

WORKERS  
OF THE  
WORLD.  
UNITE

# THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]



Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 22, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME VI, NO. 35 [WHOLE NO. 182]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1933

PRICE 5 CENTS

## Industrial Recovery Act Prepares New Capitalist Crisis in Near Future

The National Industrial Recovery Act, its immediate and its further consequences, occupy the center of the American stage today. What effects does the bourgeoisie want the new policy to have on the standards of living of the American worker, on the reformist and on the revolutionary trade unions, on the concentration of capital, on the relations between capital and the bourgeois state apparatus? The new legislation reaches so deep into the inner machinery of capitalist organization that the workers must be on their guard from the very beginning to resist the new attacks which the sharpening of these new and extraordinary powerful weapons is preparing.

To begin with a rapid survey of the economic background against which the new policy stands out, we may summarize the situation as follows: The first really prolonged symptoms of an upturn began to appear last July, with a speculative boom in securities and in commodities, following on the successful overcoming of a banking crisis in the late Spring. The tentative efforts at spontaneous recovery resulted in relatively small increases in production and trade in the second half of 1932, which failed to hold, but did not return to the lowest levels reached earlier in the year. By the first quarter of this year, some signs of a renewal of the tendency toward improvement were again perceptible, but were cut across by the banking crisis which developed in the second half of February and culminated in a nationwide closing of banks from March 4 to March 15. Within a few weeks after the banks had begun to reopen, the tendencies toward recovery again manifested themselves. From May on, however, they were powerfully accelerated by the increasing evidence that the government was prepared to make large concessions to those sections of the bourgeoisie and of the petty bourgeoisie which were demanding inflation (farmers, export trade, certain sections of industry, etc.). The biggest concession actually made was the embargo on gold shipments, which tore the dollar away from its anchorage to a gold base, and opened the door to speculation in the foreign exchanges. Along with this came the provision that banks could not pay out gold against paper money, which was generally taken as a preparation for inflation.

An enormous wave of speculation, both in the markets and in actual production, was thus added on top of the "natural" or spontaneous forces within capitalist economy making for an upturn. To give one instance, steel production, which had dropped to 11 percent of capacity, picked up by leaps bounds to 54 percent, the highest figure in more than two years. Railroad car loadings, which indicate the physical movement and consequently the production of commodities, increased over 50 percent in a period of three months. Electric power production, which had been 10 percent below 1932 figures in the early weeks of the year,

increased sharply, because of the increased demand from large industrial users of power, and is at the moment not far from figures for the corresponding weeks of 1929 at the height of the boom.

Yet during this whole period the financial basis for the upturn was not broadening, but narrowing; in other words, not inflation but deflation was actually taking place. The tremendous increase in the volume of speculative securities and commodities bought, at rising prices, together with a substantial increase in the physical volume of goods produced, also at rising prices, was financed by less money and less bank credit than had been in use before the boom started in April. Actually, money in circulation was about 1-2 billions lower, much more than the 600 millions of gold which were added to the money supply by the return of gold from private hands to the banks under threat of punitive measures; bank credits showed a corresponding contraction in deposits and loans.

Yet there was no shortage of money, although the demand for it was greatly increased and its supply reduced—money can still be obtained on time loans for 1 to 1-2 percent a year. It would seem as if the results of inflation—higher prices and stimulation of production—were being obtained while actually carrying through deflation.

The answer to the apparent paradox is simply that the existing amount of currency and of bank credits is being turned over faster, that is, that the average velocity

(Continued on Page 4)

## C.P. Holds Extraordinary Conference To Whitewash Bureaucrats' Failure

The defeat of the German working class by Fascism through the betrayal of social democracy and Stalinism has already had its repercussions in the Communist Party of the United States. The revisionist policies of Stalinism having already sapped the main vitality of the American party, it was shaken from top to bottom by this repudiation. The Stalinists do not realize the cause, but they do see the effects.

An acute party situation has been revealed. An extraordinary party conference was called to cope with this situation. The conference has issued an open letter to the party members.

The open letter is the most confused, worthless piece of trash ever issued by an extraordinary party conference. It is an attempt to prevent the disintegration setting in, in the party, at a rapid pace due to the defeat of the German proletariat and the smashing of the Communist party in Germany. It is an attempt to cover up, to prevent a real analysis from being made, to prevent an understanding, and to enable the bureaucrats to retain their hold upon the party and the apparatus.

The party fathers admit that

## SAVE CHEN DUSIU FROM WHITE TERROR!

We have received the letter printed below from our Chinese comrades. The urgent need of international action to save Chen Du Siu from a living death in jail is self-evident. Every comrade must agitate among the members of the International Labor Defense and the party members for the assumption of responsibility by the latter in the defense of our brave class war prisoner.

Chiang Kai-Shek must not be allowed to do away with the founder of the Chinese Communist movement! The Stalinists must not be allowed to sabotage his defense! Left Oppositionists, get on the job for the defense of comrade Chen!

Shanghai.—There has been no news of Chen Du Siu since the report of his having been sentenced to 13 years imprisonment, beyond a brief announcement in the press that he would appeal against the sentence. Legal processes in China, being even more slow and involved than in the capitalist West, it is not likely that this appeal, if it is ever heard at all, will come before the court in the near future. In view of the attitude taken up by the official Chinese Communist Party toward the arrest and trial of Chen—which was one of unconcealed exultation—the comrades abroad should do all possible to keep the matter before the attention of the workers. Wherever possible, protests against the continued imprisonment of Chen should be sent to the Nanking government and published as widely as possible.

## Plan to End Relief in N.Y.

New York, N. Y.—Suspension of all jobless relief by the city administration started in the faces of 2,000,000 unemployed workers and their dependents this week. The question is not yet decided as to whether the city government will go to press. Only vague promises of aid from the state government have been made. The situation of the unemployed remains highly precarious and a desperate tension exists in their ranks.

The suspension of relief came about as a result of a financial crisis due to the sabotage of Relief Bond sales by the local bankers. The bonds had been issued by the city government. The bankers are intent on cutting down the city budget so as to enable the administration to pay them on loans due, or at least to force concessions profitable for them (e.g. a raise of fares to bolster up the traction interests they control).

On Monday and Tuesday crowds of workers milled around the relief bureaus voicing their protests and demands and anxiously awaiting word of the most recent developments. On Wednesday afternoon a meeting of the Board of Estimate at City Hall to present their demands to the administration. And here, the whole sorry plight of the organized unemployed movement came to the fore. The delegates did not act in a body. Socialists appeared separately and Communists separately. No attempt was even made to get a united delegation with a united program.

The result of this split of forces was obvious. The Tammany faction naturally used the one against the other. While some time ago, on a similar occasion, they allowed the socialist Norman Thomas to speak and ejected the Communist delegation, this time they turned the tables and permitted the Communist Robert Minor to speak, while ejecting the socialist representatives. The socialists are reported to have protested vigorously against the "united front between the democrats and the Communists." It comes with ill grace from them. For they were in a similar situation the last time and may just as well be the next time. It is true that Minor did not protest against their exclusion, but neither did Thomas when he had occasion to. The responsibility for split in the ranks of the unemployed, which is of the greatest aid to Tammany fakery, rests squarely upon the shoulders of both the socialist reformist as well as the Stalinist bureaucrats.

Minor to the Board of Estimate: "Now Comrades..."

It is of special interest to revolutionary workers to observe how the delegate from the party-controlled unemployed council acted. Minor's address to the Board of Estimate was the purest reformism and did not breathe a breath of the revolutionary spirit of Communism. On the contrary, it serves to breed further dangerous illusion among the broad masses as to possibilities of permanent relief from their miseries under capitalist government. He restricted himself almost exclusively to a statement of immediate demands, never once even touching upon the Communist class struggle position. It could not be otherwise. Under the guise of revolutionary phrases, under the guise of "struggle against social fascism," the Stalinist leadership is making a new Right turn whose opportunist trappings hit the revolutionary worker right in the eye.

So engrossed did Minor become in his "positive, constructive" opportunist program that he forgot at one point before whom he was presenting it and broke out into the exclamation: "Now, comrades..." amid the smiles of the Tammany racketeers. He barely caught himself in time.

The whole position of the Stalinists flows from their past line. Their rejection of the Leninist united front and their "third period" unionization program has left them divorced from the broad mass with an artificial, "private property"—as to speak—mass movement on their hands. Unwilling to make the turn toward a correct united front tactic and union policy because that involves their shaky bureaucratic prestige, and on the other hand, afraid of losing whatever non-party forces they still control, they mimic the reformists in the unemployed council headed by themselves and capitulate to opportunism within their own four walls, so to speak. How else can a speech like Minor's be explained?

In the meantime, this policy does serious damage to the working class as a whole and discredits the very name of Communism. What the unemployed workers need in

(Continued on Page 4)

## Columbus Unemployed Confab Forms Dual National Organization

### HOLD ANTI-FASCIST STRIKE IN TORONTO

More than 25,000 Toronto workers staged a two hour general strike against the Hitler regime in Germany. The demonstration which included a monster parade was carried through in defiance of the ban of the reactionary Bennett government against all public manifestations of the Canadian working class. This effective protest of the Canadian workers is a most fitting reply not only to the savage maltreatment of the militant German proletariat by the Fascist hordes—it is a proof of the efficacy of the united front, under whose auspices the demonstration was held.

The Toronto branch of the Left Opposition took a most active part in the preparation of and in the demonstration proper. It issued a special anti-Fascist Strike number of the organ of the Left Opposition in Canada, the *Vanguard*. This issue contains an appeal to the workers of Toronto to demonstrate against the persecution of the German workers by the Nazis and at the same time against the treatment accorded the Canadian workers by the government. It concludes its appeal with a ringing appeal for international solidarity to prosecute the struggle to victory under the banner of Lenin and Trotsky!

The coming issues of the *Militant* will contain fuller and more complete reports from our comrades on the scene; on the role that they played in the strike demonstration and of the status of the Canadian anti-Fascist movement to date.

Columbus, Ohio.—The July 4-5 Columbus Conference ended by creating the National Unemployed League with an executive committee of 22, overwhelmingly dominated by the Musteites.

National Convention  
Truax opened the first session as temporary chairman, giving a long talk and later introducing Budenz who also talked at great length on "united action", etc. When Cope of the Rules and Order Committee reported how the convention would be conducted and how many delegates each state would have on the Præsidium, several delegates who had been informed that they would only be seated as fraternal delegates raised this question. Before Dennis Batt and A. J. Muste were able to maintain that the question of credentials was out of order, Delegate Newby was able to point out that the "Call" read as follows: "Who may come to the convention? Five delegates from any organized group of unemployed workers and farmers."

After the latter fact was put squarely before the delegates it was later necessary that the credentials committee admit that although it did not think that delegates from organizations affiliated to the Federation of Unemployed Workers Leagues of America should be seated as regular delegates, still the "Call" was broad enough to make them eligible. Whether delegates from F. U. W. L. A. units were to be regular or fraternal delegates were left up to the convention. Becker's question as to whether or not "Truax's organization" was affiliated to the F. U. W. L. A. was left unanswered while

Benjamin of the National Committee of the Unemployed Councils made the following statement in essence: The National Committee of Unemployed Councils believes that the delegates of Federation units should not be seated, and regards this convention to be a convention of Leagues alone. This unnecessary statement from the Councils was consistent with the Muste-Stalinist bloc policy of regarding the F. U. W. L. A. as an independent organization from the Leagues and Councils even though representatives of the latter movements had participated in the creation of the Federation less than two months ago.

But this statement of the Stalinist Council representative was out of line with the widely circulated Council resolution begging the Columbus Convention "to refrain from setting up a new dual unemployed organization" and also the previous plan of the Stalinists to send Council delegates to the Columbus Convention and ask that they be seated. In fact, there were delegates from the Councils there on the first and second day but they disappeared quickly after the Muste-Stalinist caucus on the night of July 1. At this caucus we know that the "leaders" of the Leagues and Councils reached an agreement of which Benjamin's statement was a part.

For the Councils not to try to get regular voting credentials meant that they no longer would try to prevent the setting up of a "new dual unemployed organization", that they would not demand that the League affiliate to the National Federation. For the N. C. of the Councils to say through Benjamin that it does not favor the seating of delegates from Federation units can hardly be regarded as support of the F. U. W. L. A.

And, when a few minutes later the Musteites Budenz and Montrose used this statement as an argument against the Federation unit delegates who were asking to be seated with vote as well as voice, the bloc between Muste and Stalinism was very apparent. Furthermore, when the Lovestonites Commers said that he thought he should be seated since his organization was not yet affiliated to the Federation he did not convince anyone that he was interested at that time in more than his own political fate, while others were fighting for the seating of all delegates from any unemployed organizations, whether affiliated to the Federation or part of the Unemployed Councils.

The voting strength of the various states was set as follows: Calif., Pa., and Ohio—10; Ill.—7; N. J., N. C., W. Va., and Wash.—5; Ind., Mo., Mich.—3; Conn. and N. Y.—1.

Later in the same session I. Amter was given the platform as the spokesman for the fraternal delegates from the Councils. He introduced the following proposal: "That this convention shall take steps toward the formation of a **PREPARATORY COMMITTEE**, composed of representatives of the Unemployed Citizens Leagues, the Unemployed Councils, the national Federation set up in Chicago, with which the

(Continued on Page 4)

## Stalinists in Bloc with Musteites at Columbus Meet, Retard Progress

### THE UNITED FRONT FROM ABOVE

The July 4-5 Unemployed Leagues Columbus Conference was a united front from above between the Musteites and the Stalinists. Weeks before the conference convened the Musteite-Stalinist bloc was formed with the rank and file of both organizations knowing nothing about it. The C. P. L. A. group ran the conference while the Unemployed Council representatives sat in as fraternal delegates waiting for the Musteites to pick the chestnuts out of the fire of the Ohio conference which was red hot with flag-waving, patriotic Americans who conducted religious revivals in the morning before the conference opened.

The united front from above called for a state federation of the Leagues and Councils; the adoption of the Unemployed Insurance Bill of the Stalinists; a committee of fifteen from the Leagues, Councils and the National Unemployed Federation; and a conference in Washington, in December, when Congress convenes, where an amalgamation of the unemployed organizations is to take place.

### THE POLITICAL TENDENCIES

The Musteites objected to any talk of political control or political tendencies. However, they saw it that they elected fifteen Musteites out of twenty-two on the executive committee of the Unemployed Leagues. Other political tendencies within the conference struggles were the Right wing flag wavers, the socialists, the Lovestonites, the United Workers Party, the Stalinists and the Left Opposition.

### THE MUSTEITES

The C. P. L. A. aim to use the Unemployed Leagues as the foundation for their Labor Party. Opposition to their Labor party aims did not come from the Stalinists who have formed a united front from above with them. Opposition to the C. P. L. A. by the flag-wavers in the state conference forced them to concentrate their energies to retain political control, and for the time being open agitation for the Labor party was pushed to the background.

One must recognize the mass unemployed movement the C. P. L. A. have, but at the same time one must recognize that it is still a flag-waving, religious, mass movement educated by Musteism. Much of the unemployed Leagues' growth can be accounted for by the fact that the city and county reactionary forces are using the Leagues as buffers against the Unemployed Councils.

The Hunger March on Columbus, headed by the Unemployed Councils, was met by the police with clubs while the Unemployed League's conference in Columbus was approved by the authorities. The "Workers' Patrol", established by the Unemployed Leagues to keep order, armed themselves with clubs. The Musteites cannot be accused of arming this patrol but they are guilty of miseducation which led to this end.

Steam roller tactics of the steering committee of the conference controlled by the Musteites equal those of the Stalinists in methods of cutting off opposition, trampling on workers' democracy and gagging the delegates from discussion on the most vital problems confronting the conference. When the Musteites saw they could not control the conference 100 percent and obtain what they wanted, they referred every important question to the incoming executive where decisions would be rendered. A conference that cannot decide the vital questions itself and refers such to an incoming executive that has not yet been elected is in reality no conference.

### THE SOCIALISTS

The few socialists on hand played a negligible role in the conference. If they did have policy differences, no one found it out because their steering committee wasted their time mainly on secondary points of order.

### THE STALINISTS

The united front from above netted the Stalinists nothing. They did not obtain the committee of fifteen, they did not obtain an en-

(Continued on Page 4)

## A Letter from Fascist Germany

One could never have imagined in his wildest dreams such a transformation of the daily life as Fascism has brought about. The period of transition in the workers' movement is especially terrifying. We speak of the transition period until the movement has managed to rid itself of its dregs, the worst of which are at present the traitors. The police swoops down daily on the workers' quarters. One betrays another so as to exonerate himself. The Nazis penetrate everywhere.

On holidays—and there are so many of them now—the workers hang out the swastika flag. The C. P. G. has simply disappeared. Sometimes dues are still collected, but that is all. The two issues of the *Rote Fahne* (Stalinist organ), according to which all of Germany is gripped by strikes, and stands on the eve of the revolution, have been received here. They aroused great resentment everywhere. Some party comrades who swore by the "line" as by something holy until March 5, now speak of the bureaucrats as of plain charlatans. The intelligent workers are beginning to realize that we are now entering into a long and difficult period.

Of the C. P. G. as such there is even less to be seen than of the C. P. U. S. A. But often it so happens that many former adherents of the S. P. G. are more upright and honest anti-Fascists than, for instance, some of the C. P. unemployed. Those elements who have conclusively broken with the S. P. are very sympathetic to the slogan of the "new party", since their conviction about the disaster of reformist policy has in no case been

accompanied by any conviction in the "correctness of the policy" of the C. P. G.

A few more interesting observations: When we stroll through the streets here one is struck by the fact that the men wear better clothes than before, "when democracy still existed", as we always say here. This is due to the fact that the poor people, i. e., the Communists, no longer dare to creep out of their holes, and when they do, then they put on their best clothes so as not to appear "suspicious". The coffeehouses and restaurants of the city are frequented only by Nazis now. The workers' Inns and the Houses of the People are shut down. In the "fritz restaurants" the officers frequent, in the others, the lower ranks. Very often someone starts singing the Horst-Wessel song (Nazi hymn). Then all those present have to stand up and participate.

## PICNIC

Annual Midsummer Picnic & Outing  
Sports, Games, Refreshments—  
Good Time for All  
Bring your Friends and Comrades  
SUNDAY, JULY 23, 1933  
at Tibbetts Brook Park

Directions: Take I. R. T.—Woodlawn-Jerome train to last stop—then take bus and street car to Picnic Grounds

Auspices: N. Y. Branch—C. L. A. (Opposition) and Protomagia Club

## Pocketbook Workers Struggle

New York, N. Y.—The general strike of the 4,000 pocketbook workers is spreading day after day to the non-union shops. The strike is an excellent condition. The strikers are in a good spirit. It proves that all the talk we hear from the Right wing leaders that the workers will not and cannot fight due to the fact that the bosses starved out the workers for the last few years is nonsense. The workers have been and are eager to fight to improve their conditions. It is the Right wing leadership who keep the workers back from fighting for better conditions. That is why the employers took advantage of the last few years and brought down the conditions of the workers to the lowest level.

The strike of the pocketbook workers prove that in spite of the starvation and suffering the workers went through for the last few years, they are fighting to get back some of the conditions the Right wing has given to the employers without a fight.

The Right wing leaders in the Pocketbook Workers Union as well as other Right wing leaders look at the union as their private property—they have a monopoly on the union. They think that the union is an S. P. union, S. P. leadership, and only S. P. speakers are invited to address the meetings of the strikers. If the Left wing had been given a chance to be in the leading committees of the strike, it would have been 100 per cent effective today in New York and vicinity. There is chaos and inefficiency in the leadership of the strike. The

Left wing must demand representation in all leading committees of the strike, otherwise there is a danger, as the strike goes on, that more confusion will develop which will demoralize it. More mass picketing and demonstrations must take place in order to show the employers that not a single bag will be made while the strike goes on.

In the last issue of *The Militant* there was reported that through the militant struggle of the workers in Morris White shop in New York, Mr. White was compelled to settle with the union and concede to the union demand. It also said that the agreement has not been signed. Last Saturday Morris White backed out and ran to court for an injunction instead of signing the agreement with the union. The workers of the Morris White shop are carrying on the fight against the firm with more vigor until M. White will be forced to settle with the union and grant the demands of the workers. What actually happened with the settlement of M. White nobody knows. One thing is certain and our leaders should know that diplomacy and maneuvering will not settle strikes. A strike must be fought in a militant way till the employers are forced to grant the demands of the workers. We warn the pocketbook workers again to be on guard and see to it that similar situations as the Morris White should not repeat themselves during the strike.

POCKETBOOK WORKERS BE ON GUARD!  
—N. F. D.



## Perspectives for American Class Struggles

(Continued from last issue)

It is a fundamental teaching of Marxism that capitalism, once out of its swaddling clothes, extends the scale of production at the same time as it restricts the available market. As capital accumulates, an ever larger share of its total is expended on the means of production in proportion to that expended for labor power. Competition between various capitalist units compels the production of commodities at a lower cost, that is, with each commodity containing a smaller amount of necessary labor power. In an effort to do this, more and more capital is expended for labor-saving machinery with the result that unemployment grows, at first relatively, and later, absolutely, as well.

For example, the Hoover committee report, "Recent Economic Changes," tells us that the number of workers employed in the major branches of industry (agriculture, manufacturing, mining and railways) in the U. S. fell from 25,165,000 in 1918-20 to 23,425,000 in 1924-26. At the same time, production was increased 18 percent—an increase of 27 percent per worker. In manufacturing alone the number of workers fell from 10,780,000 to 9,810,000 and production was increased 22.5 percent—an increase of 34.5 percent per worker. Between 1923-29, according to Lewis Corey, while production was increasing, unemployment was also increasing by about 1-2 millions yearly, due to the displacement of workers by machinery and other technological causes.

On one hand, this process causes the rate of profit to fall, thereby compelling the capitalists to seek to increase the mass of profit by extending the scale of operation and also to seek to increase the rate of exploitation or production of surplus value per worker by means of wage-cuts, speed-up, etc., and on the other hand, it reduces the number of effective consumers and the extent of individual consumption. It sets in motion a contradiction capitalism can never permanently solve.

Add to this the facts that capitalism has already developed its productive forces beyond the effective capacity of the world market, that its national aspects, that is, its contradictions, competition between its various units, etc., are international in scope, that capitalism is in the fourth year of a violent process which attempts to re-establish temporarily its lost equilibrium, that there has been a general narrowing of markets due to unemployment, lowered living standards and the development in many formerly backward countries of native industrial workers, and you have a rough picture of the world situation today.

The United States, as a national unit of world capitalism, is compelled to find additional foreign markets. That it will succeed in this there is little doubt. It is in the position of a highly efficient manufacturing plant competing with a less advanced one. Its superior technique and greater resources, as well as the burden imposed on its foreign competitors by means of war debts and loans, give it an advantage that cannot be overcome.

However, as the United States expands it will do so at the expense of other exporting powers, primarily England, thereby heightening their internal contradiction and driving their workers ever closer to revolutionary action. At the same time, the prerequisites for such expansion include a lowering of the standard of living of American workers by all the means at the capitalists' disposal as well as a tightening of the noose of centralization around the necks of weaker capitalist enterprises to the point where ever larger numbers of them are driven out of existence, thereby hastening the already rapid and extensive monopolization of American industry.

By the very process of attempting to escape the effects of its contradictions America will weld its workers into a class-conscious mass. As wages continue to fall and unemployment to rise, the pretty fable of American class collaboration will disappear in favor of a growth of labor militancy.

In this connection it is well to remember that the use of militant action is not alien to American shores. America is not devoid of revolutionary traditions. It has had many a stormy outburst in the past and the political lag of the American workers behind their European brothers can best be explained not by reference to something inherently conservative in their nature but rather by the absence of material conditions necessary to give their philosophy its proper social direction.

In conclusion, however, it might be well to point out that capitalism will never collapse of its own accord. As Lenin once said "there is no situation from which there is absolutely no way out for the bourgeoisie." While the shocks of economic crises open wide cracks in the structure of capitalism, to bring about its collapse more than an economic crisis is needed. The workers' will to revolution must rise to the point where it is strong enough

to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat in contradistinction to the present more or less concealed dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. A section of the working class known as "the vanguard" must have sufficient strength, both numerically and ideologically, to lead the revolutionary proletariat onto the broad highway outlined by Marx and Lenin. And, in the opinion of the writer, it is precisely this point which constitutes the fundamental task of the American revolutionary parties today. It is one of building the "vanguard," of drawing into a state of revolutionary consciousness a larger number of American workers, of educating them in the strategy and tactics of the coming struggle. Tomorrow the nature of our tasks may change. But, until that happens, they must be considered in their proper chronological order.

—SIMMONS.

A Half Year sub to the Militant is \$1. On a Club Plan with three others it is only 50 cents.

### N. Y. Doll Workers Win Demands in Strike

The Doll and Toy Workers (Lafayette St.) won their strike at the Rosenberg Doll Shop, 48 West 25th St. one of the biggest shops in the industry.

Recognition of the union, and the shop committee; hiring and firing in control of the union; and increases in wage scales even for the girls who scabbed and tried to call the police, were gained by the militant doll workers after two weeks of picketing.

This victory in the first strike of the season has set the workers in action, and preparations for striking another of the big shops is under way. On this may hang the fate of the negotiations to be carried on between the workers of the industry and the bosses, under the provisions of the Industrial Recovery Act.

Last Saturday the A. F. L. union of Furilla and Joseph Cannon, who were defeated in the elections of officers in the union last year, and who thereupon opened up their own little private office, called a mass meeting of the Doll workers, because, to use their own words, "They did not want to go to Washington without any workers to represent." About twenty workers and three thugs showed up.

The Doll and Toy Workers Union is calling a mass meeting Saturday, July 15th at Stuyvesant Casino.

In the struggle of the workers of Rosenberg Doll Co., as in the preparatory work of the union; in the printing and distribution of leaflets, in picket line duty, in work in the office; the Spartacus Youth Club, relatively small, played a more active and prominent role than the Young Communist League, for all its vaunted "activity".

—A. R.

## What Stalinism Said about Democracy and Fascism

Stalinism did not recognize as its task, to arouse the working class against the threatening danger of Fascism. On the contrary, the Stalinists took pains to "demonstrate" anew day in day out, that "between democracy and Fascism there is no basic difference." Nothing was more qualified to make the workers underestimate the danger of Fascism than this distorted formula of Stalinism.

They in our ranks who erroneously act along the line of a belief in the existence of a basic contradiction between bourgeois democracy and Fascism, between the social democracy and Hitler's party, are harmful and fatal to the Communist movement. Indeed, this is our chief danger.

(Manilsky, Report, XI Plenum of the E. C. C. I., April 1931, *Kommunistische Internationale*, No. 16, April 1931, page 703.)

From this we draw the first conclusion—that only a bourgeois liberal can construe a counter-distinction between bourgeois democracy and a Fascist regime, and can assume that we are dealing here with two basically different political forms.

(Manilsky, Report, XI Plenum of the E. C. C. I., *Kommunistische Internationale*, No. 16, April 1931, page 703.)

The fact that the bourgeoisie is obliged to suppress the workers' movement by means of Fascist methods does not mean that the upper classes no longer rule as before. Fascism is not a new kind of governmental method to be distinguished from the system of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. He who thinks so is a liberal.

(Manilsky Report, XI Plenum, April 1931, *Komm. Internat.* No. 17, April 1931, page 773.)

The Fascist dictatorship offers no basic distinction from bourgeois democracy, through which also the dictatorship of finance capital is carried out.

(Resolution of the C. C. of the

## Lessons of the Leninist United Front Tactic

(Continued from last issue)  
AGAINST UNITED FRONT FROM ABOVE

An opportunist deviation which is sure to land the revolution in the swamp is the united front from above. When the leadership of an organization comes together and decides over the heads of their membership or without the participation of the membership, except by bureaucratic decree, what to unite on and how to unite you can be assured that wrong start will not bring the desired results.

The united front between leaders, the united front from above, is a denial and violation of the united front of the working class. The united front of the leaders guarantees in advance the victory of the Right wing, the opportunists, and the labor fakers over the Left wing, the revolutionists, in the united action.

AGAINST THE UNITED FRONT FROM BELOW

The Stalinist "Third Period" united front from below is the most harmful caricature and denial of the united front possible. If an organization desires a united front on some concrete issues and proceeds to send the call to all organizations it is sure it can control, mechanically or ideologically, but refuses to send the call to other organizations of the working class, because the leaders of the other organizations are fakers, because of fear of losing control—and instead invite the rank and file alone to unite, over the heads of their own leadership, the results will be a lasting service rendered to the misleaders and the fakers and a setback for those who carry on the united front from below.

It would be excellent if the task of winning misled workers were so simple. If the united front from below were a short-cut to winning the rank and file from the misleaders, our task would already be an accomplished fact. This would imply a rapid transformation of a misled rank and file into an educated rank and file which has shaken off its misleaders and their petty bourgeois ideology. The education of misled rank and file workers is not so simple that it can be accomplished by telling them to unite with us over the heads of their leaders. The united front

BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS, where the leadership and the policies of the organizations can be put to a test, to enable the rank and file to see leaders and programs in action—that is the way to educate and win the rank and file.

Workers belonging to organizations have faith in their organizations and often, their leaders. They are placed in a position where they must function THROUGH THE ORGANIZATION if they desire to continue as members because of faith, convictions, (no matter how false), or job control. By asking these workers to unite with us over the heads of the leaders and the organization through the united front from below, we are telling these workers to break with their organization on the one hand, and giving the misleaders an excuse for sabotaging united action, on the other hand. The united front from below strengthens rather than

weakens the misleaders of the other organizations. When we invite the whole organization and the Left wing responds and the Right wing leaders decline, it is far more difficult for the Right wing leaders to fight the united front than it is when they have a chance to fight united action through the excuse of the "united front from below."

## Letter from Party Member Exposes Bureaucracy

It is time that Communists should openly state their views and aims. The tactics of the official Communist party contradict the fundamental aspects of Marxism which are so essential for the strengthening of the party.

The tactics and strategy of Stalinism flow not from contemporary requirements but from complex system of bureaucracy which bases itself on an erroneous foundation. The bureaucracy has adventuristically anticipated the successful building of an isolated socialist society in the U. S. S. R. This in turn has created a dogma of action which stands in fundamental contradiction to Lenin's teachings.

I have recently been admitted into the C. P. where I have come upon such situations that have dumfounded me and proved the impotence of my party which is allegedly the leader of the working class in its struggle for emancipation. Prior to my admittance I expounded some revolutionary principles that coincided with those of the L. O. I was immediately branded a "Trotskyite". This caused a delay to my entrance into the party. Only when it appeared that I was converted was I given my membership book.

The bureaucrats refuse to polemicize against "Trotskyism" in an objective way but immediately defend against its misleaders and their petty bourgeois ideology. The education of misled rank and file workers is not so simple that it can be accomplished by telling them to unite with us over the heads of their leaders. The united front

I will do all in my power to force the C. P. back to the correct policy of the world revolution. I consider myself a part of the Left Opposition and will fight for its reintegration into the C. P. where it rightfully belongs.

I firmly believe that the theories and practices of the Left Opposition will make their way into the party because they are endowed with the power of Marxism.

Although I am unemployed at the present time, just as soon as I lay my hands on a dollar bill I will become a regular subscriber of the Militant which is the only revolutionary organ that gives its readers a realistic version of historic facts and a corresponding revolutionary diagnosis. —E. R.

low"—over the heads of the leaders and the organizations.

THE RELATION OF THE UNITED FRONT FROM ABOVE AND BELOW

The united front with leaders and the united front from below are both wrong. A united front must be BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONS of the working class (or the working class (or between political tendencies, groups and factions, etc.) You do not appeal ORGANIZATIONALLY "from below". You bring PRESSURE on the organization from below. You win the rank and file from below to force the ORGANIZATION into the united front. Have the other organizations elect delegates through their organizational channels to the united front regardless of who are selected as the delegates. You try to obtain Left wing delegates but you take what you get—what they elect. If the organizations, send misleaders and betrayers they must be seated in the united front representing their respective organization.

The dialectics of the united front between organizations is to win the rank and file (below) and expose the leadership in action (above). This concept of below and above has nothing in common with "united fronts" put forward under these labels.

UNITED FRONTS AND INDIVIDUALS

The united front is not a tactic to corral a group of prominent individuals, liberals, and artists, who do not represent organizations or political tendencies.

A united front must have its foundation in WORKING CLASS ORGANIZATIONS. Such a united front can use as an auxiliary a few prominent individuals and friends of labor. They must play a subordinate role and in no case should they be given the leadership of the movement.

"GUARANTEE" LEADERSHIP OF THE UNITED FRONT

"Join the united front against the capitalist class under the leadership of the Communists" (the Stalinist formula)—is the best way to formulate what is not a united front. We Communists hope to win ideological control and leadership through our superior program, but no one, not even those who have the prestige of the October revolution, can mechanically obtain leadership of the movement in advance. United fronts are not called under our leadership, or any other leadership.

It is wrong for one organization or political current to set up the provisional committee and adopt a draft program and call the other organizations to the united front. There are certain exceptions where emergency demands speed, but those who take the initiative must see to it that the program and leadership is left open to be decided at the conference, where all working class organizations have delegates, even though the conditions force the initiative upon one political current. In fact, one political current will always take the initiative, but this has nothing in common with the Stalinists, who interpret this to mean, "under our leadership".

(To Be Continued)  
HUGO OEHLE

## The Bulletin of the Russian L.O. Needs Your Aid

BULLETIN OF THE OPPOSITION (BOLSHEVIKS-LENINISTS) To Readers Who Are Adherents and to readers who are sympathizers!

The profound crisis through which the Soviet Union has been passing for the last few years has reached the decisive stage. The Soviet Union is in danger. Stalinism is leading it to ruin with seven league boots. Under these conditions the struggle of the Russian Left Opposition assumes tremendous historical significance. The Bulletin serves as one of the most important weapons of this struggle for the saving of the October Revolution. Even though it penetrates into the U. S. S. R. in an insignificant quantity of copies, it nevertheless plays a big role in its life, in the formation of genuine revolutionary cadres. The ideas of the Bulletin pass from mouth to mouth. Our task lies in strengthening this role; in achieving a larger circulation of the Bulletin in U. S. S. R.; in succeeding in publishing it each month regularly.

For this we require the help of readers and friends, primarily financial help. The Bulletin is forced to contend with unheard-of difficulties.

### Spartacus Youth Club in Over-Night Hike

The Spartacus Youth Club invites all friends, sympathizers and young workers to meet at 126 East 16th St., on Saturday, July 15th, 12 noon. We leave promptly on our overnight hike.

Be prepared for a slice of genuine outdoor life, and bring flashlights, blankets, cooking utensils, etc.

We return Sunday evening to the headquarters for a social. Music, Songs, Dancing. All very informal all very free. Every Wednesday evening the Spartacus Youth Club holds a mass open air meeting at the corner of 7th St. and 2nd Ave. Members and sympathizers, take note.

### MINNEAPOLIS PICNIC

Sunday, July 23 Starting 11 A. M. Riverside Park on South Side  
EVERYBODY WELCOME  
Nationally Known Speakers  
Auspices: Minneapolis Free Mooney Conference

### 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 weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

### EDITORIAL BOARD

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

Vol. 6, No. 40 (Whole No. 182)  
SATURDAY, JULY 15, 1933  
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year  
Foreign \$2.50 5 cents per copy

## What the Left Opposition Said about Democracy and Fascism

Communist International and the German Situation", September 1930, page 13.)

The XI Plenum of the E. C. C. I. came to the decision that it was imperative to put an end to those erroneous views which originate in "the liberal interpretation of the contradictions between Fascism and bourgeois democracy, as well as between the parliamentary forms of bourgeois dictatorship and the outright forms...." The gist of this Stalinist philosophy is quite plain: From the Marxist denial of the absolute contradiction, it deduces the total negation of any contradiction at all, even of a relative contradiction. This error is typical of vulgar radicalism.—What Next, page 28.)

A contradiction does exist between democracy and Fascism. It is not at all "absolute" or, putting it in the language of Marxism, it does not at all denote the rule of two irreconcilable classes. But it does denote different systems of the domination of one and the same class.

(Page 29.) The statement that the transition from democracy to Fascism may take on an "organic" and a "gradual" character can mean one thing and one thing only and that is: without any fuss without a fight, the proletariat may be deprived not only of its material conquests—not only of its given standard of living, of its social legislation, of its civil and political rights—but also of the basic weapon whereby these were achieved, that is, its organizations. The "bloodless" transition to Fascism implies under this terminology, the most frightful capitulation of the proletariat that can be conceived. (Page 36.)

In a Fascist regime, at least during its first phase, capital leans on the petty bourgeoisie which destroys the organizations of the proletariat. Italy, for instance! Is there a difference in the "class content" of these two regimes? If the question is posed only regards the ruling class, then there is no difference. If one takes into ac-

count the position and inter-relation of all classes, then the angle of the proletariat, then the difference appears to be quite enormous. (Page 34.) In order to try to find a way out, the bourgeoisie must absolutely rid itself of the pressure exerted by the workers' organizations, these must needs be eliminated, destroyed, utterly crushed. At this juncture the historic role of Fascism begins. It sets on its feet those classes that are immediately above the proletariat and who are ever in dread of being forced down into ranks; it organizes and militarizes them at the expense of finance capital, under the cover of the official government, and it directs them to the extermination of proletarian organizations, from the most revolutionary to the most conservative.

Fascism is not merely a system of reprisals, of brutal force, and of police terror. Fascism is a particular governmental system based on the uprooting of all elements of proletarian democracy within bourgeois society. The task of Fascism lies not only in destroying the Communist advance guard but in holding the entire mass in a state of enforced disunity. To this end, the physical annihilation of the most revolutionary section of the workers does not suffice. It is also necessary to smash all independent and voluntary organizations, to demolish all the defensive bulwarks of the proletariat, and to uproot whatever has been achieved during three quarters of a century by the social democracy and the trade unions. For, in the last analysis, the Communist party also bases itself on these achievements.

—(What Next?, Page 12.)

Editors of the Bulletin of the Opposition—Paris.

## Leninism versus Stalinism

### FOREWORD

The victory of German Fascism closes a distinct epoch of political history and opens a new one. In the course of the past year the Stalinist bureaucracy did all that was possible without it, to render the Fascist victory easier. Addressing itself to the proletariat of the world, the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists) criticized implacably the policies of the Stalinist bureaucracy and gave its answers to all problems as they were posed by events.

At present no proletarian revolutionary can close his eyes to the conflict between the two factions raging within the camp of Communism. Comrade Oscar Fischer has performed an important and instructive task by collecting and classifying according to subject the clearest and most inclusive statements that were given in answer to theoretic and practical questions, on the one hand by the Stalinist bureaucracy, and on the other by the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists). I hope that this rare collection of citations will soon find its way to every thinking worker. There will be no advance unless we learn by the tragic mistakes and defeats of the past.

—L. TROTSKY.

Also in the event that the Nazis are taken into the government, there can be no question that the bourgeoisie will refuse the cooperation of the social democracy in the carrying out of the Fascist dictatorship. *Die Internationale*, January 1932, page 4.)

The XI Plenum of the E. C. C. I. has swept aside the artificially constructed counter-distinction between bourgeois democracy and Fascist dictatorship. By this it has rendered an invaluable service to the Communist parties in their fight against social Fascism. The XII Plenum has demonstrated that so-called "classist" Fascism does not exist and cannot exist, and that all confusing theories, basing themselves on the history of Italian Fascism, about the Fascist need of first striking down the working class, are bloodless abstractions.

(Schwab, "The Nature of the Fascist Dictatorship", *Kommunistische Internationale*, No. 10, January 1933, page 10.)

(Trotsky, "The Turn in the Com-



# After the German Catastrophe

An Historical Evaluation  
of the Events by  
Leon Trotsky

The imperialist epoch, in Europe at least, has been one of sharp turns, in which politics has acquired an extremely mobile character. At each turn the stakes have been, not some partial reform or other, but the fate of the regime. On this fact the exceptional role of the revolutionary party and of its leadership is based. If, in the good old days when the social democracy grew regularly and uninterrupted, like the capitalism which nourished it, the leadership of the party resembled a general staff tranquilly elaborating plans for a war in the indefinite future (a war that perhaps might not come after all), under present conditions the Central Committee of a revolutionary party resembles the field headquarters of an army in action. The strategy of the study has been replaced by the strategy of the battle field.

The struggle against a centralized enemy demands centralization. Trained in a spirit of strict discipline, the German workers assimilated this idea with renewed vigor during the War and the political convulsions which followed it. The workers are not blind to the defects of their leadership, but none of them as an individual is able to shake off the grip of the organization. The workers as a whole consider it better to have a strong leadership, even if a faulty one, than to pull in different directions or to resort to "free-lance" activities. Never before in the history of humanity has a political staff played so important a role or borne such responsibility as in the present epoch.

The unparalleled defeat of the German proletariat is the most important event since the conquest of power by the Russian proletariat. The first task on the morrow of the defeat is to analyze the policy of the leadership. The most responsible leaders (who are, heaven be praised, safe and sound) point with pathos to the imprisoned rank and file exponents of their policies in order to suppress all criticism. We can only meet such a spuriously sentimental argument with contempt. Our solidarity with those whom Hitler has imprisoned is unassailable, but this solidarity does not extend to accepting the mistakes of the leaders. The losses sustained will be justified only if the ideas of the vanquished are advanced. The preliminary condition for this is courageous criticism.

For a whole month not a single Communist organ, the Moscow Pravda not excepted, uttered a word on the catastrophe of March 5. They all waited to hear what the Praesidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International would say. For its part the Praesidium oscillated between two contradictory variants: "The German Central Committee led us astray," and "the German Central Committee pursued a correct policy." The first variant was ruled out: the preparation of the catastrophe had taken place under the eyes of everybody, and the controversy with the Left Opposition that preceded the catastrophe had too clearly committed the leaders of the Communist International. At last, on April 7, the decision was announced: "The political line... of the Central Committee, with Thälmann at its head, was completely correct up to and during Hitler's coup d'Etat." It is only to be regretted that all those who were dispatched into the beyond by the Fascists did not learn of this consoling affirmation before they died.

The resolution of the Praesidium does not attempt to analyze the policy of the German Communist party—which was, above all else, to have been expected—but constitutes another in the long series of indictments against the social democracy. It preferred, we are told, a coalition with the bourgeoisie; it evaded a real struggle against Fascism; it fettered the initiative of the masses; and as it had in its hands the "leadership of the mass labor organizations," it succeeded in preventing a general strike. All this is true. But it is nothing new. The social democracy, as the party of social reform, exhausted the progressiveness of its mission, as capitalism was transforming itself into imperialism. During the war the social democracy functioned as a direct instrument of imperialism. After the War it hired itself out officially as the family doctor of capitalism. The Communist party strove to be its grave-digger. On whose side was the whole course of development? The chaotic state of international relations, the collapse of pacifist illusions, the unparalleled crisis which is tantamount to a great war with its aftermath of epidemics—all this, it would seem, revealed the decadent character of European capitalism and the hopelessness of reformism.

Then what happened to the Communist party? In reality the Communist International is ignoring one of its own sections, even though that section rallied some 6 million votes in the election. That is no longer a mere vanguard; it is a great independent army. Why, then, did it take part in the events only as a victim of repression and pogroms? Why, at the decisive hour, did it prove to be stricken with paralysis? There are circumstances under which one cannot withdraw without giving battle. A defeat may result from the superiority of the enemy forces; after defeat one may recover. The passive surrender of all the decisive positions reveals an organic incapacity to fight which does not go unobserved. The Praesidium tells us that the

policy of the Communist International was correct "before as well as during the coup d'Etat." A correct policy, however, begins with a correct appraisal of the situation. Yet, for the last four years, in fact up to March 5, 1933, we heard day in and day out that a mighty anti-Fascist front was growing uninterceptedly in Germany, that National Socialism was retreating and disintegrating, and that the whole situation was under the aegis of the revolutionary offensive. How could a policy have been correct when the whole analysis on which it was based was knocked over like a house of cards?

The Praesidium justifies the passive retreat by the fact that the Communist party, "lacking the support of the majority of the working class," could not engage in a decisive battle without committing a crime. Nevertheless, the same resolution considers the July 20 call for a general political strike as deserving special praise, though for some unknown reason it neglects to mention an identical call of March 5. Is not the general strike a "decisive struggle"? The two strike calls wholly corresponded to the obligations of a "leading role" in the "anti-Fascist united front" under the conditions of the "revolutionary offensive." Unfortunately, the strike calls fell on deaf ears; nobody came out and answered them. But if, between the official interpretation of events and the strike calls on the one hand, and the facts and deeds on the other, there arises such a crying contradiction, it is hard to understand wherein a correct policy can be distinguished from a disastrous one. In any case, the Praesidium has forgotten to explain which was correct—the two strike calls or the indifference of the workers to them.

But perhaps the division in the ranks of the proletariat was the cause for the defeat? Such an explanation is created especially for lazy minds. The unity of the proletariat, as a universal slogan, is a myth. The proletariat is not homogeneous. The split begins with the political awakening of the proletariat, and constitutes the mechanism of its growth. Only under the conditions of a ripened social crisis, when it is faced with the seizure of power as an immediate task, can the vanguard of the proletariat, provided with a correct

policy, rally around itself the overwhelming majority of its class. But the rise to this revolutionary peak is accomplished on the steps of successive splits.

It was not Lenin who invented the policy of the united front; like the split within the proletariat, it is imposed by the dialectics of the class struggle. No successes would be possible without temporary agreements, for the sake of fulfilling immediate tasks, among various sections, organizations and groups of the proletariat. Strikes, trade unions, journals, parliamentary elections, street demonstrations demand that the split be bridged in practice from time to time as the need arises; that is, they demand a united front *ad hoc*, even if it does not always take the form of one. In the first stages of a movement, unity arises episodically and spontaneously from below, but when the masses are accustomed to fighting through their organizations, unity must also be established at the top. Under the conditions existing in advanced capitalist countries, the slogan of "only from below" is a gross anachronism, fostered by memories of the first stages of the revolutionary movement, especially in Tsarist Russia.

At a certain level, the struggle for unity of action is converted from an elementary fact into a tactical task. The simple formula of the united front solves nothing. It is not only Communists who appeal for unity, but also reformists, and even Fascists. The tactical application of the united front is subordinated, in every given period, to a definite strategic conception. In preparing the revolutionary unification of the workers, without and against reformism, a long, persistent and patient experience in applying the united front with the reformists is necessary; always, of course, from the point of view of the final revolutionary goal. It is precisely in this field that Lenin gave us incomparable examples.

The strategic conception of the Communist International was false from beginning to end. The point of departure of the German Communist party was that there is nothing but a mere division of labor between the social democracy and Fascism, that their interests are similar if not identical. Instead of helping to aggravate the discord between Communism's principal political adversary and its mortal foe—for which it would have been sufficient to proclaim the truth aloud instead of violating it—the Communist International convinced the reformists and the Fascists that they were twins, it predicted their conciliation, embittered and repulsed the Social Democratic

workers and consolidated their reformist leaders. Worse yet: in every case where, despite the obstacles presented by the leadership, local unity committees for workers' defense were created, the bureaucracy forced its representatives to withdraw under threat of expulsion. It displayed persistency and perseverance only in sabotaging the united front, from above as well as from below. All this it did, to be sure, with the best of intentions.

No policy of the Communist party could, of course, have transformed the social democracy into a party of the revolution. But neither was that the aim. It was necessary to exploit to the limit the contradiction between reformism and Fascism—in order to weaken Fascism, at the same time weakening reformism by exposing to the workers the incapacity of the Social Democratic leadership. These two tasks fused naturally into one. The policy of the Communist International bureaucracy led to the opposite result: the capitulation of the reformists served the interests of Fascism and not of Communism; the Social Democratic workers remained with their leaders; the Communist workers lost faith in themselves and in the leadership.

The masses wanted to fight, but they were obstinately prevented from doing so by the leaders. Tension, uneasiness and finally disorientation disrupted the proletariat from within. It is dangerous to keep the metal too long on the fire; it is still more dangerous to keep society too long in a state of revolutionary crisis. The petty bourgeoisie swung over in its overwhelming majority to the side of National Socialism only because the proletariat, paralyzed from above, proved powerless to lead it along a different road. The absence of resistance on the part of the workers heightened the self-assurance of Fascism and diminished the fear of the big bourgeoisie confronted by the risk of civil war. The inevitable demoralization of the Communist detachment, increasingly isolated from the proletariat, rendered impossible even a partial resistance. Thus the triumph procession of Hitler over the bones of the proletarian organizations was assured.

The false strategic conceptions of the Communist International collided with reality at every stage, thereby leading to a course of incomprehensible and inexplicable zigzags. The fundamental principle of the Communist International was: a united front with the reformist leaders cannot be permitted! Then, at the most critical hour, the Central Committee of the German Communist party, without explanation or preparation, appealed to the leaders of the social democracy, proposing the united front as an ultimatum today or never! Both leaders and workers in the reformist camp interpreted this step, not as the product of fear, but, on the contrary, as a diabolical trap. After the inevitable failure of an attempt at compromise, the Communist International ordered that the appeal be ignored and the very idea of a united front was once more proclaimed counter-revolutionary. Such an insult to the political consciousness of the masses could not pass with impunity. If up to March 5 one could, with some difficulty, still imagine that the Communist International, in its fear of the enemy, might possibly call upon the Social Democracy, at the last moment, under the club of the enemy—then the appeal of the Praesidium on March 5 proposing joint action to the Social Democratic parties of the entire world, independent of the internal conditions of each country, made even this explanation impossible. In this belated and worldwide proposal for a united front, when Germany was revealed by the flames of the Reichstag as the social democracy's word about social-Fascism. The Communist International was prepared—it is hard to believe this, but it was printed in black and white!—to refrain from criticism of the Social Democracy during the whole period of the joint struggle.

The waves of this panic-stricken capitulation to reformism had hardly had time to subside when Wels swore fealty to Hitler, and Leipart offered Fascism his assistance and support. "The Communists," immediately declared the Praesidium of the Communist International, "were right in calling the Social Democrats social-Fascists." These people are always right. Then why did they themselves abandon the theory of social-Fascism a few days before this unmistakable confirmation of it? Luckily, nobody dares to put embarrassing questions to the leaders. But the misfortunes do not stop there: the bureaucracy thinks too slowly to keep pace with the present tempo of events. Hardly had the Praesidium fallen back upon the famous "twins," than Hitler accomplished the complete destruction of the free trade unions and, incidentally, arrested Leipart and company. The relations between the twin brothers are not entirely brotherly.

Instead of taking reformism as a historic reality, with its interests and its contradictions, with all its oscillations to the right and left, the bureaucracy operates with mechanical models. Leipart's readiness to crawl on all fours after the defeat, is offered as an argument against the united front before the defeat. As if the policy of making fighting agreements with the reformists were based upon the valor of the reformist leaders and not upon the incompatibility of the organs of the proletarian democracy and the Fascist bands.

(Continued on Page 4)

# The Labor Movement in Greece

Economic and Political  
Acts of Capitalism and  
the Working Class

The national revolution of 1821-1829 against Turkish domination was carried through under the influence of the ideas of the French Revolution and financed by the island bourgeoisie, which made its fortune in the Napoleonic wars and by foreign commerce, particularly with Russia. However the long duration of the struggle and the intervention of the Holy Alliance which prevented the extension of the frontiers of free Greece so weakened the Greek bourgeoisie that for the whole period up till the beginning of the 20th century Greek capitalism was unable to make any signal advances in its development. Manufacture had practically been ruined by the war and the merchant marine which constituted the principal basis of the Greek bourgeoisie transformed into a war fleet for the exigencies of the revolution was also badly crippled. The bourgeoisie was replaced by landlord elements who governed the country until the last years prior to the war.

In 1800 small scale industry began to spring up in Greece, trade grew and the merchant marine became more and more important. Weak bourgeois democratic tendencies began to assert themselves in the political movement and the bourgeoisie showed some signs of influence.

The rise of the bourgeoisie began to take on an accelerated rhythm at the opening of this century. It made headway against the landed proprietors who lost in influence and in economic strength. In 1909 the bourgeoisie gave a demonstration of its strength. A military coup d'etat took place in Athens and the trusted man of the bourgeoisie came to power without great struggle. With Venizelos as its political leader the Greek bourgeoisie led the Greek army to victory and to the annexation of new, rich and economically well developed territories (Macedonia, Aegean Isles, etc.).

The Balkan wars and the great war which lasted for Greece till 1922 and ended in the Asia Minor catastrophe helped the Greek bourgeoisie to amass a fortune, to centralize wealth by the expropriation of the peasantry which bore the brunt of the war, and which had to support almost 1,500,000 refugees who returned without any material resources to the country.

Through the wealth accumulated during the war, particularly by the munition manufacturers Greek capitalism began to boom. It established industries which now employ 200,000 workers. Hundreds of thousands of expropriated refugees supply the cheap manual labor so necessary to capitalism. The concentration of industry has progressed and now the industrial magnates

are seated in the Council of Banks and vice versa.

We have in Greece side by side with backward forms of production the most developed type of finance capital. Save two banks, which are greatly dependent upon foreign capitalist groups, the whole banking system is bound up with the National Bank of Greece. But the National Bank also collaborates with the Bank of England and with English capital as did the Haboros during the Balkan wars of 1912-1913. It shares the surplus value of the country with them. Through its collaboration with Greek capital, English capital exploits the huge transport and industrial concessions, etc.

The Greek proletariat, created together with capitalism, has courageously struggled against the bourgeoisie. The arrival of the refugees in 1922-1923 changed the composition of the working class and its conditions of struggle. They were utilized from the very beginning by Greek capitalism to cut wages and to beat down the demands of the other workers whose unparalleled suffering and wretched conditions were no better than theirs. But these young elements of a higher cultural formation, who fell into the vise of capitalism, soon became the most aggressive elements and they have conducted severe battles together with the Greek proletariat.

The political and trade union organizations of the Greek proletariat were immensely influenced by the Russian revolution until 1923. All the sincere and even careerist elements took on a red coloration. After the reaction and aided by Stalinism, the revolutionary ferment dying down, the reformist leaders took control of the party and the C. G. T. (trade union center) was abandoned in 1925 to conservative elements by its leaders who as members of the party are now the leaders of the reaction in the proletarian movement.

The Communist Party

The Communist party was founded in 1918 by reformist elements who baptized themselves Communists under the influence of the Russian revolution and the sentiment of an imminently approaching revolution in Europe. Adventurism came to the fore in the party after 1922. It formed the basis of Stalinism. The Greek Communist party without ever having been a Communist party passed from the stage

of social democracy to Stalinism. Its most noteworthy adventurist acts are the following: in 1922 they were utilized by the militarists to explain the shooting of the royalist ministers. This was also stated at the League of Nations by the Greek ambassador at Geneva who used them as an excuse to the imperialists (the will of the workers). In 1923 at the time of the royalist rising the party allied itself with the military government and appealed to the workers to enlist as volunteers under the bourgeois flag to save democracy. In 1925 they collaborated with the dictator Pangalos. In 1926 with the enemies of Pangalos, and formulated the slogan of a "Left republic" and "pure democracy" which provided a shield for the militarist elements. Then came the third period. A logical chain.

Although the party led many workers struggles during this long period it could bring none of them to a successful conclusion, it could not crystallize a new leadership. Now the party is a shell of an organization without a spinal column. It has influence over the radicalized masses who are coming towards Communism only because it is the official and exclusive representative of the C. I. and the Russian revolution. By maintaining the apparatus of the party Stalinism only compromises the struggles of the Greek proletariat by its militarist slogans which have no basis in actual fact and are purely scholastic.

The Left Opposition

The present Left Opposition, the Communist organization of Bolshevik-Leninists (Archimarchists) has its roots in the origins of the party.

At the foundation congress of the party in 1918 the Left wing clearly distinguished itself from the reformists, and after some time it broke from it, formed the "Communist Union", published the weekly magazine *Communismo*, organized its educational, agitation and propaganda courses, etc. It progressed. But after the adoption of the 21 points by the party and the persistent recommendation of the representative of the C. I. it fused with the party.

These comrades occupied the highest posts in the party. A number of them degenerated. The others understood that it was necessary to work for the formation of cadres and to help the formation of the Communist party by its publications and by its activities inside the party and in the working class. It was in this sense that the first group met in the winter of 1921 and elaborated a program along these lines. Educational work among the proletariat began and was carried on systematically. This activity was combined with the issuance of the magazine *Archives of Marxism* which published the classical works of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky in the Greek language. Up till that time no Communist publication existed in Greece.

The appearance of the magazine so disturbed the bureaucracy that the first numbers sold at the 1st of May meeting in 1923 were torn up by gangs organized by them. This was the first hostile act against this tendency. The movement progressed. After ignoring it silently expulsions began. They kept discovering Archimarchists in the party till 1925 and expelled them. The years of 1926 to 1928 were years of bitter struggle in which the Stalinists took recourse to terrorist acts to exterminate the Archimarchists. The present leaders of the Spartacus group were the organizers of these attempts. In this way the cowardly murders of comrades Georgopoulos, a bakery worker and Ladias, a woodworker, took place. These workers were among the best in the cadre of militants in our times. That we did not have more victims is only because we had comrades in the party who warned us. In Kavalla powder and revolver cartridges, meant for us, were seized. Then came the third period. While the party was busy with the conquest of the streets, there was free ground for the rebuilding of the trade unions, so that in 1930 two revolutionary trade unions in Salonica, Athens and Piraeus were under our influence. On the eve of our first national conference there were scarcely any trade union organizations but ours and the reformists'.

(from La Verite).

SUBSCRIBE TO  
"UNSER WORT"

Workers and friends who read German and are interested in getting first hand accounts of conditions in Germany can do so by subscribing to *Unser Wort*, the illegal organ of the German Left Opposition, published in Prague.

Address all subs to *Unser Wort*, care of the MILITANT, 126 East 16th Street, New York City.

ARE YOU A SUBSCRIBER  
TO THE MILITANT?

If the number on your wrapper is 182 your subscription has expired. If you want to get the Militant promptly every week renew your subscription at once: \$2 per year for fifty two weekly issues; \$1 a half year for twenty six weekly issues.

THE MILITANT  
126 East 16th St. N. Y. C.

## Last Whimpers from Scheidemann

Philip Scheidemann, the German social-chauvinist, now safely buried in Karlsbad, reappeared for a minute—to offer his apologies in the N. Y. Times of July 9th. It seems the Nazis and that dreadful Adolf have been very nasty—in fact they have been slanderous. One of the Nazi lies is the claim that Herr Scheidemann and the other social democrats stabbed the army in the back with a revolution. Instead, on September 29, 1918, the army leaders demanded peace because the army had completely broken down. On October 16, Wilson made it clear that he would treat only with a democratic government, never with the Kaiser. Only then did Scheidemann, a member of the Kaiser's last cabinet, and Ebert, presume to take the power handed to them both by the old government and the revolution. With these facts Scheidemann defends himself against "the agitator, Hitler," who "has continued for fifteen years to peddle the legend of the stab in the back by the November criminals."

But to whom is Scheidemann apologizing? Is it to the workers whom he and the other social democratic leaders betrayed on August 4, 1914 into the slaughter and starvation of the imperialist war? Is it to the Spartacists whom the Council of Commissioners, made up of Ebert, Scheidemann, Landsberg, Noske, and Wiesel, all Social Democrats, killed in December 1918 and January 1919? Is it to Liebknecht and Luxemburg who were killed in cold blood at Noske's orders? Not at all. Scheidemann is apologizing to the same bourgeoisie whom he served so faithfully during the war, whom again and again he saved from the proletariat during the years of revolution, whose final triumph he made possible by disarming the proletariat with parliamentary lies.

But now Scheidemann and all the boot-lickers of his type are cast out as useless tools. No longer is the Social Democracy able to accomplish its task of supporting bourgeois democracy by holding back the workers. Instead the bourgeoisie are using the reactionary storekeepers, white-collar slaves, students, and peasants as a Fascist fist to crush the workers, destroy all traces of democratic rights, demolish all workers organizations—including the happy hunting ground of the Scheidemann bureaucracy the social democracy.

Now the social democrats, who have been fortunate enough to save their hides, fill the places of exile, whimper to their master how faith-

ful they were as servants, and mutter impotent threats against their successor, Hitler. These men who were glad in 1914 to support the Kaiser in the war, now call for a war against Hitler. Says Scheidemann: "It must be the task of the entire civilized world to paralyze these adventurers. That this may not exclude a bloody war is self-evident."

After a lifetime of pussyfooting with the bourgeoisie in Germany proper, Herr Scheidemann makes bold—in his Karlsbad exile. And even this Karlsbad boldness is characteristic of the social democratic bureaucracy, though it is only a deathbed snort: Herr Scheidemann calls for war against Hitler—not, god forbid, by a mobilization of the world working class—but as the "task of the entire civilized world". In this appeal he summed up the beginning and the end of the bureaucratic physiology: Too weak, too scared of itself to call upon the workers to struggle in time, the bureaucracy to the very last trust in every other quick salvation. And when everything is all over, when the enemy is firmly entrenched, it takes an order depriving them of their pensions to make the bureaucratic lepers so bold as to shake off their social-chauvinism in favor of salvation "by the entire civilized world".

The example of Scheidemann is a deep, though tragic, lesson in the logic of bureaucratic degeneration. It is necessary once more to recall that this degeneration began by the substitution of social-chauvinist reformism for the Marxist conception of the Permanent Revolution. The Stalinist bureaucracy too, within its own limits and in its own special circumstances, has already gone a long stretch of the road along this same line of degeneration. The fate of Scheidemann should serve as a warning to the Stalinists, lest they too have to resort to "Karlsbad Boldness". Communists everywhere must work with all forces to prevent this and for the reestablishment of the conception of Permanent Revolution in the Communist International and in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union —P. M.

OPEN AIR MEETINGS  
FOR NEW YORK

Manhattan: 7th St. and 2nd Ave. every Wednesday night 8 P. M., 86th Street and Lexington Ave., every Thursday night 8 P. M. Harlem: 125th St. and 5th Avenue, every Saturday night 8 P. M. Bronx: 163rd Street and Prospect Ave., every Sat. night 8 P. M. Brooklyn: Pitkin Ave. and Bristol St. (Brownsville) Friday night

## News from Workers in Naziland

LETTER FROM HAMBURG

Our groups show good advances here for the past few months. Few connections with C. P. G. and S. P. G. units have been established. There has not been any loss in numbers. Illegal work has been carried on smoothly, with only one comrade arrested for our special work. All other arrests have taken place on account of work in the party and the mass organizations. Our group is publishing its organs regularly. The composition of our group has been improved considerably in the last months by a growth in the number of factory workers.

Insofar as the party work is concerned, it must be said that its disintegration is being hastened by heavy blows dealt through spies. The most notorious of these cases is the case of a certain Kaiser. Kaiser was a leading functionary among the unemployed on the waterfront. A member of the District leadership of the party and of the defense organizations, he always kowtowed to the top leadership. Today Kaiser is a leading collaborator of the state police. Recently he declared on oath before a court that he had been for two years a functionary of the information department of the National Socialist German Labor Party (Fascists)! Further, that he carried out the orders of these people exclusively within the ranks of the Communist party. It is also possible for a healthy party to contain within its ranks a number of spies and for these spies to attain positions within it. But this Kaiser is a lumpenproletarian type, with whom any decent worker will have nothing to do. Only the inner-party regime brought him to the top. This skunk is responsible for hundreds of arrests and raids. Rumors are spreading in the party ranks that other leading functionaries are spies. It is rarely possible to test out these rumors, but they cause terrible confusion. In the last days of April the party was dealt a particularly heavy blow. In two days, 6 big printshops were discovered and material worth several hundred thousand marks confiscated. The whole manner of the action showed that it was the work of a spy in the apparatus.

About the "Revolutionary Storm Troopers"

There is a wide-spread conception among party members here that the S. A. men (Hitlerite Storm Troopers) are revolutionary. The comrades are of the opinion that in the future struggles it will not be the masses included in the present labor organizations that will play the decisive role, but the disillusioned S. A. men, who will put the rope around the neck of

Fascism. There are united front formations here with the Black Front, some collaboration has already taken place.

In the transport concerns the "equalization" action brought with it a mass discharge of R. G. O. (Red Trade Union Opposition) members. Some 4 weeks later a great many of those discharged were rehired. In some concerns (e. g., the stockyards), R. G. O. functionaries were made commissarial factory councilors, naturally after the inevitable "equalization".

The confusion in the party is increased by all sorts of clique fights among the D. E. C. leadership. The confidence of the membership in the top leaders is very low. Many units refuse to remit dues up higher. In many cases, comrades who formerly shunned the sight of "Trotskyists", come to us for advice. It is also not unusual for functionaries to request the collaboration of our comrades. The party comrades come to our discussions and ask us for material. All this forces the bureaucracy to call meetings at which they aim to "deal a final blow against Trotskyism".

The S. P. G.

The disintegration of the S. P. G. proceeds apace. The workers and officials of the state concerns hastened to leave it so as not to lose out by equalization. The trade union bureaucracy acted especially shamefully in this town. After the arrests of May 2, they were soon released on pledges to cooperate. All trade union functionaries left the socialist party in a body. If they are not yet members of the Nazi party, that is not their fault.

But in spite of its capitulation, the S. P. G. still attracts many good proletarians. This has been expressed in 10 May Day meetings attended by 100 to 150 men on an average. At the funeral of the deputy Biedermann, who was murdered by Fascists, about 2000 social democratic workers gathered. As we have heard from S. P. G. circles, a Left wing is soon to split away under the leadership of several functionaries with the perspective of the creation of a new independent Social Democratic Party. Whatever leaflets have been put out by the S. P. G. recently came through the initiative of this group. Our comrades have established connections with it.

All comrades sending in news accounts and articles for publication in the Militant are requested to prepare typed copy, triple spaced.



# Historical Objectiveness..

Everyone digests his food and oxygenates his blood. But not everyone will dare write a thesis about digestion and blood circulation. Not so with the social sciences. Since each person lives under the influence of the market and of the historic process in general, it is considered sufficient to possess common sense in order to write exercises on economic and especially historic-philosophic themes. As a general rule only "objectives" is demanded of an historical work. In point of fact whatever does bear this high-sounding title in the language of common sense, has nothing to do with scientific objectiveness.

The Philistine, especially if he is separated from the fighting arena by space and time, considers himself elevated above the fighting camps from the mere fact that he understands neither one of them. He sincerely takes his blindness regarding the working of historical forces for the height of impartiality, just as he is used to considering himself the normal measure of all things. Notwithstanding their documentary value, too many historical papers are being written according to this standard. A blunting of sharp edges, even distribution of light and shadow, a conciliatory moralizing, with a thorough disguising of the author's political sympathies, easily secures for a historical work the high reputation of "objectiveness."

In so far as the subject of investigation is a phenomenon, as poorly reconcilable with common sense as revolution, this historical "objectiveness" dictates in advance its immutable conclusions: the cause of the disturbances lies in the fact that the conservatives were much too conservative, the revolutionaries much too revolutionary; the historical excesses called civil war can in the future, be avoided if the private owners will be more generous, and the hungry people more moderate. A book with such tendencies has a good effect on the nerves, especially during an epoch of world crisis.

The demand of science, and not of a parlor-philistine "objectives", really is that one should expose the social conditioning of historical events, no matter how unpleasant they may be for the nerves. History is not a dumping-ground for documents and moral maxims. History is a science no less objective than physiology. It requires not a hypocritical "impartiality" but a scientific method. One can accept or reject the materialistic dialectic as a method of historical science, but one must reckon with it. Scientific objectiveness can be and must be lodged in the very method itself. If the author did not manage its proper application it must be pointed out exactly where.

I attempted to base my History not on my own political sympathies, but on the material foundations of society. Revolution I considered as the process, conditioned by all the past, of the direct struggle of classes for power. The center of attention for me was those changes in the consciousness of the classes taking place under the effect of the feverish tempo of their own struggle. I considered political parties and political agents in no other light than that of mass shifts and clashes. Four parallel processes conditioned by the social structure of the country formed thus the background of the whole narrative: the evolution of the consciousness of the proletariat from February to October; the change of the moods in the army; a growth of the peasant vindictiveness; the awakening and insurrection of the oppressed nationalities. By revealing the dialectic of the consciousness of masses thrown out of equilibrium, the author ought to give the nearest immediate key to all the events of the revolution.

A literary work is "truthful" or artistic when the interrelations of the heroes develop, not according to the author's desires, but according to the latent forces of the characters and setting. Scientific knowledge differs greatly from the artistic. But the two also have some traits in common, defined by the dependence of the description on the thing described. An historical work is scientific when facts combine into one whole process which, as in life, lives according to its own interior laws.

Is the depiction of the classes of Russia true? Do these classes through their parties and politicians talk their own language? Do the events—naturally, without being forced—go back to the social source, i. e. to the struggle of living historic forces? Does the general conception of the revolution conflict with actual facts? I must admit with gratitude that a large number of critics have approached my work precisely from the standpoint of these really objective, i. e., scientific criteria. Their critical remarks may be right or wrong, but the great majority of them are fruitful.

It is not accidental, however, that those critics who miss "objectiveness" neglect completely the problem of historic determinism. They are really complaining about the "injustice" of the author toward his opponents, as if it were a question not of scientific research, but of a school report-card with marks for good conduct. One of the critics is offended for the monarchy, another for the liberals, a third for the compromisers. Since the sympathies of these critics got neither recognition nor indulgence from the actual reality in 1917, they would now like to find con-

solation in the pages of history; just as some people seek shelter from the blows of destiny in romantic literature. But the last thing the author had in mind was to interpret in his book the verdict of the historical process itself. The offended persons themselves, by the way, in spite of the fifteen or sixteen years which they have had at their disposal, have never attempted to explain the causes of what happened to them. The White emigration has not produced one single historical work worthy of the name. The cause of its misfortune it still tries to find in "German gold", the illiteracy of the masses, the criminal plots of the Bolsheviks. The personal irritation of the apostles of objectiveness—I trust this is indisputable—must necessarily be the sharper, the more convincingly the historical narrative reveals the inevitability of their destruction and their want of any hope for the future.

The more cautious of these politically disappointed critics often disguise the source of their annoyance in complaints to the effect that the author of the History permits himself to use polemics and irony. That, they seem to think, is beneath the dignity of the scientific guild. But revolution itself is a polemic become a mass action. Nor is irony lacking to the historical process; during a revolution it can be measured in millions of horse-power. Speeches, resolutions, letters of those taking part, as well as their subsequent recollections, have necessarily a polemic character. There is nothing easier than to "reconcile" all this chaos of bitter struggle of interests and ideas according to the method of the golden mean; there is also nothing more fruitless. The author strove to define the true relative truth in the course of the social struggle of all opinions, slogans, promises and demands by means of a critical (or, if you wish, polemical) sorting and cleaning. The individual he reduced to the social, the particular to the general, the subjective he confronted with the objective. This is exactly what history consists of in our opinion as a science.

There exists a quiet special group of critics who are offended personally for Stalin, and for whom history outside of that question does not exist. These people consider themselves "friends" of the Russian revolution. In reality they are merely attorneys for the Soviet bureaucracy. That is not the same thing. The bureaucracy grew stronger as the activity of the masses weakened. The power of the bureaucracy is an expression of the reaction against the revolution. It is true that this reaction is still developing on the foundations laid by the October revolution, but even so it is a reaction. The attorneys of the bureaucracy are often attorneys of the anti-October reaction. This is not altered by the fact that they perform their functions unconsciously.

Like shop-keepers grown rich who create for themselves a new and more suitable genealogy, the bureaucratic class which grew out of the revolution has created its own historiography. Hundreds of rotary presses are at its service. But its quantity does not make up for its scientific quality. Even to please the most disinterested friends of the Soviet authorities, I could not leave untouched those historic legends which are perhaps very flattering to the vanity of the bureaucracy, but which nevertheless have the misfortune to contradict facts and documents.

I shall confine myself to one single example which, as it seems to me, well illustrates the matter. A number of pages in my book are devoted to refuting the fairy-tale created after 1924 to the effect that I attempted to postpone the armed insurrection until after the Congress of Soviets, while Lenin, it

seems, backed by a majority of the Central Executive Committee, succeeded in having the insurrection carried out on the eve of the Congress. By adducing numerous evidences, mostly indirect, I tried to prove—and I think I undeniably did prove—that Lenin, cut off by his illegal status from the theatre of struggle, was too impatient to bring on the insurrection, separating it completely from the Congress of Soviets. I, on the other hand, backed by the majority of the Central Committee, tried to bring the insurrection as near as possible to the Congress of Soviets, and cover it with the latter's authority. With all its importance the disagreement was of a purely practical and temporary character. Later Lenin frankly admitted that he had been in the wrong.

While I was working on my History I did not have in hand the collection of speeches pronounced at the Moscow anniversary meeting of April 23, 1920, celebrating Lenin's 50th birthday. One of the pages in that book reads verbatim as follows: "We in the Central Committee decided to go ahead with reinforcing the Soviets, to summon the Congress of Soviets, to open the insurrection, and proclaim the Congress of Soviets the organ of state power. Ilych, who was then in hiding, did not agree and wrote (in the middle of September—L. D.) that . . . the Democratic Conference must be dissolved and arrested. We understand that things were not so simple. . . . All the holes, the pitfalls on our course were more visible to us. . . . In spite of all Ilych's demands we went ahead with reinforcement, and on the 25th of October confronted the picture of an insurrection. Ilych, smiling, shyly looking at us, said: 'Yes, you were right.' (Fifteenth Anniversary of V. I. Ulyanov-Lenin, 1920, pp. 2728).

The above quotation is taken from a speech pronounced by none other than Stalin, some five years before he put into circulation the poisonous insinuation that I attempted to "belittle" the role of Lenin in the revolution of October 25th. If the just quoted document, which fully confirms my story (in cruder terms, it is true), had been in my hands a year ago, it would have relieved me of the necessity of adducing indirect and less authoritative proofs. But, on the other hand, I am content that this small book, forgotten by all, poorly printed on poor paper (1920, a heavy year!) happened into my hands so late. By this very fact it brings additional and very striking proof of the "objectiveness", or, more simply the truthfulness of my narrative even in the sphere of those disputed questions of a personal character.

Nobody—I shall allow myself to state this in a most categorical manner—nobody has so far found in my narrative a violation of truthfulness which is the first commandment for historical, as well as all other narratives. Particular lapses are possible. Tendentious distortions—no! If it were possible to find in the Moscow archives even one single document directly or indirectly refuting or weakening my narrative, it would have been long ago translated and published in all languages. The adverse theorem is not hard to prove: all the documents in the least degree dangerous to the official legends are carefully kept out of sight. It is not surprising that the advocates of the Stalin bureaucracy, calling themselves friends of the October revolution have to make up for this lack of arguments by a surplus of zeal. But this type of criticism worries my scientific conscience least of all. Legends dissolve, facts remain.

—LEON TROTSKY.  
Prinkipo, April 1, 1933.  
(Translated by Max Eastman)

With this perspective of shocks and sharp readjustments, the working class will find itself opposed by the class enemy, under the Industrial Recovery Act, in a threefold form—the capitalist himself, strengthened and concentrated through the encouragement of monopoly and the elimination of "wasteful competition"; the bourgeois state, as supervisor and coordinator of the concentration of capital and guardian of the new "code"; and the reformist trade-unions who will endeavor to utilize the present situation, so advantageous for them, to secure the exclusive monopoly before the capitalist organizations and the government of the representation of the working class, to the end of reducing it to a willing victim to the super-exploitation planned for the immediate future.

—B. J. FIELD.

FROM CHINA  
Preparations are being made here to reopen the Soviet Consulate building, which has stood deserted since 1927 when Sino-Soviet diplomatic relations were ruptured by the Nanking government. It will interest readers of the Militant to know that in the imposing reception hall of the building—when the latter was opened by the renovators—there were found a bust of Lenin and a large portrait of Leon Trotsky. The removal of the latter has evidently been overlooked up to now, but it will be absent for a certainty when the building is again officially opened, and doubtless a life-size portrait of Stalin will take its place. There is none at all there now. Stalin was evidently not thought of as a "great leader" by Soviet consular officials in China even as late as 1927.

seems, backed by a majority of the Central Executive Committee, succeeded in having the insurrection carried out on the eve of the Congress. By adducing numerous evidences, mostly indirect, I tried to prove—and I think I undeniably did prove—that Lenin, cut off by his illegal status from the theatre of struggle, was too impatient to bring on the insurrection, separating it completely from the Congress of Soviets. I, on the other hand, backed by the majority of the Central Committee, tried to bring the insurrection as near as possible to the Congress of Soviets, and cover it with the latter's authority. With all its importance the disagreement was of a purely practical and temporary character. Later Lenin frankly admitted that he had been in the wrong.

While I was working on my History I did not have in hand the collection of speeches pronounced at the Moscow anniversary meeting of April 23, 1920, celebrating Lenin's 50th birthday. One of the pages in that book reads verbatim as follows: "We in the Central Committee decided to go ahead with reinforcing the Soviets, to summon the Congress of Soviets, to open the insurrection, and proclaim the Congress of Soviets the organ of state power. Ilych, who was then in hiding, did not agree and wrote (in the middle of September—L. D.) that . . . the Democratic Conference must be dissolved and arrested. We understand that things were not so simple. . . . All the holes, the pitfalls on our course were more visible to us. . . . In spite of all Ilych's demands we went ahead with reinforcement, and on the 25th of October confronted the picture of an insurrection. Ilych, smiling, shyly looking at us, said: 'Yes, you were right.' (Fifteenth Anniversary of V. I. Ulyanov-Lenin, 1920, pp. 2728).

The above quotation is taken from a speech pronounced by none other than Stalin, some five years before he put into circulation the poisonous insinuation that I attempted to "belittle" the role of Lenin in the revolution of October 25th. If the just quoted document, which fully confirms my story (in cruder terms, it is true), had been in my hands a year ago, it would have relieved me of the necessity of adducing indirect and less authoritative proofs. But, on the other hand, I am content that this small book, forgotten by all, poorly printed on poor paper (1920, a heavy year!) happened into my hands so late. By this very fact it brings additional and very striking proof of the "objectiveness", or, more simply the truthfulness of my narrative even in the sphere of those disputed questions of a personal character.

Nobody—I shall allow myself to state this in a most categorical manner—nobody has so far found in my narrative a violation of truthfulness which is the first commandment for historical, as well as all other narratives. Particular lapses are possible. Tendentious distortions—no! If it were possible to find in the Moscow archives even one single document directly or indirectly refuting or weakening my narrative, it would have been long ago translated and published in all languages. The adverse theorem is not hard to prove: all the documents in the least degree dangerous to the official legends are carefully kept out of sight. It is not surprising that the advocates of the Stalin bureaucracy, calling themselves friends of the October revolution have to make up for this lack of arguments by a surplus of zeal. But this type of criticism worries my scientific conscience least of all. Legends dissolve, facts remain.

—LEON TROTSKY.  
Prinkipo, April 1, 1933.  
(Translated by Max Eastman)

## Relief Cut in New York

(Continued from page 1)  
the face of the threat to cut off relief is a single, united unemployed organization that will be able to rally the whole million or more of jobless in the city solidly behind the serious Communists must strive under its banner. That is the task for at present. That requires the immediate adoption by the Unemployed Councils of the unity basis conference, which last May created the national Federation of Unemployed Workers Leagues, in which the Stalinist participated. On this basis, they will be able to challenge the social reformists to enter into the united front and to hold them responsible before the masses of workers.

The establishment of such a genuine, Leninist united front—with freedom of expression and criticism for every labor tendency—will also enable the Communists to carry out the Communist task in the mass movement—that of educating broad layers of the working class facts in the utility and rottenness of the capitalist system and in the inevitability of the Communist way out of misery—the proletarian dictatorship.

The Tammany threat still impends. The need for the unity of the unemployed workers is indispensable, if it is to be defeated, if Tammany is to be prevented—by splitting the workers' ranks—from reducing the unemployed to a state where they get not enough to live and just too much to die. The task of the Communists is obvious—a frank and open, Leninist united front proposal to the reformists, which will make unity possible and which will be of permanent value insofar as it will permit the Communists to implant class consciousness within broad strata of the workers.

# The Columbus Conference

(Continued from Page 1)  
Unemployed Councils are associated (note the substitute for affiliated), and such other groups as are willing to cooperate in the unification of the unemployed organizations into one organization through a Unity Convention."

We call attention to the fact that this official statement of the Council N. C., which had been circulated in leaflets from the first day on, was made before any national organization of Leagues was formed. Thus we see that the Stalinists for some reason or other saw fit to stop their earlier plea that "a new dual organization" be not set up. We also call attention to the fact that although both the Councils and Leagues are represented on the N. C. of the Federation, Amter and the Councils did not ask support and affiliation to the FUWLA; they proposed instead a Unity Convention for amalgamation, which unification should be prepared by local "united front federations."

All the Stalinist-Musteite talk about preparing for "unity" and amalgamation without first of all having all the unemployed organizations work together in a National Federation for a long period of time is plain deception. Both of these groups are more interested in maintaining mechanical control of their own national movements for the furthering of their own "political" ends than they are in building one huge mass organization of unemployed workers on a national scale. When the Musteites and Stalinists refuse to support completely the national Federation movement they in fact refuse to take the most necessary step towards the complete unification and amalgamation of the unemployed; and all their talk about the fact that the FUWLA has not yet told them just how much representation they will get on its committees shows that neither of them believe that they will be able to long re-

tain their "leadership" if once they should happen to lose mechanical control of their movements.

While the Stalinists found it necessary to sabotage the work of the national Federation in a roundabout manner the Musteites merely used their machine for a steam roller. First the Resolution Committee which they controlled saw to it that no resolutions dealing with the question of affiliation, to the FUWLA came up until long after they had placed a new constitution before the convention and had it adopted. This constitution of the National Unemployed League contains a clause which leaves the whole question of unity, federation, etc., up to the incoming Musteite National Committee.

After this was adopted, a resolution by delegate Newby, asking that the convention affiliate the new organization which it had just set up to the FUWLA, was allowed to come before the convention for a short time. But this was only after the new organization had been set up and all of the officers' uncontested nominations. Moreover, a resolution from Rose of California dealt with the setting up of a provisional committee of federated and other delegates for the calling of a unity conference was just ignored in committee.

Budenz set the Musteite key-note by speaking against Newby's resolution for affiliation to FUWLA, and after Newby was permitted to speak, the Musteite chairman Lamugla closed the discussion and routed Budenz's motion that the resolution be referred to the incoming National Committee. A "division of the house" was not permitted as such would have shown much more support for affiliation to the FUWLA than the mere hearing of "ayes" and "nays" showed. For example, if put to a vote the 8 delegates from California would have received 10 votes equal to the votes of the 307 from Ohio,

and one delegate from Washington who favored affiliation had a vote of 5. The big votes of Ohio and Pennsylvania would have been split, and enough votes from the other states could quite likely have been gained for the federation affiliation had the Musteites railroaded the thing through because their followers could make the most noise.

It appears that the struggle of the workers for first federation and later unity of unemployed organizations on a national scale will have to be fought out in opposition to the Musteites and Stalinists. —N.

## The German Catastrophe

(Continued from Page 3)

In August 1932, when Germany was still ruled by the "social general," von Schleicher, who was supposed to assure the union of Hitler with Weis, announced by the Communist International, I wrote:

Everything goes to show that the Weis-von Schleicher-Hitler triangle will fall apart before it has really been put together. But perhaps it will be replaced by a Hitler-Weis combination. Let us assume that the Social Democracy, without being afraid of its own workers, would seek to sell Hitler its toleration. Fascism, however, does not need this commodity, it is not the toleration of the Social Democracy which it needs but its abolition. The Hitler government can realize its task only when it has broken the resistance of the proletariat and all the possible organs of such a resistance. Therein lies the historical role of Fascism. ("The Only Road," page 31.)

That the reformists, after the defeat, would be happy if Hitler were to permit them to vegetate legally until better times return, cannot be doubted. But unfortunately for them, Hitler—the experience of Italy has not been in vain for him—realizes that the labor organizations, even if their leaders accept a muzzle, would inevitably become a threatening danger at the first political crisis.

Doctor Ley, the corporal of the present "labor front," has determined, with much more logic than the Presidium of the Communist International, the relationship between the so-called twins. "Marxism is playing dead," he said on May 2 "in order to rise again at a more favorable opportunity. . . . The sly fox does not deceive us! It is better for us to deal him the final blow rather than to tolerate him until he recovers. The Leipzarts and the Grossmans may feign all sorts of devotion to Hitler—but it is better to keep them under lock and key. That is why we are striking out of the hands of the Marxist rabble its principal weapon (the trade unions) and are thus depriving it of the last possibility of arming itself again." If the bureaucracy of the Communist International were not so infallible and if it listened to criticism, it would not have made additional mistakes between March 22, when Leipart sword fealty to Hitler, and May 2, when Hitler, in spite of the oath, arrested him.

Essentially the theory of "social Fascism" could have been refuted even if the Fascists had not done such a thorough job of forcing themselves into the trade unions. Even if Hitler had found it necessary, as a result of the relationship of forces, to leave Leipart temporarily and nominally at the head of the trade unions, the agreement would not have eliminated the incompatibility of the fundamental interests. Even though tolerated by Fascism, the reformists would remember the fleshpots of the Weimar democracy and that alone would make them concealed enemies. How can one fail to see that the interests of the Social Democracy and of Fascism are incompatible when even the independent existence of the Steud Helms is impossible in the Third Reich? Mussolini tolerated the Social Democracy and even the Communist party for some time, only to destroy them all the more mercilessly later on. The vote of the Social Democratic deputies in the Reichstag for the foreign policy of Hitler, covering this party with fresh dishonor, will not amiorate its fate by one iota.

As one of the main causes for the victory of Fascism, the luckless leaders refer—in secret, to be sure—to the "genius" of Hitler, who foresaw everything and neglected nothing. It would be fruitless now to submit the Fascist policy to a retrospective criticism. One need only remember that Hitler, during the summer of last year, allowed the high peak of the Fascist tide to escape him. But even the gross loss of rhythm—a colossal mistake—did not have fatal results. The burning of this act of provocation was crudely excused, did, however, yield the necessary result. The same must be said of the Fascist policy as a whole, for it led to victory. One cannot, unfortunately, deny the superiority of the Fascist over the proletarian leadership. But it is only out of an unbecoming modesty that the beaten chiefs keep silent about their own part in the victory of Hitler. There is the game of checkers and there is also the game of losers-win. The game that was played in Germany has this singular feature, that Hitler played checkers and his opponents played to lose. As for political genius. Hitler has no need for it. The strategy of his enemy compensated largely for anything his own strategy lacked.

Prinkipo, Turkey. —L. TROTSKY.

## Stalinites in Bloc with C.P.L.A.

(Continued from Page 1)

dorsement of their BILL, they did not obtain an endorsement of the December meeting. Muste gained the most out of the united front from above. However, this Muste can be said, now that the Musteites have the executive committee and the power to make the decisions that the conference should have made, they will be able to complete the original agreement by the continuation of the united front from above. The bloc of Leagues and Councils lost at Columbus but they hope to make up for this by December.

While Muste and Hathaway were roaming the conference grounds arm in arm the Daily Worker, in an editorial, accused the Musteites of breaking the agreement. When the Stalinists steering committee saw how reactionary the conference was the Unemployed Council representatives decided it was time to be ready in case they had to change horses in the middle of the stream, to negotiate with the Left bloc of the conference around the National Unemployed Federation, of course trying to exclude the Left Opposition members present.

### THE RIGHT WING

In the state conference of the Unemployed Leagues the flag-waving patriots took the conference out of the hands of the Musteites. A revival atmosphere filled the air more than once. This bloc of Ohio delegates numbered 300 out of the 500 in the national conference, were mainly composed of Right wing elements. The bulk of the remainder were influence on the national conference and determined its main course. The Musteites fought this Right wing where they threatened the Musteite control but the Musteites did not take one step beyond this in a political fight against them.

### THE FREE LANCERS

The Musteites catered to the progressive free lancers, slobbered all over them and roped some in on this basis. Dennis Batt was also present, but he paddled his own canoe. He was made chairman of the Constitution Committee that drew up the Musteite, "Declaration of Independence". In the main, Batt supported the Musteites.

### THE LOVESTONEITES

The Lovestoneites were criticized by Lovestone for their concessions at the Chicago Unemployed Conference so they came to Columbus ready to bargain with Muste. But Muste had already closed his deal with Stalinism and did not care to deal with the Lovestoneites. The Lovestoneites, through their unemployed organizations which are affiliated to the National Unemployed Federation, presented a draft program for a new federation to the Columbus conference. They did not present this to the Federation to which they are affiliated. If the Lovestoneites had been able to obtain a "better deal" at Columbus they would have deserted the Federation which they are affiliated with. The old Lovestone policy, the two-faced game, cannot be discarded by their group.

The Declaration of Independence or rather Declaration of Workers Rights, a political document of the Musteites is signed by the Constitution Committee headed by Batt and the Steering Committee of the Conference which includes four Lovestoneite signatures. Does the Lovestoneite agree with the action of his fraction?

The political tendencies primarily carried on a struggle around the three positions; of the Right wing, socialist grouping; the centre, Musteite-Stalinist bloc and the Left wing around the National Federation of Unemployed which included the Left Opposition. The Lovestoneites flirted between the centre bloc and the Left bloc.

### LEFT OPPOSITION DELEGATES

A fraternal delegate from the Left Opposition was given the rights of a fraternal delegate but the Musteites overcame the problem of reporting a fraternal delegate from the Communist League by reporting through the credential committee that the report on the fraternal delegates will be given later. It was never delivered. Left Opposition members, representing unemployed organizations from all parts of the country as regular delegates and fraternal delegates representing a substantial number of unemployed in different organizations were at the conference.

### THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF UNEMPLOYED

The Unemployed Councils are affiliated to the Federation but they came to the Ohio conference fighting the Federation because they do not have mechanical control of it. The Musteites have two members on the national committee of the Federation so they established a division of labor. The members of the national committee could talk for the Federation but the other Musteites took the floor to speak against a resolution calling for affiliation. One must listen to the words of leaders of the different tendencies but one must see that the action conforms to these words. At Columbus the words and deeds of the Stalinist-Musteite bloc were two altogether different things.

The Muste-Stalinist bloc attempted to establish a committee of five Leagues, Councils and Federation which would give the Muste-Stalinist bloc 13 of the 15. This committee was to call a conference to amalgamate all the organizations into one. The Left bloc objected to this attempt at mechanical control of the unemployed movement and the exclusion of other larger unemployed organizations on the provisional committee, for example, the California unemployed organization which has 150,000 members. Other organizations should likewise have been considered in the provisional committee.

So far the Stalinists obtained nothing from their united front from above, and the Musteites obtained only a hollow victory. The Musteites are trying to marry their child, the Unemployed Leagues, to the Stalinist Unemployed Councils, but the reactionary child, the product of the miseducation of Musteism, objects to the marriage. However, the continuation of the united front from above will no doubt force the deal.

The Left Opposition fraction in the unemployed organizations will continue the work started at Chicago for the unification of the unemployed movement. The Muste-Stalinist bloc at Columbus and the Right wing flag-waving element prevented the working class from utilizing this conference to its full extent. The temporary setback can be overcome in the coming months by intensifying the work for the unemployed program of the Left Opposition and the building of the National Unemployed Federation.

—H. O.