

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 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1923 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME IV, NO. 29 [WHOLE NO. 88]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1931

PRICE 5 CENTS

UNITE EMPLOYED AND UNEMPLOYED IN RELIEF STRUGGLE

In at least the same ratio by which growth of unemployment and wage cuts go hand in hand increases also the importance of effecting unity of action of the workers who are employed with the unemployed. Moreover, when facing the inescapable future prospect of a standing army of unemployed, this issue becomes one of major importance.

That unemployment is still increasing is substantiated by the United States Department of Labor. According to its monthly report for September of statistics obtained from the various manufacturing establishments throughout the country, it is made clear that for every 100 persons employed 3.58 were taken on as compared with 5.62 laid off. The extent to which wage cuts inevitably follow in the train of the increasing unemployment by capitalism utilizing the situation to shift the whole of its burden upon the workers, is also revealed by Department of Labor report. Thus during the first eight months of 1931 there were a total of 1,895 wage cuts, the average reduction applied being about 10 percent.

All present indications bear out the contention that with the continued reduction of the standard of living and the increasing pressure upon the workers (they will inevitably be set into motion to resist. Nevertheless the distance still to be traveled to make this resistance a broad and effective one becomes clear by an analysis of the number of wage disputes during the present crisis as compared to the one of 1920-21. These figures are illuminating. The wage disputes listed by the Department of Labor were:

First seven months of 1920... 2,246
First seven months of 1921... 1,790
First seven months of 1931... 498

In the first instance it must be remembered that 1920-21 occurred in a period when workers actually were in motion to maintain their most recent gains and further elevate their position. It was an aftermath of the great strikes of 1919 and the methods of militancy still prevailing. In the intervening period the illusions of bourgeois prosperity became deeply rooted. Deterioration of the trade union movement proceeded apace, feeding upon the false sense of security. But what cannot be overlooked by revolutionists is the salient fact that, growing out of this situation, the working class enemy has made considerable progress in its obvious designs to separate the unemployed from the employed workers, to isolate the former in order to facilitate the defeat of their struggle for actual relief, and to utilize their position to keep the employed in submission.

Opponents Divert Unemployed Issue Into False Channels

This prospect is fraught with serious dangers to the American proletariat as a whole. Worse, however is the fact that the tactics and organization methods pursued by the official party leadership have unwittingly played into the hands of the class enemy, strengthening them in their designs. While the party is undisputedly at the head of whatever organized unemployed activities exist today, it has failed in the main object of uniting the employed with the unemployed. If another sharp "turn" is contemplated by the party leadership, which, of course, is to be expected, we ask emphatically that this be the first turn to be considered without delay.

From its early stage of mass response to party calls for unemployment demonstrations, the movement in every respect, including its actual organized expression, has become reduced to a position of stagnation. The center of the stage has been taken by the reserves mobilized by monopoly capitalism. The so-called progressives from within the class enemy's camp have taken upon the unemployment issue and to a large extent have already succeeded in diverting the objective away from struggle and into the illusory channels of hope from capitalist charity crumbs. They have made themselves the spokesmen for relief, in a manner seemingly occupying an unusual radical position. Senator Borah proclaims the necessity to tax the rich for the benefit of the unemployed but carefully avoids any concrete steps in that direction. Governor Roosevelt made proposals for extended char-

ity measures of relief. Governor Murray ("Alfalfa Bill") violently denounces the bankers for their guilt in this situation. Senators and congressmen and sections of the capitalist press speak vigorously for relief—alas, as opposed to actual unemployment insurance. Unquestionably there is much fishing for issues and preparations for the 1932 elections. But it just as assuredly reinforces the conclusion that these spokesmen for the petty-bourgeois interests, caught in the squeezers of advancing monopoly capitalism, have actually become alarmed by the much more dreaded spectre of potential proletarian revolt. True to their position and driven by these fears, they hurry to become the saviors of monopoly capitalism and forestall the greater danger.

Unemployed and Employed Must Be United in Struggle

On a whole these attempts at diverting the issues into the channels of illusions serve first of all to blunt the edge of the proletarian struggle. Secondly it serves to strengthen the endeavors to dislodge the Communist leadership of the unemployed masses. Thirdly, it serves to facilitate the general efforts to separate the unemployed from their class brothers and to isolate their struggle for lesser defeat.

The enormous increase of productive capacity under monopoly capitalism creates all the conditions for the standing army of the unemployed. Its constant overproduction can seek an outlet in the recurring crises which accentuate the unemployment problem. The fact of the increase of output per man, reliably calculated at from 48 to 50 percent during the last decade, just that much more emphasizes the permanency of unemployment even during the future upward economic conjuncture. The violent slashing of the workers' standard of living, now so much intensified, accentuates the indications of the capitalist preparations to gain a respite for them from the crisis. But with the prospects of the standing unemployed army remaining under such a possible upward economic conjuncture, there are reasons aplenty for an ever sharper emphasis upon the need of unity of employed and unemployed workers. There can be no successful struggle for relief, for actual unemployment insurance, without it. To the employed workers facing the inevitability of resistance to the attacks, it becomes a question of serious magnitude. Today the crowding of unemployed workers at the factory gates seeking work is the club effectively wielded over their heads to make them hesitate and submit. For tomorrow's struggles it is necessary that this threat be removed by making clear the common objectives of both categories of the class and uniting their efforts for its realization.

Party Recognizes Narrowness of Unemployment Movement

It appears that the party leadership has learned at least one lesson from past experiences. Platnitsky, commenting upon the "Weaknesses in Our Unemployed Work", says that the unemployed workers movement in "America was attached to the weak red trade unions, which are few enough" in number. The association with the "red trade unions" and "revolutionary trade union opposition" drove away the unemployed who belonged to other political parties and to the reformist, catholic and other trade union organizations." (Daily Worker, 10-13-31).

Small and criminally belated as this recognition is, it is nevertheless to be welcomed. However, we clearly and much more emphatically warned against precisely that at the time of the very formation of the national unemployment councils on July 4, 1930 in Chicago. We said in these columns:

"Certainly the successful carrying on of the struggle for the unemployed means to spare no effort to really unite T. U. L." Further, commenting upon the working class, which cannot be done within the narrow framework of the detailed measures of organization, we declared: "These added mechanical limits isolate the movement and confine it within that section of the workers ready to join the 'revolutionary unions'."

(Continued on page 4)

In the Next Issue On the Manchurian Events!

We have received, at the moment of going to press, a comprehensive and brilliant review from Shanghai, China on "The Manchurian Event, the Communist Party of China, and the Left Opposition." by comrade Niel-Sih. Comrade Niel-Sih is a leader of the Left Opposition in China whose articles have appeared on previous occasions in *The Militant*. We are glad to be able to announce to our

readers this significant and timely article. Be sure to get your copy of *The Militant*.
Russian Revolution Anniversary Issue
The next issue also will be an anniversary number in commemoration and celebration of the 14th Anniversary of the Russian Revolution. *The Militant* will contain important reviews of this historic event for the working masses.

England Goes to the Polls

LONDON.—
(As we go to press, a Conservative victory is announced in the British elections, together with an overwhelming defeat for the Labour Party. Forthcoming articles in *The Militant* will carry an analysis of the British elections and the perspectives for the labour and revolutionary movement in Great Britain.)

When in 1867 the Tory government introduced the second Reform Bill, Disraeli described the innovation as a "leap in the dark". This epigram of the great phrase-maker of British politics irresistibly occurs to one at the present time in connection with the forthcoming General Election in Great Britain. For the British bourgeoisie this election also is a "leap in the dark", and the British ruling class hesitated on the brink, uncertain whether to take the plunge.

Two prominent members of the "left", Messrs. J. Maxton, M. P., and W. J. Brown, M. P., a clown and a careerist, boldly waded in public speeches that there would be no General Election, and that formal democracy had shot its bolt in Britain. But while superficial reasoning pointed in that direction, one does not change the regime in a day. "In the beginning, the act". The theory comes afterwards. While the British ruling class is now more than ever resorting to fascist methods of rule, it re-

quires time for a conservative ruling class to make up its mind formally to discard those methods of democracy with which it has achieved such immense triumphs, and by means of which it has galled the working class with such triumphant success. The present regime in Britain is a transitional regime between Democracy and Fascism; and it is the essence of a transitional regime that its acts are the acts of the future while its words are echoes of the past. (It is this phrase that in the crucible of Stalinism becomes that monstrous miscarriage "Social Fascism"!)

The essence of the Marxist method consists in seeking for the concrete situation behind the abstract formula which is too often merely apologetic verbiage. If we apply this method—the only scientific method—to the British Election, we shall find that "appearances are deceptive" and that the formulas of the contending parties are by no means a complete picture of the facts. Our method will consist in expressing first the political situation as it appears to the bourgeoisie, and then as it presents itself from the viewpoint of Marxian science.

Labour Party Battles for Capitalism
Apart from the Communist Party which has, in any case, no possibility of parliamentary success, all the contending parties go into battle under the (Continued on page 3)

Chicago I.L.D. Persists in Isolation Policy

After months of waiting the I. L. D. of Chicago called a Mooney-Harlan United Front Conference Oct. 25 at the Capital Building in a hall seating not more than 200. The report of the credential committee showed forty seven organizations represented: 8 A. F. of L. organizations, 20 fraternal organizations, 18 branches of the I. L. D. and 1 unemployment council. It was the driest, deadest conference held for some time. The above representation shows its narrowness and where the policy of the bureaucrats is leading the I. L. D., which has such favorable opportunities at present for growth and mass influence.

The credential committee and conference under protest of several delegates refused to seat the representative of the Communist League. Slander and the usual abuse was used against the League and its representative, comrade Oehler. A delegate from the John Reed branch of the I. W. O. took the floor and spoke against the splitting, narrowing policy of the bureaucrats, pointing out what a united front should be as well as what it should not be. This was followed by more attacks on the Communist League and the speaker who only wanted a real united front in the Leninist sense.

The bureaucrats' main arguments against the Left was that we wanted a united front from the top (?) and that they would always conduct their united

fronts from below.
A united front implies unity of action on a specific class issue by ORGANIZATIONS of the working class.

The discussion from the floor was a sad affair. No one wanted the floor; only a few took the floor after much coaxing and then they had to force some to take the floor by nominating them to speak. They brought up no concrete proposals for the conference. The Left Communists who had Marxian proposals were denied the right to speak, not only under discussion but also on the motion not to seat them.

The conference is calling another conference in December and elected a committee of 15 to carry out the work and also to arrange a mass demonstration. The bureaucrats could not obtain a committee of 15, the majority declined, they were forced to reopen nominations three times and ask for volunteers several times. They finally obtained the 15 by accepting names of delegates who were not present.

In spite of the tactics of the bureaucrats, the Chicago League calls upon the workers to support the I. L. D. in its campaign, calls upon the workers to correct the line of the I. L. D. on the united front and on the right of freedom of expression of workers in the I. L. D. who do not happen to agree with the bureaucrats.

GREEK OPPOSITION ACTIVE AMONG BRITISH SAILORS

On October 10th, the Salonica section of the Archio-Marxists (Left Bolshevik Opposition) of Greece, distributed a leaflet to visiting British sailors. The leaflet contained an exposure of the labor traitors of England; it further pointed out the errors and crimes of the Stalinists in connection with the Anglo-Russian Committee and the betrayal of the British General Strike by the British labor fakery.

The Greek comrades called for support of the British Communist Opposition in order to regenerate the British Communist Party and hailed the leadership of comrade Trotsky. It expressed the enthusiasm of the Greek Opposition and world proletariat with the gallant

strike recently of British sailors against wage cuts, etc., and exhorted them to follow the example of the Potemkin sailors in the latter's struggle against czarism.

The Greek comrades were especially organized to meet the British sailors as they landed. The sailors were surprised with the conspirative manner of distribution and placed the leaflets in their pockets. A British Oppositionist who happened to be in Salonica distributed the leaflet aboard the battleships. An English provocateur in a sailor's uniform attempted to arrest the comrade and to give him into the custody of the Greek police, but failed to do so on account of the interference of the British sailors.

Railway Bosses Drop their Masks

After four months of public hearings and the presentation of bales of evidence by railroad men, shippers, and bankers, the application of the railroads for a general 15% rate increase has been denied, and instead an increase in certain lines permitted, averaging 3 to 4% but subject to the condition that the financially strong roads turn over the profits from the rate increase to the financially weak ones (cries of "Socialism!" from the Right).

The *Railroad Age* says to this, "However confusing it may be in other respects, one thing that the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the 15% rate advance case has made clear and certain is that railway wages must be reduced as soon as practicable. This Commission could not have made this more inevitable if it had been deciding a wage case instead of a rate case."

Three days after the decision was handed down, three of the smaller systems had already announced wage cuts, while the Association of Railway Executives still hypocritically refuses to take up the wage question. Evidently they want each road to deal piecemeal with its own workers. The Brotherhood leaders naturally support these tactics, confining themselves to misty generalizations

about the maintenance of wages being in capitalism's own best interest.

The defense against wage-cuts must be fought nationally, and by concrete action, not words; the railroad labor leadership refuses to do either. If it were to fight the cuts on a nation-wide scale, even on a purely legal basis by invoking the provisions of the railroad labor law, which call for hearings and eventually a decision by the Railroad Labor Board, the cuts could be postponed a year. During this time the railroads would be weakened and the workers could be strengthened.

Splitting up the railroad workers' resistance into negotiations with individual railroads means the immediate betrayal of the workers, and is a living proof of the worthlessness of legal safeguards of wage standards where the leaders of the workers refuse to assert their interests against those of bondholders and stockholders. The only way for the workers to see to it that their interests are protected is to exert determined pressure on their leadership, grouping themselves around the Left wing elements in their unions who have a consistent record of struggle against the bosses.

Trotsky Greet "El Soviet"

TO SPANISH WEEKLY

Dear Friends:

You are preparing the publication of the weekly. This is a serious step forward. Let us hope that the others will follow swiftly, after this one.

In Spain, as elsewhere, communism is divided into three factions: Right wing, Centrist and Left. The Right represents a combination of communism and social democracy, trade unionism or syndicalism, functioning according to the national conditions. In Spain, as in other countries, the official representation of the Comintern is in the hands of the Centrists, that is, people who vacillate between revolutionary Marxism and various phases of "Communist" opportunism. The strength of Centrism in the Comintern is conditioned by the fact that it supports itself on the state power of the U. S. S. R. Under the present conditions, Centrism is not only an ideological current, not only a faction, but a powerful bureaucratic state apparatus. In conducting a perfunctory, confused and contradictory policy, with not only the authority but also by the material means of the Comintern at its disposal, Centrism has created cruel ravages in the world vanguard of the proletariat, and already led several revolutions to catastrophes. In Spain, through the fault of the Centrist bureaucracy, the Communist party proved to be a miserably small factor at the beginning of the revolution. Imposing a false policy on the national sections, the Stalinist bureaucracy permits no criticism of itself and thereby obstructs the education of the proletariat vanguard, preventing the formation of a vigorous Communist party, independent and sure of itself. Therein consists the chief danger threatening the Spanish revolution which is

developing so powerfully before our own eyes.

The principle position of the Leninist-Bolsheviks (Left Opposition) has been confirmed by the gigantic events of world development, particularly by the entire advance of the Spanish revolution. The official Communist party, thrown off guard at each step in the progress of the revolution, corrects its mistakes in little parcels, basing itself on our criticism, utilizing our principle line, because Centrism in itself is empty and barren.

But, for the faction of the Leninist-Bolsheviks, a correct principle position does not suffice; it is necessary to apply it precisely to the daily events. Revolutionary strategy requires a corresponding tactic.

The importance of the weekly consists therein, that it brings the Spanish Left Opposition face to face with all the current happenings and forces it to give its immediate fighting reply to them. With the creation of the weekly, the Spanish Opposition rises to a higher stage.

To assemble the proletariat, especially in an epoch of tempestuous convulsions, can only be done on the basis of a consistent revolutionary position. This is your historic mission, Spanish Leninists! You must increase your efforts twofold, threefold, tenfold. The voice of the Leninist-Bolsheviks must resound in all parts of the country, at all the mass meetings. Yours are grandiose tasks. The revolution does not wait. Woe to those that lag behind! With all my heart I wish you that you may not prove to be lagging behind!

Yours,
L. TROTSKY.

Kadikoy, September 29, 1931

Banking Crisis in the U.S.

Perspectives of Future Finance Developments

(Continued from previous issue)

The immediate perspectives of the American banking crisis center around three major phases: the outflow of gold, the number and size of bank failures, and the break in the price of bonds, which constitute 20 to 25% of all banking assets. Any one or more of these factors, taking the most unfavorable turn possible, would paralyze the plans of the finance-capital oligarchy for domination, (1) over the smaller aggregates of finance-capital, (2) over industry as a whole, through the maintenance of boom values of claims expressed in dollars in a time of crisis when dollars are worth twice as much, (3) internationally, as against finance-capital, and the industrial capital which it represents, in the other imperialist countries.

These are the stakes for which American finance-capital is fighting in its struggle to overcome the present financial crisis.

1. The outflow of gold is contrary to the general trend of American finance. U. S. A. normally imports more gold than it exports, as a result of its excess of exports over imports, and of its large investments abroad. A permanent cessation of the flow of gold imports into America, the most unfavorable variant for American finance, would result only from the loss of its export markets, and from the refusal of foreign debtors to pay interest or their loans. A temporary outflow of gold, even on the unprecedented scale of recent weeks, can be met by using the mechanism of the

Federal Reserve system, through raising the rediscount rate and substituting eligible paper for gold, down to a minimum of 40% gold reserves, as the backing for Federal Reserve notes. This is being done, and has so far resulted in the Federal Reserve system maintaining an excess of "free gold" above its reserve requirements not materially lower than a year ago, when gold was flowing freely into the U. S. A. A further use of the resources of the system, plus 1.2 billions of gold dollars in the U. S. Treasury, can take care of the withdrawal of all the short-term gold claims of foreign countries. It will be at the cost of imposing fresh financial burdens on industry through high interest rates, but we believe the most probable variant is the continued maintenance of the gold standard in U. S. A. in spite of gold withdrawals.

2. The increase in bank failures is caused by two factors—runs by depositors, and inability of banks to pay out cash against deposits due to the "freezing" of their assets, that is, the conversion of good loans and investments into poor ones as a result of the crisis. Unquestionably, even the strong banks could not long resist the continued operation of both factors. The higher interest rates, however, are bringing deposits back out of hoarding into banks to counterbalance in part the continued withdrawals from others; many of the weakest and smallest banks have already been closed; and the slowing down of the tempo of the crisis in the past three (Continued on page 4)

Rush Funds to The Militant!

The *Militant* needs your continued financial support. Since our appeal in the recent issue, her has begun a response. Through the New York branch, which first received our appeal, a total of fifty dollars to date has been raised. The branch will speed up its drive in the forthcoming week, and on Saturday and Sunday, October 30 and 31st, the Communist League members will canvass all readers and sympathizers for donations. His example should be followed by all branches.

OUR NEED YET IS GREAT. Much needs to be done and given by our supporters to ensure the continued existence of *The Militant* as a weekly paper. Our only support comes from the rank and file of the worker-revolutionists who understand what *The Militant* means the rebuilding and regeneration of the

international Communist movement as it was in the days of Lenin. Great tasks remain for *The Militant* in giving expression and interpretation to the events of the international labor and Commun-

ist movement, the policies and activities of the Communist party, problems of the trade unions, etc. Maintenance of our *Weekly Militant* is the best way to enable us to carry through our tasks and

duties.

Contribute to the Sustaining Fund!
The best way in which our readers and sympathizers can assist *The Militant* today is to make a contribution immediately, and then pledge to make a steady donation to the Sustaining Fund for the continued and regular issuance of the paper.

WE COUNT UPON YOUR SUPPORT!
What is your reply? Send money to *The Militant* to help us in our task of the preservation and propagation of the theories and practices of Communism, as set forth by its leaders, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky.

SEND YOUR DONATION TODAY!
to
The Militant, 84 East 10th St., N. Y. C.

* N. Y. OPEN FORUM *

Fri., Oct. 30: Tom Mooney's Appeal For A United

Front --- by James P. Cannon

LABOR TEMPLE, 14th St., and 2nd Ave. Unemployed admitted free with Unemployed Council card
Admission: 25 Cents

Questions and Discussion
NEXT WEEK, Friday Nov. 6: 14 Years of the Russian Revolution.
by ARNE SWABECK

ON THE WORKERS' FRONT

The Morgenstern-Goodman Case and the I.L.D.

The Defendants Present a Statement of the Facts

The Morgenstern-Goodman Defense Committee has recently sent to *The Militant* a statement of facts and information regarding the case of Goodman and Morgenstern. It is a declaration by the defendants themselves.

The Committee points out that Goodman and Morgenstern were convicted of violation of the Flynn Sedition Act of Pennsylvania, at Philadelphia on June 18, 1931. It welcomes communications from organizations and individuals relative to the case. The declaration of the defendants has the complete endorsement of *The Militant*. The Committee further requests that workers and sympathizers everywhere shall give publicity and support to the defendants. Letters and news should be sent to the Morgenstern-Goodman Defense Committee, 327 South 11th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. The statement follows:

"On Monday, February 23, Bernard Morgenstern and Leon Goodman, members of the Communist League of America (Opposition) in Philadelphia, were arrested while distributing leaflets entitled: 'Unite the Masses in Struggle for the Unemployed'—an open letter to the Communist Party of America, issued by the National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition). The leaflet presents the program of the Communist Left Opposition toward the present unemployed situation. To this leaflet was pasted a sticker calling upon the workers employed and unemployed to attend a demonstration on February 25, at City Hall; this demonstration was called by the Unemployed Councils of the T. U. U. L.

When arrested, we were booked for "blocking the highway and disorderly conduct". That night our branch secretary, who knew of the intended distribution, got in touch with the International Labor Defense. They would have nothing to do with Left Oppositionists. In order to have a lawyer at the hearing the following morning, he then called the American Civil Liberties Union. At the hearing the charge was changed by the district attorney's office to "disorderly conduct and distributing seditious literature"—the latter charge based on the entire leaflet, and particularly on the following passages: "There can be no solution to the unemployment problem under capitalism. The solution can be found only in the socialist revolution, and finally only on a world scale." . . . "Our principle object is and remains the proletarian revolution". Further, the official Communist Party must revive and apply the united front as Lenin taught us." The hearing was postponed to the following day to await further action from the prosecutors' office. The A. C. L. U. attorney was unable to get the case squashed. On the same day comrade Goodman saw the district organizer of the I. L. D., Jack Ross, and tried to interest him in the case. He was told that it would have to be "considered" by the National Office of the I. L. D.

The hearing resulted in dropping the charge of "disorderly conduct" and holding us on \$1,000 bail each for court on the charge of sedition (being members of a Communist organization) and distributing seditious literature, these commencing under violations of the notorious Flynn Sedition Act of Pennsylvania. Bail was furnished by relatives.

I. L. D. Refuses to Aid Class War Victims

On Sunday, April 1st, the I. L. D. held an Anti-Flynn Sedition Conference, supposedly a "united front" conference. J. Louis Engdahl was present as national secretary of the I. L. D. Our branch sent two of our comrades as delegates. We were also present. Ross promised to give us an answer to our request for defense by the I. L. D. This is the "answer" we received: the conference, a closed family affair, did not even mention the case (only a few days old, and the news of which appeared in all local papers.) One of our delegates "reminded" the conference of it. Our delegates were denied a seat, and we were all requested, after being denounced as counter-revolutionists, to leave the hall. We did so without making any further ado.

This shameful conduct on the part of the I. L. D. bureaucrats created quite a stir, not only locally but nationally as well. *The Militant* rendered invaluable service in giving publicity to the whole affair. We on our part kept asking the I. L. D. to take up our defense as two class-war victims. To this date not a single word has appeared, even in mention of the arrests, in any of the Communist Party controlled organs. This despite rumors outside of Philadelphia to the contrary. We all well know how important publicity is in such cases. The July 18 issue of *The Militant* contains many letters passed between the I. L. D. and those who had our defense at heart. These letters expose the corrupt maneuvers by means of which the bureaucrats of the I. L. D. try to avoid the issue of class defense of two Left Oppositionists.

On Wednesday, April 15, Goodman and Morgenstern met with the I. L. D. organizer, Jack Ross, and had a lengthy discussion with him. He was evasive but we put him to the wall. We forced a definite stand on the part of International Labor Defense. He was asked what the policy of the I. L. D. here was on the Flynn Sedition Act, arrests, etc. He replied that they were collecting signatures on petitions for repeal. We asked

if they would call any demonstration or mass meetings. He said, No; they were engaged in too many outdoor meetings; it was inadvisable to have any more until June 5, when the petition campaign would be completed and a delegation sent to the Governor. Indoor meetings would not be a success, he said, since it was too warm. What they intended to do, instead, was to have open air neighborhood meetings.

We asked Ross if the I. L. D. speakers will mention our cases at such meetings. He said they would (this he later refuted). Would the *Daily Worker* mention the case? "No." Would the *Labor Defender*? Also "No." Would he have one of us speak at the I. L. D. neighborhood meetings? No, they could not permit that.

We proposed the following: 1. the holding of an open-air meeting or a mass meeting at which one of us should speak; 2. a united front conference.

The first proposal he answered as reported above. The second he ignored. Finally he was forced to come out openly and tell us that the I. L. D. would give us "legal defense only" and no propaganda of any kind.

"Is this what you meant," we asked, "when you told us at a previous meeting that we would receive the same defense from the I. L. D. as the other labor cases, Ryder, Lynn and Lawrence?"

"Yes, the same legal defense only."

We then told Ross that our Communist League (Opposition) branch would send the I. L. D. a letter giving the points we proposed, and request an answer. Ross told us we would get an answer—the same he just gave us. This letter was sent and no answer ever received. Indeed, never at any time did we receive a letter, visit or telephone call from the I. L. D., this despite their promise and the necessity for them to do so.

Convicted on Sedition Charges

Even the promise to furnish legal defense was a lie. On June 18 we were in court before Judge Reed and were represented by two lawyers from the Civil Liberties Union. We were quickly found guilty of sedition. The I. L. D. was not represented, nor were any of its officials even in court. This was complete sabotage on the part of the factionally blind and corrupt bureaucrats of the officialdom of the Communist Party and I. L. D. Before the trial, and upon getting notice of it, we again paid a visit to the I. L. D. Again no response. "They would see" (?). They refused not only to give us a working class defense, but even to have a lawyer in court. This is the absolute truth. Please refute all statements to the contrary. They are lies with which the wreckers try to cover themselves and their treachery to the cause of class-war prisoners. Similarly the statements of these same people that we gave them "no chance". Why then no mention in their press of our case?

On May 25 the International Labor Defense and the League of Struggle for Negro Rights held a Scottsboro United Front Conference. Bernard Morgenstern was one of the delegates of the Communist League of America (Opposition). He, together with all our comrades, including Goodman, were forcibly ejected—despite the cries of worker-delegates that Morgenstern be permitted to speak. Forty delegates walked out of the hall after us.

Rally to Defendants

In regard to our independent line of defense. It became early evident to ourselves and sympathizers that the I. L. D. officialdom intended to do, or rather not to do, on our case; we began to propagandize here the idea an independent working class defense for us. The C. L. U., be it remembered, is furnishing legal talent only. We, communists, well aware of the capitalist class role of the courts, are not going to pin our faith in their plea to the court's "fairness". We know well that only the protest of masses of workers can defeat the attacks of the bosses on the vanguard section of the workers. It is necessary that we explain our case, as well as all similar labor cases, to the workers.

Locally we have a "Morgenstern-Goodman Defense Committee". It is to do the work the I. L. D. is not doing: the working class defense of two victims of capitalist class justice—Goodman and Morgenstern. At the same time, we constantly advocate the necessity of united action on the part of the I. L. D. We have gotten out collection lists to raise money for the proper functioning of the

THE MILITANT

Published weekly by the Communist League of America [Opposition] at 84 East 10th St., N. Y.

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

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

Vol. IV No. 29 (Whole No. 88)
SATURDAY, October 31, 1931
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.
Bundle rates, 5 cents per copy

defense work. We propose to develop the work of the Committee locally to the calling of a conference to support the Committee. We will print leaflets popularizing the case, call meetings, speak before forums on labor defense, appeal to trade unions and fraternal labor organizations for support, arrange speaking tours, etc. All this will concern itself with the problems of working class defense, linking up our case with others.

We appeal for the support of all workers.

Rally to the defense of ALL class war victims!

(Signed) Leon Goodman
Bernard Morgenstern

Penn. Sedition Victim Dies in Cell

Milan Resetar, Croatian baker and communist, who was serving five years for sedition against the commonwealth of Pennsylvania because he had Communist literature in his possession, died of tuberculosis in the Allegheny county workhouse October 19, after all efforts to obtain adequate medical treatment for him had failed. Appeals in Resetar's behalf were made to judges, parole board members, the workhouse superintendent and Governor Gifford Pinchot, according to the International Labor Defense, but no action resulted.

Resetar was arrested Dec. 13, 1929, with two other Croatian workers—Tom Zima and Peter Muselin—in Woodlawn, Pa. Leaflets had lately been distributed protesting against low wages and bad working conditions in the Jones and Laughlin steel works, which dominate the lives of Woodlawn's working class. Literature found in the homes of the three defendants was the principal evidence. The defendants were convicted of utterances intended to overthrow the government of Pennsylvania.

Efforts to obtain the release of Zima and Muselin are now being made, and a hearing before the parole board is scheduled for November.

It is in Pennsylvania, through the instrument of the infamous Flynn Sedition Act, that numerous working class defendants have been sentenced to long prison terms. There is need for the initiation of a genuine and broad united front movement by the I. L. D. to arouse the masses against the Flynn Sedition Act and for the release of all the working class victims of the Pennsylvania coal and steel barons. The most recent victims, convicted for the distribution of "seditious literature", are Leon Goodman and Bernard Morgenstern of Philadelphia. They are members of the Communist League of America (Opposition) whom the International Labor Defense, in outright violation of its principles, refused to defend, with the result that it was necessary to organize a special Morgenstern-Goodman Defense Committee on behalf of the working class victims of Pennsylvania's capitalist justice.

DO YOUR SHARE HELP SUPPORT THE MILITANT

Siskind's Report: Party Failures and New «Plans»

NEW YORK.—

At the convention of Section Two of the Communist party in New York City, George Siskind reported. He spoke of the necessity for the party to form its base actually in the shops, which is not the case today. The experiences in the furriers' strike must not be passed by. Did the party appear in that strike as an independent leader? In the miners' strike, in the sense the party melted away its identity among the masses. In the furriers' strike, the party absolutely failed; he declared; as a party it had not succeeded in anything.

The party must now turn its face to the shops. Toward the 13th Plenum, it has shown itself capable of independent leadership, as among the coal miners and Paterson, but the party had failed to get results because of isolation from the masses, and because our unions are only skeleton organizations. He said that the masses are assuming a counter-offensive, but he corrected himself by saying that "if that is too much to say, then they are revolting against wage cuts, etc." That, I thought, was saying something else again. 230,000 workers had participated in strikes, one third of whom had been led by the T. U. U. L.

Siskind stated that the main weakness had been the failure to organize the workers on a national scale. We enter strikes unprepared. There is need to organize grievance committees, party shop nuclei, etc. If we fail to lead the workers, others will because the workers are ready. In Paterson we did not succeed to organize a single shop nucleus. Lovestone and Muste took away the workers from us after we had prepared the strike. He failed to explain Workers' Union failure to apply a genuine united front policy as advised in *The Militant* toward the Associated Silk Workers Union and the Musteites made it very easy for the outright fakers, Musteites and Lovestoneites to carry through their aims and to isolate the Party and N. T. W. U. The sentiment that the A. F. of L.

Serious Unemployment Problems Suffer Because of Stalinist Maneuvers

Left Opposition Brings Program Before Chicago Conference

CHICAGO.—A few additional words on the Unemployment Conference that took place in Chicago on October 18 might interest readers of *The Militant*. It was grimly humorous, if humor can be associated with unemployment and the struggles of the working class.

"SLIP UP" OF THE MACHINE

The conference which was to unite the workers for a hunger march in Cook County started at 11 o'clock, an hour late. The attendance was not as large as at the preceding conference. The preliminaries being done away with, the conference proceeded to the election of a credentials committee. The committee elected consisted of five: Rubicki, Brown, Williams, O'Hare and Curtiss, the last being a member of the Left Opposition. It would be too much to say that this was the result of pressure from the ranks; it was evidently a slip-up of the machine, although the Opposition's stand, particularly for unity, had a large following also from the floor.

The credentials committee then convened in a room above. Of course, there was no great difficulty about seating anyone; everyone was seated except the delegates of the Communist League of America (Opposition) whose credentials were taken up when all other business was cleared away.

Rubicki then said, "I move that the delegation of the Communist League of America (Opposition) be not seated" because it was an organization that was against the Communist Party, the only party of the workers, and he drooled his litanies on and on. Rubicki was very anxious to go to a vote. The delegate from the Opposition however got the floor and spoke, in brief, as follows:

OPPOSITION ON FLOOR

"The statement of comrade Rubicki is untrue. While the Communist League of America (Opposition) is undoubtedly outside the Communist Party against our wish and action, because it disagrees with the policies of its leaders, it still recognizes the Communist Party as the incarnation of the ideals of communism which live in spite of the actions of the leaders of the party. Comrade Rubicki is challenged to prove that we, by word, writ or deed in any way are against communism. Even if this statement were true, which it is not, the call for the conference specifies that all organizations "regardless of the affiliations to unions or political parties" are invited. Would that mean that the Democratic, Republican or Socialist parties or their controlled organizations would be allowed to send representatives and the Opposition not permitted? Unity is the need of the movement; rally the workers behind the Communist Party and T. U. U. L."

Rubicki constantly hurried the delegates and begrudged them a few words and demanded that a vote be taken. Discussion was for the moment cut short.

"All those in favor of the motion that the delegates of the Communist League of America (Opposition) not be seated, raise their hands". Two hands were

raised. Rubicki blinked in amazement, counted again. There were yet two.

"All those opposed." . . .

Three hands were raised. Rubicki went pale with horror. It was bad enough that he had had to sit on the same committee with a "renegade", but to have that committee go down and recommend the seating of the delegates of the Communist League of America was more than flesh could stand. Three to two the credentials committee stood, for seating the delegates of the Left Opposition.

RUBICZKI IN FRENZY

Rubicki now became interested in further discussion. The Negro delegate, Williams, was evidently a new party member and instinctively he reacted to the proposals of the Left Opposition for unity. Upon him all the attention of Rubicki was turned. Rubicki was in a frenzy. The delegate of the Left Opposition, calm, had no difficulty in refuting Rubicki's arguments. Rubicki had to dig deep into the sewers of slander and demagoguery in order to bully the Negro delegate into voting to unseat the delegates of the Left Opposition.

The Committee then stood three to two on the question of seating the Opposition. A demand for a minority report was voted down—a Jeffersonian prejudice; it is all right for left wingers to ask such rights from reactionary labor unions, but quite different when the Opposition demands it from the party bureaucrats.

OPPOSITION'S PROGRAM

Meantime, down below the work of the conference had begun. During the discussion, comrade Oehler of the Opposition had put forth the position of the Communist League: for the six hour day and five day week without reduction in pay; for social insurance; for the extension of long term credits to the Soviet Union and development of economic relations between the United States and the U. S. S. R.; for unity of the workers; for the ultimate goal of the proletarian revolution. Oehler's remarks were received with manifest applause by the delegates. Following him, Gebert party district organizer, spoke.

Gebert's speeches never vary, especially against the "Trotskyites": the same adjectives, verbs, nouns, adverbs, etc. He scarcely allows himself to give order to his words of what he would like to be "burning scorn", but he only succeeds in boring his audience. Maybe there is merit in Gebert's methods. Since he will never discover any new proofs of the "renegacy" of the Left Opposition, he will also not be guilty of deviations.

THE MACHINE "REPAIRED"

Finally the report of the credentials committee was called for. Rubicki reported and scarcely allowed himself time to mention the number of delegates, 320, before he attacked the "renegades". The slip-up of earlier in the day was not to be repeated. The machine had been repaired, oiled and put again into first class shape, but in spite of all this, the attempts at steam-rolling had quite a bit of resistance. The unprecedented refusal of a minority report abashed even a number of party comrades. "When 'Noes' were called for, there was quite a sprinkling of them throughout the hall. Some of the die-hards then arose and demanded that the unseated delegates leave the hall. The bureaucrats thought better of it, the action would be too

obvious, and our support was not negligible. The die-hards, who plainly did not have much support from the floor, were quieted.

During all this hub-bub the delegates from the Left Opposition received whispered words of encouragement from workers. Their attitude was admiration of the more advanced communists and their sincere proposals, so obviously in place. The Opposition demand for unity aroused many of the workers. Our support was larger than ever before. In spite of the methods of the bureaucrats, we advise all workers, especially those who supported our seating, to remain in the Unemployed Conference for these, among other, reasons: (1) It is the only conference for unemployment relief under the leadership of the revolutionary party; (2) To fight from the inside for the seating of the Left Opposition in the best interests of the immediate and historical needs of the working class.— C. C.

The Bureaucracy in the I.W.O.

The lengths to which the Stalinist bureaucracy will go in order to prevent workers from discussing the vital problems of the revolutionary movement has recently been demonstrated in Chicago.

At the last meeting of the John Reed branch of the Chicago International Workers' Order, the educational committee brought in a proposal to have among the speakers at the branch meetings comrade Hugo Oehler, of the Left Opposition, to speak on the Five Year Plan.

The Stalinist watch-dog in the branch is the party functionary, Sam Hammersmark, who has apparently left his best days behind him and carried his worst ones forward. Upon the proposal being made, Hammersmark, at the end of a long discussion, announced that if the branch voted to allow "this gentleman" to speak, the party would mobilize to break up the meeting and to see to it that comrade Oehler did not speak. Under the influence of this papal decree, a number of votes were cast against the proposal by members who were favorable to the idea originally. Even then, the vote stood 12 to 12, so that only the vote of the chairman decided finally in favor of submitting to threats of Stalinist hoodlumery. Some of the workers who voted against Oehler speaking said that they knew the Left Opposition was not counter-revolutionary, but that in order to have peace in the branch they would vote against his lecture.

Such a stand, while understandable, is highly unfortunate. To obtain "peace" in the movement by swallowing the insults and despotic arbitrariness of a high-handed Stalinist functionary is one good way of destroying the movement. Only the most stubborn resistance to such scandalous methods, which strike for the "peace" of the graveyard, can deliver the movement from its present state of confusion and impotence which Stalinism has introduced into it.

Geibert's speeches never vary, especially against the "Trotskyites": the same adjectives, verbs, nouns, adverbs, etc. He scarcely allows himself to give order to his words of what he would like to be "burning scorn", but he only succeeds in boring his audience. Maybe there is merit in Geibert's methods. Since he will never discover any new proofs of the "renegacy" of the Left Opposition, he will also not be guilty of deviations.

New International Bulletin Out on Sale

International Bulletin No. 7 of the Left Opposition is now out. This issue contains documentary material on the German Left Opposition and statements by Leon Trotsky, as well as other material of interest.

In order to insure the regular appearance of the *International Bulletin*, we ask our readers and sympathizers to subscribe. The rate is \$1.00 for ten issues.

Additional issues of the *International Bulletin* have already been received and are now being translated into English. Send subscriptions to the *International Bulletin*, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.

FOR YOUR LIBRARY

Books by Leon Trotsky

| | |
|--|--|
| THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION 86 pages, two-colored paper cover 25c Introduction by Max Shachtman | THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL A Criticism of Fundamentals Introduction by J. P. Cannon 140 pages hard paper cover 35c |
| THE SPANISH REVOLUTION 30 pages, paper cover 10c | THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION 208 page book—cloth bound 1.00 paper bound .50 |
| THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA Introduction by Max Eastman 364 page book formerly \$2 now 1.00 | MY LIFE—600 pages 5.00 |
| COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM The Trade Union Question Introduction by James P. Cannon 64 pages, paper cover 15c | THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER 64 pages paper cover 15c |
| PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. E. 48 pages, paper cover 15c Special Rates in Bundles of 5 or more | SINCE LENIN DIED By Max Eastman 1924 158 page book printed in London 50c |

Pioneer Publishers
84 East 10th Street
New York City

—A PARTY MEMBER.

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

THE BRITISH SCENE

England Goes to the Polls

(Continued from page 1)

banner of capitalist slogans. It does not require a profound knowledge of Marxism to see through the pretence of "Socialism" as advocated by the Labour Party Congress at Scarborough. A very slight knowledge of the record of the two Labour governments is sufficient to reveal only too well the nature of the "socialism" that the Labour Party advocates in practice. It is a "socialism" that differs from capitalism precisely as tweedledum does from tweedledee! The Labour Party that was put out by a Red Letter will not return by means of an obvious red herring! The sight of Mr. George Lansbury leading the Labour Congress to the refrain of the "Red Flag" no longer moves the British workers. The excursions of the Indian people find it difficult to act a revolutionary part, and if Jesus fed the multitude, his Labour disciples were quite prepared to starve the unemployed!

All this cant about socialism cannot hide the transparently obvious fact that the Social Democracy is now a part of the normal machinery of the capitalist state. The slogans of the opposition may have a "left" sound, but their program is a program of capitalist reform and reconstruction, and we know that in practice such reconstruction will be at the expense of the broad working masses. The General Election is, therefore, a bourgeois election. The alternative programmes that are offered to the workers are merely programmes for the reconstruction of capitalism. In actual fact, the workers are merely asked to write on the ballot the name of the party which is to reduce their wages!

Tories Shift to Protection "Issue"

The economic necessities of the bourgeoisie find expression in politico-economic formulas. The 17th century revolutionary bourgeoisie put forward its demands under cover of the demand for the supremacy of the House of Commons. To-day, the demand for tariffs represents the necessity of the declining ruling class of Britain. The desire of the Tory party for protection precipitated the election, and protection versus free trade will form its chief battle-cry. (While the Beaverbrook wing of the party advocates Empire Free Trade (protection) this does not seem likely to become a practical issue.) Before British politics pass into the openly revolutionary stage of fascism versus communism, it must be demonstrated that capitalism is itself the inevitable cause

of the terrific plight of the masses. It is still possible to throw the blame for the crisis not on capitalism, but upon its local form, i. e., free trade. Until protection also has demonstrated its complete incapacity to restore Britain's lost prosperity; British politics will not, in the opinion of the writer, pass into the revolutionary stage.

Protection has thus a twofold root. It is a necessary prop to declining British capitalism, (and is, as such, a convincing proof of the decline of British capitalism, which once arrogantly spurned all forms of protection). It is also a psychological necessity to the British bourgeoisie, in that it enables them to offer free trade as a scapegoat to the starving masses who are thus prevented from realizing that it is capitalism which is the cause of the crisis, and that its forms are immaterial. By this means, the political representatives of the ruling class are able to draw the masses from the broad highway of revolution into the side-track of tariff reform. It is not until this also proves a blind alley that the issue of revolution as the inescapable issue from permanent crisis will raise itself with irresistible force in the minds of the masses.

If a forecast may be hazarded, it would seem that a conservative victory at the polls is indicated, backed as it is by a terrific mass drive on the part of the press. It may also be predicted with reasonable certainty that, in the event of a decisive victory, the Tories will serve MacDonald as in 1922 they served Lloyd George when they no longer needed him. An imperialist bourgeoisie invariably cherishes an immense esprit de corps which makes it instinctively despise Judas Isariots of the MacDonald Thomas type whom it spurns when it no longer needs them.

The opposition will consist of the Labour Party plus the free trade Liberals with a programme of free trade plus a few platitudes about bankers ("Silly-lock versus the people", etc.). In this opposition it is probable that Lloyd George will swallow Henderson and become leader of the Labour Party in fact if not in name. In that case, Labour would probably shed its "socialism" (which is in any case too obviously absurd to continue to be of any use; the I. L. P. and the "left" would be expelled, and the Labour Party would become an avowedly liberal party; a position which could not last long in the conditions of British decline.

— CARUS GRACCHUS.

A Communist Party - The Problem of the Revolution in England

The contemporary situation in Britain can only be understood against its historic background. Considered as a "thing in itself" the present crisis is as meaningless as would be a single algebraic formula deprived of its correlative factor. The problems of Britain are problems that history has placed on the order of the day. And problems of such an order are not to be arbitrarily checked or swept back by the broom of the bourgeois Mrs. Partingtons.

The Industrial Revolution created new conditions in Britain, its classical home. To serve its newly-acquired world market, British capitalism brought into existence a population of wage slaves far in excess of its domestic capacity to maintain on even the barest subsistence level. Now that the Victorian age is gathered to its fathers and the world hegemony of Britain is a thing of the past, the British bourgeoisie finds itself faced with a reaction of proportionate dimensions to its previous gigantic action. The markets have gone but the working class remains! The problem of British imperialism, to-day, is to reduce its population in proportion to the rapid loss of its markets. How this can be done without riot, insurrection, and, ultimately, civil war; that is the question of the day for the British ruling class.

Taken in its broadest sense (and history, unlike the historian, is never narrow) the present crisis is merely the first stage in this process. Now that the World Banker, London, has followed London, the commercial metropolis, into limbo; the British bourgeoisie has lost no time in reminding the British working class that it must no longer remain on the stage now that its raison d'être, the world market, is a thing of the past. The concerted attack on the whole working class, (unem-

ployed and employed alike) is merely the first step in the process that will render the socially unnecessary working class socially impossible. The issue is now transparently clear. If the capitalists are shown in the light of Marxian science to be a socially unnecessary class, it is clear that the continued existence of the working class (in, at any rate, anything like its present dimensions) is incompatible with the necessities of the bourgeoisie. And this fact is most of all evident in Britain, the classical parasitic rentier, whose World Empire has gone but whose swollen slave class yet remains.

British Situation is Beyond Reform

Viewed from this angle, nothing could be more mechanical and insane, than to isolate the crisis both from what preceded it and also from what will come after it. The present attack on the British workers is merely experimental, and, with an imperialist bourgeoisie, notoriously, "appetite comes with eating". The British working class is not, therefore, fighting merely for trade union standards. It is, ultimately, fighting for bare existence. And this, save the mark, is the time that the mandarins of the C. P. G. B. deem fit and proper for the slogan of a workers' charter and a guaranteed minimum wage! If the issue were left to reformism, the only concession that the members of the working class are likely to get is a "stake in the country" large enough to contain their coffins!

It is clear that the situation has now got beyond reform. It is no accident that there is a simultaneous collapse of the bourgeois reformist Liberal Party and the working class reformist Labour Party whose policy is, in any case, merely the cast-off clothes of liberalism. It is Socialism or starvation, Communism

or chaos! Only the iron broom of revolution can be relied upon to cleanse with complete efficiency, this Augean Stables.

The events of the last few weeks have shown that the "inevitability of gradualness" only applies to overthrowing Capitalism. There was nothing gradual about the methods taken by Messrs. MacDonald Snowden and Co., to save it! Reformism presupposes a stable and expanding capitalism as an essential preliminary to its reforms, and an even relatively stable capitalism can in Britain only be achieved over a literally decimated working class. The logical conclusion of reformism is, undoubtedly, that of MacDonald; since, unless Capitalism can be first saved, obviously, it cannot be reformed! The position of the Fabians in their 'cloud-cuckoo-land' is, therefore, a fantastic farce, and the attitude of the I. L. P. in trying to pour the new wine of revolution into the old bottles of reformism, is merely a grotesque comedy.

If the I. L. P. is a comedy, the Communist Party is a tragedy. In an era when speedy revolution has become the one crying necessity of the working class, the only alleged revolutionary party indulges in chartist antiquarianism, converting the living slogans of the period of capitalism's rise into musty falsehoods in the period of its decline. When the proletariat needs its party as never before in British history, the party is skulking in a sectarian corner, striving vainly to cling to the coat-tails of the militant workers outside.

Objective Conditions Favorable to Revolution

Indeed, so completely has a vulgar empiricism succeeded and superseded a Marxian analysis, that theory in the C. P. G. B. is despised on the eminent grounds that it is "unpractical". In the laboratory of these alchemists, the word "intellectual" has undergone a "translation". In the epoch of Marx and Lenin, the term "intellectual" denoted a revolutionary student preoccupied (sometimes excessively) with the intellectual problems that are inseparable from a revolutionary analysis. In the epoch of Stalin and Polit, an intellectual is scouted and condemned as a counter-revolutionary merely because he possesses an intellect! It is only such an attitude that could produce such theoretical Siamese Twins as the Workers' Charter and the doctrine of socialism in one country, with its corollary of friendly (sic) competition with the world bourgeoisie.

What is our conclusion? It is that the era of gradual reform is over, and that of a swift reaction is at hand. The law of the pendulum applies to politics. The decline of British imperialism will be of a corresponding magnitude with its unparalleled ascent, and the speed of its world decline will be matched by the ferocity of its drive against the working class. If the 2nd Labour Government represented the last ineffective splutterings of British democracy, the "National" government represents the first stage of British fascism, which only requires time to become fully articulate. Under these conditions, the period when the working class mustered under the banner of the Labour Party, with its bourgeois outlook and "evolutionary" socialism, is doomed to a speedy end, and an epoch of revolution is already missing above its ruins. For that revolution two things are indispensable, militancy and a party that is revolutionary to the end. The militancy is there, and grows rapidly—of that there can be no doubt whatsoever. Only the party is lacking, and the time is short. If, as Disraeli once said, "adventures are to the adventurous", it is no less true that revolutions can only succeed, if, and when, they are led by revolutionaries. From the era of Wat Tyler to that of the general strike of 1926, British history affords examples to show what happens to a movement whose leaders fear victory more than defeat!

For the solution of the revolutionary problem in England, all the ingredients are there except one; the most essential of all; the party that is not afraid both to think and fight out the problems of the British proletariat to their revolutionary end. The British revolution is now attaining dramatic proportions; but it is a drama without a centre; Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark, so to speak. All the problems of the British revolution are now reduced to this single problem. Without the lead of a mass party, revolutionary energy will dissipate itself in abortive and scattered riots. The problem of the revolution is now, simply and solely, the problem of a party.

—F. A. RIDLEY.

CLASSES

Marxism
Instructor: Arne Swaback

Fundamentals of Communism
Instructor: Martin Abern

Registration Fee: \$1.00 — one dollar per course — unemployed workers — Special rates

Register at 84 East 10th St., at once

Boston Classes

THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY
A Course by Antonette F. Konikow
Starting on
Tuesday, October 20, 1931, 8 p. m.
at Ambassador Palace — Berkeley and Warren Sts., BOSTON, Mass.
Sponsors: Communist League of America (Opposition), Boston br.
Further announcements at lecture.

THE SITUATION IN GERMANY

The Elections in Hamburg

Although it is a little late for discussion, the Hamburg election's are still of interest as a barometer of the German political situation.

According to the figures of the 83% of the voters taking part in the election, the Nazis gained 58,000 votes (40%) and took the second place with 202,000 votes against 214,500 for the S. P. D. which remained first. The Deutsch-Nationale, after a long period of defeats also gained (12,000 votes). The S. P. D. lost only 10% of its voters, which a Berlin liberal newspaper justly described as "surprising"; in fact, as a result of their policy of tolerance and of using the club, one might have expected a much greater loss.

The same as in the elections of September 4th, 1930, these two factors, the increased growth of Fascism on the one hand and the large masses of workers who are still more numerous in the S. P. D. than in the German Communist Party, represent the unfavorable side for communism, of the present situation. The C. P. G. gained 33,000 votes (25%),* particularly at the expense of the S. P. D. This is obviously an important success.

But compared with the victory of the Fascists, the C. P. G. on the contrary has suffered a defeat, which becomes still more serious if we examine the figures since February, 1928: the Fascists have gained 188,000 votes, the Communists, 54,000. The real victors are the Nazis.** They are on the upswing. The tendency of the September 14th elections has gone further. The elections in Oldenburg and in Brunswick several months ago followed the same

lines. The relation of forces throughout Germany, we can say definitely, is still worse.

This situation ought to have determined all the policies of the C. P. G. but what is it actually doing? It talks only of "Communist victory", "Red elections", "Red Hamburg". They talk about the victory of the Nazis casually, as a matter of secondary importance, they laugh at it (literally, Remmele in his speech laughed at it), or they give irresponsible explanations which are as ridiculous as they are stupid.

In the Communist press, they say that "the success of Fascism is more an echo (?) of September 14th than a new upswing". The Communist newspaper at Hamburg writes that "in spite of the gain in votes, the Nazis even in Hamburg, have become not stronger but weaker" (?), and so on. I do not take the time for these explanations, on a level with these where with shrewd sophistry they try to prove that Hamburg is a commercial town, as if this figure of 202,500 could represent the votes of employees and petty bourgeois only! At the same time the fact that the little employees have followed the Nazis only speaks against it, the C. P. G., which has not known how to attract them and has completely neglected this work as a Hamburg correspondent tells us.

By its policy of concealing the victory of the Fascists and of shouting deafeningly about its own victory the leadership of the C. P. G. only demoralizes and disorients the masses, instead of orientating them and concentrating all its efforts on the struggle

against Fascism as the principal danger. To put itself in position to subdue Fascism which has gone over to the offensive on all fronts, the C. P. G. the only one who can subdue Fascism, must make a sharp turn in its policies. Today in the face of the threat of counter-revolution in Germany, this turn is more indispensable than ever.

The first elements of this turn should be, to tell the truth, not to understate the success; to re-establish Party democracy; to break with National Communism; instead of trying to gain Scheringer's on this soil, to find a way to the Social-democratic worker; to give up the theory of social fascism and the Red Trade Union policies of the R. G. O. The creation of the Workers' Socialist Party (Seydowitz-Rosenfeld) is a striking proof of the crisis in the S. P. D. on the one hand and at the same time a proof of the inability of the C. P. G. to win the revolutionary workers away from social democracy.

Without a sharp and immediate turn, the C. P. G. will certainly not be able to meet the enormous tasks which it faces.

—M.

Berlin, Oct. 31st, 1931.

* All these figures are in comparison with the elections of September 14th, 1930

** By the way, this shows that the "defeat" of the Fascists loudly proclaimed by the Social Democratic and Democratic press after the plebiscite, did not in any way correspond to the facts. The party that really lost, in the plebiscite, was the C. S. G.

Notes from Berlin

The Abend, the evening edition of the Vorwarts in its issue of September 17, claims that the social-democratic press has retained all its readers, but that, on the other hand, the economic crisis has at the present caused a drop in the sale of the various other papers. It quotes the Frankfurter Zeitung, the Deutsche Tageszeitung, the Germania and other paper trusts. Then the Abend proceeds to the Communist press, on which it says, it is in a position to give annihilating figures. The material, we are told, does not have its origin in the police occupation of the party headquarters during a period of ten days of the occupation, according to the affirmation of several party functionaries, no domination made itself felt and nothing prevented the Central Committee from beginning to function either. There is a central publishing house of the party, the V. Z., where all the different publications of the party are required to give an account every month, particularly on the state of its readers in the local groups. These reports are given in terms understandable to all and kept on file. A trunk full of these files was, probably carried off during the occupation in the haste, and no measures having been provided for such a case, it was entrusted just to any one at random. After the evacuation of the Karl Liebknecht House, when they wanted to bring the trunk back, it could not be found. According to information we received, it was in this manner that the S. P. D. got into possession of the exact data on the party press. "A great part of the Rote Fahne," the Abend says, "goes to Russia and hundreds of copies are read by the Russian embassy, the trade representation and other organizations close to the party."

On the other hand, according to information we have received from a well situated comrade, the Rote Fahne has 18,873 subscribers and sells only from 5 to 6,000 copies besides, which shows a great decrease with relation to the Here is the information of the Abend which has been confirmed entirely by the comrade mentioned above.

"There are several hundred local groups," says the Abend, "that do not have in their ranks a single reader of the Communist press, mainly in the following regions:

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| Munich—62 groups without a reader |
| Nuremberg—44 " " " |
| Pomerania—34 " " " |
| Koenigsburg—34 " " " |
| Dresden—33 " " " |
| Essen—28 " " " |

as well as others, in Brandenburg, the domain of the Rote Fahne itself, the greatest figure of all is attained with 154 groups without a reader. This—says the Abend—is taken from a report to central organs of the party." "Six months ago, the administration of the R. F. was "re-organized". The new responsible director complained continually about the lack of support from the party functionaries. "If this continues," he wrote, "the R. F. will soon fall down to the level of a small provincial sheet." On solidarity days, the comrades who went soliciting for the R. F. in the coffee houses, were often thrown out. And still, how many organizations are kept up by the party for its short-lived readers, with an army of secretaries and employees: there is the Gecha, the United Publishers, the Central Publications, A. G., the Vulkan and the Peuvag (the central printing establishment)."

A few remarks in regard to the notorious demonstration of the Nazis on the

Kurfuerstendamm, the day of the Jewish New Year. The demonstration was well organized, the demonstrators did not gather in large masses, but formed little groups shouting: "Deutschland Erwache, Juda, Verrecke!" and later on mixed with the crowd, re-forming their ranks again further on. For more than an hour, the police, which arrived much too late, could not reestablish "order" in the street, precisely because the demonstrations were held by little groups and at different corners. What is noteworthy in these demonstration is the fact that they were made up of young unemployed workers and employees,—partly also of rowdies, to be sure. Their dress contrasted violently with the garments of the Kurfuerstendamm crowd, and it was by this mark, cap and no necktie, that they were recognized by the police.

Part of these young Nazis, members of the Sturm-Abteilungen (shock-brigades) live in armories, kept and fitted out by the Nazis. Very significant too, was one of the remarks of an arrested Nazi before the bench: "We wanted to show the Jews, covered with diamonds and with gold, who parade along the Kurfuerstendamm, that there are people in Germany who actually suffer from hunger!"

A former ultra-leftist, a capitulationist who lives in Moscow, said that all the Opposition groups in Moscow are dead. The only Opposition that exists ideologically and organizationally are the "Trotskyites", although to sympathize with them means to go to jail or to be sent to the deportation camps. He himself, according to his statement, agrees with the Left Opposition 98%. But these two per cent are the ones that count (these are probably the two p. c. that include the Isolators?).

A letter from a village on the Baltic. "During my vacations, which I spent in my native village on the Baltic coast, I noticed that the big landlord of the locality allowed his fields to lie idle. He had no money to buy seeds. Naturally, he is a national-socialist. He can't even keep up his poultry-yard and lets his fowl starve to death. One can hear them crow of hunger. It is a village of about 200 inhabitants and serves as a residential section for small employees. This year, the railroad has issued a thousand tickets less for this station than last year. However, the conditions of the unemployed agricultural workers are not very bad at present. They receive some relief, and they get little jobs that cannot be submitted to control; there are also a few opportunities for them. . . ."

A comrade who works in the building trades tells us, that despite the great unemployment current in the trade, there are still workers who work as much as 17 hours a day. Formerly, it was impossible for such elements to exist in the building trades. The contractors use this mode of working, so as to be able to save on their part of the contribution to the social insurance funds, since they employ fewer workers.

The personnel of the police force will not receive any furlough, beginning with October 1. They say among themselves that a patch from the Right is expected. It is significant that the police is engaged in imprisoning the most active elements by preventive arrests, etc. There is already a great number of these. Some comrades say that there is a

strong tendency to leave the party among many of its members. These elements are ready for "action", but cannot be confined any longer by a political organization.

The party has implied and vulgarized its propaganda methods. Instead of posters, they are now content with inscribing slogans of a primitive character on the walls and on the side walks.

The problem of the economic relations between Soviet Russia and Germany forms a very important subject for discussion between Communist and Social democratic workers.

The social democracy has begun—and this shows how important and how difficult this question is for them—a broad press campaign on this question. At times, it gives articles, like that by Heinig, that credits, cannot be of any use for the working class. Then, it also has a supplement in all the papers: "Is a Soviet Germany possible?", in which "proves" that the possibilities for mutual economic work between Germany and Russia are very narrow. This subject has called forth a big discussion in the factories. At the sessions of the Executive of the C. P. it has been recognized for a fact that the party members are not capable of giving an answer to this question.

An oppositionist member of the party, who has been entrusted with a post, says that the organizational system is very weak. The work rests on the shoulders of a few. The majority of the membership does not participate actively. Even the majority of the functionaries—even they are only seen on "parade" (big meetings, etc.). For instance, the problem of replacing the sheeted newspapers by mimeographed sheets has met with general apathy.

Berlin, September 31, 1931

Prepare for Third Annual Dance

The second week in November marks the third anniversary of the issuance of The Militant, official organ of the Communist League of America (Opposition). The first issue of the paper found in our ranks only a handful of members and just a very few sympathizers. Today our ranks have grown to more than ten times that number.

We are still a small group. But the force of our ideas, the correctness of our policies in given situations, and our criticisms of the official party are penetrating daily into the rank and file of the party members and the Left wing workers who are willing to read and think for themselves. The recent banquet held in New York City, where more than one hundred were present and contributed over \$200 testifies to the truth of this claim.

The third anniversary of the founding of The Militant will be a jubilant affair where all the friends, sympathizers and members of the organization gather to get better acquainted with each other.

The next issue will carry the definite date and place for the affair, and it is hoped that this third annual affair will prove another step in the growth of our organization.

Watch for further announcements.
Circulate THE MILITANT Among Your Friends

Subscribe!

With the Militant now appearing weekly there should be excellent possibilities for all of our supporters to enlist new subscribers. If you agree with us you will want to extend the Militant circulation. You will want to keep your own subscription paid up to date. If the number on the wrapper of this issue is less than 75, it means that you should renew your sub. Next you should endeavor to get other workers to become subscribers. For convenience use the blank below.

THE MILITANT,
84 East 10th Street, New York City.
Please enter me for a subscription one year, \$2.00; six months, \$1.00.

Name Address.....
City State

EDITORIAL NOTES

AN APOLOGIST FOR STALINISM.

One of the surest signs of the significance of alien classes upon the course of the Stalinist bureaucracy in the Soviet Union is its rabid persecution of the Left, proletarian wing of the Party. It is the hounding, exiling, imprisoning and murdering of the unwavering and incorruptible defenders of the ideas and the tradition of the October revolution which give the lie to every pretended "left" turn of the Centrist regime and deprive it of the right to confidence. The defense of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union involves in the highest degree the unceasing exposure of the reactionary terror against the Bolshevik-Leninists and the most energetic defense of its victims. Every Oppositionist worthy of the name counts this among his first duties.

Weisbord, who assisted in the expulsion and terror campaign against the American Oppositionists, turned up—it will be recalled—two years later with the offer to instruct us how to interpret the principles of the Opposition in America. Now he is enlarging his territory. First he wanted to correct our misconceptions of the situation as comrade Trotsky explained it; now it is comrade Trotsky himself whom he takes to task. Trotsky, who knows something about the bureaucratic degeneration of the Stalinist apparatus and its terror against the Leninist Opposition—and not by hearsay—has again illuminated this side of the question, among the others, in his recently-published thesis on the "Problems of the Development of the U. S. S. R." Therein he demonstrates once more that "the Stalinist plebiscitary regime has been converted into a main danger of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Against this reasoned and deliberate conclusion Weisbord has intervened with a statement of his own in which he corrects the "exaggerations."

In this statement we read the following: "Comrade Trotsky declares there is not a trace of party democracy. Local organizations are selected and automatically reorganized by secretaries. Local secretaries are appointed, Congresses are arbitrarily postponed, delegates selected from the top, every spark of those features which go to make up the nature of a revolutionists crushed; Blumkins are shot down, Besedovskys direct the purging of the party, etc." All this is literal quotation from the thesis of Trotsky, but it is quoted with disapproval. Things are not so bad as Trotsky makes them out. Like the impartial judge who "sees both sides" he comments: "We submit (1) that this evidence is exaggerated (2) that while some of the above is true in part, yet this is not decisive as to whether there is a party."

Exaggerated? Only "some" of it true, and that only "in part"? Where, how and in what way, the Weisbord statement does not say, and cannot say. We know that the monstrous accusations against the Left Opposition (The "Wrangle Officer" and so forth) were all exposed and refuted, but we do not know of a single instance where the Opposition was convicted of falsifying or "exaggerating". Is there a trade of party democracy? Can a worker Bolshevik stand up and speak out for the basic ideas of the October revolution without being sent to prison or Siberia? Was not the heroic Blumkin assassinated? Was not the organizer of the October revolution and the Red Army exiled to Turkey by a dicker with Kemal Pasha and kept there by an agreement with the Bourgeois governments of Europe? Did not Besedovsky help to purge the Party of "Trotskyists" before he jumped over the fence into the camp of the White Guard?

We have one more question that is of the deepest concern to every revolutionist of the entire world: Is not the sick Rakovsky, the great hero and warrior of the revolution, being slowly and deliberately done to death right now in the bitter cold of Siberian exile? Exaggerations? No! We "submit" that comrade Trotsky has only told the indisputable truth and that this truth must be made known to the proletarian vanguard without any mitigation or glossing over of the cruel facts. It is not Trotsky who exaggerates the bureaucracy and the terror against the Bolshevik-Leninists, but (Weisbord who minimizes and thereby apologizes for them.

The Weisbord statement is, of course, no accidental error. It has an intimate connection with the whole campaign he has conducted against the American section of the Opposition with ideas and slanders borrowed from the Centrists and the Right Wing. Our National conference unanimously rejected the proposal of Weisbord to present his "views" before it. And rightly so. We have nothing in common with such "views". It would have been a disgrace if a single delegate had expressed any doubts on this question. For our part, if we have to choose between the out-and-out Stalinist henchman who defends everything and the camouflaged apologist who blunts the edge of criticism—if we have to choose between the one who justifies the crimes and the one who "submits that they are exaggerated"—we prefer the former. It is best to have enemies out in the open. And if they conceal themselves behind the pretence of "adherence to the International Left Opposition" it is all the more necessary to drag them into the open.

THE DRESSMAKERS' SYMPOSIUM.

The symposium held last Sunday under the auspices of the "Dressmakers' United Front Committee" represents a step forward. Under certain conditions it can become the starting point of the revival of the militant union movement in the industry and a stimulus to the

left wing labor movement in general. The "United Front Committee", as everybody knows, is under the leadership of the Stalinists. It is a long way from their mad bounding campaign of yesterday against everyone who differed with the official party in the slightest degree to today's polite invitation to all factions to meet together and talk things over. This inconsistency only reveals once more the instability of Stalinist policy, in the trade union field as elsewhere. It does not alter the correctness of the action in calling the symposium. Every revolutionary worker in the trade—and in the first place the group of the Left Opposition—should welcome and support and strengthen this trend.

The leaflet issued by the committee, inviting the workers to the symposium, is well worth reading—especially by those who want to check up on the issues of controversy on trade union policy in the Party and, consequently, in the Left wing labor movement. The leaflet says: "The present state of affairs in our industry is, to a very large extent, the result of the split and the artificial division in the ranks of the workers which the bosses are taking advantage of." In our opinion this statement is incontestable—even though it was written by, or at the direction of, people who made a virtue, and even a fetish, of the split at the last convention of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union. And following that there is another complete right-about-face, when the leaflet says: "Dressmakers representing all shades of opinion will be called upon to come and present their views and proposals..." (Our emphasis). On this point also the leaflet is just as correct as yesterday's sectarianism was false.

How were the infallible leaders of the Party induced to approve such a complete reversal of policy? The answer is simple. In this instance, as always, they did it under the whip of necessity. The results of the old approach have been so catastrophic that further steps on that road became impossible. Even a blind man knows he has reached a blank wall when he bumps his head against it. When it came to the point that the Kaufman gang of boss-and-police agents were able to appropriate the slogan of "unity" and make fun of the left wing workers in the fur trade, a revolt from below against the suicidal policy of the leadership was no longer to be avoided. It was this logic of events and the pressure of the workers that persuaded the bureaucrats to approve the symposium and the properly worded invitation to it. The criticism of the Opposition played its part in enlightening the workers, a part which would have been greater and would have brought results sooner if, while remaining entirely loyal to the Party, it had been sharper, more aggressive and more ruthless against the leadership. Stalinist bureaucrats cannot be cured with kindness.

An interesting question arises: Does this action in the dressmakers' signify a deliberate change of policy motivated by a principle conception, or is it merely a panicky "goat-leap" in an isolated case under the compulsion of necessity? Most likely the latter. Centrists in general are incapable of following a consistent line of policy, and still less a principled one. They live from day to day, attempt to solve each problem separately and move one way or the other according to the pressure of the moment. Hence their repeated contradictions, the attempt to escape from which only leads to others. This is the case right now with their policy toward trade unions and non-party mass organizations in general. If they have purchased a respite in the dressmakers' situation by the policy implied in the conduct of the symposium it is only at the price of multiplying their complications in the broader field.

Here is their dilemma: If the policy of the symposium is defended as a correct one, if they claim that it represents a worked-out line, then it must be applied generally. But such a general application would bring them to a head-on collision with their present course in the other mass organizations where yesterday's policy in the dressmakers' still survives, and with similar results. They are crying out loud these days to the effect that the skeletons of left wing trade unions must take on the flesh and blood of membership and that such organizations as the I. L. D. must be transformed into "mass organizations." But such a consummation must logically presuppose—since only a comparative few of the workers are as yet Communists—that other workers are given a chance to live and breathe and feel at home there, that "all groups and shades of opinion"—to quote the invitation to their symposium—are made free to "present their views and proposals."

But this is precisely what their fear of criticism and discussion impels them to deny, as the expulsions in the Marine Workers' Union and the I. L. D. so eloquently testify. This is one of the reasons why the "mass movements" do not materialize, or if they do take momentary shape as a result of a spontaneous activity of the workers they are quickly wrecked. The bureaucratic regime narrows down and defeats the movement everywhere. A regime of workers' democracy, which is the prerequisite for the healthy growth and development of the Left wing organizations in the labor movement, is at the same time incompatible with the survival of a leadership by appointment and command. All the Browders are stranded on this contradiction. —J. P. C.

WATCH FOR DATE OF MILITANT DANCE

From an I.L.D. Delegate Our Own Interview with Ben Gitlow

NEW YORK.

Logic is a most consistent touchstone—but experience is more so. Facts make logic genuine. For about a year or so I have been reading The Militant. My ideological knowledge of Communism being in a sorry state, somewhat akin to Earl Browder's education along party lines, my political attitude was undetermined, vacillating. The logic as presented by The Militant seemed logical enough. My mind was turning towards Marxism-Leninism, but my feet as yet resisted—until—October 11, 1931, when I attended the I. L. D. "Mooney-Harlan-Scottsboro" conference as a duly accredited delegate.

This meeting was an eye-opener and also affected my mind. The bureaucratic manner, the steam-roller tactics employed, the railroading through of motions, was, to say the least, disgusting. No open election of a chairman, no open election of a credentials committee; all appointed by the leadership, this smelled of the sewer, but the absolute refusal to seat non-party or sympathetic delegates, smacked of the A. F. of L. cess-pool. But to cap the climax, one smirking, wash-faced bureaucrat, rattling in his master's empty shoes, had the colossal effrontery, the brazen gall, to threaten to report back to that delegates' local his actions at the conference and thereby to have him thrown out of the local and possibly out of his job! All this before a Communist audience. But this is not all. After the district organizer of the I. L. D., Carl Hacker haranguing his audience after the fashion of a William Green, proposed a motion to put four delegates, refused seats, out of the hall, and the Stalinist myrmidons began to applaud frantically, one bellicose individual, seeing me not applauding, turned towards me with threatening gestures and even went so far as to poke me in the side, meanwhile saying, "Why don't you applaud?", thereby trying to force me to justify the criminal motion of the D. O. . . .

As soon as the expelled four left the hall, or rather were forced to leave (they were threatened to be thrown out by force), I left the hall in disgust. At any event, a change in the party must take place, if it must prevent being smashed. The day draws near and the rope hangs high for the Stalinist misleaders. —A CONFERENCE DELEGATE

The Opposition at Party Forum

NEW YORK.

The Communist Party's New York forum on Sunday, October 17, at their headquarters was attended also by two members of the Left Opposition and their experience is worth recounting. William Weinstone was the speaker on the subject "Capitalism or Socialism—Which Road Out of the Crisis?" Except for two important points his speech was the usual one, that of contrast of the Soviet Union with the capitalist world.

The first point of interest was Weinstone's constant repetition of the necessity of the use of the united front tactic by the party, before it could hope to organize the American working masses. He likewise pointed this out for the English Communist Party. But Weinstone's explanation of what he meant by the united front was "penetrating the shops and uniting the workers against their enemy, the bosses" (1). The second point centered on Weinstone's remarks on conditions in the Soviet Union today. "No strikes take place", said Weinstone, "because the workers don't go on strike. If they are dissatisfied with conditions in their factory, they simply move and shift from one factory to another, as was pointed out in the latest decree on wages and by comrade Stalin in his speech before the Xth Plenum." For an analysis of this question of migration of workers from job to job, see comrade Trotsky's article on Stalin's speech in The Militant.

I took the floor and endeavored to state some of the tasks of the Communists in this present crisis, upon which point the speaker had concluded. Stressing the question of unemployment relief, the immediate importance of the slogan and demand for unemployment insurance, I also emphasized the slogan of the six hour day and five day week without reduction of wages, and the slogan of the extension of long term credits to the Soviet Union by the United States, as one of the means for the development of economic relations between the two countries and the amelioration of thousands of unemployed in the United States, etc. I stated also that there were demands of the Left Opposition, of which faction I was a member; and that these were some of the tactical questions on which we differed from the position of the official party. There was no disturbance when I spoke and evidently these correct slogans had aroused some thought and questions in the minds of the workers present.

When I sat down, several workers around me questioned me about the Communist League (Opposition). I gave cards advertising our forum to them. One Young Communist League member took the floor and warned the audience to beware of "social demagogy". About a third of the audience applauded him. Following him, one confused young chap took the floor and argued against our slogan of the six hour day on the basis of its inapplicability in the jewelry industry!

Discussion was closed with one or two additional speakers and then Weinstone proceeded to answer a number of questions. Comrade Morris and myself went downstairs and proceeded to distribute free copies of The Militant. We had given away about 30 without any difficulty.

We notice by the current issue of the Revolutionary Age that it has scooped the whole labor press with an exclusive interview, obtained at great cost and travail, granted to a special correspondent by . . . Ben Gitlow. We are told that "your correspondent took the initiative in interviewing Gitlow . . . he stated . . . he stated further . . . Gitlow further stressed . . . he further stated" and so on and more of the same. We were naturally deeply chagrined at having been beaten to the draw by the Age in so difficult, and yet so important, a matter as an interview with Gitlow. How the correspondent got to him and managed to turn the trick, continues to mystify us beyond words. In a feeble attempt to stage a comeback, we will evocatively try to emulate the enterprising and successful staff of the Age by publishing a wholly imaginary interview with the same Gitlow. The fact that our interview was never given is no great shakes as an argument; the truth of the matter is that Gitlow would have been better off if he had not given any interview at all in his present place. * * * * *

WE: What is your general view of the present situation, Mr. Gitlow?

BEN: These are times which try men's souls. What is needed is a concrete program of action adapted to the physiology of the American working class. We stand foursquare on the platform of pasteurized Leninism.

WE: What is going to come out of the crisis in this country?

BEN: It is clear to all of us that one of two things will happen for sure: the crisis will either blow over, or it will not blow over. In the meantime, things look pretty bad. What we need is less theory and more action. Theory is all right in a way. I used to make speeches about it myself years ago. But as Marx said, we need action and a mass labor party.

WE: What about the socialist party?

BEN: We have nothing against the socialists. Some of my best friends are socialists. I was once a socialist myself. But it appears to us that the Socialist Party is getting too conservative. We need a new party, a more radical party. We stand for that, too.

WE: What about the Left wing in the Socialist party?

BEN: These are times which try men's souls. Live and let live. We are against the stupidity of the Communists. We

are against the stupidity of the Norman Thomas group. We are against stupidity altogether. We also stand against Moscow dictation if it's we that are dictated to. The Communist International is a noble experiment.

WE: What has happened to your own International, Mr. Gitlow?

BEN: We are against foreign intervention. We stand foursquare with the father of our country: no entangling foreign alliances! Slam for the Slamese! America for the Americans! Russia for the Stalinists! See America first! From the sunny pines of Florida to the evergreens of Maine, we must build up the united front of all the workers. Brandler is a nice fellow. I met him once. Some of my best friends are Brandlerites. We believe in live and let live.

WE: What do you think of Stalin and the Five Year Plan?

BEN: Stalin is a nice fellow. I met him in Moscow. I was once a delegate to the Communist International. Stalin is a Russian, but he is also a leader of men. He invented the Five Year Plan, although Lenin invented Leninism. Bucharin is also a nice man. Sometimes I find it hard to say which of the two is nicer. But they ought to let the Americans work out their own historic destiny. What does Stalin know

The Party on the Philippines

In a declaration (Daily Worker, 10-23-31) addressed to the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands by the Central Committee, Communist Party of U. S. A., a large share is devoted by way of advice to the Philippine comrades on the lessons afforded by the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27. The declaration refers to "especially the treacherous role of the bourgeois nationalists, the butcheries of workers and peasants by the Kuo Min Tang and the servility of its factions to one or the other of the imperialist bandits," all of which, it appears, has finally become known to the American Communist Party. The years are not so many, however, since the Stalinized Communist International and its American lackeys, saw in these bourgeois "nationalists" the leaders of the Chinese Revolution, permitted the butchery of the Chinese proletariat and peasantry in order not to break up the grotesque "united front" of the "bloc of four classes", and deliberately held back the agrarian uprisings. The restoration of the Comintern in those stirring days said: "The apparatus of the national revolutionary government (of Chiang Kai-Shek) offers a very real road to solidarity with the peasants". Chiang Kai-Shek was hailed as a "warrior against imperialism". Many little Stalinists—the Browders and Neumanns—were in China in these days to avow such theories and thereby to aid in the treacheries to and butcheries of the workers and peasants.

"Above all else," continues the declaration to the Philippine Communist Party, "the lessons of China should teach the Filipino masses the danger of following the leadership of the national bourgeoisie which chatters of 'opposition to imperialism' . . . the example of China should prove to the Filipino workers and peasants the imperative need of their own revolutionary mass movement, organizationally and politically independent of and opposed to the vacillating and compromising leadership of the national bourgeoisie, their own movement which is positive of success only when led by the proletariat whose guide and leader is the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands."

But, we ask in all humbleness, have the American Communist Party and its Browders really accepted these ideas in regard to China and which they now advise for the Philippines?

Does the American Communist Party, in defiance of the conceptions of Stalin, Bucharin, the Vth Congress of the Comintern, now agree with the Left Opposition that the subordination of the Communist Party to the Kuo Min Tang was unqualifiedly wrong; that the acceptance of the leadership of the Chinese revolution placed a noose around the necks of the Chinese proletariat and peasantry and the young Communist Party? Or do we have a case of Lovestonian exceptionalism in upside down form? Does the American Central Committee have one theory regarding the role of a Communist Party in China and another for the Philippines? Perhaps, like Minor, the comrades will change their minds a little more. —A.

about the situation in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union? You can't expect him to know anything about it. He is too busy with Russian problems. Russia has many problems. All the Russians are busy with them. We are busy with ours. When the Five Year Plan is completed we have every reason to believe that it will come to an end. Then there may be another Five Year Plan. We do not know for sure, but whatever happens is all right with us. We stand foursquare on the platform of Marx: Live and let us live. The American workers are very backward and we must keep up with them. The Five Year Plan is a great success. We say: Long live the Soviet Union! Quote me if you like.

WE: What do you think of Trotsky?

BEN: Trotsky has made a lot of mistakes. Trotsky is not Stalin. Stalin is not Lenin. Lenin was not Bucharin. In one word, that sums up the situation, although we hope that better times are ahead. That is the position of the Communist Party of the United States (Majority Group). These are times that try men's souls. Trotskyism is not Leninism. One is Trotskyism and the other is Leninism. I met Lenin once at the Third Congress. He was a nice fellow. He was a Russian too. The Russians are all right for Russia. Trotsky didn't fit into the Russian situation. That's why he's in Turkey now. Turkey is a semi-feudal country, bounded on the North by Bulgaria, on the South by Africa, on the East by Afghanistan and on the West by the Bosphorus. It is populated mainly by Turks who eat halvah. Trotsky is a sectarian. He does not know the situation in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers union. There is quite a struggle there between Hillman and Orloffsky. I wrote an article about it, but Trotsky hasn't written any. We are not sectarians. We make alliances with anybody except with the Communists. They are stupid. We are against stupidity. I said that in one of my other answers.

WE: What about the Paterson—

BEN: Glad you called. Have a cigar—a friend of mine from Havana makes them up for me. Drop in to see me again some day.

Banking Crisis in the United States

(Continued from page 1)

months has kept the percentage of "frozen" paper from increasing. The Hoover National Credit Corp., will probably not be of much help to the banks as a whole, but will transfer some of the excessive strength of the stronger banks to the weaker ones, helping along the process of concentration and monopolization of finance-capital. The turn from the stage of crisis to the stage of depression, whenever it comes, will "thaw out" some of the assets of those weaker banks who can survive, or be kept alive, between now and that time. The most probable variant is a continuance of an abnormal number and size of bank failures, but not on a scale that will threaten American finance-capital as a whole.

3. The price of bonds has an immediate bearing on the position of the banks. Many bank failures have been due to a decline in the value of bond investments to a point where the surplus was wiped out and the capital impaired, under which conditions a bank is technically insolvent, has no right to accept further deposits, and must close down. Bond prices have recovered since the first week in October—the campaign of wage-cuts, by increasing the surplus values accruing to industry, has strengthened the standing of bonds whose interest is paid out of such surplus values, and the anticipation of wage-cuts on the railroads has strengthened the prices of railroad bonds, which constitute the largest single group of bond investments next to government bonds. A renewed intensification of the industrial crisis toward new depths will of course reverse this tendency; in the absence of present indications of such a turn, the most probable variant appears to be a stabilization of the value of the investment assets of the banks.

The immediate perspective of the American banking crisis, based on these valuations, is one of increased hegemony over industry, of increasing monopolization nationally, and of maintaining its international position, through the maintenance of the gold standard, to a point where America can go forward, under the leadership of its oligarchic finance-capital and its highly developed and monopolized industry, toward imperialist expansion and inevitable conflict with the declining imperialism of England and the rising capitalism of France.

—B. J. FIELD.

Read! Subscribe! TO Young Spartacus SOON Watch For It Published by the National Youth Committee, Communist League of America (Opposition) YOUNG SPARTACUS official organ of the Communist youth organization in the United States, prints news, articles, educational material and editorials on the economic and political situation in the United States and elsewhere, particularly as related to the youth and young workers in industry. It prints also the writings of Leon Trotsky and other leaders of the International Left Opposition of the Communist movement. Published Monthly 84 East 10th Street New York, N. Y. Fifty (\$0.50) cents per year (Canada and Foreign \$0.65) 5c per copy. YOUNG SPARTACUS 84 East 10th Street New York, N. Y. Enclosure please find fifty (\$0.50) cents for one year's subscription: Name Address City State

—ARNE SWABECK.