



Shall Tom Mooney Stay in Jail?

Governor Rolph of California has announced his decision refusing to grant Tom Mooney's appeal for a pardon. This should neither prove startling, nor record disappointed expectations on the part of revolutionists. But it should serve to settle once and for all any illusions which have existed in the minds of credulous workers. We can now once more affirm that for militant workers there is no redress in appeals to capitalist justice.

Undoubtedly many workers have held such illusions. Moreover they have been deliberately and deceptively nourished. Not so much for the purpose of maintaining expectations, but rather to prevent and to disorganize any serious efforts to actually set in motion the only real means at the disposal of the working class to force the jail doors open—its own mass pressure. The facts of this contention have been clearly established. We do not address it as a charge to the steeped in corruption and perfidy officials, of the A. F. of L. No, their crime was infinitely worse. Their special representations, particularly those in the state of California, have already been exposed as the actual connivers in the frame-up game. But there were special capitalist agents selected to nourish the illusions.

Tom Mooney, when informed of the decision, said: "It is a class decision with a class motive, and along these lines it shall be fought out in the future." These are serious words coming from the lips of a sterling fighter. In reality that has been the only way ever to fight it out. But the American workers did not yet fully see that, and were held back.

The effective organization of that fight is now more than ever on the agenda. But it cannot fulfill its objective without all workers being given the most ample opportunity of participation. To overlook that, or to put obstacles in the way of its realization, condemn any efforts to isolation and impotence. Such could only directly and criminally play into the hands of the rapacious jailors of Tom Mooney. It becomes, of course, a question of fighting back the capitalist offensive all along the line. It embraces the issue of release of all class war prisoners.

That Tom Mooney particularly symbolizes the body and spirit of all these class war victims is so amply illustrated in his call issued after receiving this recent decision. In part it says, "I am ready and willing today as always to give my life to the cause of the toilers of the world regardless of race, creed, color or nationality. This decision in the face of world-wide protest against my brutal frame-up, is an insolent and sinister challenge hurled by a doomed capitalist system into the teeth of the entire working class.

"I call upon the united militant and revolutionary working class of the entire world to accept this challenge. They must close ranks and raise louder than ever the demand that the plunderbund of California let go their victim.

"They must fight not only for my freedom, but for the abolition of the capitalist system."

But to discharge our duty to this call

SERIES ON DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

On May 13 at the Labor Temple comrade Swaback will give the first of a series of four popular lectures for workers on Dialectical Materialism. The four lectures will be delivered on four successive Friday nights. The admission price will be 15¢ per lecture. Comrade Swaback will undertake an exposition of the subject from its many aspects.

May 13—The Historical Struggle between Materialism and Idealism.

May 20—Dialectical Materialism Applied to Nature.

May 27—The Materialist Conception of History.

June 3—Dialectical Materialism Applied to Society.

To the Readers of "The Militant"

To Our Readers and Supporters:
Gratifying results have been obtained in our subscription drive. It gives us an excellent basis for a yet more effective wind-up during the coming month, May 1 to June 1. Its goal is \$1,000. It should be translated in to reading. More power to the Left Opposition press.

This proposal we address not only to our members but to our supporters and readers as well. In the subscription drive a couple of our branches have participated excellently and set a splendid example. Some of our readers have done their bit. But our aim is to extend it during the final month to include the activities of all.

One month of efforts to build the Left Opposition press. This is a modest request. We have published our proposal as to how we aim to attain it. We want to extend the circulation of our various papers and secure their financial foundation. With the help of all supporters of

as revolutionists should do we must again remind of the previous call sent from St. Quentin prison, in which Tom Mooney, in full realization of the enormous task ahead, demanded that a genuine united front movement be organized to force this plunderbund to let go of their victims. In such lies also the guarantee for more effective steps toward the abolition of the capitalist system.

Tom Mooney's call was then and is now primarily addressed to the revolutionary workers to the Communists, for them to take the initiative. There is no other force in the movement fully conscious of the goal and with sufficient vitality to take the initiative. It is high time that the official party leadership realizes that this it must undertake.

The State and the Trade Unions in Canada

TORONTO, ONT.

In his final address to the jury at the historical trial that outlawed the Communist Party in Ontario, the Crown Prosecutor declared that "the trade unions were not being attacked... every institution throughout the country protected the trade union movement" (*Mall and Empire*, Nov. 13, 1931). It is the purpose of this article to show that on the contrary, the legal status of the Canadian trade union movement, precarious enough before the repression of the Communist party, is more completely at the mercy of the capitalist state than ever. For the trade unions (we do not mean the officialdom) to accept the suave assurances of the Crown at their face value would lull them into a state of false security.

I.
Hostility to freedom of association in general is an early juridical phase of the capitalist reconstruction of society. The last decades of the eighteenth century industrial and agrarian revolutions released business enterprise from the fetters of feudalism and mercantilism in favor of freedom of competition and contract. The French Declaration of Rights and the American Declaration of Independence breathe the same spirit of optimistic (and "rugged") individualism as Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations": The democratic state is conceived as a mass of free citizens, each of whom is an ultimate source of sovereign authority, which would be impeded by "artificial" groups. The end of law was to secure the absolute and universal natural rights of individuals, a conception very congenial to the English courts where for a century and a half the doctrine of *laissez-faire* masqueraded in the guise of "public policy".

In the eyes of the law, the wage-worker was on a footing of formal equality with all other citizens. But whatever the philosophical speculation of Rousseau, the device of universal suffrage merely ignores economic classes; it does not destroy them. Sovereignty in reality passed from the landed interest to the money power. The "new freedom" brought glittering prizes to the capitalist entrepreneur: to the proletariat it brought the factory system, low wages, long hours, slums and unemployment. Divorced from the ownership of the means of production, the wage-worker has only a Hobson's choice. From the very outset the employer was a combination in himself. To speak of the freedom of the labor contract under these circumstances was a mockery. In the later stage of capitalist consolidation and monopoly, the unorganized worker is more than ever a helpless figure in his own fate.

Trade unionism was the organized refusal of the workers to submit passively to the rigors of the sacred "wage fund" and the "inexorable laws of supply and demand." The trade unions, in Marx's phrase, were centers of resistance to the encroachments of capital. Neither the

value of the workers' commodity labor power, nor his standard of living, in general are fixed automatically but by way of struggle. The first attempts, however, to combine in trade unions encounters the savage repression by the State. A series of combination acts in Great Britain declare a trade union an unlawful society and the strike a crime. The penal codes of other countries likewise deem "collective bargaining inconsistent with 'liberty'". Nevertheless, the workers organize secretly and strikes break out despite long terms of imprisonment for the leaders.

Against the right to combine, the capitalist courts invoked two doctrines (a) the doctrine of conspiracy and (b) the common-law rule holding as unlawful all combinations in restraint of trade. Originally limited to specific offences, the judges, when faced with the problem of association, extended the conspiracy doctrine to combinations of workers. Conspiracy was the agreement "to commit any unlawful act or any lawful act by unlawful means." The attempt of "Old Toryism" to enforce customary wage rates fixed by Justice of the Peace, long after the craft guilds had lost their power, was doomed. The Combination Laws, passed in additional fear of the French Revolution were repealed in 1824-25. The judges, however, gave form to the doctrine that a conspiracy in restraint of trade is indictable independently of statute.

The growing resistance of the workers, and the strength of their political agitation, combining with the circumstances of an expanding capitalism, resulted, though with considerable unevenness, in a stage of concessions. The Trade Union Acts of 1871 and 1906 gave the unions in Great Britain particularly, immunity from liability under the doctrine of conspiracy in both its criminal and civil aspects. That was a period when "democratic" reformism appeared to have achieved great triumphs. Combination was no longer unlawful. The right to strike and to picket were freed from the fear of the injunction (we are not here speaking of the United States). Domestic and inter-union affairs were more or less safe-guarded from the jurisdiction of the courts. Their funds were protected against embezzlement.

But a reactionary counter-current was at work even then. Already in 1902 the impeccably Fabian Webbs had to record in their "Industrial Democracy" that "the public opinion of the proletariat and professional classes is in fact even more hostile to trade unionism than it was a generation ago... Under this adverse bias the courts of law have for the last ten years been gradually limiting what were supposed to be the legal rights of trade unions." At the present day, the capitalist class is once again engaged in sharp restriction of trade union activities. The Emergency Powers Act and Trade Union Act of 1927 are scarcely to be regarded as landmarks of greater class harmony in England, which experienced the great General Strike.

In the United States, Canada, and Australia, in addition to the former merely permissive, there is now coercive legislation regarding strikes and lock-outs. Australia and New Zealand, the stamping fields of "Labor Governments", have made compulsory both arbitration through administrative tribunals and compliance with the award. Statutes forbid the boycott, peaceful picketing and even the simple strike. Use of the injunction to enforce compliance with these prohibitions is sanctioned and violation of the statutes made punishable by criminal proceedings. The high-water mark of the capitalist control, or rather dissolution, of the trade unions was reached by the Fascist government in Italy which declared its policy to be the break with *laissez-faire* liberalism and the socialism of class-welfare". The independent unions have been outlawed. Strikes are repressed like sedition. The Fascist "unions" are incorporated in the state-machine, under the supervision of a "Minister of Corporations."

(Continued in next issue)

Debate

SOCIALISM versus COMMUNISM

Can the Program of the Socialist Party Emancipate the Working Class?

Yes: Young People's Socialist League
No: Spartacus Youth Club (Communist Youth Left Opposition)

FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1932
at 8 P. M.
at the Labor Temple
14th Street and Second Avenue
ADMISSION: 20 Cents
Auspices: Joint Arrangement Committee

Demonsstrate on May Day!

The forty-fourth International Labor Day on May 1, 1932 takes place at a time when the decline of the capitalist system is reaching new depths, when the most intense and most wide spread of its economic crises is approaching unprecedented aggravation. Factories, shops, magazines, ships are lying fallow; trade is at its lowest ebb, the bourgeois factions are wrestling among themselves to unburden themselves of the load of taxation upon one another's and the working classes' shoulders; more than 30 million workers walk the pavements in search of jobs the world over; those still at work suffer one wage reduction after another; poverty and wretchedness lurks in every corner.

The wise men of the bourgeoisie have seen all their utopian schemes, all their plans, all their remedies blown up like toy balloons by the ravages of the economic chaos. Only one country has thrown a ray of light into the world darkened by the shadow of the capitalist system. That is Soviet Russia, the land of the proletarian dictatorship.

The successes of socialist construction in workers' Russia have shown to the workers of the world the possibilities of socialism, their solution to the present anarchy. In spite of the mistakes of the Stalinist leadership, in spite of the backwardness of the country, the example of socialist planning and control in Russia has shown to the workers of the world how to avoid unemployment, how to build up and maintain industry for the benefit of those who run it, for those who toil.

International Labor Day 1932 reveals the irreconcilable contradiction between the socialist system and the capitalist system. In their agony, the defenders of the capitalist system are trying to save themselves by plotting the destruction of the Soviet Union and the utter subjugation of the workers the world over with it. The Soviet Union is faced with the threat of an attack from Japanese imperialism in the Far East and from the rapidly growing Fascist reaction in Germany. A tremendous and immediate danger is hanging over the head of the Soviet Union and the working class: the menace of Hitlerism which is out to crush the strongest ally of the U. S. S. R.—the powerful German proletariat.

The First of May, International Labor Day originated as a holiday of the American workers, it grew out of the struggle for the eight hour day in the eighties of the last century. The international working class made the holiday of the American proletariat its own holiday, a day of international working class solidarity. On the First of May, this

MILITANT AFFAIR

An intensive campaign is being conducted at present throughout the country to put our press on a sounder financial basis and increase our circle of readers. In connection with this drive the New York Branch of the League is holding an affair at its headquarters, 84 East 10th St., on Saturday, April 30th at 8 P. M. The proceeds of the affair will be turned over to Press Fund.

From present indications the affair will be a success. Tickets are selling well. An entertaining program has been arranged, including a singer, recitations etc. Admission is by ticket and is only 25¢. The unique feature of the affair is that everyone who pays for a ticket is entitled to an eight issue sub to **The Militant** for himself or a friend. Come and help us to enjoy ourselves.

THE STALINIST-LOVESTONE UNITY NEGOTIATIONS!

NEXT WEEK

The outstanding and most significant new development in the internal struggle of the American Communist movement is represented by the unity negotiations between the Stalinist Party officials and Lovestone, the leader of the expelled Right wing. In next week's **Militant** we will publish a report of these negotiations with an analysis and comment by James J. Cannon.

Marine Workers Sentenced to Jail

The three militant marine workers involved in the "bomb plot" frame-up in New York harbor have been sentenced by the capitalist court to long sentences in Sing Sing. Soderberg received from 12 to 25 years and Bunker and Trajer from 5 to 25 years each. The first two are to be deported when they have served their terms. The prisoners were denied the right to reply to the sentences.

The dastardly frame-up of the harbor bosses has received legal sanction from the capitalist government. The class conscious workers of the country must be aroused against this new outrage of capitalist class justice. We must not allow the class enemy to throw these three militant union men into his dungeons. That means their destruction. It is the duty of every revolutionist to

call upon to rally to the side of its German brothers, to the defense of its victorious Russian brothers, to the support of the workers' fatherland, the U. S. S. R. Today, more than ever, the solidarity of the international proletariat is an urgent need.

The party of the working class, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. is holding demonstrations in all parts of the country to celebrate the First of May. Every class conscious worker, every member of the revolutionary working class of America will demonstrate on May 1 under the banner of the Communist party. The American workers must gather on this day to voice their unflinching support of the Soviet Union against

all its imperialist aggressors, to show their inseparable community of interests with the workers of Germany in the face of battle.

Make the May Day demonstrations fighting demonstrations by manifesting your undying hatred of American imperialism—your enemy, the enemy of the U. S. S. R. and of all workers. Make the First of May a day of struggle against the capitalist system, against unemployment and for unemployment relief at the expense of the bosses. Against wage cuts, speed up and long hours and for the maintenance of the wage scales, for better conditions in the shops, for the Six Hour Day without reduction in pay. Make the First of May a banner day of working class struggle against capitalism!

The Prussian elections of April 24 made the National Socialist Party of Adolf Hitler the strongest party in that German province, which by virtue of the fact that it contains nearly two-thirds of the entire population of Germany and holds within its boundaries the most important industries in the country, represents the key position to the Reich as a whole.

The Fascist victory signifies not only an advance over the last Landtag elections (their success there has been properly described as phenomenal—a rise from 9 seats to 159, but also a high point in their steady increase of strength as a whole. In the run-off elections for the presidency on April 10, they received some 32 per cent of the total vote. Last Sunday they received 35 per cent of all votes cast.

The Hitler forces are flushed with victory. It is inconceivable that they should not exploit the moral strength of their success for decisive actions. While keeping up the mockery of legalism, Hitler is already warning the government itself against... illegal actions. How Hitler will proceed with the seizure of power, whether he will be able to establish a coalition with the Catholic center party or whether he will resort to a coup d'Etat is inconsequential. He is determined upon drastic measures. He is on the threshold of fulfilling the task assigned to him by the needs of the German bourgeoisie—that of throttling the working class of Germany.

Wherein Lies the Responsibility of the Social Democrats?

In its editorial on Tuesday, April 26, 1932, the **Daily Worker** poses the question as to who is responsible for the menacing advance of Fascism. It comes to the conclusion that the social democracy with its theory of the "lesser evil", with its support of the notorious government, decrees of the Brüning government, with its deceit and systematic misguidance of the workers, has paved the way for Hitlerism. Is this true? Unquestionably true. No one who claims to be a revolutionist can deny it. But can anything else be expected from the traitors of August 4, 1914, from the henchmen of Noske and Scheidemann? Hasn't it been an A B C fact for Communists that the social democrats can play no other role than that of selling out the working class? And isn't it precisely the duty of the Communists to break through the deception and the betrayal of the social democracy in order to rally the working class against Fascism, against the class enemy?

The Stalinist scrivener of the **Daily Worker** blame the social democrats for Hitler's forward march. We consider the treacherous preparatory work of the party of Wels and Breitscheid as a matter of fact.

"... a new argument is brought forward," writes the **Daily Worker** editorialist, "the argument that the Communists are responsible because we do not form a united front with the social democrats. This new position is also supported by the... Trotsky-Cannon renegades." And he goes on to show that Norman Thomas also uses this

turn in the German party already. According to a dispatch in the **New York Herald-Tribune** of April 27, the Communists have decided to fight to the end against any form of Nazi government in Prussia. Furthermore, the dispatch says, the Communists have changed their view that the party leadership no longer regards the social democrats the chief enemy as before, but the Fascists. United action of the Red workers with the trade unions is foretold. There are indications of a change also in the editorial in the **Daily Worker** quoted above. It is significant that the social democrats are not once referred to as "social Fascists". If this information proves to be correct a good part of the urgent proposals of the Left Opposition have already broken ground for themselves.

What Does the Left Opposition Propose?

As a first step in this direction, the Left Opposition of the C. P. G. proposes the convocation of an extra-ordinary part congress to review all these questions. It demands that these questions be discussed on the basis of party democracy, that the worker Communists be allowed to voice their opinions. The harm already done can thus be dispelled rapidly and conclusively.

The capitalist press reports a semi-turn in the German party already. According to a dispatch in the **New York Herald-Tribune** of April 27, the Communists have decided to fight to the end against any form of Nazi government in Prussia. Furthermore, the dispatch says, the Communists have changed their view that the party leadership no longer regards the social democrats the chief enemy as before, but the Fascists. United action of the Red workers with the trade unions is foretold. There are indications of a change also in the editorial in the **Daily Worker** quoted above. It is significant that the social democrats are not once referred to as "social Fascists". If this information proves to be correct a good part of the urgent proposals of the Left Opposition have already broken ground for themselves.

—S. G.

call upon to rally to the side of its German brothers, to the defense of its victorious Russian brothers, to the support of the workers' fatherland, the U. S. S. R. Today, more than ever, the solidarity of the international proletariat is an urgent need.

The party of the working class, the Communist Party of the U. S. A. is holding demonstrations in all parts of the country to celebrate the First of May. Every class conscious worker, every member of the revolutionary working class of America will demonstrate on May 1 under the banner of the Communist party. The American workers must gather on this day to voice their unflinching support of the Soviet Union against

all its imperialist aggressors, to show their inseparable community of interests with the workers of Germany in the face of battle.

Make the May Day demonstrations fighting demonstrations by manifesting your undying hatred of American imperialism—your enemy, the enemy of the U. S. S. R. and of all workers. Make the First of May a day of struggle against the capitalist system, against unemployment and for unemployment relief at the expense of the bosses. Against wage cuts, speed up and long hours and for the maintenance of the wage scales, for better conditions in the shops, for the Six Hour Day without reduction in pay. Make the First of May a banner day of working class struggle against capitalism!

The Prussian elections of April 24 made the National Socialist Party of Adolf Hitler the strongest party in that German province, which by virtue of the fact that it contains nearly two-thirds of the entire population of Germany and holds within its boundaries the most important industries in the country, represents the key position to the Reich as a whole.

The Fascist victory signifies not only an advance over the last Landtag elections (their success there has been properly described as phenomenal—a rise from 9 seats to 159, but also a high point in their steady increase of strength as a whole. In the run-off elections for the presidency on April 10, they received some 32 per cent of the total vote. Last Sunday they received 35 per cent of all votes cast.

The Hitler forces are flushed with victory. It is inconceivable that they should not exploit the moral strength of their success for decisive actions. While keeping up the mockery of legalism, Hitler is already warning the government itself against... illegal actions. How Hitler will proceed with the seizure of power, whether he will be able to establish a coalition with the Catholic center party or whether he will resort to a coup d'Etat is inconsequential. He is determined upon drastic measures. He is on the threshold of fulfilling the task assigned to him by the needs of the German bourgeoisie—that of throttling the working class of Germany.

Wherein Lies the Responsibility of the Social Democrats?

In its editorial on Tuesday, April 26, 1932, the **Daily Worker** poses the question as to who is responsible for the menacing advance of Fascism. It comes to the conclusion that the social democracy with its theory of the "lesser evil", with its support of the notorious government, decrees of the Brüning government, with its deceit and systematic misguidance of the workers, has paved the way for Hitlerism. Is this true? Unquestionably true. No one who claims to be a revolutionist can deny it. But can anything else be expected from the traitors of August 4, 1914, from the henchmen of Noske and Scheidemann? Hasn't it been an A B C fact for Communists that the social democrats can play no other role than that of selling out the working class? And isn't it precisely the duty of the Communists to break through the deception and the betrayal of the social democracy in order to rally the working class against Fascism, against the class enemy?

The Stalinist scrivener of the **Daily Worker** blame the social democrats for Hitler's forward march. We consider the treacherous preparatory work of the party of Wels and Breitscheid as a matter of fact.

"... a new argument is brought forward," writes the **Daily Worker** editorialist, "the argument that the Communists are responsible because we do not form a united front with the social democrats. This new position is also supported by the... Trotsky-Cannon renegades." And he goes on to show that Norman Thomas also uses this

turn in the German party already. According to a dispatch in the **New York Herald-Tribune** of April 27, the Communists have decided to fight to the end against any form of Nazi government in Prussia. Furthermore, the dispatch says, the Communists have changed their view that the party leadership no longer regards the social democrats the chief enemy as before, but the Fascists. United action of the Red workers with the trade unions is foretold. There are indications of a change also in the editorial in the **Daily Worker** quoted above. It is significant that the social democrats are not once referred to as "social Fascists". If this information proves to be correct a good part of the urgent proposals of the Left Opposition have already broken ground for themselves.

What Does the Left Opposition Propose?

As a first step in this direction, the Left Opposition of the C. P. G. proposes the convocation of an extra-ordinary part congress to review all these questions. It demands that these questions be discussed on the basis of party democracy, that the worker Communists be allowed to voice their opinions. The harm already done can thus be dispelled rapidly and conclusively.

The capitalist press reports a semi-turn in the German party already. According to a dispatch in the **New York Herald-Tribune** of April 27, the Communists have decided to fight to the end against any form of Nazi government in Prussia. Furthermore, the dispatch says, the Communists have changed their view that the party leadership no longer regards the social democrats the chief enemy as before, but the Fascists. United action of the Red workers with the trade unions is foretold. There are indications of a change also in the editorial in the **Daily Worker** quoted above. It is significant that the social democrats are not once referred to as "social Fascists". If this information proves to be correct a good part of the urgent proposals of the Left Opposition have already broken ground for themselves.

—S. G.

LETTERS FROM THE MILITANTS

Once More on the Bronx Cooperatives

NEW YORK, N. Y.

The conflict which has arisen between the members of the Food Workers Industrial Union and the C. P. bureaucracy (See The Militant, April 16, 1932) is constantly becoming sharper and has aroused wide spread interest among Communist and Left wing workers all over town.

As The Militant reported two weeks ago, the clash resulted from the expressed intentions of the management of the Consumers Cooperatives in the Bronx—which stands under the control of the party leadership—to reorganize that enterprise at the general expense of the food workers employed there. So far, a 10 per cent wage cut has already been increased by one hour and a tax of 10 per cent for the benefit of the T. U. U. C. (the Left wing union center) has been imposed upon the Cooperative employees, not content with all these measures, the bureaucracy has seen fit to engage non-union men in place of the old help. This aroused the F. W. I. U. members to the point of exasperation.

The workers of the Con-Coops brought to the attention of the management the fact that a non-member of the Union was working there and requested that he be replaced with a Union man. The manager, an ex-drug store boss from Washington, D. C., refused their request. They were therefore compelled to lodge a protest with the Union.

Tribesh, one of the organizers of the F. W. I. U. was sent to the Con-Coops to investigate the complaint. He informed the management that the Con-Coops were Union shops and that only members of the F. W. I. U. could work there. He demanded that the non-member be removed and that he be substituted with one of the many unemployed workers from the Union.

The manager refused to comply with the demand, and a temporary stoppage was the result. This stirred the anger of the Con-Coops and Union workers. The situation became so heated that a meeting of the District Control Commission of the Communist Party had to be called. After a long and weary session, the following amazing decisions were rendered:

- 1. To condemn the action of the Union organizer.
- 2. To mildly criticize the management of the Con-Coops.

It is only natural that the workers have been made furious by these decisions. It is hard for them to swallow the fact that the unheard of actions of the management have the tacit approval of the party bureaucrats. The suspicions of the rank and file with regard to the bureaucracy have been heightened to an unprecedented degree. And there is good cause for their suspicions. A few of the following incidents, known to all of the Left wing food workers will show why.

In the fall of 1930, there was a conference of the camp workers of all the party summer camps. The conference was shocked and outraged by the demand of one Doroshkin, manager of Camp Kinderland, to reduce the wages of the camp employees. The protest of those present was so unanimous that the party representative to the conference was forced to repudiate Doroshkin and to make an official statement that the latter would not be returned to his post this following summer. But last year this same Doroshkin was right back in his old place and even much more of a slave driver than before.

As was reported by The Militant on August 1, 1931, a certain Newman, manager of the camp Woclonia, threatened to call the state troopers to oust a worker from the camp who had resisted against his arbitrary dismissal. The party Central Control Commission, acting under the pressure of the workers following this outrage, decided very diplomatically to keep Newman from occupying any paid post for six months. The six months will be up in July. The workers are wondering: Will Newman, like Doroshkin, be returned to his post once more?

While Newman gets this mild rebuff, the worker who resisted his bureaucratic methods, a militant worker arrested at the time of the needle trades strike last year, was faced with a very mysterious withdrawal of his bail and finally, with deportation by the government authorities.

The case of the worker Napoleon, whose exceptionally militant record is well known among the party members, and whose heroism was even made the subject of poems that appeared in the Daily Worker, similarly arouses suspicion. Napoleon was expelled from the Food Workers Industrial Union as a counter-revolutionary because he dared criticize the leadership. He happened to be out on bail for union activities in the strike at the Zeligreen cafeterias at the time. He was never notified by the bureaucrats when to appear in court. His bail was forfeited and he has been left to rot in jail.

The food workers are restless. They have been called counter-revolutionaries and worse by the bureaucrat Zack for daring to take a stand against the spurious "reorganization" of the Con-Coops. Are they too to be left at the mercy of the class enemy because they are courageous enough to criticize the headmen?

The incidents above and the latest occurrences at the Con-Coops are not accidental. Hundreds of Left wing workers have already reacted to the arbitrary

and headless antics of the party bureaucracy with their feet. They have gone over to the A. F. of L. union. The devoted and sincere party members are alarmed. They will not allow the bureaucrats to wreck the work for which they have offered so many sacrifices in the union and on the picket line. They know the danger involved in tampering with the rights of the Union membership. They realize that workers join the union not as full fledged Communists, but to better their conditions. They know that it takes time and patience and self-sacrifice to develop the union workers into hardened class fighters. The party workers will not stand by and see the bureaucrats drive the union workers away from the movement. They know what is at stake.

The Left Opposition has been warning the party workers against the bureaucracy ever since its existence. It is a pioneer in the fight. The party workers who have come to realize the balafulness of the bureaucratic methods of the party leadership must search deeper for the causes behind them. Whatever is wrong with the leadership in the Cooperatives is also wrong with the leadership on a national and more than that, on an international scale. The roots of the bureaucracy lie in the whole system of Stalinism which has been leading the Comintern as a whole to a steady decline, to disintegration and impotence, ever since the death of Lenin. The workers who really want to fight bureaucracy, will have to fight against the whole rotten Stalinist system. The time is not distant when the best elements of the party membership will realize this and struggle side by side with the Left Opposition for the regeneration of the party and the Communist International along the Leninist line, along the line of revolutionary victory.

-FOOD WORKER.

From an Illinois Miner

Dear Comrades: It has been some time since I wrote to you relative to the situation in southern Illinois. Well, the situation is plenty hot down here now.

The strike is effective in every degree throughout the whole state. The District Organization is pursuing once more the wrong policy of separate agreements. This has caused a stir among the miners from the large mines, especially here in Franklin County. In several local unions we have pushed resolutions demanding that the officials recall those separate contracts.

The negotiations between the bosses and the miners are at a deadlock. The operators moved to adjourn sine die. The perspective is that a plenty hot struggle will develop. The District Officials are making every maneuver to get the miners to accept a wage cut. However, they have not openly committed themselves to this proposition. "Competition, stabilization, freight rates," are the substitutes for an energetic program of struggle. That the District Officials are not as brazen as before is simply due to the fact that progressive forces within the miners are fast developing and have attained a powerful following. On the other hand Lewis has declared himself to be after Wilker's scalp to the end. This causes the district to cater to the progressive elements.

April 1st we held a huge mass meeting at the West Frankfort Ball Park with several thousand miners present. We cooperated with the Communist party to the extent of using this 8 hour day celebration as a protest meeting against Criminal Syndicalism. Our active young militant, Gerry Allard, spoke and acted as secretary of all arrangements. This seemed to be much to the disappointment of the Stalinites. A resolution was unanimously adopted calling upon the miners to mobilize their forces in defense of the seven workers. It was also decided to call upon all local unions to send delegations to the State's Attorney demanding the release of the victims. The program consisted of 8 prominent progressive mine leaders. In spite of the fact that the Party opposed Edmundson he spoke at the meeting. William Browder was squeezed in the program as presenting the I. L. D. This is the first time that the Party representatives have been able to speak publicly since the raids.

We have a powerful unemployed movement started here in southern Illinois, which the Party attacked. We have branches in West Frankfort, Herrin, Coello, Benton, Christopher, Marion, Johnston City and Logan. Allard is serving in the capacity of general organizer of the movement and Secretary of the West Frankfort Unemployed Branch with seven hundred members. It is really valuable experience that we all have gained in this work. The organization is reaching greater powers every day and beginning to develop along militant lines in spite of the weak beginning it had due to the lack that time of real leadership, also being infested with religious cults of every description. Organizing unemployed is like organizing Negroes, the religious angle always breaks loose. Thus far we have exercised the greatest possible degree of democracy, but by degrees we are placing a check on it.

Over 4,000 members have joined our movement in 2 months period. Starting out with five men the organization is maturing to a point where it will be a fighting, achieving organization. It is comical to see all the crafts of the A. F. of L. come to the support of the movement after it attracts thousands of people. All the U. M. W. A. locals in the country have endorsed it, several churches, the Sub-District Commission and one

The First Week of the Press Drive

We are off on the first week of our drive to BUILD THE OPPOSITION PRESS. This is a week to be devoted to the distribution of recent back issues of our papers. Back numbers have been mailed and are already in the hands of the comrades. The thing to do now is to distribute them and follow up these distributions with sales of current issues and our literature. An encouraging response to our appeal for our sympathizers to help us in this drive came in from South Bend, Indiana. The back numbers asked for were in the mail three hours after receipt of request for them. Comrade should remember that all returns must be in the mail (air mail) not later than Monday noon following the close of the week.

Upon consideration we found it advisable to revise some of the quotas. As they stand now they include a larger number of cities and are closer to what can actually be realized. They are: New York—\$325; Minneapolis—\$200; Chicago—\$100; Toronto—\$70; Philadelphia—\$40; Cleveland—\$40; Boston—\$40; Newark—\$35; Kansas City—\$30; St. Louis—\$25; Los Angeles—\$20; Youngstown—\$10; New Haven—\$10; Montreal—\$10; Duluth—\$10; Springfield, Ill.—\$10; W. Frankfort, Ill.—\$10; Pittsburgh—\$10; Trenton—\$5. Which city will be the first to reach its quota?

Judging from the returns to date and especially from last week's showing Minneapolis is a two to one shot. But the final word has not been said and any one of our branches which has been saving its wind for the drive down the home stretch may step out to the front of the race. For last week Minneapolis reported 16 subs, New York, 5; Youngstown, 4; Chicago, 1; and 1 is credited to miscellaneous. This brings the total for the drive to 127. The standing of the branches is as follows:

Minneapolis	49
New York	38
Chicago	9
Boston	4
Youngstown	4
St. Louis	1
Newark	1
Philadelphia	1
Montreal	1

chapter of the American Legion, all without solicitation.

The meetings of the unemployed down here pack every hall we meet in. Relief has been rushed. This has developed the enthusiasm of the masses to a point where they suddenly realize what an ounce of organization can do. Rough roads lay ahead of them and in the bumpings that they will get scores of good fighters for the revolutionary movement will develop. Young workers, who formerly were attracted to a distant Metropolis in search of employment, no longer can be swayed by a general exodus. They are staying here now and fighting is going to be on the order of the day.

Tomorrow is a big day for the miners of Franklin County. A huge county demonstration is planned by the miners. Every local union has called a special meeting and made plans for the parade and demonstration. We anticipate, conservatively, 5,000 miners. The advertising leaflet calls for a fight on Boss Scabery. This is the latest maneuver of the bosses to wedge in for open shop. 500 of us marched at the Big Mine out near the edge of the town and pulled the bosses out of the mine. After we did this we threatened to put out all maintenance men if the practice of using boss strike breakers was abused. Maintenance forces are the men who take care of the mines from flooding, squeezes, falls, etc. The bosses attempted to use their stool pigeon crew of bosses instead of members of the United Mine Workers. This caused a commotion. As a result hell is going to pop out unless this demand of the miners is adhered to. The officials tell us, "Boys, we have no contract with the coal operators so what can we do about it?" Hot stuff! We have been busy thinking of slogans for banners. Scores of banners will stream the whole country.

The Party bureaucrats have been out maneuvered on every issue where they tried their Centrist policies, and where they attempted to discredit those who fought against bureaucracy. They have been forced to like it on several occasions. The artillery that they let loose against Allard for a while, has now stopped. It was doing them more harm than good and at the same time giving Allard publicity on matters that reacted very bad against them and Communism. Now they are attempting to use Party members of the rank and file to start in sniping away a him. But even this has failed simply because his position was unavaliable. If any one is responsible for the uplifting of the terror against Communists in this country, Allard and a handful of militants are to be given the credit. The Party came forward on a May Day program and again we were instrumental in getting various local unions to endorse the demonstration. It appears to me that the Party is orientating itself to progressive elements, some with shady records. I cannot understand the sudden change of political lines. However, I am fully in accord with a united front of all miners.

Your article on the Anthracite was very informative. I received a personal letter from a young miner from Shenandoah, Pa. He reported along the lines that you had in your article. Our next big step among the progressives is to give our district forces centralized and then develop national contact.

Best Regards to all the Comrades,
-AN ILLINOIS MINER.

Miscellaneous 19
Minneapolis is now far in the lead but New York regards this as a small item to be wiped out at its subscription drive affair to be held this Saturday. The idea of giving ticket holders an 8 issue sub to The Militant should draw a large attendance and shoot it back into the lead. Minneapolis—on your toes, the fight isn't over. The showing made last week by Youngstown is very encouraging. We still expect to hear from Cleveland, Kansas City, New Haven, Los Angeles, Pittsburgh, Springfield and W. Frankfort, Ill., Toronto. We also expect to hear again from Philadelphia Boston, St. Louis, Newark, Montreal, Chicago, and Youngstown.

MILITANT BUILDERS
The staff of Militant Builders is moving upward. This is one of the most encouraging signs. It means that more and more comrades are being drawn into the drive. In our opinion we are approaching the point at which the simple addition of numbers produces a quantity far in excess of their sum. Our barometer of progress is proving itself. The staff and its record follow: C. R. Hedlund—9; C. Cowl—5; V. R. Dunne—5; M. Dunne—5; A. Kohlov—4; F. Barach—4; L. Basky—3; L. Roseland—3; C. Skoglund—3; O. Coover—3; C. Johnson—2; J. Carr—2; R. Sacharow—2; F. Cheloff—2; G. Ray—2; M. Glottlieb—1; M. Koehler—1; W. Winne—1; J. Carter—1; R. Ruskin—1; C. Forsen—1; H. Capella—1; S. Zalmanoff—1; W. Hermann—1; A. Swaback—1; A. Glotzer—1; L. Logan—1; Kaldis—1; M. Sterling—1; W. Curran—1.

The staff looks very much like a roll call of the Minneapolis branch. The comrades in other branches should get busy and bolster up their end of the re- presentation.

Comrade Coover reports the following from Minneapolis: No. 1 team scored nine points this week making their total as of April 21st—thirty-seven and a quarter (37 1/4) points. No. 2 team scored sixteen (16) points making their total forty-three (43). The total score for the branch—eighty and a quarter (80 1/4) points.

"We warned Chicago and New York they had better watch out and we meant it and offer the above as proof.

"Several of the Minneapolis Militant Builders have not been mentioned in the Militant yet. The complete list is as follows: M. Dunne—5 points; V. Dunne—10; F. Barach—8; S. Lesin—4 3/4; J. Ross—4 1/2; C. Forsen—1 1/2; C. Johnson—3 1/2; W. Curran—1/2; C. R. Hedlund—17; O. Coover—5; L. Rosland—4 1/2; C. Skoglund—4; S. Barach—1; S. Kalmajoff—2; C. Cowl—1 1/2; M. Glottlieb—1/2. (A point is equivalent to one dollar). The above includes the subs for Enser Kampf, Young Spartacus.

"Comrade Hedlund in turning in \$11 for subs he got from members of his union remarked: 'I didn't have much time or I would have got them all'". Comrades everywhere—PLEASE COPY

BOOKS BY TROTSKY

DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
A Criticism of Fundamentals*
(Out of Print in paper cover)
Part 1 and 3 140 pages, cloth bound \$1.00

STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION*
Part 2 of the Draft Program
86 pages 25c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION
158 pages paper cover 50c
cloth cover \$1.00

PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.*
48 pages paper cover 15c

THE FIVE YEAR PLAN*
(out of print)

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION*
30 pages paper cover 10c

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER*
64 pages paper cover 15c

COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM*
64 pages paper cover 15c

THE TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION*
(out of print) 10c

WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT AND GERMANY — THE KEY TO THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION*
—SHALL FASCISM REALLY BE VICTORIOUS?*
48 pages paper cover 10c

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Vol. 1
522 pages. Retail at \$4
By Special arrangements with the publishers of this book we can offer it to certificate holders at \$3

THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA*
364 pages cloth cover \$1.00

SINCE LENIN DIED
by Max Eastman
158 pages paper cover 50c

In Preparation

PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION
400 pages cloth cover \$1.50
paper cover 1.00

WHAT NEXT?—VITAL QUESTIONS FOR THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT
200 pages paper cover 50c
Bound Volume of all the pamphlets indicated by * Only 100 copies available. Cloth cover \$2.00
SPECIAL RATES IN BUNDLE ORDERS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street,
New York, N. Y.

Lovestone and the «Pseudo-Revolutionists»

Our attack upon the proposal made in Izvestia by Karl Radek for a military alliance between the Soviet Union and the United States against Japan, has called forth at least one reply. If the diplomats and statesmen in the Stalinist camp who hastened to endorse Radek's idea promptly relapsed into silence and have since said nothing more on the matter, at least their Right wing brothers-under-the-skin have entered the field to break a lance for the embarrassed Stalinists.

In the current issue of the Workers Age (April 23, 1932), the leading editorial is devoted to a warm defense of Radek and an "anonymous" assault upon our position, with the argument that even though Radek is playing "bad politics based upon an unrealistic analysis" there is nothing at all the matter with the idea in principle, that it is quite in harmony with the teachings and practices of Leninism. The case is even helped along by the printing of a quotation from Lenin which is supposed to put the imprimatur of Bolshevism on the idea of a military alliance and, by implication, upon the Lovestonites. As for our arguments, they are summarily dismissed as follows:

"That it is wrong in principle for the Soviet power to form temporary alliances, even military alliances, with capitalist powers, only a muddled pseudo-revolutionary phrasemonger will maintain. For we must remember that war is the continuation of politics by other means, and that 'politics' is concentrated economics; any 'principle' that would forbid a military alliance must likewise, if logically extended, forbid a political treaty or a commercial agreement!"

Utilizing Capitalist Antagonisms
Have the Bolsheviks (or any other ruling revolutionary proletarian party) the right to utilize differences and antagonisms existing at a given moment in the camp of world imperialism? Absolutely, the right and the duty. So long as the proletariat in other countries has not yet come to the aid of an isolated workers' dictatorship, the latter must exploit the antagonisms in the camp of world imperialism in the interests of its own preservation. The noteworthy example of this is the action of the Bolsheviks when the German imperialists marched against the Soviets following their failure to accept the terms of the Brest-Litovsk treaty in February 1918, that is, while the Allied imperialists were still at war with Germany. Trotsky describes the action as follows:

"On the twenty-second of February, at the meeting of the Central Committee, I reported that the French military mission had conveyed the French and English offers to help us in a war with Germany. I expressed myself as in favor of accepting the offer, on condition, of course, that we be completely independent in matters of foreign policy. Bucharin insisted that it was inadmissible for us to enter into any arrangements with the imperialists. Lenin came vigorously to my aid, and the Central Committee adopted my resolution by six votes against five. As far as I can remember now, Lenin dictated the resolution in these words: 'That comrade Trotsky be authorized to accept the assistance of the brigands of French imperialism against the German brigands.'"

This is the "agreement" (Lenin deliberately uses ironical quotation marks around the word) to which Lenin refers in his "Letter to the American Working Men". In reprinting excerpts from this letter, Lovestone, to justify his contention, commits a little forgery which is quite characteristic of him and entitles the letter: "On 'Alliances' with imperial-

Opposition Press in Czecho Slovakia

Our Left Opposition in Czecho Slovakia is publishing two organs, a theoretical monthly, entitled MARXISTIKA REVUE and a weekly, entitled Delnicka Politika, Czecho Slovakia workers in America who may be interested in keeping in touch with our movement in their own country can obtain these papers by writing to: Marxistska Revue, Fr. Kohut, Zizkov, Chavlickovo nam 4), Prague, and to: Delnicka Politika, Havlickovo nam 4, Prague XI.

ST. LOUIS, ATTENTION!
OPEN FORUM
on
May 6th at 8 P. M.
at the
Cranden Branch Library Auditorium,
14th and Cass Avenues
Subject:
Lynch Law, the Negro and the
Scottsboro Boys
Speaker: MARTIN PAYER
ADMISSION FREE

MINNEAPOLIS, ATTENTION!
STUDY CLASS
at the
Minneapolis Spartacus Youth Club
"Elements of Marxism-Leninism"
Every Friday Night
LABOR LYCEUM
Sixth Ave., N. at Irving
Instructor: CARL COWL

HAVE YOU READ TROTSKY'S PAMPHLET ON GERMANY?
The face of the labor movement of the entire world, and of the Communist workers in particular, is closely tied up with the fate of the German workers in their immediate political situation. To understand this in its full and Marxian implications, every militant worker should read Trotsky's pamphlet GERMANY, THE KEY TO THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION—Shall Fascism Really Be Victorious?
Get your copy from Pioneer Publishers.

ism". Lenin writes: "We shook hands with the French monarchist although we knew that each one of us would be pleased to hang the other . . . And however much the hypocrites of Anglo-French and American imperialism may howl and abuse us . . . I will not hesitate for a moment to conclude a similar 'agreement' with the German imperialist robbers in case the attacks of the Anglo-French armies would require it."

But such entirely legitimate "agreements" are quite a distance from the alliance proposed by Radek and justified by Lovestone in principle. What Radek proposed was the conclusion of a military alliance between the United States, as one of "the capitalist powers which at the present stage do not infringe on her (the Soviet Union's) frontiers or interests", an alliance against imperialist Japan. That is how the issue stands. In reply to this reactionary proposal we quoted from Lenin's theses in March 1918, directed not only against the ultra-Leftist advocates of a "revolutionary war against Germany" (Bucharin and Radek), but also against the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists who insisted upon a Soviet alliance with France and England against the Hohenzollern armies.

"Our policy must be based, not on a choice between two imperialisms but on the possibility of strengthening the socialist revolution or at least on the necessity of enabling it to offer resistance until the other countries join the revolutionary movement . . . We have always fought our own imperialism, but the overthrow of the imperialism of one country by means of an alliance with the imperialism of another, is a line of action that we reject both on reasons of principle and because we consider it inadmissible."

Let us remember that this was written at a time when Russia's need for "allies" was infinitely more acute than today, at a time when there was no Red army and when (unlike the situation in Manchuria) the German forces had already advanced upon Russian territory into the very heart of the country. In spite of this Lenin offered objections in principle to the proposals for an alliance with the Anglo-French imperialists. He did not withdraw them even when Kamkov, leader of the Social Revolutionists, announced to the Soviet Congress the withdrawal of that party's support of the Bolshevik government because Lenin preferred to sign the humiliating treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

Towards the end of the same year, Lenin wrote to the party's Central Committee: "Now the least enlightened will understand what cowardly treason to socialism the Mensheviks and the S. R.s committed by accepting the alliance with the rapacious Franco-English bourgeoisie with the alleged aim of annulling the Brest peace." And again, to the Sixth Congress of the Soviets, Lenin declared in retrospect: "Fate condemned us to isolation and after the Brest peace we have lived through a grievous period. We were told: 'Better a new alliance with the imperialists than such a peace.' . . . rather a new war together with the Anglo-French than the yoke of this violent peace. We replied: if we address ourselves to the international working class, we shall be able to continue our work."

As Lenin writes in the "Letter" published by Lovestone: "There are agreements and agreements." With one, the proletariat makes a revolutionary use of temporary divisions in the imperialist camp; with the other, the proletariat allies itself with the bourgeoisie of one country, sacrificing its revolutionary principles—towards a reactionary end, to which we shall refer later on.

Lenin made one kind of "agreement". When the Soviets were pressed to the wall by the advancing Germans, he readily accepted arms and ammunition from the French and English; he agreed to use their military specialists to blow up bridges and railroad lines in order to impede the German advance. The Soviets bound themselves to nothing. They created no illusions among the workers of the world concerning any "friendliness to the Soviet republic" or "nobleness of purpose" on the part of the Entente brigands. They concluded no secret (or any other kind of) treaty of alliance with France. They continued to agitate unreservedly for the overthrow of both sets of imperialist powers by their respective proletarians.

Under similar circumstances, the Soviets would act the same way today in the conflict with Japan. In face of a Japanese intervention against the U. S. S. R., or even a threat of such a step, the Soviets would be entirely justified in buying or accepting arms or ammunition from, let us say, the United States (if it could get them from this imperialist power which, far from standing aside, as Radek implies, is the fundamental counter-revolutionary force in the world (Continued on page 3)

THE MILITANT
Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition)
at 84 East 10th St., N. Y.
EDITORIAL BOARD
Martin Aabern James P. Cannon
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
Arne Swaback
Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879.
SATURDAY, APRIL 30, 1932
Vol. 5, No. 18 (Whole No. 114)
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.
Bundle rates, 8 cents per copy.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

Appeal to the S. A. P.

The Left Opposition Addresses the Centrist Party Congress

(Continued from last issue)

If one is of the opinion that in the S. U. the beginnings of a classless society are already in existence, it is not necessary to concentrate all forces for the development of a proletarian revolution in other countries. As the realization of a classless society in the S. U. will apparently lead by example to the introduction of socialism in other countries. Therefore the whole policy of the Communist parties is confined to a simple role: propaganda against the war of intervention against the S. U. Only people who do not grasp the international character of the proletarian revolution (like Brandler and Thälheimer and now in the S. A. P.—Rueck, Schaber, Dueby) can assert that the policy of Stalin is good and only the policy of Thälmann is bad. Just as until 1923 the correct policy of the Communist Party of the S. U. exerted a fruitful influence on other Communist parties, so the false policy of the Communist Party of the S. U. now exerts a devastating influence on other Communist parties. Until 1923 the leading role of the C. P. of the S. U. influenced the C. I. positively, now negatively. From this follows the necessity of changing the policy of the C. P. of the S. U., the abrogation of the theory of socialism in one country from which all the strategic and tactical errors of the C. I. follow. So long as the only proletarian revolution exists in Russia, the leading role in the C. I. will remain that of the Communist Party of the S. U.

National Socialism vs. Leninism

If it is correct that socialism can be realized in the S. U., that a classless society can be built, then the victory of Fascism in Germany is not dangerous, at least not so dangerous that it can jeopardize the existence of the proletarian state. If the existence of the S. U. is determined only by national factors, then the events on the international arena, in China and especially in Germany are only of a secondary nature. And if the consequences of a possible seizure of power by the Fascists in Germany are underestimated and it is considered as a phenomenon of short duration then one can hold the point of view that the S. P. G. is now the principal enemy. Then the programs of "national and social liberation" and of "social Fascism" are correct, then a united front with the S. P. G. and with the unions is not necessary, then also is acceptable the policy of the "Red Trade Union Opposition" (R. G. O.—the C. P. trade union organization). Without a correct revolutionary theory there can be no correct revolutionary practice! It is not a matter of a few mistakes of the C. I. on "fine points" but of a whole system of backsliding from the positions of Marxism-Leninism. The Brandler and Thälheimers could not grasp this and therefore their policy suffered a complete bankruptcy. Rueck, Schaber, Dueby are repeating the same thing today.

One cannot train Communist cadres without taking a definite stand with regard to the whole policy of the C. I. for the past 9 years. The policy of the C. I. in China shows how a revolution in colonial countries should not be organized. Contrary to the theses and statutes of the Communist International adopted at the Second Congress (Theses on the national and colonial questions, 1920, 9-66-77) which state:

"The Communist International should enter into a temporary collaboration, even an alliance with the revolutionary movement of the colonies and the backward countries, must not however combine itself with it, but must unconditionally maintain the independent character of the revolutionary movement—be it even in embryo form", the Comintern under the leadership of Stalin pursued a policy in China which aimed at the suppression of "the independent character" of the Communist party of China by all means. The counter-revolutionary party of Chiang-Kai-Shek's Kuo Min Tang was recognized as a party "friendly" to the Comintern, the Communists of China were ordered not to come out as an independent party which warns the proletariat and the peasants of the inevitable betrayal by the Kuo Min Tang and then leads them to the realization of the revolution, but to remain as a fraction of the proletarian dictatorship but to the "democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants". The Communists of China were forced in the years of 1925-1927 to suppress workers' strikes and peasants uprising because of the union with a "friendly" party and for the sake of "national unity". This policy led to the tragedy of the Chinese revolution, to the murder of thousands of Communists and of an even larger number of workers and peasants by the blood-thirsty counter-revolution, by Stalin's allies of yesterday. The C. I. stands helpless in the face of present events in China. The Communist Party of China does not exist.

The Anglo-Russian Committee

The experiences in England are just as important. The history of the Anglo-Russian Committee should be studied by all revolutionaries who want to gain clarity on questions of the United Front and who want to understand the present weakness of British Communism. The bloc of the Soviet-Russian and English

lishes the dictatorship of the proletariat which is the form of the rule of the working class in the transition period from capitalism to socialism.

2. The dictatorship of the proletariat is exercised through councils (Soviets) which exercise the widest proletarian democracy. They are led by a party which in struggle for the seizure of power gains the confidence of the proletariat and this can only be a Communist party.

3. The Communist party is the mind of the working class and must represent its historical interests. It leads the proletariat into struggle for power and after the victory toward the building of socialism.

4. The struggle for a socialist society is an international struggle. The Communist International is that organization which directs this struggle, subjects the temporary interests of the proletariat to the historical ones and its limited national aims to the international aims.

5. The "theory" of the possibility of realizing socialism in a single country is reactionary, it contradicts the teachings of Marx and Lenin.

6. The presupposition for the recognition of the revolutionary, that is, Communist world movement is the reform of the Communist International and of the C. P. which will remove the strategic and tactical errors of the present leadership, will re-introduce inner party democracy and will achieve the unity of the Communist ranks on the basis of Leninism.

7. The victory of Fascism in Germany will mean not only the bloody suppression of the German working class, but also the greater sharpening of the war danger for the Soviet Union.

8. One of the most important tasks in the present situation is the defense of the Soviet Union as the fortress of the international proletariat. Only the defeat of Fascism and the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in one's own country can safeguard the existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union.

Therefore, comrades of the S. A. P., fight all forms of reformism and centrism.

Forward to Communism!
Executive Committee of the Left Opposition of the C. P. G. (Bolshevik-Leninists)

Without the C. P. G., S. P. G. and unions, no united front of the proletariat is possible. Many of you seem to forget this obvious truth. This can be seen from the cartels which you have established. We see that the cartels are made into discussion clubs in which one speaker after another tries to prove that the C. P. G. is incapable of carrying through actions, thus creating unbelievable illusions in the fighting strength of the cartels. We never denied the necessity of discussions, but it is clear to us that the aim of anti-Fascist cartels—or whatever other name they may bear—consists in the first place in extra-parliamentary actions. The first condition for this is the participation of the decisive proletarian organizations. Due to the fact that the cartels became meeting places of the bankrupt Brandler group, the Urbahns group and various other unimportant organizations, you made it impossible for yourself, workers of the S. A. P., to reach members of the C. P. G., their local organizations, as well as the S. P. G. and the Unions. You must learn this lesson from the past if you want actively to help build the class front of the proletariat.

The example of our organization in Bruchsal is instructive. Thanks to our group, there was established a united front with the S. P. G. with the unions and all other non-party organizations. This it seems is the only place in Germany where in spite of the existence of the Eastern group of the S. P. G. not an "iron front" was forced but a class front of the workers of Bruchsal.

We consider the question of a united front of the proletariat not a thing in itself. The necessity and significance of the united front becomes clear only when the closeness and full danger of Fascism is realized, as well as the necessity to defeat Fascism before the seizure of power, since after its victory this would be incomparably more difficult and bloody, if not impossible for a long period. None of the existing proletarian parties can do this work by itself. That is why we turn against the treacherous policy of the S. P. G. as well as against the false policy of the C. P. G. From this appraisal of the situation it follows for every worker who wants to struggle against Fascism earnestly and successfully that a real united front must be established between the various political camps of the divided working masses. The private anti-Fascist cartels consisting of yourselves, Brandler and Urbahns will not solve this problem as you have not the masses with you.

Correct united front tactics are possible only on the basis of a clear revolutionary policy. Your party has in no way yet fully overcome reformism but repeatedly makes concessions to it. If you will remove this condition and fully embrace a real revolutionary policy you must struggle for the following Communist fundamentals:

1. The victory of the proletariat is possible only through an armed uprising, during which the proletariat destroys the bourgeois state apparatus and estab-

The Bureaucrats Analyze the Elections

How the Rank and File Party Members React to their «Analysis»

The article below, taken from our German brother organ *Die Permanente Revolution*, gives a good picture of the party bureaucracy's methods of "analyzing" election results and of the genuine reactions of the party membership to the set-backs the C. P. G. has recently suffered.

The result of the elections "lags behind the objective possibilities that the present situation offers us. The election results are unsatisfactory for the Communist party". (Rote Fahne, March 14).

"The Communists do not consider it necessary to shout out loud about their victory" (Pravda, March 17, 1932)

"From this point of view, the five million votes for the fighting candidacy of the C. P. G. in the first ballot must be described as a big victory" (Thälmann on March 25. See Rote Fahne of March 30.)

It can readily be seen from these quotations how, inside of 14 days the defeat of March 13, which the Rote Fahne expressed with the words "unsatisfactory result" became a "great victory" of the C. P. G. What is this about face based on? Is it really true that after a more thorough investigation, the election results must be evaluated differently the way the Rote Fahne did on March 14? Let us look at the figures more closely. We find that in almost all the decisive industrial districts the party lost many votes. For example, in the "Thälmann fortress" Hamburg, in several of its proletarian quarters alone: St. Pauli, St. Georg, Barmbeck and Elmsbüttel, the party lost from 25 to 28 percent of the votes it received in the last local elections. The Nazis too have had small losses there. Only the Hindenburg Front gained from these losses. An investigation of the results in the other districts in the Reich does not permit an optimistic evaluation for the C. P. G. It is significant that the optimism of the Rote Fahne came into view only after the article in the Pravda. The Pravda, however, must baptize the defeat as a victory, because Stalin can stand no de-

feat, his policy is infallible. His theory that "the social democracy and Fascism are twins" has suffered shipwreck, the S. P. G. and the Nazis have become still stronger, the party has become weaker. This must not and cannot be expressed openly. That is why the decline of March 13 has become a "big victory of the C. P. G." The tone has been given, the line has been drawn, and now the editors and orators can rave about the "big victory". Now it has become clear that "the correctness of the strategic and tactical line of the party has been confirmed completely" and the barrage of slander against all those who are of a different opinion, can continue even in an increased measure.

The Lies of the Party Press

The "victory" of the party at the presidential elections, which has been invented by the bureaucracy, cannot, however, placate the party members. They know well, how they must evaluate the results of the elections. The bureaucracy offers a cheap explanation to quiet down the membership. The social Fascist leaders are guilty, because with the slogan of the lesser evil they have held the workers back from giving their vote to Thälmann. But this is precisely the task of the social democracy! That the leaders of the S. P. G. and the trade unions are betrayers—every Communist is well aware of. That it is the task of the enemy to fight against C. P. G., is only natural. The leaders of the S. P. G. can travel no other road than the one they have taken ever since August 4, 1914. To get excited over this is useless. But how is it possible that the S. P. G. succeeds in winning millions, yes, the greatest part of the German working class for the policy of the "lesser evil", even though they have no more reforms to offer to the workers? How is it possible that the C. P. G. has not been able to extend its influence in the working class, what with the socialist construction in the Soviet Union? These are questions which require an answer. But that leads too far: By answering such questions it must become clear how false the

strategic and tactical line of the party is. And this, the party bureaucracy can in no case permit to happen. Therefore, the cheap explanation, that the leaders of the S. P. G. are guilty for the defeat of the C. P. G.

Furthermore, "the counter-revolutionary, deceptive maneuvers of the S. A. P. and the Trotskyists: For Thälmann—against the C. P. G." are also to blame for the party's defeat. Only an editor of the Rote Fahne can write such lies about the Left Opposition. The brother organ of the Rote Fahne in France, *L'Humanité*, in the article by Perin of March 13, goes as far as to maintain that Trotsky has appealed for the election of Hindenburg. But the scribblers on the party press know very well that *Die Permanente Revolution* appealed to: "Vote for Thälmann, the Candidate of the C. P. G." and "Despite the Thälmann Course, Every Force for the Strengthening of the C. P. G." So much for the lessons the party press draws from the results of the March 13 elections.

By means of self-criticism the party will overcome all shortcomings and weaknesses, the party press writes day in day out. Is the examination of the political line of the party, and of its actions therefore in order? May the party members, for instance, say how they evaluate the results of March 13? What is self-criticism? Let us take a few examples: In Berlin there was a gathering of party functionaries after the conclusion from the election results to the effect that the party policy must be corrected. That was sufficient to arouse an uninterrupted hullabaloo on part of the party bureaucracy. One discussion speaker, excited by the continual interruptions, had to call out: "This is even worse than among the Nazis" and another: "Heinz Neumann may speak, but no workers!" Such self-criticism was too much for the bureaucracy and the meeting was adjourned abruptly. It was to be continued on Thursday, March 24. The bureaucracy needed this postponement, in order to eliminate all criticism. The following document, which we bring in full, is an exact picture of what took place:

"Berlin, March 21, 1932
"To All Sub-District Committees!
"To All Unit Organizers!
"To All Fraction Leaders in the Mass Organizations!

"What must absolutely be kept in mind in distributing invitations for the continuation of the conference of party functionaries on Thursday, March 24?"

"1. The last party functionaries' conference was attended to the extent of about 5-6 unemployed party comrades. The functionaries from the most important front, from the factory front, were therefore almost entirely absent. That is why invitations must be extended in such a manner that more than half of the representatives are factory workers."

"2. Half of the comrades present at the last conference were in the party less than a year, and half of these in turn, less than three months. We must see to it that this time our really active party functionaries are invited and represented."

The sub-district committee, the unit organizers and the fraction leaders in the mass organizations are responsible for such a distribution of the invitations as will make it impossible in the future, for open enemies of the party to get access to our internal conferences through a careless distribution of invitations.

Only in this manner can the responsible party functionaries guarantee that the coming party functionaries' conference will be a real impetus to revolutionary mass work for the next few weeks and months in the struggle around the run-off elections and the elections in Prussia.

Secretary of the D. E. C.
This is a concrete example of "self-criticism" in Berlin. Every party member who criticizes is an "open enemy of the party". In Hamburg, the District Organizer, Schubert went so far as to say at a conference of party functionaries that the poor results in the elections at Hamburg are due to the comrades in the Kampfband (the party's anti-Fascist "mass" organization), who were only guarding the posters at night and slept in the daytime, when they should have been discussing at the unemployed registry offices. When those present protested against this shameful arrogance, Schubert declared: "Whoever does not maintain discipline to the end of the elections, stands expelled". This is the picture of the party's "self-criticism". Such "self-criticism" is the deception which makes it possible for the party bureaucracy to insult the members and to forbid any criticism of the policies of the party leadership.

But this cannot go on. The members are beginning to realize that the party leadership is leading them into the void. They will criticize. After the second ballot, the party members will resort even more to criticism. It is the task of the Left Opposition to pose the demand for free criticism in the party into the foreground. It is on this field that we must drive the first wedge.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.
—Die Permanente Revolution

Lovestone and the «Muddled Pseudo-Revolutionists»

(Continued from page 2)

today and, in the deepest sense of the world, the spearhead of the anti-Soviet movement in the camp of imperialism).

The Meaning of an Alliance

But the conclusion of a military alliance with America is another matter entirely. Such measures are not taken merely for the sake of remaining on paper. In the event that war actually breaks out between the Soviet Union and Japan, the United States will appear on the scene as the military ally of the former. It will be in a position to carry out its imperialist designs not merely against Japan, but primarily against China, under the convenient banner of defending the workers' fatherland from military intervention by Japan! The American bourgeoisie, which has always fastened the imperialist yoke upon weaker peoples in the name of the loftiest ideals—the "open door" in China or "democratic elections" in Nicaragua—could not wish for a more noble banner under which to sink its teeth into China than the "defense" of the Soviet Union from Japanese intervention!

Still more: Let us again assume the outbreak of a Japanese-Soviet war. On the basis of the "alliance", the Soviets are "legally" justified in calling for the dispatch of American aid to relieve its hard-pressed forces from the Japanese offensive. If Lovestone is a member of Congress by that time, we assume that he will vote war credits to the army and navy; perhaps, also, he will call upon the working class to suspend its war upon the bourgeoisie which is engaged, you see, in fighting to a successful finish its war in defense of the Soviet Union.

If not, he will be infinitely less con-

Now on the Press!

Problems of the Chinese Revolution

WHAT HAPPENED IN THE 1925-1927 CHINESE REVOLUTION? WHY WAS THE SITUATION LOST BY THE PROLETARIAT? WHAT IS HAPPENING IN CHINA NOW? WHAT SHOULD THE COMMUNISTS DO?

These questions and many more are posed and answered in this book. In Trotsky's own words: "The lessons and problems in the strategy and tactics of the Chinese Revolution constitute at the present time the greatest teaching for the international proletariat."

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!
Money is Needed
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street,
New York, N. Y.

Economics, Politics and War

The Soviet Union grants foreign imperialist concessionaires certain economic rights, even allowing them to exploit Russian labor and accumulate capital. And yet, even though "politics is concentrated economics", it stubbornly refuses, in principle, to grant the concessionary any political rights whatsoever. With the introduction of the N. E. P., the exploiting Kulak was granted definite economic privileges, yet Lenin opposed granting him any political rights.

Here you have a classic instance of how generally accepted postulates can be prostituted to serve a reactionary purpose, of how truth, "logically extended", becomes a lie.

The worker makes a "commercial agreement" to work for his employer and to surrender the surplus value he produces so that his employer may accumulate capital. William Green "logically extends" this idea, he "concentrates" economics into politics, and tells the worker to vote for his employer at the polls. And since "war is a continuation of politics by other means", he helps

herd the workers into the trenches so that more capital can be accumulated at home.

The Soviet Union might allow the Japanese the use of the Chinese Eastern Railway for the "economic" purpose—let us imagine—of dumping Japanese products on the Chinese market and causing the ruin of certain native industries. Yet, Russia would rightly refuse the use of the Chinese Eastern for the transport of Japanese troops in a war against China, in spite of Lovestone's learned explanations that war is a continuation of politics which is only concentrated economics.

A revolutionary trade union, finally, would take proper advantage of a rift in the ranks of the manufacturers, or of antagonisms between different strata among the latter, and adjust its tactics in order to make the most gains for the workers. But it would not enter into an "alliance" with one set of manufacturers for the purpose of wiping out a rival set of manufacturers. (It is with some reluctance that we refrain from dwelling here on an analysis of the extent to which Lovestone's recent advocacy of a "logical extension" of the policy pursued in the needle trades union under the regime of Lovestone-Zimmerman . . .)

No, we are against "military alliances" of the Stalin-Browder-Radek-Lovestone type, and yet we are entirely in favor of utilizing imperialist disagreements as well as of concluding "commercial agreements". If "logical extension" is to be spoken of at all, then it is only in this connection:

The reactionary theory of socialism in one country is predicated upon transforming the international Communist movement into a pacifist frontier guard defending the Soviet Union from intervention while it builds an isolated, national utopia. In endeavoring to build this national socialist fantasy, intervention must be warded off at any price. The price thus far has included the heavy payments made by the English proletariat for the Soviet alliance with Purcell; the payments made by the Chinese proletariat and peasantry to Stalin's alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek and Wang Chin Wei; the payments still being made for the pacifist confusion and delusion of the world proletariat by the signing of the Kellogg Pact and Litvinov's Kautskism antics every six months at Geneva.

Lovestone exerts himself, and defames Lenin in the bargain, in an effort to present Radek's proposal, as well as the party's demand for the "expulsion of the Japanese diplomats", as isolated aberrations, as accidental deviations from the generally correct line. Not at all! They are entirely logical results of the fundamental line. The tree of national socialism can only bear chauvinist fruit.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

—Die Permanente Revolution

EDITORIAL NOTES

“UNDER RANK AND FILE LEADERSHIP”

One of the demands in the program of the lefts, who were elected to the convention of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, was for “a real strike under rank and file leadership”. This slogan does not appear here for the first time. It did not originate with the workers who stood as the candidates of the Left in the International elections, and they should not be blamed for it. There is no doubt that this anti-leadership slogan was imposed upon them by their own “leaders”, the Stalinists, whose “rank and file” ballyhoo is intended for the deception of others and by no means for their own guidance in relation to their own rank and file.

In their steadily losing battle of recent times with the traitorous leaders of the Right wing unions, the demoralized officials of Stalinism have been trying to outwit their opponents and to sneak into the leadership of the workers without their knowledge. This is the grand “strategy” which motivates the demagogic appeal for the leadership of the “rank and file”. The sad results which these unworthy maneuvers have brought, not the least of which has been the disorientation of the Communist workers in the simplest and most elementary questions, justify a discussion of this ridiculous slogan from the standpoint of the A B C of Marxism.

The first thing which must strike the observant worker, and which in part accounts for the miserable failure of the slogan about rank and file leadership, is the howling inconsistency of its authors. On the one side they stand at the head of the party by virtue of appointment and rule it with the most bureaucratic arbitrariness. If one is looking for an example of “the leadership of the rank and file” he will never find the merest trace of it in the Stalinized party. The rank and file Communist who would venture to assert the modest right to say what he thinks in criticism of the leadership, to say nothing of the advocacy of the slogan which he propagates in the unions under party instruction, would soon be handed his passports. This is what has happened to many, and the workers in the unions know it. Integrity, common sense and a decent respect for ordinary human intelligence all argue against this sordid attempt to fool the workers with an idea that is flatly contradicted in the practices of the Amters and all the other Fosters.

But hypocrisy and dishonesty are prime ingredients of Stalinism; and, in addition, contempt for the workers. Abusing the faith of the conscious proletariat in the Russian revolution and the Comintern, they imagine they can sanctify anything by mere command. This is what misleads them into such self-contradictory policies in relation to the general labor movement. Ruling within the limited sphere of the party by decree, they forget that in order to influence the non-Communist masses it is necessary to convince them. And since the

masses take nothing on faith, but test everything out in life and learn from their experience, the slogans of the party which do not correspond to reality are unavailing. Thus it happens that such manifest absurdities as the “leadership of the rank and file” leave the masses untouched, and only succeed in deceiving and disorientating the Communist workers. In this case simple questions, long ago settled in the camp of the Marxists.

LENIN ON LEADERS AND MASSES

Twelve years ago Lenin wrote a pamphlet for the purpose of clearing up some misconceptions in the newly-formed Communist parties. One of these misconceptions was the prejudice, derived from syndicalism, regarding leaders and masses. Replying to the arguments of those “Leftists” in the German party who contrasted the one to the other he remarked: “What old and well-known rubbish! What ‘left’ childishness!” The simple explanations and ironical comments of the great teacher, regarding the masses and the leaders and the inter-relationships between them, apply so pertinently to the present aberration of the American Stalinists on the subject of “rank and file leadership” that a few quotations will be in order.

“One notices the superficial and incoherent use of the now ‘fashionable’ terms, ‘masses’ and ‘leaders’. People have heard much and have conned by rote all the frivolous attacks on ‘leaders’—contrasting them with the ‘masses’—but failed to grasp the application and the inner meaning of these words.”

“To a Russian Bolshevik . . . all talk of ‘from above’ or ‘from below’, the ‘dictatorship of leaders’ or ‘the dictatorship of the masses’ cannot but appear as childish nonsense. It is something like discussing whether the left leg or the right arm is more useful to a man.”

“People bend every effort to elaborate something extraordinary, and in their zeal to be intellectual they become ridiculous. It is common knowledge . . . that the classes are usually and in most cases led by political parties, at least in modern civilized countries; that political parties, as a general rule, are led by more or less stable groups of the more influential, authoritative experienced members, elected to the most responsible positions, and called leaders. All this is elementary. It is simple and plain. Why then all this rigamarole, this new Volapuk?”

These citations are taken from *The Infantile Sickness of “Left” Communism*. Have the new members of the party ever seen this pamphlet, and have the old members forgotten it? These teachings, like all the fundamental doctrines elaborated by the Comintern under Lenin, have been declared out of date; they are buried under the filth and confusion of the Stalin regime. The Communist worker who wants to find his way back to the Lenin path might well begin with a study, or a reexamination, of the “Infantile Sickness”.

After that he would never be able to go around shouting such absurdities as “the leadership of the rank and file”. He would not be able even to listen to such an instruction from his own “leaders” without laughing under the table.

THE ROLE OF THE CONSCIOUS WORKERS

The chatter about “rank and file leadership” is a disgrace for Communists. Such horseplay can very well be left to the confusions of syndicalism who object to the idea of a workers’ political party on the ground that the masses need no leaders. This demoralizing nonsense only hampers the organization of the working class and thus serves the bourgeoisie. The mission of the Communists is to educate the workers, not to muddle and confuse them; to aspire, frankly, to lead them in their struggle, not to trail behind them and cater to ignorance and prejudice with demagogic slogans.

The working class under capitalism, is not and cannot be a homogeneous body. The enormous pressure of the ruling class ideology presses heavily upon it. Bourgeois ideas, disseminated through the press, the schools, the church, the movies, the political parties, and in other ways, demoralize and corrupt the thoughts of the workers. Besides that, the working class under capitalism is divided into various economic categories, with different standards of living and, to a certain extent, different immediate interests. The upper stratum, the aristocracy of labor, which is the most conservative, and at the same time the best organized, becomes a means of strengthening bourgeois influences over the class. The labor bureaucrats, with their high salaries and petty-bourgeois standards of life, act as the agents of capital in the labor movement.

As a result of all this, it is possible, under capitalism, only for a minority of the working class to free itself from bourgeois influences and ideas and to understand the historical class position of the proletariat. These are the conscious workers, the vanguard of the class. In order to influence the class in its own interest most effectively it is necessary for these conscious workers to organize themselves and to fight unitedly against the domination of the capitalists and their agents in the labor movement. From this arises the Marxist idea of the centralized workers’ party. It is the first letter of the Marxist alphabet on the question of working class organization.

This principle of leadership, by the most conscious and resolute elements, applies to strikes and other daily struggles as well as to the class struggle as a whole. The agitation for “the leadership of the rank and file” negates this principle and sows confusion. By this it only makes the leadership of the reactionary agents of the capitalists more secure. This harmful and anti-Marxist slogan should be cast aside. Instead of it, the Communist workers in the unions, as in every other field of the class struggle, should frankly contrast their policy and their leadership to the policy and the leadership of the labor henchmen of capital. This is the only way to teach the workers and help them in their struggle. There is no roundabout way.

—J. P. C.

The Negro and the Class Struggle

The National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition), by direction of the National Conference, appointed a commission to assemble material on the Negro question in America and to open a discussion in the League. The following article by comrade Oehler, a member of the commission, is a contribution to the discussion and presents his personal views. —Ed.

In modern Europe, where capitalism has long ago had its decisive battles with feudalism, there still linger remnants of the past, feudal carry-overs complicating the solution of the proletariat’s problems. This complication does not confront the workers of America, but in its place we have a variety of more conflicting inheritances. One of these was the carry-over of chattel slavery, a more backward system which gained supremacy over attempted feudalism inroads in new America by its economic advantages in the south for large scale agriculture production. The race form of chattel slavery in America gave impetus to this development.

The period when economic systems were gaining a foothold in new America cannot be separated from the class struggles in Europe at that time. The discovery of America which gave the feudal kingdoms greater land rights only accelerated the internal contradictions between the feudal land property relations and the developing bourgeois property relations. The commercial system of Europe was on the upgrade and the race for America reflected this. The discovery of America accelerated bourgeois development in Europe and logically expressed its growth in the colonies.

In Europe, feudalism ruled by the monopoly of land through the feudal estates and the Catholic church and by hindering the developing handicraft system, keeping it part of the feudal hand-tool production. Free land in America played havoc with feudal relations, not just because there was free land, but primarily because with this free land developed the bourgeois property relations. Bourgeois relations are made difficult by free land, but the presence of large tracts of usable free land in a new country smashes all feudal attempts at stability when capitalism moves in at the same time.

The Problem of Labor Power

Labor power and its control was the burning problem of the rulers of the colonies, not only its scarcity but also its control once obtained. Wage workers would soon disappear as free farmers, hunters and trappers. The white slaves and indentured slaves from Europe enabled the merchant and commercial classes to retain a sufficient supply of cheap labor power, but this could only be kept up by a constant influx from Europe. The land to the west was an escape for this labor supply. At the same time, however, this resulted in developing bourgeois agriculture relations in the northern part of the colonies.

In Europe, where capitalism was already at work appropriating those who

had escaped feudalism through the handicraft system or by free peasant farming, and turning them into an army of propertyless wage slaves, there was no further escape. Either work as wage slaves, starve to death, or be killed or imprisoned as beggars and thieves—these were the alternatives. In America the escape to the west was still open. But this “escape” laid the basis for the further development and strengthening of bourgeois domination in America.

In the south conditions were different. The kinds of crops and the climatic conditions called for a different form. The crops demanded large scale agriculture production, and, capitalist agriculture relations were yet in their infancy. Feudalism could answer this request but, it could not furnish Serfs tied to the land and accustomed to the hot climate, when livelihood could be obtained by hunting and fishing, and trapping and free land for farming. The only suitable alternative, that rising bourgeois relations could tolerate was chattel slavery; bringing in large scale agriculture production, labor power bound in slavery, suitable for the climate. It was proven that the Indian could not serve this purpose. The white man from Europe had too easy an escape, even if it were possible to brand him as a chattel slave. The Negro race answered the need. Indentured slavery was the closest form to chattel slavery possible for the white man of Europe. It sufficed for the recruitment of a supply of labor in the north, but was not suitable for cotton and tobacco production in the south.

The traffic in Negro slaves was just as profitable as the traffic in indentured slaves. The chattel slave was more profitable for the south under the conditions. But in the latter period of Slavery in America the bourgeois relation had far outstripped the other forces and had shown that the wage slave was by far the most profitable for the master class. The conflict of these two antagonistic systems reached its climax in the Civil War. The forceful expropriation of the chattel masters’ property in the form of the slaves put an end to the most dangerous internal enemy of the bourgeois system. However, this did not remove all the obstacles and give a free hand for capitalist penetration. The carry-over was as heavy as a mountain, hindering all speedy solutions.

The expropriation of the chattel masters of their property in the slaves, opened up new avenues for capitalist development and new markets for penetration. The dictatorship which the capitalists set up in the south after the Civil War soon reduced the chattel masters to submission to the new rulers of America. In fact, the dictatorship was becoming a boomerang. The former slave was taking his liberty seriously in an increasing degree. The exploiters of the wage slaves were not long in learning they had a hundred times more in common with the former chattel masters than with the former slaves. The freedom taken by the slaves had to be checked; the dictatorship against the chattel masters was modified when their resistance was broken,

when they came to terms—the terms of the northern capitalists. From them on the capitalist supremacy took on a form of democracy for the white rulers of the south, and a new form of dictatorship against the Negro masses who were driven into worse slavery than before.

The New Role of the Negro

The freeing of the Negro from chattel slavery opened the door to a tremendous supply of cheap labor for the American capitalist. In fact the supply was too great for developing capitalism to absorb. However, it remained in reserve, ever ready to be used as expansion would warrant. Although capitalist development in America was fairly fast, the influx of European wage slaves, already trained, kept in check the rapid transformation of former chattel slaves into wage slaves. The slaves’ “freedom” turned out to be a bourgeois joke. The former slave found himself, free from his former master’s obligation to feed, clothe and shelter him, and keep him well as property, but not free from the economic exploitation and political domination of the capitalists and plantation owners. Left “free”, without economic means for a livelihood (land and tools), the Negro was free to starve to death, to submit to his former master in worse economic subjection than before, or to become a wage slave, providing he could find an employer. The “free” Negro, without land or tools, had only one road to travel as a class and race—to submit to the new forms of exploitation, since conditions were not ripe for a successful revolution to free themselves from their white masters and obtain the land and tools of production for themselves. As a race they adjusted themselves to the new condition—unassimilated as wage slave; not held as chattel slaves; reflecting the old and looking at the new, but representing neither. They started the process by eking out an existence on the land and as servants of the white rulers; part slave, part serf and part wage slave.

At the time of the transformation only the Marxists realized the historic significance of the “freeing” of the chattel slaves. The history of American labor cannot be written properly unless this current is traced back and properly connected with the development of the white and negro proletariat and their allies in the coming revolution.

Westward expansion, internal northern American development and colonial expansion could tolerate concessions to the white rulers of the south in return for their political support as plantation owners. Rule the Negroes in your own state as you like so long as you support your political hegemony, said the northern capitalist; and besides you can make more profits by your support than by resistance. And just as the freedom of the American revolution amounted to so many words and pieces of paper for the workers and farmers, so much did the freedom of the Civil War amount to for the Negro masses.

—HUGO OEHLER.

(To be continued)

Get a Sub for The Militant
Get Behind the Press Drive
Send Us Your Contribution

BUREAUCRATIC ULTIMATISM

by LEON TROTSKY

(Continued from last issue)

Instead of aiding the social democratic workers to find their way through experience, the C. E. C. of the Communist party abets the leaders of the social democracy against the workers. The Welles and the Hilferdings are enabled to screen with flying colors their own unwillingness to fight, their dread of fighting, their inability to fight by citing the aversion of the Communist party for participating in a common struggle. The stubborn, doltish and insensate rejection by the Communist party of the policies of the United Front provides the social democracy, under the present conditions, with its most important political weapon. This is just the reason why the social democracy—with the parasitism inherent in its nature—snaps up our criticism of the ultimatic policies of Stalin-Thaelmann.

The official leaders of the Comintern are now expatiating with profound demeanor upon the need to elevate the theoretical level of the party and to study “the history of Bolshevism”. Actually “the level” is falling constantly, the lessons of Bolshevism are forgotten, distorted and trampled under foot. In the meantime, it is by no means difficult to find in the history of the Russian party the precursor of the present policy of the German C. E. C.: he is none other than the deceased Bogdanov the founder of ultimatism or of “the up-and-outers” (Otzovists). As far back as 1905 he deemed it impossible for the Bolsheviks to participate in the Petrograd Soviet, unless the Soviet recognized beforehand the leadership of the Social Democrats. Under Bogdanov’s influence, the Petrograd Bureau of the C. E. C. (Bolsheviks) passed a resolution in October 1905: to submit before the Petrograd Soviet the demand that it recognize the leadership of the party; and in event of refusal—to walk out of the Soviet. Krassikov, a young lawyer, in those days a member of the C. E. C. (Bolsheviks), read this ultimatum at the plenary session of the Soviet. The worker deputies, among them Bolsheviks also, exchanged surprised looks and then passed on to the business in the order of the day. Not a man walked out of the Soviet. Shortly after that Lenin arrived from abroad, and he raked the ultimaticists over

the coals mercilessly. “You can’t—he lectured them—nor can any one else by means of ultimatums force the masses to skip the necessary phases of their own political development.”

Bogdanov, however, did not discard his methodology, and he subsequently founded an entire faction of “ultimaticists” or “up-and-outers” (Otzovists): they received the latter nickname because of their tendency to call upon the Bolsheviks to get up and get out from all those organizations that refused to accept the ultimatum laid down from above: “you must first accept our leadership.” The ultimaticists attempted to apply their policy not only to the Soviets but also in the parliamentary sphere and to the trade unions, in short, to all legal and semi-legal organizations of the working class.

Lenin’s fight against ultimatism was a fight for the correct interrelation between the party and the class. The ultimaticists, in the old Bolshevik party, never played a rôle of the slightest importance, otherwise the victory of Bolshevism would not have been possible. The strength of Bolshevism lay in its wide awake and sensitive relation to the class. Lenin continued his fight against ultimatism even when he was in supreme command, in particular and especially, as regards the attitude to the trade unions. “Indeed, if now in Russia,” he wrote, “after two and a half years of unheard of victories over the bourgeoisie of Russia and of the Entente, we were to place before the trade unions as a condition for their joining us that they ‘recognize the dictatorship’ we would be guilty of stupidity, we would impair our influence over the masses, we would aid the mensheviks. For the task of the Communists consists in being able to convince the backward to know how to work among them and not to fence ourselves from them by a barrier of fictitious and puerile ‘left’ slogans”. (THE INFANTILE DISEASE OF “LEFTISM”.) This holds all the more for the Communist parties of the West, which represent only a minority of the working class.

During the last few years, however, the situation in the U. S. S. R. has changed radically. The arming of the Communist party with sovereignty means the introduction of a new element into the interrelation between the vanguard and the class: into this relation

there enters the element of force. Lenin’s struggle against party and Soviet bureaucracy was in its essence a struggle not against the faulty organization of departments, nor against departmental red-tape and inefficiency but against the apparatus laying down the law to the class, against the transformation of the party bureaucracy into a new “ruling” clique. Lenin’s counsel, from his death bed, that a proletarian Control Commission be created independent of the C. E. C. and that Stalin and his faction be removed from the party apparatus was aimed against the bureaucratic degeneration of the party. For various reasons, which cannot be dealt with here, the party ignored this counsel. Of recent years the bureaucratic degeneration of the party has reached the extreme limit. Stalin’s apparatus simply lays down the law. The language of command is the language of ultimatism. Every worker must perform and forthwith accept as infallible all the past, present and future decisions of the C. E. C. The more erroneous the policies become, the greater are the pretensions to infallibility.

After gathering into its hands the apparatus of the Comintern, the Stalinist faction naturally transferred also its methods over to the foreign sections, i. e., to the Communist parties in the capitalist nations. The policy of the German leaders has for its counterpart the policy of the Moscow leadership. Thaelmann observes how Stalin’s bureaucracy rules the roost, by condemning as counter-revolutionary all those who do not recognize its infallibility. Wherein is Thaelmann worse than Stalin? If the working class does not willingly place itself under his leadership that is only because the working class is counter-revolutionary. Double dyed counter-revolutionaries are those who point out the balefulness of ultimatism. The collected works of Lenin are among the most counter-revolutionary publications. There is sufficient reason why Stalin should—as he does—submit them to such rigid censorship, particularly on their publication in foreign languages. Baleful as ultimatism is under all conditions—if in the U. S. S. R. it dissipates the moral capital of the party—it breeds double disaster for the Western parties which must yet begin accumulating their moral capital. Within the Soviet Union, at least, the victorious revolution has created material grounds for bureaucratic ultimatism, in the guise of an apparatus for repression. Whereas in capitalist countries, including Germany, ultimatism becomes converted into an impotent caricature, and interferes with the movement of the Communist party to power. Above all, the ultimatism of Thaelmann-Remmele is funny.

And whatever is funny is fatal, particularly in matters concerning a revolutionary party.

Let us for a moment transfer the problem to England, where the Communist party (as a consequence of the ruinous mistakes of Stalinist bureaucracy) still comprises an insignificant portion of the proletariat. If one accepts the theory that every type of the United Front, except the Communist, is “counter-revolutionary”, then obviously the British proletariat must put off its revolutionary struggle until that time when the Communist Party is able to come to the fore. But the Communist party cannot come to the front of the class except on the basis of its own revolutionary experience. However, its experience cannot take on a revolutionary character in any other way than by drawing mass millions into the struggle. Yet non-Communist masses, the more so if organized, cannot be drawn into the struggle except through the policy of the United Front. We fall into a charmed circle, out of which there is no way out by means of bureaucratic ultimatism. But the revolutionary dialectic has long since pointed the way out and has demonstrated it by countless examples in the most diverse spheres; by correlating the struggle for power with the struggle for reforms; by maintaining complete independence of the party while preserving the unity of the trade unions; by fighting against the bourgeois régime and at the same time utilizing its institutions; by criticizing relentlessly parliamentarism—from the parliamentary tribunal; by waging war mercilessly against reformism, and at the same time making practical agreements with the reformists in partial-struggles.

In England, the incompetence of ultimatism hits one in the eye because of the extreme weakness of the party. In Germany the balefulness of ultimatism is masked somewhat by the considerable numerical strength of the party and by its growth. But the German party is growing on account of the pressure of events and not thanks to the policies of the leadership; not because of ultimatism, but despite it. Moreover, the numerical growth of the party does not play the decisive rôle; what does decide is the political interrelation between the party and the class. Along this line, which is fundamental, the situation is not improving, because the German party has placed between itself and the class the thorny hedge of ultimatism.

—L. TROTSKY.

(To be Continued)

(From WHAT NEXT?—Vital Questions for the German Proletariat)