

WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE

THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879

VOLUME V, NO. 51 [WHOLE NO. 147]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1932

PRICE 5 CENTS

A Million to Be Expelled!

The New Stalinist Plan for «Purging» the Russian Party Ranks

The New York Times of December 27, informs us in Moscow dispatch from Walter Duranty, the correspondent whose services it commands in partnership with the Stalinist apparatus, of a new event impending in the Soviet Union.

"Nearly a million members of the Communist party may be deprived of their membership rights in the coming months, when Joseph Stalin follows the example set by Lenin and purges the organization of undesirable elements. The party itself has a little more than 3,000,000 members... The party has grown too fast, and many of its members, though loyal, are undisciplined. Many, though loyal and disciplined, are ignorant and unfit for the leadership to which Lenin destined them. Some are not even loyal and have broken discipline. Only today the newspaper Pravda reports the expulsion and arrest of nine Communists, Ukrainian district leaders, who had made common cause with the kulak enemy, and there are similar cases from the Caucasus to Siberia. In 1921, when Lenin purged the party, wolves in sheep's clothing, the blind leading the blind, he called them, and Stalin will follow his hard example."

The gratuitous reference to Lenin was undoubtedly furnished Duranty by the liaison officer in the Stalinist Agit-Prop department. For in reality, there is no natural connection between the purging of the party carried through in Lenin's day and the one being planned today, in which an estimated third of the party membership is to be expelled.

An Involuntary Admission

The mere observation that in the sixteenth year of the Bolshevik revolution, one third of the party membership must be turned out, is itself a crushing indictment of the whole system introduced into the party by the Stalinist apparatus.

How did Lenin carry through the cleansing of the party during his period of leadership? The key to the situation at that time as well as to Lenin's approach to the problem is indicated by his famous proposal that nine-tenths of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists who joined the Bolshevik party after the revolution, should be expelled forthwith! The difference now is that Stalin has been carrying through his purgings at the other end.

Under the Centrist regime, the bureaucracy has been swelled to enormous proportions. Into its ranks have been injected all the Menshevik elements who "discovered" the Bolshevik revolution after it was already firmly established and consequently "respectable", whereas the organizers and leaders of the revolution and the Comintern have been simultaneously ejected from the party. For the Trotskys, Rakovskys, Muralovs and Sosnovskys who were expelled from the party, the Stalin machine substituted such organic anti-Bolsheviks as Chubar, Martinov, Saslavsky, Rafes—to say nothing of the bourgeois saboteurs like Ramzin, Groman, Kondratiev and Co.

Coincidental with this process and inseparable from it, the party has been systematically dissolved into the class as a whole, reduced to an amorphous, inert mass. When the Opposition demanded mass from 1924 onwards that the proletarian composition of the party be decisively strengthened, the bureaucracy raised a hue and cry against it on the grounds that the party would be swelled into a huge membership. This did not

prevent it from stuffing the party in so promiscuous and indiscriminate a manner as to burst its firmness, its mobility, its vanguard character. Particularly in recent years, this plebsitary decomposition of the party has taken on the most disastrous forms. The working force of whole factories—composed in large part of backward workers whom 17-18 years of world war and two revolutions did not inculcate to join the party!—was obliged to enter the party by purely administrative means. In this whole job of eliminating the vanguard character of the party, i. e., of eliminating that feature which makes it the party of the proletariat, the Stalinist apparatus has been careful to strengthen its own bureaucratic position. For to the same degree that the party was being dissolved into the class, the upper stratum of the party dissolved the bonds which connected it with the party ranks, and raised itself above and beyond them.

Dissolving the Party

For all of this the proletarian dictatorship is paying a heavy price today. The idea conceived in the distorted mind of the bureaucrat that a socialistically planned economy could be carried out by purely administrative means, by command, and without the direct and genuine participation, the real control, the real initiative of the masses—which can be assured only under a regime of workers' democracy—has proved to be false to the roots and pernicious in its consequences. This necessary workers' democracy must start in the party, which leads the class. But that is precisely where the trouble lies. The party, shot through with alien elements, is hacked to bits. Its restoration as a party, pulsing, breathing, thinking, acting and controlling its executives, is the burning need of the moment.

A letter from Moscow, written towards the end of November, will serve to give an insight into the real situation: "Yes, many things have changed in recent weeks. The dominant feature of the situation remains the shaking of the personal position of Stalin. The 'general secretary' has lost all standing among his own supporters. On the other hand, we are happy to observe how the standing of L. D. Trotsky is growing in the political circles and among the advanced proletarian strata. Those who were once his most embittered critics are becoming, in many instances, his warmest partisans. We could cite many examples in the capitals. Many of those who fought him, who approved of his exile, admit today that a great future is opening up to him, his ideas and his companions. Others are disturbed without end over his new works, his viewpoints, etc.... Believe us, this tells more than all the official panegyrics for Stalin."

The "purging" proposed by Stalin is aimed at consolidating his own badly shaken position. Which does not mean that the party does not require a cleansing. It does, and it must be a drastic one. It must run from top to bottom. It must commence with the fulfillment of Lenin's last advice to the party, the advice that it should find ways of removing from the post of party secretaryship the man whom he qualified as rude and disloyal: Stalin.

The party must be purged indeed. And the purging must commence with the removal of Stalin and the bureaucratic crust which has strangled the party!

THE MILITANT MUST BE SAVED!

An Appeal of the National Committee of the League

To all Members of the League,
To all Friends and Comrades of the MILITANT!

Our weekly organ THE MILITANT, is now in the greatest danger it has experienced for more than a year. Unless drastic measures are taken immediately, the success we have had thus far in maintaining the weekly will end with its collapse. Throughout the country our friends have continued to make brave and generous efforts to sustain us in the work of publishing our paper regularly. But the unrelieved crisis has had telling effects. The regular income of THE MILITANT is today too low to make possible its unhampered appearance. What is required for this purpose is a number of special contributions which we can obtain only from our comrades and sympathizers.

The seriousness of our position should be obvious to all. For the first time this year we have been compelled to omit two of the regular issues of THE MILITANT, as well as to print a half-size edition of two other numbers. THE MILITANT is the principal weapon in our fight and whenever it is weakened, the effectiveness of the whole Opposition in the United States is weakened. This blow has already been felt throughout the country and we are confident that all energies will now be bent to make impossible a repetition of the retreat.

THE MILITANT has fixed a distinct place for itself in the revolutionary labor movement. It is today the only paper in the United States which fights unrelentingly for those fundamental principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky which enabled the Russian Bolsheviks to lead the proletariat to power, which were embodied in the foundation and building up of the Communist International, in restoring the goal of the international social revolution to its rightful place of pre-eminence in the working class movement. THE MILITANT alone is in a position to speak out what is in reality, to tell the truth to the workers so that they may be able to emancipate them-

selves from the bourgeoisie, to tell the truth to the Communist so that they may be able to liberate themselves from the physical and intellectual strangulation of Stalinist Centralism. If the voice of THE MILITANT, which never compromises with unprincipledness, fraud and revisionism, with the bureaucracy, and adventurism—is silenced even for a week, a wide gap is left in the continuity of the revolutionary struggle we are carrying on for international Bolshevism.

That is why no stone must be left unturned in the campaign we have launched to save the MILITANT! The National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) has set aside the next two months for a concentrated national campaign to collect a special fund of \$1,000.00, apart from the regular income of the organization, to guarantee the regular weekly appearance of the MILITANT. For the whole period of the campaign, this question must remain Point One at the top of the agenda of every unit of the organization. It must be kept in mind as the matter of paramount importance by every friend of the Left taken now. And above all, action taken now, with speed, is doubly important! Our need at the present moment is most acute, and every measure must be taken with this in mind.

We look forward to two months of systematic, organized activity to put the campaign over the top, to raise the thousand dollar fund, and thereby to make the MILITANT independent of the crisis which has struck it with such violence.

We express the common opinion of every Oppositionist when we declare: THE MILITANT is in danger! THE MILITANT must be saved! Shoulders to the wheel, Left Oppositionists!

—National Committee,
Communist League of
America (Opposition).

All funds should be sent immediately to the Militant, 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y.

Ala. Negro Croppers Resist White Terror

Pitched Battle Between Posse & Negroes

The attempt to seize the mule and cow of a Negro share-cropper in Notasulga, Tallapoosa County, Alabama, and the armed conflict between the harrassed croppers and the legally armed mob that attacked them, brings to the forefront all the horrors and misery of "Black Belt" in the South. At least three of the band of Negro croppers who gathered in the home of Clifford James to defend him from the mob of armed deputies, are known to be dead; several are wounded. As was the case in the Camp Hill, Alabama, affair a year and a half ago, the attack was courageously resisted by the assembled Negroes, who were finally compelled to submit in the presence of an overwhelming hostile force recruited from the entire country for miles around and even outside the county limits.

As a sequel to the Notasulga battle, the International Labor Defense office in Birmingham was raided and its equipment practically destroyed; while Alice Burke, the wife of the I. L. D.'s Southern organizer, was arrested a short time afterward in the home of a white worker of East Lake, Alabama, where a protest meeting was being held.

The Bourbon System

The fact that the Negroes invoked did not meetly submit to the arrogant demands of the white landlords and their armed posse, is of tremendous significance. Ever since the end of the Civil War, the bourgeoisie of the South has put at the very spearhead of its policy the determination to keep the Negro submerged as far as possible, to inculcate in him the spirit of subservience and non-resistance, to impress him with the absurd, unfounded, reactionary theory of "Negro inferiority". The whole social and political system erected around these ideas has been bolstered up by "Jim Crowing," the Negro, disfranchising him in every conceivable manner, keeping him on the lowest rung of the economic ladder, and, to impress him with the advisability of not resist-

ing, by torturing and murdering him in accordance with the principles of Judge Lynch. The unremitting persistence which the Southern bourgeois have shown in preserving this barbaric system of virtual enslavement of the Negro, is accounted for by the fact that the emancipation of the millions of colored toilers in the South is equivalent to the end of white capitalist domination.

Suffering most acutely from the nightmare of Southern capitalist democracy, are the Negroes engaged in "share-cropping". The leasing of land, and sometimes also of mechanical equipment or live-stock, to the croppers, is paid for by them in the form of a portion of the crop they garner. The system is strongly reminiscent of the dark feudal ages. It replaces the cropper at the mercy of the white landlord from whom he can scarcely ever liberate himself. The living conditions of the croppers, lowest in the scale of tenant farmers, are indescribable. They are constantly, and more often than not, increasingly indebted to the landlord, who robs them of their already scanty income not only by the "cropper's contract" which puts the Negro in the hands of the landlord, but also by the fantastic prices charged at the latter's food and clothing commissary.

The Negro Stand Their Ground

When there is added to this the fact that cotton, the principal cash money crop in the "Black Belt" has been hit terrific blows by the crisis, the desperation of the Negro share-cropper may be easily imagined. No wonder that in spite of the tremendous forces the landlords have at their disposal, the Negroes in the South are beginning, for the first time in years, to stand their ground against the arbitrary, tyrannical encroachments upon their already sufficiently miserable living conditions.

Camp Hill and Notasulga of symbolic significance. No longer does there exist a progressive bourgeoisie in the North which is compelled to grant at least formal recognition to the rights of the Negroes, in the interests of their own fight for liberation from the hampering fetters of a slave-owning aristocracy. The union of the Southern Bourbons and the Northern republicans into a reactionary financial oligarchy, has long ago been accomplished. From that source, the Negro can look for anything but support or comfort. But not much more support will the cruelly exploited Negro get from the petty bourgeoisie, his own not excepted. The Negro petty bourgeoisie is in that peculiar position where it actually thrives on the segregation and Jim Crowing of the black toiler! That is why its interests are so intimately associated with those of the ruling bourgeoisie. That is why it continuously counsels the Negro masses to wear the "Uncle Tom handkerchief" on its head, the symbol of the fawning slave who never fights back.

This leaves the Negro of town and country only one way out of the purgatory in which they are confined. The Negro tenant and cropper of the South cannot lead and organize the movement for liberation; they can, however, contribute (as they have) all the passion of the wronged, the strength at their command, the heroism they have already displayed. But at the head of the columns marching to victory must stand the class conscious, machine-organized, urban proletariat, white and black. Eventually, it will stand there. When it has reached the consciousness of its task, it will not find the Southern Negroes wanting. Camp Hill and Notasulga are signs of the vast inflammable material in the South which can be ignited to burn to the roots the bestial rule of oppression.

—Sn.

OPEN FORUM

Will Social Reformism
Grow in the U.S.?

Speaker:

HUGO OEHLER

December 30, 1932

126 East 16th Street,
ADMISSION: 15c

Auspices:
N. Y. Br. Communist League of A
(Opposition)

Canadian Organ Issued

Left Opposition Launches 'Vanguard' as Monthly in Toronto

A new achievement for the International Left Opposition is represented by the launching of its own organ in Canada, *The Vanguard*. For several years the Canadian Communist movement was more or less isolated from the worldwide party and the struggle begun around the problems raised by the Left Opposition did not find immediate echo in Canada. It was only after the public declaration in favor of the Opposition issued by the chairman and co-founder of the party, comrade Maurice Spector, that the Left wing received its first organized form. In recent times, the preliminary ground work done with the aid furnished by the Militant and the distribution of comrade Trotsky's work has borne fruit in the forward spirit that the Canadian Opposition has experienced. Several months ago, the movement was strengthened by the addition of comrade Jack MacDonald who was for years secretary of the party and most prominent spokesman for Communism in the country. Since then, the Opposition in Toronto has gained considerably in membership and prestige, and extended the sphere of its activities in the trade union movement and among the unemployed workers who have created a fairly elaborate movement in

that region. In addition, the Left Opposition is engaged in work among the revolutionary students who have already published the second number of their magazine, *The Spark*.

The first issue of the *Vanguard* (which can be obtained at 5 cents a copy from P. O. Box 63, Toronto, Ont., Canada), is devoted largely to the Russian revolution annually. Besides some timely articles from the recent writings of comrade Trotsky, there are contributions and editorials on the most important questions of the Canadian labor and revolutionary movement. Of heartening significance is the article by comrade Bill Matheson, former head of the American Unemployed movement and active Communist party militant in the mine fields of two countries. In it he submits the party trade union policy to searching criticism and shows how telling has been the view of the Left Opposition. We have every reason to believe that our Canadian comrades have only made a beginning which augurs well for the future. We look forward with confidence to encouraging progress that will carry our revolutionary banner to every working class militant in Canada.

Our heartiest wishes go to our Canadian comrades-in-arms!

Unite to Smash the Trade Union Racketeers!

The shots fired by a member of the Waiters' Union, Local 1 of New York, which sent to the hospital two of its business agents, bring sensationally to the forefront one of these ranning sores which has made the American labor movement unique in the entire world. The publicity attendant upon the shooting brought to public view the following facts:

It has been the custom in this union for the business agents to charge workers anywhere from \$100.00 up to be "placed" on a job, in agreement with the petty bosses who received from the labor racketeers a portion of the tax imposed illicitly upon the worker desperate for a job. A short time after the worker had parted with his money, and obtained the job, he found himself discharged by the boss, in cahoots with the labor officials, who promptly proceeded to start the game all over again with some other worker. While the jobs were "rotated" in this ingenious manner, the workers were being separated from vast sums of money which found their way into the bank accounts of the union skates.

The sufferings of the union members under this atrocious system may be judged from the fact that one of them felt impelled to vent his desperation by shooting at the two most notorious profiteers.

The class conscious worker is not the partisan of methods of individual terrorism. While we do not go into fits of hysterical horror—we leave that to the "liberal" friends of the labor movement—we are aware that the incubus of labor racketeering, like all the manifestations of class rule and labor exploitation, cannot be solved by individual attacks. They are at best the futile act of desperation which ignores (and sometimes evades) the imperative need of setting into motion the masses of those who suffer injury and injustice. The assassination of this or that king of Europe never brought about the abolition of monarchism. It was abolished, however, when the masses rose in a social revolutionary movement against that decadent system, as happened in 1917 in Russia, in 1918 in Germany and in 1931 in Spain. On a smaller scale, the same rule applies to the petty monarchs of the American trade union movement, who have fixed themselves to it like leeches exercising at times a power

The Meaning of the Shooting in Waiters Local, No. 1

beyond the dreams of many present-day kings.

The Sam Kaplans, the Frank Commerfords, the Big Tim Murphys, the Mike Boyles and all the rest of the underworld gangster crew who have bullied their way to the top of whole sections of the labor movement with the aid of strong-arm men, blackjacks and pistols, can be thrown back into the gutters whence they came only if the masses of the workers affected are organized to put them out. While the struggle is no easy one, as has been demonstrated on more than one occasion, it is the only way out. The establishment of trade

union democracy and the conversion of the unions into class struggle organizations instead of class collaborationism which invites racketeering—these are the sticks of dynamite which blow the underworld leeches out of the labor movement. A quintessential prerequisite for this is the restoration of the Left wing in the unions, where it was once a growing force, commanding respect and making for progress.

The fact is that the so-called socialist unions are not very greatly distinguished in this respect for many others. To rid them all of the poisonous hydra which is devouring their vitals is a task which every worker can join in carrying out.

SEND YOUR CONTRIBUTORS TO
SAVE THE MILITANT

A. F. L. and Union Unity

The Stalinist Policies Fail to Meet the Test of the Situation

In viewing the relationship of the revolutionary party to the trade union movement in the light of the events at the recent American Federation of Labor Convention, one specific feature stands out strikingly. And for the thinking worker there should be little difficulty in drawing a conclusion. We have, for some time, been faced with an unemployment situation pressing so acutely upon the working class that the Green bureaucracy found itself compelled to execute a change of front. The A F of L became committed, though so far only on paper, to the important measures of unemployment insurance and the six-hour work day without reduction of pay. Yet the revolutionary party had no direct influence in producing this change.

The best proof of this fact is furnished by the party's own actions. There assembled in Cincinnati, at the same time as the A F of L gathering, a rank and file convention for unemployment insurance. It was sponsored by the official party, but, of course, without any apparent formal connection. It had up to 200 delegates in attendance, a few of them officially elected by A F of L union locals. Its purpose was, as indicated by its name, to fight for unem-

ployment insurance, to focus attention upon this issue alongside of the A F of L convention, to expose the A F of L and stand to serve as the true expression of the trade unions on this issue. Yes, the party leadership had actually come down from its lofty perch of the third period dogma, from the "revolutionary upsurge of the American workers"—to speak to the A F of L about unemployment insurance. From an adventurist position which had no foundation in reality to dragging entirely at the rear of events. This is the sum and substance of its recent course. But before the rank and file convention had even gathered, the hidebound reactionaries of the A F of L had already framed their insurance policy and, in addition, made ready for the six-hour day proposal. The rank and file convention therefore became entirely overshadowed by the A. F. of L. action. It exposed primarily its own backwardness.

There is on the other hand, at least, a compensating feature in the fact that the A F of L convention action has already served to influence the party views somewhat. Party speakers are beginning to use the term class colla-

(Continued on page 8)

New Year's Eve

DANCE AND ENTERTAINMENT

SATURDAY DECEMBER 31, 1932
at 126 East 16th Street
ADMISSION: 35 CENTS

Auspices: N. Y. Branch, Communist League of America

The Hunger March to Wash.

Now that the Washington Hunger Marchers have returned home with instructions to organize the class for immediate relief and unemployment insurance it is time to follow up our report of last week and to draw some lessons from the march. We can say that the spirit of the marchers on the way to Washington was excellent and that native-born workers, white and Negro constituted the majority of the marchers. It showed that the largest percent of the marchers were from the new layers of the class shifted forward by the crisis.

But overbalancing these good points, as well as the publicity obtained, are a whole series of negative points that can be traced back to the wrong Stalinist policies which we criticized in issues of the *Militant* previous to the Hunger March.

The 3000 delegates represented directly about 200,000 of the millions of unemployed American workers. The organizations represented were: the unemployed councils, TUUL unions, Left wing groups of AFL unions, the ILLD, the IWO and workers fraternal organizations and at most, a few A F of L locals, some of the delegates were elected at mass meetings held by the U. C. All in all, it was a "united front" of the party and its close sympathizers with special delegates from the Councils who could give the movement a real "American face". In other words, so far as a Leninist united front is concerned the Washington Hunger March was a failure. The other working class organizations, with their reactionary and reformist misleaders, were not represented. And the absence of delegates from these other organizations was not due to their elimination because the misleaders would not unite. Their absence as organizations was due to the fact that the party and the unemployed councils did not apply the united front to win the rank and file for the march and to expose the leadership IN ACTION.

The Communist party was in complete control, it dominated every fibre of the movement, and yet not once during the march did it show its face officially. No political parties were represented, not even the Communist party. To have one hundred percent control and not to be officially represented is to hide the face of the revolutionary vanguard of the class. Everybody knew the Communists held the leadership of the movement. Why fear to be officially represented and speak to the marchers as the Communist party?

The Workers' Congress held in Washington, supposed to be rudimentary and first steps toward educating the class to the idea of the American Soviets were mechanical gatherings where "leaders" made reports and delegates listened; where resolutions were carried unanimously but no conclusions or lessons drawn. Such is the way to alienate the American workers from the idea of Workers Congresses.

On the way to Washington some attention and some results were obtained in a demonstrative way, but in Washington we were practically held as prisoners under arrest. The Washington watchers of the parade were far from friendly, in fact in the main they could be catalogued as hostile. On the way home from Washington things were different. In the main it resulted in a rush for home. The spirit was low and confusion seemed to reign in the minds of a great number of delegates. They seemed bewildered as to what had been accomplished.

It was not the police and hostile capitalists we met all the way to and in Washington that changed the attitude of the delegates. It was internal factors of our own weakness. One critical stage where the change could be noticed was at the Second session of the Workers' Congress after the march, when comrade Benjamin was making a report and said we knew Congress would not give us any relief but he did not explain what we did go to Washington for and substituted for this analysis the advice to go back home and organize the workers to carry on the struggle for the same demands. The reaction to these remarks was bewilderment and confusion, as if the delegates, at least a large section of those who made up the new layers into our ranks, came to Washington with the idea that they were coming to get some results and winter relief. From this point on the spirit lagged and sank to a low point.

The Stalinists can be blamed for this because the method of their propaganda, divorcing the immediate demands from the revolutionary goal and posing the immediate demands isolatedly and apart from the end, invites such a conclusion. To aim at Congress without this correct base for the program, with an extra-parliamentary form (mass pressure) but in reality resulting in the direction of creating parliamentary illusions within the class. At least this is what happened to many of the delegates. They came there expecting results from the "pressure" on Congress and when they found that this did not materialize they went away bewildered. They were not disillusioned. They came with illusions and went away confused.

We warned the Stalinists of this danger before. A movement of demonstrations without the base, without mass pressure, a top without a bottom, results in creating a shell without content. Without this class content, without Communist class directives of the party, it shifts into opportunist channels. The New York and New England delegation rushed back home. A difficult spirit hung over the return. Returned delegates were instructed to make the report but the delegation as a whole failed to make reports along the way, until protests from the ranks forced a meeting in Newark.

In New York, for the first time, at a meeting to welcome the delegates at Cooper Union, Hathaway officially spoke for the party. By this time the pressure from the Left Opposition and the ranks itself forced the party to speak. Hathaway said the Communist party was proud of its part in making the Hunger March a success and giving it the issues of immediate relief and unemployment insurance. Weisman, at this meeting said, the party at no time concealed the fact that it supported the march.

Instead of correcting a mistake, this belated explanation made things worse. Delegates in the hall asked each other, why say this now? Why was this not said at the beginning? Some of the Western delegates did not know what the role of the party in the march was. They know it played a part but just what part they could not make out.

The party again failed to carry out a united front and again isolated the advanced layers from the class. Benjamin made a speech on Monday when the question of a march was under discussion. The vague threat that we would march regardless of the authorities refusal, was picked up by the capitalist yellow sheets and flamed into


a direct revolutionary threat against the state. Of course Benjamin was only throwing a sop to the delegates. The C. I. picked up this story in the capitalist press and on the enemies' slander sent a cable asking if this was so. The alarm of Moscow can be understood when we turn to the fact that Stalinism has control. They are for demonstrations, "peaceful demonstrations", providing the activity of the American party in no way upsets the anxious plans of "the builders of socialism in one country". They want to obtain United States recognition. The leaders of the world revolution are so concerned over reports in the lying capitalist press because they subordinate the world revolution to maintain peaceful relations with the capitalist powers in order to... build socialism in one country.

—BILL KITTY.

THE MILITANT
Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879.
Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th St., N. Y.
EDITORIAL BOARD
Martin Abern James P. Cannon
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
Arne Swaback
SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1932
Vol. 5, No. 51 Whole No. 147

Leon Trotsky

History of the Russian Revolution



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

BOXED SETS OF THREE
VOLUMES — \$10.00

POSTAGE ON ALL ORDERS: Extra

Send All Orders Immediately To
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street, New York

New Expulsions in the Comintern

(Continued from last issue)
In Germany, another pillar of the apparatus has—if not fallen, then at least been rudely disturbed. Out of a clear blue sky, the official party press in Germany has announced that Heinz Neumann was all along engaged in clandestine factional work against the Leninist Central Committee, its line and its leadership. What is more, the shortcomings, defects and errors made in the past (it appears that, after all, there were some made!), are to be ascribed to the work of Neumann.

The usual offensive has been opened up all along the line, not only in the German but in the international party press. The current issue of the *Communist International* (No. 17-18) contains an article by Piatnitsky which gives some idea of how heavy is the burden which the infallible bureaucracy is now shifting on to the shoulders of the latest scapegoat. The "line" in Germany for the last three or more years was held to be irrefragably "Leninist", as were the leaders who conceived it and those who carried it into effect. The criticisms directed against the party policy in Germany by the Left Opposition—criticisms which each new day confirmed with telling accuracy—were denounced in unmeasured terms as "counter-revolutionary". The theory of "social Fascism" ruled supreme, in all its worst aspects. But the accumulation of the terrific consequences of this policy has reached a height that can no longer be ignored. We now learn, therefore, that while the "general line" was correct, it was carried out in practice erroneously, from start to finish, and that the fault lies exclusively with yesterday's aide-de-camp of Stalin, Heinz Neumann.

Who is Heinz Neumann?
Neumann occupies a rather sinister place in the history of the last decade of the Comintern. He not only adjusted himself with bland ease to every leadership chosen by or imposed upon the party—Brandler, Fischer, Ewert, Thaelmann—but was himself the actual political leader of the German party since the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern. An adventurer out of nowhere, of that peculiar stripe represented by John Pepper, he was known in informal circles as the direct representative of Stalin in Western Europe. In fact, he was, together with Lominadze, the principal organizer of that notorious "Corridor Congress" during the Sixth C. I. Congress in 1928 which corralled the majority of the delegates for Stalin from under the very nose of the official leader, Bucharin.

A few weeks ago, without the faintest preliminary warning, Neumann—a Neumann group, in fact!—was suddenly attacked in the open by the central organ of the German party. It is discovered at a single blow that the "Bolshevik Central Committee" has had differences of opinion with Neumann on a series of fundamental questions for a period of close to four years now.

The "differences" concern no small questions. Neumann, reads the bill of particulars, sought to replace the slogan of the "Red United Front" with that of the "Red workers' front"—although the indictment skips over the interesting question of wherein lay the distinction between the two. Further, Neumann is accused of "a lack of understanding of the importance of inner-trade union opposition work"—with the implication (entirely unwarranted, to be sure!) that the rest of the party leaders were not lacking in such an understanding. Moreover, he "coined the false formulation back in December 1930 concerning the Bruening government, according to which the Fascist dictatorship was already here". That it was the Left Opposition which first ridiculed this preposterous identification of Bruening with Fascism, is of course not even whispered by the Central Committee which has all the time been engaged in denouncing (together with Neumann!) the Opposition as "social Fascist" for its standpoint. That Neumann's contentions were idiotic

«Traitors» and Scapegoats In the Bureaucracy

is perfectly obvious—today, apparently, even to the Central Committee. But does the fact that the latter advanced the identical contentions in every one of its pronouncements, exempt it from the same charge?

Finally, Neumann is taxed with having sought to "replace the main strategic slogan of the conquest of the majority of the working class with the slogan of the people's revolution". Unluckily for the Central Committee and its Stalinist commanders, it is impossible to burn up the mountain of documents on this score which have been written in the last two years. The nationalist degeneration of the party was the common work of Neumann, Thaelmann, Manuilsky and Stalin. They jointly demanded the "national emancipation of Germany"; they jointly participated in the infamous Fascist referendum in Prussia; they were jointly responsible for the nationalist-anti-Semitic fraternization with the Lieutenant Scheringers, and more of the same.

The simple, incontestable fact is that Neumann is being made the goat for the second time; it happened once in 1927-1928, when he was made responsible for the made-to-order-in-Moscow push in Canton. The second time is now, when his narrow shoulders are being weighed down with all the crimes, blunders and stupidities of the central Stalinist apparatus in Germany which have set back the revolutionary movement in so dreadful a manner.

Whole Spanish Leadership Expelled
Neumann was given a comparatively light sentence. His character, or rather lack of it, makes it possible for him to adapt himself to the new circumstances. A shrug of the shoulders, a cynical grin, a statement of guilt—and a place is opened for him again in the apparatus. But the Neumanns of the Spanish party have not been let off so easily. No mere denunciation here. In this case we have the out-of-hand expulsion of nothing less than the whole party leadership!

The whole group in charge of the Spanish party from the days before the republican uprising down to yesterday, has been summarily expelled. In the text of the communication from Moscow, the ECCI declares that all four of the party's most prominent leaders, Bullejos, Adame, Trilla and Vega, are "traitors to the Spanish revolution, to the Spanish Communist Party and to the Communist International". As may be seen from these choice terms, it is a trifling matter....

The whys and wherefores of the case, the Stalinist center contemptuously refrains from specifying. That Bullejos and Co. are guilty of many things is beyond dispute. But in our eyes, their greatest crime consists in having followed slavishly and without dissent the disastrous instructions of Stalin, Manuilsky, Kun and Co. At every stage in the development of the Spanish revolution, the Comintern laid the basis for the tragedy of errors of Communism in Spain. In this sense the loyalty of Bullejos cannot be questioned.

(By the way, the "traitor" Bullejos, like Celor in France, Neumann in Germany, Varski in Poland, was in the forefront of the struggle against the Left Opposition. He not only wrote a pamphlet several months ago to prove that the "Trotskyists" were the agents of counter-revolution, but on more than one occasion he threatened to exterminate the Spanish Opposition center with the aid of "strong" and "piercing" arguments....)

If there is any doubt that the newly-expelled are simply scapegoats for Stalin, who must find some explanation for the calamity in Spain, it is enough to read the resolution of the Comintern published last May in the central theoretical organ of the Spanish party: "This leadership (i. e., the "traitors" Bullejos

and Trilla) which has given numerous proofs of heroism in the revolutionary struggle, holds our confidence." And again, in a resolution against the Right wing Maurin group, the Comintern expressed itself with regards to the Bullejos leadership in the following unmistakable terms: "The ECCI unreservedly approves the policy followed by the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain." Unreservedly! Ah, what a supreme contempt the bureaucrats have for the mental faculties of the workers in the ranks, of their powers of memory, that they can denounce today as traitors whom they have fought all along, those very people whom they supported without reservations only yesterday!

The fate of Bullejos is shared by a product of that stinking swamp which bears the name of Communism in Austria and from which so many thousands of Austrian workers have recoiled into the arms of Austro-Marxism. The victim in this instance is none other than the party leader of yesterday, Karl Toman. Unfortunately, we know very little about his case, even less than about Bullejos, but the reports inform us that while in Moscow, Toman was also expelled as a traitor. The thick wall of obscurity behind which these apparatus machinations take place is part and parcel of the whole Stalinist system.

«Traitors» and Scapegoats
In the best days of the Comintern, there were many traitors and turncoats to the revolution in the leadership of various parties. There was even the case of Dr. Paul Levi, for whom Lenin had such a high respect when he stood at the head of the German Communist Party. During the "March Action" in 1921, Levi stabbed the party and the embattled workers in the back. His action caused surprise and confusion to most of the Communists, although he had been slipping away from the Comintern prior to that event. But the settlement of accounts with Levi took place in the open, before the eyes of all, with the material available for study and decision. Levi parted with the Comintern because his views did not harmonize with those of the latter, because he refused to follow the path of Lenin with regard to Centrism in Italy or the situation in Germany.

Nowadays, the Stalinist system consists in finding "traitors" to serve as scapegoats for its own crimes and errors. It is not so much because they disagreed with Stalin that they are expelled or removed, but usually because they did not agree with the policy, did execute it as best those policies can be executed, or else because the confusion sewed in their own minds by the fantastic theories of Stalinism, disabled them from a sufficiently speedy re-orientation along a suddenly presented "new general line".

The latter is the case, on the whole, with Varski, Kostrzeva, Brand and their group who have just been expelled from the leadership of the Polish party and constituted a Right wing opposition. Varski felt more than at home during the whole period of the Right-Center bloc in the Comintern, the rule of Stalin-Bucharin from 1923 to 1928. He was the political genius who in 1927 greeted the reactionary Pilsudski coup d'Etat in Poland as the beginnings of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry"! The Stalinist swing to ultra-Leftism in 1929 left this Right wing group quite disoriented. It continued to cling for some time to the apparatus. The constant turns of the apparatus wheel finally threw it off at an angle, in the direction to which it was always inclined: the Right opposition.

At the same time, if we are to believe the report of the Warsaw organ of the Bund, a Left Opposition group has been formed with considerable support throughout the industrial centers of Poland and with strong roots in the Left wing trade union movement. The lateness of the appearance of an Opposition group in Poland may serve to bring it on the political scene in much stronger form than in many other countries. But on this score, we must await more authoritative details from our comrades abroad.

The recent expulsions in the Comintern are inseparably associated with the just concluded 12th Plenum. In virtually every case, those removed were most prominently associated with yesterday's ultra-Leftist and sectarian course. Their removal symbolizes the half-hearted turn to the Right which the 12th Plenum foreshadowed. We are apparently on the eve of one of those prolonged zig-zags to the Right which will make more ludicrous than ever the superficial Brandlerist standpoint that the essence of Stalin is "Leftism". It is neither that nor is it "Rightism" as such. As the sum of its two principal periods—from 1923 to 1928 and from 1929 to date—indicate, Stalinism represents the politically parasitic faction of bureaucratic Centrism, with a system of inner-party management all its own. The recent expulsions are eloquent in their significance. —MARSH.

We cannot refrain from adding a note on the recent expulsions in the Italian party over questions of policy which are clothed in total darkness, so far as the Stalinist press is concerned. Six comrades, Brightenti, Barioni, Drago, Sansane, La Camera and Gliodi, have been expelled from the party. In the Stalinist press, the names of the comrades are printed, together with the city each lives in and his home address! If this unprecedented act has any significance at all, it means that the comrades are being delivered into the hands of the police. That too is not in contradiction to the Stalinist system....

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

(Continued from previous issue)
In Kansas City we did not succeed in establishing contacts with the Jewish movement prior to our arrival but a lecture was arranged for us by "Shorty" Buehler who issued an English leaflet announcing that we were to speak in Jewish on the Left Opposition. In response to this leaflet came a number of English-speaking workers who requested us to hold a lecture in English. We readily consented and had a very spirited meeting. The few Stalinists in the audience by their arguments only helped us bring out in sharper relief the viewpoint of the Left Opposition. As a result of our short stay in Kansas City we now have a number of subscribers to *Unser Kampf* and a comrade in charge of the work who will try to broaden the circle of our readers.

In St. Louis we spent three days. Our activity was concentrated primarily upon laying a foundation for an *Unser Kampf* Club, since our circle of readers in this city makes the building of a club possible. Unfortunately, we could not stay much longer and we only succeeded in bringing together a group of people who constituted themselves as a provisional committee for the building of a club. Our lecture in St. Louis was attended by a small but attentive and responsive audience.

Our branch in St. Louis is concentrating its activities among the unemployed workers. They are under fire from two directions: the Stalinists are trying to isolate them, and the Citizens Unemployed League, under control of reactionaries and in which the Mustelites have a hand, is likewise combatting them. The Stalinists use all kinds of trickery and abuse in trying to keep our comrades out of the situation. For example, comrade Payer was elected by his branch of the ILLD as a delegate to the Hunger March. When he appeared with his bundle ready to leave for Washington he was promptly informed by the local Stalinist bureaucrats that a spee-

the meantime, cancelling his election for the Hunger March. When workers in his branch heard of this outrageous act, they protested vehemently. But it was too late. The marchers had already left and Payer was not permitted to go with them. Comrade Goldberg applied for membership to one of the branches of the Citizens Unemployed League. At the very meeting he was accepted, he moved that this branch send delegates to the Hunger March United Front Conference. This carried and comrade Goldberg was elected, participating very actively in the preparations for the Hunger March. This act of the branch in sending a delegate to the "Communist" Hunger March terrified the officials at the head of the Citizens Unemployed League. Their primary concern is to get on the good side of the Chamber of Commerce and the police officials. They do not believe in struggle; their method is that of ingratiating themselves with the bosses and collecting a few crumbs. We had the occasion to be present at the meeting where the venom of the officials was directed against comrade Goldberg. They saw in him the danger of the organization being radicalized from within. A long letter of the Central Committee was read off to the branch in which it was condemned for participating in the Hunger March. When comrade Goldberg asked for the floor he was told by the president of the organization, Frank Wall, a renegade Communist, that he is not a member, that his membership was not approved by the membership committee consisting of three individuals who have the sole right of accepting or expelling members. The whole structure of the organization, according to the constitution Frank Wall read off, is that of a company union. To our amazement we found that Carl Lore, a Mustelite organizer, is one of the three on the membership committee. Apparently, they consider this "progressive" labor action.

—SYLVIA BLEEKER.
—MORRIS LEWITT.

Negotiations with Weisbord Suspended

This is the reply of the National Committee to the statement of comrade Weisbord:
COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF AMERICA
(Opposition)
126 East 16th Street, N. Y. C.
October 31, 1932.

Dear comrade Weisbord:
In the *Militant* of October 1 and 8, the National Committee made public a statement of its views on the letter sent by the Communist League of Struggle in reply to the letter of comrade Trotsky. Our statement was aimed at facilitating the fusion of the Communist League of Struggle with the American section of the International Left Opposition on the basis of a clearly and honestly established agreement in principle, and without permitting matters of secondary importance to constitute an insurmountable obstacle. The National Committee must regretfully establish that the reply to its statement made by the Weisbord group, even less than its first letter, meets with the requirements which we consider necessary for a solution of the question. Instead of a clear statement of its point of view in the sense we indicated, the reply of the Weisbord group takes a step backward in this respect and attempts to defend the errors which have separated it from us. This is carried out behind a barrage of minor issues, real and alleged, with which is combined that petty, false and outrageously exaggerated criticism of our League, against which Weisbord has been cautioned before, especially in comrade Trotsky's letter. Finally the

whole tone of the reply in no way indicates a desire or intention to engage in a loyal and comradely collaboration with the Communist League of America. On the contrary. For these reasons the National Committee is compelled to suspend any further negotiations with the Weisbord group until such a time as the latter shall have established its position in a manner, as laid down in our statement of October 1 and 8, which we consider a minimum for the fusion of the two groups and the future discussion inside of the united organization of any serious differences of a secondary character which may have arisen or will arise.

National Committee,
Communist League of America,
Secretary.

(Copy of letter from Trotsky to Weisbord dated Oct. 13, 1932.)
Dear comrade Weisbord,
This is an answer to your letter, and through your mediation to the letter of your group. My delay in answering was due to my assurance that the *Militant*, contrary to our premature assumption, would answer your request. And, in point of fact, I find in the last issues my letter to you and your answer published integrally and even without any criticism in the same issues.
This procedure is very accommodating, perhaps a little too much so. If you still remember our discussion about the possibilities and methods of fusion, you will understand without any comment from me that I cannot find your steps

very happily chosen for the purpose, if the purpose remains that of fusion.

It is scarcely necessary to go into the details of your letter, I feel obliged to emphasize the fact that your treatment of the question of Centrism appears to me absolutely unsatisfactory. It is not a question of name, but of the political content of the Stalinist faction.

It is superfluous to repeat that I would be glad to observe a real coming-together between your group and our American section, but it is evident that in the present stage this procedure cannot be seriously influenced from abroad. It is a task between yourself and the League.

Prinkipo, Oct 13, 1932.
With Communist greetings,
L. TROTSKY.

(Excerpt of letter from Trotsky to the National Committee dated Oct. 22, 1932, and regard to the above).

It appears that you were not sent a copy of my reply to comrade Weisbord. This reply I wrote before I had the opportunity to become acquainted with your comprehensive reply to the Weisbord group. You will notice, however, that our parallel actions quite well supplement one another.

L. TROTSKY.

Pressure of space compels us to omit from this issue the continuation of Jack Weber's series of articles on Japan. It will appear in the forthcoming number.

Perspectives Of Marxism

Open Letter by Leon Trotsky to V. F. Calverton on the Revolutionary Intellectuals

Dear Comrade Calverton:—
I have received your pamphlet, "For Revolution", and read it with interest as well as advantage to myself. Your arguments against the American "knights of pure reform" are very convincing, certain of them are really splendid. But, so far as I understand your inquiry, what you wanted from me was, not literary compliments, but a political evaluation. I shall be all the more willing to grant your request since the problems of American Marxism have acquired at the present time an extraordinary importance.

By its character and structure, your pamphlet was most appropriate for the thinking representatives of the academic youth. To ignore this group would, in any case, be out of the question; on the contrary, it is necessary to know it and talk to it in its language. However, you yourself have frequently emphasized in this study those thoughts which are elementary to a Marxist that the overthrow of capitalism can be effected only by the proletariat. The revolutionary education of its vanguard, you rightly proclaim as the chief task. But in your pamphlet, I do not find the bridge to that task, nor any indication of the direction in which it must be sought.

CALVERTON OMITTS

REVOLUTIONARY REALITIES
Is this a reproach on my part? Both yes and no. In its essence your little book represents an answer to that kind of petty bourgeois radical (in America they seem to be wearing out the threadbare name of liberals) who is ready to accept the boldest social conclusion on condition that they involve no political obligation. Socialism? Communism? Anarchism? All very good but in no other way than that of reform. To transform from top to bottom society, morality, the family? Splendid! but by all means with the permission of the White House and of Tammany. Against these pretensions and fruitless tendencies you develop, as said before, a victorious argumentation. But this dispute thereby inevitably takes on the character of a domestic debate in an intellectual club where there is a reformist and a Marxist wing. So thirty and forty years ago in Petersburg and Moscow the academic Marxist disputed with academic Populist: must Russia pass through the stage of capitalism or not? How much water has flowed over the dam since that time! The very necessity of taking the question as you do in your pamphlet throws a glaring light on the political backwardness of the United States, technologically the most advanced country in the world. Insofar as you neither can nor have the right to tear yourself out of the American background, there is no reproach in my words.

Yet at the same time there is a reproach, since, beside pamphlets and clubs where academic discussions for and against revolution are carried on, in the ranks of the American proletariat, with all the backwardness of its movement, there are different political, and among them, revolutionary groupings. You say nothing about them. Your pamphlet does not mention a word about the so-called Socialist party, nor the Communists, nor the transitional formations, not to speak of the struggling factions within Communism. This means that you are talking to nobody in particular and calling them to nowhere in particular. You explain the inevitability of the revolution, but the intellectual who is convinced by you can quietly smoke his cigarette to the end and go on to the order of the day. Insofar there is in my words an element of reproach.

I would not put this circumstance in the first place if it did not seem to me that your political position as I conceive it from your articles is typical of a quite numerous and theoretically very valuable stratum of left intelligentsia in the United States.

INTELLECTUALS FEAR

CONSEQUENCES OF CLARITY

To talk of the Hillquit-Thomas party as a tool of the proletarian revolution is evidently out of the question. Without having achieved in the slightest degree the power of European reformism, American Social-Democracy has appropriated all its vices, and barely passed childhood, has already fallen into what the Russians call "dog-senility". I hope that you will agree with this evaluation and perhaps explain these considerations on many future occasions. But in the pamphlet "For Revolution" you did not speak a word about Social-Democracy. Why? It seems to me because, after speaking of Social-Democracy, you would have had to give an evaluation of the Communist party too and this is not only a delicate but also an exceedingly responsible question, which imposes obligations and leads to consequences. Perhaps I may be mistaken in thinking so with respect to you personally but many American Marxists obviously and ostentatiously avoid fixing their position with respect to the Party. They consider themselves friends of the Soviet Union, sympathize with Communism, write articles about Hegel and the inevitability of the revolution and that is all. Still that is not enough, since the instrument of the revolution is the party, is it not?

I would not like to be misunderstood. Under the tendency to avoid the practical consequences of a clear position, I am far from understanding the concern for personal well-being. Admittedly, there are many quasi-Marxists whom the Communist party repels by its aim of bringing the revolution out of the dis-

ussion club into the street. But to dispute about a revolutionary party with such snobs is a waste of time. What we are talking about are the other, more serious Marxists, who are in no way inclined to be scared by revolutionary action, but whom the present Communist party disquiets by its low theoretical level, bureaucraticism and lack of genuine revolutionary initiative. At the same time, they say to themselves, that is the party which stands furthest to the Left, which is bound up with the Soviet Union and which represents it in a certain sense. Is it right to attack it, is it permissible to criticize it?

STALINISM DRIVES INTELLECTUALS TO QUANDARY

The opportunist and adventurist vices of the present leadership of the Communist International and of its American section are too evident to require emphasis. In any case, it is impossible and useless to repeat within the framework of this letter what is said on this theme in a series of independent works.* All questions of theory, strategy, tactics and organization end by becoming the object of deep divergences within Communism. Three fundamental factions have been formed, which have succeeded in demonstrating their character in the course of the great events and problems of recent years. The struggles among them have taken on the sharper character since in the Soviet Union every difference with the current ruling group leads to immediate expulsion from the party and to State repressions. The Marxist intelligentsia in the United States as well as in other countries is placed before an alternative: either tacitly and obediently to support the Communist International as it is, or to be included in the camp of the counter-revolution and the "social-Fascists". A part of the intelligentsia chooses the first way; with closed or half-closed eyes, it follows the official Party. Another part wanders without a party home, defends where it can the Soviet Union from slander, and occupies itself with abstract sermons in favor of the revolution without indicating through which gate they can go to meet it. The difference between these two groups, however, is not so great. On both sides it is an abdication from the creation of an independent opinion and from the courageous struggle for it, which is precisely where the revolutionary begins. On both sides we have a type of fellow-traveler and not an active builder of the proletarian party. Certainly, a fellow-traveler is better than an enemy. But a Marxist cannot be a fellow-traveler of the revolution, and besides, the experience of history bears witness that in the most decisive moments the storm of the struggle hurls the majority of the intellectual fellow-travelers into the enemy's camp. If they still return, it is only after the victory has been consolidated. Maxim Gorky is the most colorful but not the only example. In the present Soviet apparatus, incidentally, clear up to the top a very important percentage of people stood fifteen years ago openly on the other side of the barricades.

MARXISM NO DOGMA—GUIDE TO ACTION

It is necessary to remember that Marxism both interprets the world and teaches how to change it. The will is the moving element in the domain of knowledge, too. If Marxism loses its will to transform political reality, it loses the ability to understand it. The Marxist who, for one secondary consideration or another, does not carry his conclusion to the end, betrays Marxism. To overlook the different Communist factions, so as not to engage and compromise oneself, signifies to ignore the activity which through all its contradictions, forms the vanguard of the class; it signifies to cover oneself with the abstraction of the revolution, as with a shield, from the blows and bruises of the revolutionary process.

When the Left bourgeois journalists summarily defend the Soviet Republic as it is, they accomplish a progressive and praiseworthy work. For a Marxist revolutionary, it is absolutely insufficient. The task of the October revolution, do not forget, has not yet been accomplished. Only a parrot can find satisfaction in the repetition of the words, "the victory is assured". No, it is not assured! The victory is a problem of strategy. There is no book which indicates in advance the correct orbit for the first workers' State. The head does not and cannot exist which can contain the complete formula for Socialist society. The roads of economy and politics must still be determined through experience and created collectively, that is, in permanent conflicts of ideas. A Marxist who limits himself to a summary sympathy, without taking part in the struggle on questions of collectivization, industrialization, the regime of the Party, etc., stands no higher than the progressive bourgeois of the type of Duranty, Louis Fischer, etc., but on the contrary, lower because he misses the name of revolutionary.

To avoid direct answers, to play blind man's buff with great problems, to remain diplomatically silent and wait, or still worse, to quiet oneself with the thought that is the present struggle within Bolshevism is a question of personal am-

* I permit myself to refer you to a New York weekly paper, *The Militant*, and a series of books and leaflets issued by the Pioneer Publishers. The paper as well as the publishing house belongs to the Communist League of America (126 E. 16th Street, New York City).

positions, means to protect mental laziness, to yield to the worst Philistine prejudice, and to be doomed to demoralization. On this subject, I hope we shall not have any differences with you.

The policy of the proletariat has a great theoretical tradition and that is one of the sources of its power. A trained Marxist studies the differences between Engels and Lassalle with regard to the European war of 1859. It is necessary to do so. But if he is not a peacock of Marxist historiography, not a bookworm but a historian, not a pundit and urgent for him to elaborate for himself an independent opinion about the revolutionary strategy in China from 1925 to 1932. It was precisely on that question that the struggle within Bolshevism first reached the state of an explosion. Impossible to be a Marxist without taking a position in a question on which depends the fate of the Chinese revolution and of the Indian, too, that is, the future of almost half of humanity!

AMERICAN MARXISM AT CROSS ROADS

It is very useful to study, let us say, the old differences among Russian Marxists on the character of the future Russian revolution; naturally, according to first hand authorities, and not the ignorant and disloyal compilations of the eplogues. But incommensurably more important is it to elaborate for oneself a clear understanding of the theory and practice of the Anglo-Russian committee, of the "third period", of "social-Fascism", of the "democratic dictatorship" in Spain, and the policy of the united front. The study of the past is in the last analysis justified by the fact that it helps one to orientate himself in the present.

Impermissible for Marxist theoretician to pass by the congresses of the First International. But a thousand times more urgent is the study of the living differences concerning the Amsterdam anti-war congress of 1932. What is the value, in effect, of the sincerest and warmest sympathy for the Soviet Union if it is accompanied by indifference to the methods of its defense?

Is there now a theme more important for a revolutionary, more gripping, more burning, than the struggle and the fate of the German proletariat? Is it possible, on the other hand, to fix one's relations to the problems of the German revolution while passing by the differences in the camp of German and international Communism? A revolutionary who has no opinion on the policies of Stalin-Thaelmann is not a Marxist. A Marxist who has an opinion but remains silent is not a revolutionary.

It is not enough to preach the utility of technology; it is necessary to build bridges. What would be thought of a young doctor who, instead of working in the operating room, would satisfy himself with reading the biographies of great surgeons of the past? What would Marx have said about a theory which, instead of deepening revolutionary practice, would serve to separate one from it? Most probably he would repeat his sarcastic sentence, "No, I am not a Marxist".

All the evidence is that the present crisis will be a great milestone in the political road of the United States. The self-sufficient American provincialism is in any case nearing its end. Those commonplaces which invariably nourished American political thought in all its ramifications are completely worn out. All classes need a new orientation. A radical renewal, not only of the circulating but also of the fixed capital of political ideology, is imminent. If the Americans

persist in their backwardness in the domain of Socialist theory, it does not mean that they will remain backward always. It is possible to venture without much risk a contrary prophecy: the longer the Yankees are satisfied with the ideological old clothes of the past, the more powerful will be the impetus of their revolutionary thought when its hour will strike. And it is near. The elevation of revolutionary theory to new heights can be looked for in the next few decades from two sources: the Asiatic East and America.

The proletarian movement has displaced in the course of the last hundred-odd years its national center of gravity several times. England, France, Germany, Russia—this was the historical sequence of the home of Socialism and Marxism. The present revolutionary hegemony of Russia can least of all claim a durable character. The fact itself of the existence of a Soviet Union, especially before the proletarian victory in one of the advanced States, has naturally an immeasurable importance for the workers' movement of all countries. But the immediate influence of the Moscow ruling faction upon the Communist International has already become a brake on the development of the world proletariat. The fertilizing ideology of Bolshevism has been replaced by the stifling pressure of the apparatus. It is not necessary to prove the disastrous consequences of this regime: it suffices to point to the leadership of the American Communist Party. The liberation from the witless bureaucratic command has become a question of life and death for the revolution and for Marxism.

You are totally right; the vanguard of the American proletariat must come to base itself on the revolutionary traditions of its own country too. In a certain sense we can admit the slogan, "Americanize Marxism!" It does not mean, certainly, to submit its foundations and methods to revision. The attempt of Max Eastman to throw overboard the materialistic dialectic in the interests of the "engineering art of evolution" represents an obviously hopeless and in its possible consequences retrograde adventure. The system of Marxism has completely passed the test of history. Especially now, in the epoch of capitalist decline—of wars and revolutions, storms and shocks—the materialistic dialectic fully reveals its indestructible force. To Americanize Marxism signifies to root it in American soil, to verify it against the events of American history, to explore by its methods the problems of American economy and politics, to assimilate the world revolutionary experience under the viewpoint of the tasks of the American revolution. A great work! It is time to approach it with the shirt-sleeves rolled up.

NEW VISTAS BEFORE U. S. COMMUNISTS

On the occasion of strikes in the United States, where the decomposing center of the First International was transferred, Marx wrote, on July 25, 1877 to Engels: "The porridge is beginning to boil, and the transfer of the center of the International to the United States will yet be justified finally". Several days later, Engels answered him: "Only twelve years after the abolition of bond slavery, and the movement has already achieved such acuteness!" They both, Marx and Engels, were wrong. But as in the other cases, they were wrong as to tempo, but not as to direction. The great porridge from the other side of the ocean begins to boil; the turn in the development of American capitalism will inevitably provoke a blossoming of critical and generalizing thought, and perhaps in not so long a time as from the transfer of the theoretical center of the International to New York.

Before the American Marxist open virtually grandiose, breath-taking perspectives!
With sincere greetings,
Prinkipo, Nov. 4, 1932 L. TROTSKY.

The A. F. L. and Union Unity

The Stalinist Policies Fail to Meet the Test of the Situation

(Continued from page 1)

Wrought by a false trade union policy. And it is from this that the Left Opposition proceeds with the slogan of trade union unity fully cognizant of the fact that the forces of class relations are in constant motion. Hence the process of unity cannot remain the same at every stage or in every sphere. While revolutionists have the general road to their goal definitely marked out, the method of making the curves encountered depends entirely upon the nature of the curves and territory traversed. We are not bound in advance, nor can we lay down in advance, any specific form or formula which will fit the various situations which arise. Our slogans, our tactics and our methods while fitting into a general strategy must also be so molded and applied that they harmonize with each specific stage of development.

Will There Be a Change of Policy

In general the whole question of trade union policy, and in particular, the question of independent unions by splitting off minorities versus the issue of trade union unity is due for some serious attention by the Comintern and the various parties. That is not only indicated in the compelling force of developments of the class struggle but also in the shifting winds within the Comintern.

In Germany, for example, the official party has attained a mass basis. But it has, of course, pursued the Comintern policy of splitting the trade unions. The independent, "revolutionary" unions failed to attract the masses. Consequently the German delegation went to the fifth RILU congress with the slogan to "conquer Lozovsky but not to annihilate him". They counted on the support of Piatnitzky. But that was before Stalin intervened. After that the idea of splitting and creating independent unions all along the line won out completely. One of the German delegates reproached Piatnitzky: "But comrade Piatnitzky you spoke yesterday in an entirely different vein." Whereupon the latter answered laconically: "Yes, that was yesterday."

But within the Comintern the turn toward the Right has since become more unmistakable. Many of the lesser bureaucrats, who want an end to the policy of trade union splits, are therefore again turning upon Lozovsky, not merely to conquer him, but also to annihilate him. The formula, by which he won them over in the past; that just as the revolutionary unions are schools for Communism so are the reformist unions schools for capitalism; that formula is now used as the noose with which to hang him and his policy. But such methods of change, of course, can not serve at all to educate the revolutionary cadres.

Should these shifting winds not fully succeed in affecting a change at this moment we may expect that the actual forces of class relations will soon exert a sufficiently strong pressure in that direction. We will not contend that the question of these independent, "revolutionary" unions and the liquidation of that kind of splitting policy is posed as acutely here as, for example, in Germany. Not at all. Nor do we attempt to draw a direct analogy. But we do contend that the increased speed of the class relations in motion compels much more serious consideration of this question than heretofore.

The Unorganized and the A. F. of L.

Such consideration involves primarily the question of attitude toward the two main problems: the organization of the unorganized and activity within the A. F. of L. Essentially the policy of organization of the unorganized adopted by the party in 1928, in the shaping of which we, who are today in the Left Opposition, had a considerable part, still remains correct. The potentialities in this field have not grown less today but have rather increased. That will be even more the case in the future period of rising struggles and therefore becomes decisive for our orientation. But this question cannot entirely await a future settlement; it demands a correct preparation today.

Today the only trade union base resembling a mass character is the A. F. of L. and the kindred unions of the railroad brotherhoods. It would be foolish to contend that things will always remain so. As a matter of fact, as the A. F. of L. has constantly become narrowed down toward embracing skilled trades exclusively, it is well to pay attention to the possibilities of organization within the basic and unorganized industries arising entirely as a new movement. That should also mean possibilities for a new militant base. But even that gives no reason whatever to assume that the A. F. of L. will pass out of existence. Nor should the revolutionary policy be predicated upon that. On the contrary, even the most favorably variant of future possibilities would still not eliminate the question of trade union unity. If the revolutionists are able to build up some strength within the unions they will also be able to participate in determining conditions for unity.

These, in general, were our views when we participated in shaping the correct party policy. But, subsequently, following our expulsion, the policy became completely emasculated. Instead of organization of the unorganized we had the withdrawal of the militant minority sections from the A. F. of L. unions. The TUUL was taken off its path as the center of the Left wing within the mass unions. It was transformed into a revolutionary center to organize "revolutionary" unions from the top down which all remained numerically small, sectarian and kept in leading strings. This could serve only the A. F. of L. bureaucracy leaving it in undisputed control. Generally speaking the reactionaries gained at the expense of the revolutionists. In the South, whatever unionism is left is in the hands of the A. F. of L. In the needle trades the A. F. of L. has gained. In the mine fields new independent unions have replaced the TUUL. And to complete the picture practically the same conditions obtain throughout the union field.

The Question of Trade Union Unity
This is the picture of devastation

Two years ago the Left Opposition advanced the unity slogan for the needle trades unions in the form of proposing a united front leading to a merger between the party directed industrial union and the ILGWU. Today we propose, as a step toward unity, that the industrial union should declare its readiness to re-enter in a body into the ILGWU on the condition of trade union democratic rights being guaranteed. In this there is no change of general policy; only the formula for realization of unity has changed and, of necessity, so as to correspond to the relation of forces which have become more favorable to the Right wing. The proposal of two years ago did not attempt to define in a direct sense the relations to the A. F. of L. while the present directly implies inclusion within it. Such questions, of course, must also be determined primarily upon the basis of the relation of forces in each specific instance.

In the minefields today, on the other hand, we have a situation of a different character. In the soft coal fields the UMW of A. broke down, the rebel forces within became the majority and found no alternative but the formation of a new, independent union. Nevertheless the unity issue is posed there and has been advanced correctly by the Left Opposition. But it is an issue of unity not with the UMW of A. but of the various new miners unions against it, and in this sense also against the A. F. of L. In this field, as elsewhere, the formula for the realization of unity must correspond to the existing conditions, because it is primarily determined by the relation of forces. But while the formula is quite different from that of the needle trades it is still essentially the same general policy.

To the party leadership these questions are still anathema. Can they remain so very long? Obviously not. It will also be compelled to take cognizance of the development of the relation of forces within the trade union field. In the future, the question of trade union policy will have more far-reaching implications.

If the revolutionary party is to have any influence upon the future course of the trade union movement it must, first of all, return to the policy of active work within this movement. It should now be in a position to draw a balance from its period of creation of new, "revolutionary" unions. The result will, of course, appear quite negative! but it can and should become a starting point for a new orientation, an orientation toward trade union unity. Within that general orientation should be coordinated the efforts of a correct policy of organization of the unorganized together with active work in building a Left wing within the existing mass unions.

—ARNE SWABECK.

PARTY MILITANT SPEAKS FROM PLATFORM OF OPPOSITION IN NEWARK, N. J.

A very interesting lecture was arranged by our Newark branch on Sunday, December 4, at the Hungarian Workers' Home. The lecture was delivered by comrade Basky on the subject of the world crisis and the immediate tasks of the Communist parties. An unusually large crowd turned out, among them many party members and sympathizers. Before the floor was turned over to the speaker, a party comrade, representing the Unemployed Council of Newark requested the floor to speak on outrageous brutalities the Hunger Marchers received at the hands of the authorities. He called upon the meeting to register its protest. Comrade Basky supported his call and suggested the adoption of a resolution of protest, to be sent by the meeting to president Hoover, demanding the right of the Hunger Marchers to present their petition to Congress. A resolution to this effect was drawn up, adopted by the meeting and sent by wire.

The lecture of comrade Basky, presenting the position of the Left Opposition on the world crisis and counterposing the Marxian-Leninist policies of the Left Opposition to those of the Stalinist leadership of the party, was followed by the audience with the greatest attention. After the lecture comrade Nagy, chairman, called upon comrade Letner, a well known functionary of the party, to present the position of the party on the same subject, offering him the floor for whatever time he deemed necessary for an adequate discussion of the question. Comrade Letner spoke for forty minutes, quite objectively. He made a very sincere, but unsuccessful attempt to defend the Stalinist policies of the party. After his speech the floor was thrown open for questions which were answered by comrade Basky.

—L B

Pioneer Publishers Notes

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Volumes two and three of the *History of the Russian Revolution* by comrade Trotsky will be out in January. The price of a boxed set of all three is \$10.00. They may be bought singly or in sets of two at a time.

We know that a great many of our comrades and readers are anxious to read and study these books but are unable to pay for them at one blow. For them we offer the following arrangement: they may begin now to pay for them on an installment plan; when they have paid up we will ship them copies of the volumes they want. We would like to ship the books on credit but we are unable to do so. Our very bad financial situation makes it impossible to invest any money in this. We will keep accurate records and issue receipts as we go along. There will be no errors from this end.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT PAMPHLET

The raging financial crisis has made it necessary to postpone for a while the publication of the two popular Marxist pamphlets we announced a short time ago. From the enthusiasm which greeted our announcement we know that many will be keenly disappointed by this delay. But it could not be helped.

We are getting around to the first one, Unemployment and the American Working Class by comrade Swabek. If we are able to keep anywhere near our schedule it should be out toward the end of January. It will be about twenty-four pages, printed on newsprint, and will sell for five cents. We will sell them from New York in lots of not less

than five. Postage will be extra. In lots of ten and more we will give a reduction of two cents on a pamphlet. A lot of ten will sell for thirty cents plus postage if ordered from us at one time. Comrades who order a lot of five or more can sell them one at a time, of course. The idea behind the lot requirement is to cut down the excessive cost of postage which is terrific.

THE PUBLISHING FUND

Comrades may order now. It will help considerably. The funds raised for this purpose will be used exclusively for getting out the pamphlet. It is too early to speak of a publishing fund. But that is the direction in which we are headed. This can be very well the beginning of it. The idea is to raise a fund to be used only for the publication of literature.

OUR SCHEDULE

This fund will be devoted in the next period to getting out the following works: after the unemployment pamphlet will come *What the Left Opposition Stands For* by comrade Shaachtman; *Soviet Economy* by comrade Trotsky; *The Only Road* by comrade Trotsky; and a reprint of the *Draft Program and the Strategy* as one work, which they really are.

We are unable to assign dates now for these. The financial crisis plays ducks and drakes with our plans. But the publishing fund is the key to the problem. We will return to this theme again.

USE THE CLUB PLAN. GET SUBS FOR THE MINERS.

The Death of the Father of Revisionism

There are few figures left in the international social democracy today who ever exercised so pronounced an influence upon it as did Eduard Bernstein, the "Father of revisionism" who just died in Berlin. With his name is inseparably associated the current which finally won the day in the socialist movement, gaining favorable recognition even from many of those who originally fought it. One of those who never reconciled herself with it, Rosa Luxemburg, summed it up more than three decades ago: "The opportunist current in the party theoretically formulated by Bernstein is nothing but an unconscious endeavor to assure the upper hand to the petty bourgeois elements who have come over to the party, to remodel the practice and the aims of the party in their spirit. The question of social reform and revolution, of final goal and movement is on the other hand the question of the petty bourgeois or the proletarian character of the labor movement."

Bernstein came to prominence in the German social democracy during its heroic days. At the head of the party stood the popular tribunes, Bebel and Liebknecht. The movement had been strengthened by the unity of the two factions—Lassalleans and "orthodox" Eisenachers—even if at a sacrifice of clarity which provoked the classical polemic of Marx against the Gotha program. Not even the exceptional laws of the Bismarck regime were able to prevent the party from forging ahead.

Friendship with Engels

It was during this period that Bernstein was entrusted with the editorship of the central party organ, *Der Sozialdemokrat*, which was published in Switzerland (later in London) for illegal distribution in Germany. The confused views he expressed in its columns at the outset did not bring him much praise from Marx and Engels who, from England, followed the continental movement with unflagging attention. But the young editor finally managed to establish closer relations with the founders of the movement, particularly with Engels, after meeting with them in London.

From that time on, Engels was able to maintain much more intimate contact with the *Sozialdemokrat*. Under his tutelage, Bernstein guided the paper in a manner so true to the ideas of the two London exiles as to cement a firm and almost unbroken friendship with Engels. The latter energetically supported Bernstein's views in Zurich against the dubious conduct, criticized in the *Sozialdemokrat*, of the social democratic Reichstag fraction—even when a split threatened the party. In 1885, engrossed in the work of completing the unfinished manuscript of Marx, he wrote to Bernstein as if in anticipation of the fact that the rising writer was to become his literary executor: "For the moment we have a lot against us. Bebel is sick and, as appears, discouraged. I too cannot help as I should like to until I am finished with Marx's manuscript. So the burden of the struggle falls upon you and Kautsky. But do not lose sight of the old rule: because of the present of the movement and the struggle, not to forget the future of the movement. And that belongs to us."

Bernstein proved to be unworthy of the trust placed in him. He seems to have been organically indisposed to maintain a revolutionary standpoint, and the period of Engels' decisive influence turned out to be a fleeting episode in his life. His long exile in England during the Bismarckian epoch had brought him into intimate association with the British labor movement, such as it was. It was then in the process of emerging from the "romanticism" of the militant Chartist days. The might of British imperialism weighed mountain-heavy upon the working class and most particularly upon its leadership. The successful Liberal-Labor politicians, the respectable members of the Fabian Society, the "practical", conservative trade union leaders—all of these created the environment which reawakened all the reformist inclinations dominant in Bernstein when he first joined the social democracy. Upon his return to Germany, he had already shaken off the revolutionary teachings of Marxism. In the interests of his restored convictions, he utilized the first opportunity to pay back Engels in forged coin for the confidence placed in him.

Bernstein's "Fine Trick"

Engels had just then (1895) written a foreword to a German edition of Marx's "Class Struggles in France". It was a bold reaffirmation of the proletarian right to revolution. At the same time it pointed out that under the prevailing conditions the old tactics of barricade by militant minorities were unfavorable for the working class. What was required at the moment was the consolidation of the proletariat under the socialist banner, utilizing the legality which the bourgeoisie was compelled to grant. Bernstein, together with Wilhelm Liebknecht and the other party elders—terrified at the prospect of new exceptional laws with which the bourgeoisie threatened the party—chopped up this foreword in such a manner as to arouse Engels to a fury. His protesting letters were of no avail (he died practically a few days later) and the forged introduction was transmitted to the new socialist generation as proof that Engels had revised his whole revolutionary outlook at the last moment. On this day the reformists have played the falsified words of Engels as their trump card, but fortunately Engels lived just long enough to make clear his views. "X... (Bernstein) has just played me a fine trick", he wrote to Lafargue on April 3, 1895. "He has taken from my introduction to Marx's articles on the France of 1848-1850 all that could be of use to him to support the tactic of peacefulness and anti-violence at all costs which he has been pleased to preach for

Eduard Bernstein's 'Triumph' Over Militant Marxism

some time now, especially at the present moment when the coercive laws are being prepared in Berlin. But I advocate this tactic only for the Germany of today, and even then with substantial reservations. For France, Belgium, Italy and Austria this tactic, taken as a whole, cannot be followed and for Germany it may become inapplicable tomorrow."

Engels did not revise his revolutionary conceptions. But it is likely that at the last moment he did revise his judgement of Bernstein. As for the latter the Berlin falsifications were a sort of springboard for the whole revisionist movement which he launched more formally a year and a half later. By that time he was freed from the vigilance of a living Engels, whose injunction "not to lose sight of the old rule" left no trace upon him.

The Father of Revisionism

In October 1896, he commenced a series of articles on the problems of socialism in the theoretical organ of the German party, *Die Neue Zeit*. Towards the end of his then still cautiously worded observations, he wrote the sentences which were to become bywords of the revisionist movement: "I admit openly that I attach extraordinarily little sense and interest to what is commonly understood by the 'goal of socialism'. This goal, whatever it may be, is nothing to me, the movement is everything, and by the movement I understand the general movement of society, that is, social progress, as well as the political and economic agitation and organization for the bringing about of this progress." Although he explained later in his autobiography—when a storm of discussion broke over his head—that by these words he meant only that he had no interest in Utopias, he soon left no doubt in anybody's mind that under the heading of Utopia he meant the social revolution.

Bernstein was more than a child of his epoch: he was the clearest and boldest spokesman for it. He set down the fundamental guiding lines of social reformism in a far more rounded-out manner than even his spiritual and practical predecessor, the former radical and post-Bismarckian apostate, George von Vollmar who first scandalized the party with his patriotic speeches. The situation was as if specially created for the appearance of Bernsteinism on the scene. The Exceptional Laws of Bismarck had not only been badly defeated, but the second attempt to make the social democracy illegal was unsuccessful. The party had grown considerably even during its underground days. It marched ahead from election to election, swelling its legislative representation.

Germany was well launched on her imperialist career and a new stratum of better-situated workers began to break through the social structure. Bismarck's successor, Caprivi, was introducing a number of social reforms, including the reduction of the high customs walls. The conditions of labor, at least of its upper layer, were undergoing a distinct improvement. The trade unions progressed and attracted the interest of the proletariat mass towards the practical daily questions of bread and butter, hours and wages. Even during its illegality, and more so afterwards, the party gained the adherence of countless numbers of petty bourgeois from the middle class and the intelligentsia, who saw in the social democracy the only popular democratic movement. In such an idyllic atmosphere the problem of the proletarian seizure of power seemed remote indeed, and Bernstein's pioneering for reformism did not encounter insuperable obstacles.

The Essence of Bernsteinism

In 1899 he presented his views in a systematic and more outspoken form in a book called "Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie" ("The Prerequisites of Socialism and the Tasks of the Social Democracy", published in English as "Evolutionary Socialism"). It left no front of the Marxian system unassailed. The theory of historical materialism, the dialectic method, the conception of the

class struggle, the theory of value, the Marxian crisis theory, the seizure of power—all of them encountered his opposition. He disputed Marx's contention that the capital is concentrated and centralized into even fewer hands, with the concentration of poverty at the other pole of society. The middle class was not disappearing, for there was a growth of those whose income was derived from the possession of small properties or from sharing in the benefits of corporate ownership and management. He was one of the first avowed opponents of the dictatorship of the proletariat: what sense did it have when the party representatives were increasingly active in all the popular legislative bodies in such a practical manner as stripped the term of any meaning?

The party's tactics must not be founded upon the idea of social convulsions or catastrophes; the utopia of a coming revolution must be given up. The evolution of society was moderating all the social antagonisms and class conflicts. The management and ownership of industry was being democratized, and so also—with the granting of suffrage, the legalization of the party and its growth in the Reichstag—was the political management of society. With an audacity which does not seem astounding today, but was then, he concluded by asserting that the social democracy can progress only by having the courage "to emancipate itself from a phraseology which is actually outlived, and be willing to appear as what it is today in reality: a democratic-socialist reform party".

(Concluded in Next Issue)

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

Campaign On For Militant Subs

Our campaign for the increase of the *Militant* circulation is far from being in full swing. The forty subs received between the 10th and 24th of December do not come up to our expectation. Cities like St. Louis, Los Angeles, Kansas City, Cleveland are not represented in the record for these two weeks. A total of ten from New York or five from Chicago, or two from Minneapolis is surely not the best that can be done in these cities with strong branches and numerous connections with militant workers. If we really want the principles and policies of the Left Opposition to penetrate the party, its auxiliary organizations and the trade unions, we must spread the *Militant*. The spreading of the *Militant* is a prerequisite for such a penetration. This question should be taken up at once by every branch for discussion and the work should be organized without any delay. Also it should be borne in mind that without a substantial increase of the circulation the financial situation of our paper will remain precarious in spite of continuous contributions from the branches. Comrades, get busy.

The record for December 10-24: (Two or more)

CITIES	
New York	10
Chicago	5
Lynn	4
South Bend	4
Philadelphia	3
Minneapolis	2
Montreal	2
MILITANT BUILDERS	
C. Ingram	4
A. Friend	4
J. Ritz	4
H. Capelis	4
M. Sterling	2
L. Basky	2
Drucker	2
H. Milton	2
J. Ross	2
J. Joel	2

A HALF-YEAR SUB TO THE MILITANT IS \$1; WITH THREE OTHERS ON A CLUB PLAN BLANK IT IS ONLY \$50.

LEON TROTSKY

Soviet Economy in Danger

The Situation on the Eve of the Second Five Year Plan

The Suppression of the Nep, Monetary Inflation, and the Liquidation of Soviet Democracy

The need for introducing the NEP, the restoration of market relationships, was determined in its time first of all by the existence of 25 million independent peasant proprietors. This does not mean, however, that collectivization even in its first stage leads to the liquidation of the market. Collectivization becomes a living factor only to the extent to which it leaves in force the personal interest of the members of kolkhozes, by molding their mutual relations, as well as the relations between the kolkhozes and the outside world, on the foundation of commercial calculation. This means that the correct, and economically sound, collectivization, at the given stage should lead not to the elimination of the NEP, but to a gradual reorganization of its methods.

The bureaucracy, however, went the whole way; at first, it might have appeared to it that it was taking the road of least resistance. The genuine and indubitable successes of the centralized efforts of the proletariat were identified by it with the successes of its a priori planning. Or to put it differently: It identified the socialist revolution with itself. By administrative collectivization it masked the unsolved problem of establishing the link with the village. Bucking up against disproportions through the NEP, it liquidated the NEP. In place of market methods it enlarged the methods of compulsion.

The stable currency unit, in the form of the chervonets, constituted the most important weapon of the NEP. While in its state of dizziness, the bureaucracy decided that it was already standing firmly with both feet on the soil of economic harmony; and that the successes of today automatically guaranteed the progression of subsequent successes; and that the chervonets was not a bridle that checked the sweep of the plan but on the contrary provided an independent source of capital funds. Instead of regulating the material elements of the economic process the bureaucracy began to patch up the holes by means of printing presses. In other words, it took to the road of "optimistic" inflation.

After the administrative suppression of the NEP, the celebrated "six conditions of Stalin"—economic accounting, piecework wages, etc.—became transformed into an empty collection of words. Economic accounting is unthinkable without market relations. The chervonets is the yardstick of the link. Of what possible use for the worker can be a few extra

roubles a month, if he is compelled to purchase in the open market the necessities of life he lacks at ten times their price?

The restoration of open markets came as an admission of the inopportune liquidation of the NEP, but an admission that is empiric, partial, thoughtless and contradictory. To label the open markets as a form of "Soviet" (socialist?) trade, in contrast to private trade and speculation is to practise self-imposture. Open market trading even on the part of the kolkhoz, taken as a whole, turns out to be speculation on the required necessities for the nearest city and by its consequences leads to social differentiation, i. e., to the enrichment of the minority of the more fortunately situated kolkhozes. But the chief place in the open market is occupied not by the kolkhozes but by individual members of the kolkhozes, along with the independent proprietors. The trading of the members of the kolkhozes, who sell their surplus at speculative prices leads to the differentiation within the kolkhozes. Thus the open market develops centrifugal forces within the "socialist" village.

By eliminating the market and by installing instead Asiatic bazaars the bureaucracy has created, to consummate all else, the conditions for the most barbaric gyrations of prices, and consequently has placed a mine both under the plan and under commercial calculation. As a result, the economic chaos has been redoubled.

Parallel to this, there has gone on the ossification of the trade unions, the Soviets, and the party, which dates back not from yesterday. Bucking up against the friction between the city and the village, against the demands from the side of various sections of the peasantry and from the side of the proletariat, the bureaucracy ever more decisively forbade any demands, protests and criticism whatsoever. The sole prerogative, which it ultimately left to the workers, was the right to exceed production tasks. Every attempt to influence from below the economic management is immediately assigned to a deviation either to the Right or to the Left, i. e., it is practically made a capital offense. The bureaucratic upper-crust, when all is said and done, has pronounced itself infallible in the sphere of socialist planning (disregarding the fact that its collaborators and inspirers turned out often to be inimical machinators and saboteurs). Thus was liquidated the basic mechanism of socialist construction—the plan and elastic system of Soviet democracy. Face to face with economic reality and its

difficulties the bureaucracy turned out to be armed only with the twisted and rumbled wire carcass of the plan and with its own administrative will, also considerably rumbled.

THE CRISIS OF SOVIET ECONOMY

Had the general economic level, set by the first Five Year Plan, been realized only 50 percent, this in itself could have given no cause as yet for alarm. The danger lies not in the slowing down of growth, but in the growing unconformity between the various branches of economy. Even if all the integral elements of the plan had been fully coordinated a priori, the lowering of the coefficient of growth by 50 percent would have by itself engendered great difficulties because of the consequences; it is one thing to produce one million pairs of shoes instead of two millions; but it is quite another thing to finish building one half of a shoe factory. But reality is much more complex and contradictory than our hypothetical example. Disproportions are inherited from the past. Stipulations which are made by plan include in themselves inevitable mistakes and miscalculations. The fulfillment of the plan does not occur proportionately, due to the particular causes in each individual instance. The average growth of 50 percent in economy may mean that in sphere A the plan is filled 90 percent, whereas in sphere B, only 10 percent; if A depends on B, then in the subsequent cycle of production, the branch A may be reduced below 10 percent.

Consequently the misfortune does not lie in the fact that the impossibility of adventurous tempos has been revealed. The whole trouble is in that the prize leaps in industrialization have brought the divers elements of the plan into a dire contradiction with each other. The trouble is that economy functions without material reserves and without calculation. The trouble is that the social and political instruments for the determination of the effectiveness of the plan have been broken or mangled. The trouble is that the accrued disproportions threaten ever bigger and bigger surprises. The trouble is that the uncontrolled bureaucracy has tied up its prestige with the subsequent accumulation of errors. The trouble is that a crisis is impending with a retinue of consequences such as the enforced shutting down of enterprises, and unemployment.

The difference between the socialist and capitalist tempos of industrial development—even if one takes for comparison, the former progressive capitalism—astonishes one by its sweep. But it would be a mistake to consider as final the soviet tempos of the last few years. The average coefficient of capitalist growth results not only from periods of expansion but also of crisis. Matters are otherwise with Soviet economy. In the course of the last 8-9 years it has experienced the period of uninterrupted growth. It has not as yet succeeded in

A Footnote to Browder's Record in the Chinese Revolution

In the *Daily Worker* of October 21, the anointed (i. e., appointed) leader of the American party, Earl Browder, directed a venomous attack upon our arrested comrade Chen Du-Hsiu, in the course of which he presented a defense of his own record in the 1925-27 Chinese revolution. Our reply to Browder was printed in the *Militant* of October 29, 1932. With numerous quotations from the official party press, we proved that not only had Browder and all the other Stalinists "failed to carry on a resolute struggle against Chiang Kai-Shek" (which Browder insists he did carry on), but quite the contrary. We showed that Chiang was covered up by the Stalin-Bucharin regime up to the day he covered up the streets of Shanghai (for the second time) with proletarian blood. Further, that the Stalin regime (Browder, of course, included) shifted its reliance to Wang Chin Wei and the Hankow government, which promptly proceeded to play the same treacherous role as Chiang had played before them.

As his defense, Browder referred to "records" which he knew were not easy to obtain. "These show", he declared, "that in April, in the period when Chen Du-Hsiu was actively and bitterly fighting for the disarmament of the workers and peasants, I wrote a statement for the All-China Federation of Labor energetically calling for the further arming of the workers and peasants and the development of seizure of the land. This statement was printed in English in the magazine *Chinese Correspondence* published at that time in Hankow."

Our answer in the *Militant* on this score read as follows: "What Browder wrote in his statement at that time, we do not know. It would be interesting to read it, of that we have no doubt. But it is not needed for an estimation of Browder's position in China during that period, for we have at our disposal fairly adequate material..."

Browder's "Records"

Since that was written, our good English comrade H. S., who was in China during the events of which we write, sent us a copy of the "Chinese Correspondence", issued in Wuhan (Hankow), seat of the Wang Chin Wei government, under date of May 1, 1927. On page 14 and 15, we find eloquent evidence of Browder's "resolute struggle". It is in the form of a "Declaration of the Delegation of the Communist International", composed of Browder, Tom Mann of England and Jacques Doriot of France. The declaration was written in Hankow under date of April 22, 1927, that is, after Chiang Kai-Shek's coup d'Etat in Shanghai and only a short time before the unaccounted treachery of Wang Chin Wei and Co. at Hankow itself.

As for "energetically calling for the further arming of the workers and

peasants"—not a trace, not a hint of it is to be found in the declaration of this august delegation.

As for "the development of seizure of the land"—there simply is not a single word said about it in the statement of these official representatives of the Communist International.

And as for the Communist Party of China—this "trifle" is passed by without so much as the vaguest reference to its existence!

But the "resolute struggle against Chiang Kai-Shek"—what about that? The delegation refers to his counter-revolutionary coup d'Etat of more than a year before (the first one, on March 20, 1926!) and other "previous numerous acts of violation", and adds the following tearful observation, which should be engraved on tablets:

"We watched all these violent actions of Chiang Kai-Shek and his agents with great anxiety, but hoped that he would hesitate to turn a bare-faced traitor to the Nationalist movement. At this critical period of the nationalist revolution, preservation of the united front is so imperative that all crimes of those who fight against imperialism can be temporarily overlooked." (Our emphasis.—S.)

That was "resolute struggle" Number One: overlooking all the crimes of Chiang Kai-Shek who is, as we see, not the only one that is... bare-faced.

The statement continues its lament with a reference to the preceding conflict between the Central Committee of the Kuo Min Tang and Chiang, who "appeared to the Communist International to send its delegation in China to visit him". "We immediately telegraphed him..." writes the delegation, and "informed him that should he take our advice we would visit him in order to discuss the way and means of preserving the unity of the revolutionary forces in the face of imperialist attack."

That was "resolute struggle" Number Two: begging the man who was so skillfully preparing his treachery, to remain within the fold, to preserve the "unity of the revolutionary forces".

The Comintern and Hankow

Now what about the petty bourgeois government at Hankow, which succeeded Chiang in the affections of the Comintern, and which was at that very moment laying the basis for its own open shift into the camp of counter-revolution? Did the Comintern Delegation carry on a "resolute struggle" against it? Did it even sound a note of warning? Did it urge the masses to establish their own fighting organs to forestall the consequences of a second calamity? Here is what Browder was "energetically calling for" on April 22, 1927:

"Supported by the united forces of the village and town democracy, that is, the proletariat, peasantry and the middle classes, the Nationalist government (that is, the regime of 'comrade Wang Chin Wei', as Browder so tenderly called him then!) will be able to resist the attack of imperialism and develop the Nationalist revolution in the way which will consolidate its base in the popular masses. Then the nationalist revolution will be free from the danger of betrayal by reactionary elements..." (Bold face in the original.—S.)

The declaration ends with the slogans: "Down with Chiang Kai-Shekism!" (Very bold slogan, now that Chiang was already massacring the masses!), "Long live the Nationalist Government! Long live the Kuo Min Tang!"

As the "nationalist revolution" was not "free from the danger of betrayal"—on the contrary, Wang promptly "betrayed" it—we can only conclude that the fault lay not with the Hankow regime but... with the "united forces of village and town democracy". It would appear that Wang "betrayed" because the masses failed to support him, as Browder urged in the course of his resolute struggle.

The whole situation is as clear as crystal. Browder—but enough of Browder; he was only an obscure agent—we mean the Stalin faction. Stalin did indeed fight resolutely against Chiang and Wang Chin Wei. But the fight began only after the horse, which Stalin helped these counter-revolutionists to mount, had ridden rough-shod over the prostrate bodies of the Chinese masses.—M. S.

Announcing Classes for 1933

International Workers School

COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF AMERICA (Left Opposition)

ENROLL NOW!

Sunday American Labor Leaders Instructor—James P. Cannon Starts January 22nd—Popular Lectures

Monday Elementary Communism Instructor—Martin Abern Starts January 2nd—Lecture-Question

Monday Marxian Economics Instructor—Hugo Oehler Starts January 2nd—Lecture-Question

Wednesday American History Instructor—Jack Weber Starts January 3rd—Lecture-Question

Wednesday The Program of the Left Opposition Instructor—Max Shachtman Starts January 24th—Popular Lectures

Registration one dollar per course

J. WEBER, Administrator 126 East 16th Street New York City

(To be continued)