proletariat in October 1933. A new political orientation became an inner necessity for the majority of the Communist parties. When the Soviet bureaucracy, exploiting the disappointment of the Russian workers with respect to the European revolution, set forth the national-reformist theory of Socialism in one country, the young bureaucracy of the other sections breathed a sigh of relief; the new perspective opened before them a road to Socialism independent of the process of the international revolution. In this way the internal reaction within the U. S. S. R. coincided with the reaction in the capitalist countries and created the conditions for a successful administrative punishment of the Left Opposition by the centrism bureaucracy.

But in their further movement to the Right, the official Parties collided with the real Kuo Min Tang, the real bureaucracy of the Trade Unions and of the Social Democracy, just as the Stalinists collided with the real kulaks. The new zig-zag to the side of an ultra-Left policy carried out thereafter led to the split of the official Comintern majority into the ruling Center and the Right oppositionist wing.

In the camp of Communism, therefore, during the past years it has been possible to follow clearly three fundamental groups: the

Marxist wing (Bolshevik-Leninists); the Centrism fraction (Stalinists), and finally the Right, or properly speaking right-centrist wing (Brandlerists), which leads directly into reformism. The political development of almost all countries without exception has confirmed and every new day confirms the correctness of this classification and its living reality.

It was and remains in the highest degree characteristic of centrism that for long periods it went hand in hand with the right as the current most nearly related to it in principle, but never made a bloc with the Bolshevik-Leninists against the Right. As to the Right wing on an international scale, like every form of opportunism it is marked by an extraordinary variety and contradictoriness among its national constituents, while they all have in common hostility to the Bolshevik-Leninists.

In the U. S. S. R., under the conditions of the dictatorship, in the absence of legal opposition parties, the Right Opposition inevitably becomes the tool whereby the class forces which are hostile to the proletariat exert their pressure—therein consists the main danger of the Right Opposition; on the other hand, the consciousness of this danger paralyzes those leaders of the Right Opposition who through their whole past are bound to the Communist party all the shades up with the Party. In capitalist countries, where to the right of reformism can spread themselves, the Right wing (Brandlerists) has no field of activity. Insofar as the Right Opposition has mass organizations, it turns them over directly or indirectly to the social democracy (Czecho-Slovakia, Sweden), except for the revolutionary elements who find their way to the Bolshevik-Leninists (Czecho-Slovakia, Poland). The Brandlerist elements who have remained independent here and there (Germany, U. S. A.) build their calculations on being called back and pardoned sooner or later by the Stalinist bureaucracy; in the name of this perspective they carry on a campaign of lies and slander against the Left Opposition quite in the spirit of Stalinism.

To be continued

### OFF THE PRESS!

Two New Pamphlets By

LEON TROTSKY

Soviet Economy  
In Danger

In Defense of the  
Russian Revolution

72 Pages 10 cents 48 Pages 5 cents  
3 for twenty-five cents Minimum number per order 5

Postage 1c extra per copy  
PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
84 East 10th Street, New York