

WORKERS  
OF THE  
WORLD.  
UNITE

# THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

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

VOLUME V, NO. 148 [WHOLE NO. 14]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1932

PRICE 5 CENTS

FOUR YEARS!

## Trotsky Greet's Militant

### The Revolutionary Kernel Is Assembling Around Opposition

To the Editors of the Militant.  
Dear Friends:

I fear that my greetings to the fourth anniversary of the Militant will arrive a little late. But my greetings are none the less hearty because of it. All our friends on this side of the ocean value highly the work which you have carried on during this long, and yet short, period.

Can we consider ourselves satisfied with the results of our work? Of course, this question concerns not only the United States but also all the other countries in which our adherents live and struggle. To answer this question is not so simple. As yet, the Left Opposition has nowhere become a mass movement. But it has assembled the revolutionary kernel which knows what it wants. Precisely in this field are the achievements of the Militant greatest. Not so long ago the Right Opposition in a number of countries seemed to be much stronger and more deserving of attention than the Left. From the very outset, we were of the opinion that the Right wing group will experience an evolution towards the social democracy; giving up some of its elements to us and some to official Centrism. The developments of the last year have completely confirmed this prognosis. In Germany, the Brandlites have split, giving a considerable minority to the Socialist Workers Party, which means to the Left social democracy. In Czechoslovakia, the Right Opposition went over to the social democracy; the minority, with the revolutionary elements, under the leadership of comrade Neurath, joined us. In Switzerland the Right Opposition is coming closer to the social democracy while among the better section of the workers sympathies are flowing towards the Left Opposition. As far as can be judged from here, the Lovestone group in America can hardly boast of any successes. Their official organ, in the first place, is characterized by confusion. These people do not know what they want and are scarcely capable of foreseeing what shore they will be washed upon by the first strong wave.

In the camp of official Communism, confusion of no lesser degree. The resolutions of the Twelfth Plenum of the ECCI offer a terrible testimonial of poverty which the leadership of the Comintern issued to itself. In spite of the exceptional conditions of the economic crisis and a complete international impasse of imperialism, Communism barely

moves ahead. In some countries (Germany, Bulgaria), it registers certain purely parliamentary successes, which do not, however, correspond in any way to the scope of the social crisis. In other countries, Communism retreats before the social democracy on every field of the working class movement (France, Czechoslovakia). In all countries without exception, the cadres of official Communism are most dissatisfied, disoriented, split into separate inimical groups.

The condition of the party apparatus in the USSR bears a most menacing character. No one really trusts the leadership there and the leadership has completely lost all faith in itself. Everything that the party contains of thinking revolutionary elements, is turning towards the Left Opposition. The forces on which Stalin based himself in the struggle against us, are turning over more towards the Thermidor. The situation in the Soviet Union is an extremely difficult one. In the political chaos to which the Centrist bureaucracy has brought the party, only the Left Opposition knows what it wants.

The political life of the United States is clearly approaching a turning point. Within the near future it will become clear that when Heraclitus the Dark said, "Everything flows, everything changes", he had in mind also the republic of Hoover-Roosevelt. Old traditions, conceptions, prejudices, will go by the board. Through a period of ideological chaos and stress, the classes in American society will create for themselves a new modern ideology. A strong revolutionary kernel, welded by a uniformity of doctrine and political method, will be called upon in such a period to play a great role. The creation of such a kernel is the achievement of the Militant. So much the heartier is my greeting.

—L. TROTSKY.  
Prinkipo, November 1, 1932.

## OPEN FORUM

### Congress and the War Debts

Speaker:  
**HUGO OEHLER**  
Friday, December 2, 1932  
126 East 16 Street,  
ADMISSION: 15c  
Auspices:  
N. Y. Br. Communist League of America  
(Opposition)

## Fight for Left Opposition Proposals in Pittsburgh Hunger March Conference

**PITTSBURGH.**—Friday evening, Nov. 11, the United Front Hunger March Conference of Pittsburgh was held at Walton Hall. According to the report of the credentials committee, 69 delegates representing 22 organizations were present. The report said these organizations were such as the I.L.D., the I.W.O. and also mumbled something about A. F. of L. locals.

But the names of the organizations were not given. From the faces of those present, it was, however, easy to ascertain that the vast majority were party members or members of organizations directly controlled by the party. Aside from the two delegates of the Communist League (Opposition) we know of only the two delegates of a single Unemployed Citizens Committee (Musteite?) as being non-party workers in attendance there. This is sufficient to characterize the "united front" nature of the conference as genuine and new and latest turn toward "genuine united front" made by the recent Stalinist plenums on a national as well as an international scale. Characteristic also of the caricature "united front" was the fact that in this heart of the steel industry the "representative of the steel workers" was a frail girl comrade, who herself told us that she comes from—the Hill Section, that well-known citadel of steel production.... She was the delegate of the party's Steel and Metal Workers Union, the only one to speak in its name at the conference.

**The Left Opposition Takes the Floor**  
After two very matter of fact reports, dealing with practical directives rather than with the outline of a political program of action, by comrades Kearns and Myerscough, discussion was opened. The discussion dragged along at a slow tempo for about half an hour, the participants dealing with minor questions, which though important in themselves, were in place at practical committee meetings, rather than at a united front conference. It was not until the delegates of the Left Opposition took the floor that the conference became alive mainly due to the anxiety of the party bureaucrats to drown out the Leninist united front proposals of the Opposition.

Comrade Gordon took the floor for the Communist League of America (Opposition) and in the brief time allotted to him greeted the conference in the name of our organization, pledged support to its work and outlined in concise form the

Leninist united front policy of the Left Opposition on the unemployment question. After criticizing the official reporter for not drawing the highly important lessons of the Chicago hunger march, explaining the latter and calling for their application in Pittsburgh, the delegate from the League closed with a presentation of the unemployment platform of the Leninist Opposition (immediate relief, unemployment insurance, the six-hour day without reduction in pay, long term credits to the Soviet Union, etc.). He repeated the pledge of loyal cooperation with the conference and its committee, in spite of differences in policy, and took his seat amid vigorous applause from the other delegates.

Immediately, the party fraction started with its organized attack. A certain Menken made himself ridiculous with the charge that the Opposition wanted to cooperate with the treacherous Bill Green and by slinging with some assinine slanders about the local group. A whole string of others followed with the same

(Continued on page 2)

## Call the Scottsboro Conferences!

As day after day passes, the great opportunity to mobilize the masses of the working class to demand the freedom of the Scottsboro boys, which the Supreme Court decision gave to the Communist party, is slipping away. All eyes were on the party and the I. L. D. when the decision was handed down. The workers expected that the party would give the signal for an even greater struggle. As yet there is no struggle, and no call to build one. Are the workers to be disappointed? The answer rests with the party.

What is the reason that the party does not issue the call for united front conferences of workers' organizations? Why do they hold back?

What is there to be gained by this delay? The new trials will be held in March. No time must be lost in building a fighting movement of the black and white workers to give a great force to the legal arguments which the I. L. D. lawyers will make in the courtroom in the Spring. That is the way the working class wins its "law cases".

Every worker inside the party and outside must now raise his voice in comradesly criticism of the party for this harmful delay and urge it to issue the call for united front conferences on a national scale. Let us proceed at once to forge the weapons which can accomplish the freedom of these boys and strengthen our fight against all class persecution.

## A SHANGHAI REPORT OF COM. CHEN'S ARREST

The letter below, which we have just received from our comrade in Shanghai, will serve also as a reply to the vicious police article which appeared on the question of comrade Chen Du-Hsiu a few days ago in the Daily Worker. The article of the Shanghai correspondent of the Worker, if it had any meaning at all, might have been written in the cancelled office of Chiang Kai-Shek. It announced that our comrade Chen was merely going to Nanking to "interview Chiang Kai-Shek". In China, such "interviews" have a murderous meaning: the word is the cynical expression used to signify that a revolutionist is being sent to his death. The

**SHANGHAI.**—

On October 15, the Kuo Min Tang government and British imperialism dealt a heavy blow to the Chinese section of the International Left Opposition Comrade Chen Du-Hsiu was arrested, and other arrests and raids continued for about three days. Twelve comrades were taken altogether, among them four members of the Central Committee, the rest being functionaries and technical workers. This came about, just as in May 1931, as a result of betrayal, of which there has been an epidemic in these last two years, in the official party as well as in the Left Opposition. For example, in Nanking, responsible workers went to the authorities to betray all the other comrades, so that over 30 comrades were shot. In some local organizations, the party secretary has handed to the police the other party workers. As for us, our best comrades, six of whom are members of the Central Committee, two of May arrests in 1931 took away many of them already dead in prison. The second betrayal followed in August 1931, in which five comrades, one of them a C. C. member, were arrested. There were also several individual arrests made this year.

But this time the loss to us is infinitely greater. Now nearly the whole C. C. (except for two worker-comrades) has been put in prison and you can well imagine the consequences.

**Bourgeoisie Jubilant**

The arrest of comrade Chen has called forth, both in the imperialist and in the Chinese bourgeois press a satisfaction and a wild joy. The Shanghai Times speaks of him as "the father of Communism in China". The Chinese bourgeois press speaks of his arrest as "the most important case since the drive against Communism started". Thus, in spite of the slanders of the Stalinists, in spite of the numerous arrests of Communists, the capitalist press still regards the arrest of comrade Chen as the most important one since 1927.

The Chinese Communist Party is dejected. Nobody, not even in the party ranks, knows the party leader or leaders. Several months ago, I learned that

Stalinist crime in this case lies in the fact that they are not only surrendering our noted revolutionist to the Kuo Min Tang assassins without joining in our protest, but are actually covering up the black butchers by disseminating the malicious lie that comrade Chen has been sent under military escort to... "interview Chiang Kai-Shek." No conscientious revolutionist can remain silent in the face of this horrible piece of Stalinist police work. Demand your voice in protest and raise that party and the I. L. D. act to remove the stain they have cast on the Communist movement!—Ed.

the general secretary of the party is a youth named C. whom I knew well. He is of student origin, sent to Moscow at the end of 1926 to study as a member of the Y. C. I. First as student and then as interpreter, he remained in Moscow until 1929 or 1930, joined the party there and in 1932 he becomes the general secretary of a party which claims hundreds of thousands of members. There is nothing strange in it; he attained the post simply because he is the puppet of the Stalinist specialist on China, Mif. The party's old leaders have either gone into the "Soviet and Red Army districts", occupying posts as "people's commissars" there, or have simply been removed from responsible work, like Strakhov, or have been expelled from the party. The party is physically exterminated under the "leadership" of such Moscow students who are only capable of obeying and transmitting instructions from the Comintern to the lower organizations, and of carrying on intrigues against their adversaries. Thus, a comrade in the high leading party organs once told me that the members of the Political Bureau show absolutely no initiative in the work, but only do what they are ordered. One of our own comrades from Hongkong, who just came out of prison, told me the following: in prison he met a responsible party worker who informed him that in Canton there are not even Communist elements, and in Hongkong there are only two party nuclei which consist exclusively of functionaries sent out by the party. Communist ideas not only cease to penetrate into the masses but they even lose their hold on the old party members. Some vie with each other in delivering their own comrades to the police; others have recanted and re-entered the Kuo Min Tang to receive jobs there.

**Chiang's Blue Shirts**

Meanwhile, Chiang Kai-Shek has found a new justification for his policies. He no longer feels able to control the heterogeneous K. M. T. effectively and has therefore organized a Fascist organization for himself, the so-called "Blue Shirts Association". In actuality, the

(Continued on page 3)

## What Do the Communists Say About Mr. Duranty and Comrade Stalin?

There is no capitalist newspaper correspondent in the world today more authoritative and accurate in reporting the standpoint of the central Stalinist leadership than Mr. Walter Duranty, the highest paid foreign correspondent in the world, stationed in Moscow for years. What he writes about Russia in the conventional language of the bourgeois press is a faithful copy of what is generally left half-said or unsaid by the decisive Stalin staff.

We have pointed this out on many occasions in these columns and it has become a commonplace in the radical movement. The only ones who still deny it ferociously (and always with that hollow conviction dictators), are the editors of the Daily Worker. The division of labor still operative in the Stalinist machine does not permit them to acknowledge what is apparent to a child, for to do so would explode too many notions disseminated by the Centrist faction of falsification. The untrustworthiness of the denial, however, is confirmed by the fail-

ure of the local Stalinists to meet our challenge, i. e., to deny that Duranty's dispatches to the New York Times are used as the basis for countless "re-writes" in the Daily Worker office, which finally make their bow as "special correspondence from Moscow." It is quite well known in informed party circles (we know it from personal observation for weeks on end) that the Duranty dispatch of the morning usually re-appear in more "orthodox" language in the following day's issue of the central party organ.

If for no other reason, then, the most recent of Duranty's sensational dispatches are of more than ordinary interest to the Communist workers. If you want to know what is really happening in the cabinets of the Kremlin, what is really going on in the minds of Stalin & Co. (not what they say on holiday occasions), pay close attention to the informed reports of Mr. Duranty, which are read with equal avidity by the State Department officials and the members of the Central Committee of our Communist Party.

In the Times of December 20, 1932, Duranty, referring to two editorials in Pravda, official organ of the Russian party, which "throw new and interesting light on the Soviet attitude toward foreign labor unrest", remarks:

"The earlier editorial for the first time enunciated clearly what has become known as the Stalinist (Attention, Messrs. Lovestone and Co.—S.) doctrine—that a successful Socialist State can be established in the USSR irrespective of what happens abroad.... The editorial did not specifically disavow so-called Bolshevik propaganda—that would be too much to expect (As yet?—S.)—but made it clear that the establishment of a Socialist State in the USSR had replaced propaganda as a means and a purpose of the Kremlin policy...."

As to the second editorial, Duranty writes, "the Kremlin fears the danger of war is now so great in Europe, especially Germany, that even the gains—from the Bolshevik point of view—of a social revolution disappear in comparison

## Marchers Advance To Demand Relief

### Broad, Militant Movement Can Win for Unemployed

Delegates of the national unemployed hunger march are converging upon Washington to demonstrate at the opening of the coming short session of congress. They are going to demonstrate to give a great emphasis to the need for working class relief. They are the advance guard in a struggle which, of necessity, must develop into much larger proportions. Every ounce of working class energy should therefore be thrown into the scale to support this demonstration.

These hunger marchers represent something very real regardless of their present limited credentials. They represent millions of workers thrown onto the social scrap heap by a protracted and growing unemployment crisis. No security whatever for these millions has so far been provided by those who, today, rule us all. On the contrary, the changing economic structure of the country works in the opposite direction. Today, decaying capitalism throughout the world, transforms millions of workers into hungry, homeless tramps. And it is an important sign for the future when especially in the United States a section of them clearly show that they chose not to submit, but prefer the road of fighting resistance. In this sense the hunger march is a great harbinger of the future. But so far it represents directly only the militant working class section.

In a small measure the hunger march is another test to decide the future direction of working class struggle. Reform or revolution. This test will have an influence on the coming decision which the class must make. But it is also a test of policy which, in the end, will determine our success and victory. It is not the revolutionists alone who are recorded in favor of unemployment relief. The distinction between the reformists and revolutionists cannot be made that way, as the official party leaders have so often attempted to do; nor in the amount of dollars and cents demanded for relief, as they have also done. The reformist leaders of the Socialist party long ago, began speaking for the needs of the unemployed, for relief, for a measure of security through unemployment insurance. Now even the A. F. of L. leaders speak in favor of a system of unemployment insurance. But actual struggle

for its attainment is the test of the sincerity of these proposals. There has not been one step taken or proposed by the Socialist party leaders, nor, of course, by the A. F. of L. hierarchy, to obtain this mere reform measure. These elements are bitterly hostile to hunger marches and to any fighting demonstration for relief. Is not this the surest proof of their game of deception?

Actual relief can be won only by a determined fight against the opposition of the capitalist rulers, and we are here confining ourselves solely to the question of amelioration of unemployment, and not speaking at all of its solution. In this determined fight the national hunger march plays its important part. Moreover, when correctly pursued it can, in a measure, become one of the stepping stones toward reaching the revolutionary solution of the unemployment problem.

But to have any significance at all in this respect and to really play an important part in the struggle for relief such hunger marches must become an expression of the working mass as a whole, not merely of one small section. The workers under social reformist influence should be drawn in. The workers of the A. F. of L. and all unions should be drawn in. Most certainly the success of efforts in that direction will determine the success in getting relief for the class as a whole. This was very clearly demonstrated in Chicago where the official Communist party, despite its present false views of the united front policy attained a great temporary success.

It is pertinent to ask: are the Socialist party leaders, are the A. F. of L. leaders to be allowed to record themselves formally in favor of relief without being formally, in reality and in every other respect, put to the test in the struggle which is necessary to obtain relief? The official party has nothing to gain from confining the unemployment demonstrations to the section of the working class which it influences or controls. On the contrary, it must take the opposite road. The way to do that is through the united front policy which brings the workers' organizations together, with their leaders, or in spite of their leaders, in unity of action for specific objectives.

—A. S.

## Stalinists Make Right About Face in Chicago Unemployed United Front

The recent united front conference held in Chicago to fight the 50 percent reduction in unemployed relief instituted by the city authorities, was a striking vindication of the policy of the International Left Opposition and its American section on the united front. What lends this fact such importance is that for the first time in many years in Chicago, a genuine united front of working class struggle on a specific issue affecting all workers. The organizing committee that initiated the conference was composed, strange as it may seem, of the Unemployed Councils dominated by the Communist party, the Chicago Committee on Unemployment, controlled by the Socialist party, and the Workers League, representative of the split-off section of the Proletarian party.

That the whole incident is regarded with utmost seriousness by our party is illustrated by the fact that the columns of the Daily Worker contained lengthy reports of the conference, the demonstration, and topped this off by publishing a page article by Bill Gebert on the "Lessons of Victory of Chicago Unem-

ployed." The Socialist party similarly engaged in such an inner discussion. To understand this heated discussion, we will endeavor to examine the conference, the demonstration and the post-conference period.

**Birth of the Movement**

Without a doubt the birth of the conference was due entirely to the pressure of the rank and file elements in all three unemployment organizations. We shall not here take part in the discussion as to who were the prime initiators of the conference. The party claims this distinction—the Workers League contests this claim. We let the readers judge upon the examination of the material presented. The unemployed in Chicago have undergone severe suffering during these years of crisis. They have faced police clubs on numerous occasions. At other times they watched their comrades fall by bullets. Starvation and misery was and remains their lot. Those small numbers of workers receiving a measly sum for relief suddenly found this relief cut in half. It was this latest act which caused a fermentation in the ranks of the unemployed and was responsible for the pressure put upon the leadership of all three unemployed organizations, to act. That is the only explanation as to how a united front was organized through the initiative of three organizations, two of which were the Communists and Socialists.

The need for such united front action has existed for a long time. It was not brought about because of the opposition of the Communist party and the Socialist party. The Socialist party refused to participate in united front actions because they did not want to join in struggle with the Communist party, because they fear real struggles of the masses, because their role in the workers movement is in reality to check the militancy of the working class. The party, whose duty it was in the very beginning and at all times to initiate such united front actions, was bound hand and foot by its stupid, sectarian policy of the "united front from below". This policy, based on the false conception of social Fascism, which ascribed to all other organizations and their membership a "counter-revolutionary" role, resulted in a conference organized by the party which brought to it only party organizations and party members, but no broad masses of non-

(Continued on page 3)

"For this reason a grave revolutionary outbreak in Germany or elsewhere looms desirable and almost necessary."  
(Continued on page 4)



# Letters from Militants

## Party and Opposition in Pittsburgh

**PITTSBURGH.**—The Left Opposition is on the go in old Smokeytown. Our literature and our propaganda are beginning to dig deep into the sentiments of the Left wing workers. "Trotskyism" is becoming a by-word on the Hill, in the downtown section, out in Oakland near the Pitt campus and on Squirrel Hill. The reason is not hard to guess. After years of crisis and after so many experience of Stalinist bungling with the great possibilities for Communist work among the suffering and discontented proletariat, Communist and non-Communist workers are beginning to reflect upon causes.

They want to know why so little progress and so much backsliding has been the fate of the labor movement under conditions favorable for its growth. They want to know what the way out is. And they are inevitably turning to the ideas that correctly analyze the past mistakes and point the way to the right road for the present and the future—to the ideas of the Left Opposition led by Leon Trotsky. Workers want to know what the Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition stands for, they are eager to become acquainted with its Marxist program. Here are a few examples:

### Opposition Holds Classes

Recently, two classes, one in the history of the Three Internationals—with comrade Gordon as instructor and one in the Fundamentals of Communism (in the Greek language)—with comrade Sifakis as instructor, have been organized by the local committee of the Communist League. Three sessions have already been held of the first and two of the latter. Every session brings with it new faces. All the workers who attend them show a deeply gratifying interest. Comradely discussions take place, in which supporters of the official party policy take the floor for argument and rebuttal. All the comrades are anxious to equip themselves with a Marxist education. Needless to say, the Stalinists have up to now not even thought of conducting such educational activities.

In addition, a Greek Workers Circle has been organized which is going ahead with planned activities.

### Gordon Speaks Before Young Workers

On Sunday, October 16, comrade Sam Gordon spoke before the Progressive Youth Club, a young workers' organization up in the Hill section. A few words are necessary for a description of this club.

The Progressive Youth Club of Pittsburgh was organized some seven or eight months ago to carry on social, sport and cultural activities among the local working class youth. Its membership is of a lively and spirited composition thoroughly proletarian in character and alert in mind. Within the club, members and supporters of the official party, supporters of the Left Opposition and a few non-descript reactionary elements are active. The latter have been campaigning to "keep politics out of the organization" and have been getting a measure of support from some of the members who are still inexperienced and to whom the inevitable connection between the activities of the club and the forces of the class struggle within capitalist society under which it exists—has not yet become sufficiently apparent. The party members, equipped with the misleading and abortive policies of Stalinism, have been conducting a hard—but hopelessly muddled—fight for an enlightenment of the club members and against the reactionary idea of making the club "non-political".

### Oppositionist Gets Floor in Spite of Machine Tactics

But, as in so many other instances, the Stalinist line imposed upon the party membership shows its real, back-sliding and opportunist character, in fact—its meaninglessness, whenever it bucks up against the Left Opposition. And so, on the Sunday in question, when comrade Gordon was invited to take the floor by several members of the organization and by its secretary, a young party comrade jumps up and objects. And here is the strange point: He objects—no doubt under instructions from the bureaucrats—on the grounds that Gordon is a "Trotskyist" and that a motion was passed at some time or other not to have political speakers take the floor at meetings. (This was a comrade who had, as a matter of fact, led the fight against the "no-politics" tendency). Harping, thereby, on backward sentiments in the club, he succeeded in pushing through a motion not to give the representative of the Left Opposition the floor.

A short verbal skirmish took place among the members only, in the course of which, the workers supporting the demand that Gordon be given the floor called for adjournment and invited all those who wanted to listen, to stay. But the party comrades had received their instructions. They were determined to prevent the Left Opposition from being heard, no matter for what length of time, no matter on what subject. They were ready to fight in their determination. In order to avoid a fist fight, the sympathizers of the L. O. called upon all those who wanted to hear Gordon to adjourn to a nearby room.

The great majority of the club members remained and took their places in the next room. Even the party comrades decided to stay. Comrade Gordon, referring to the incident of the evening, gave a short half hour's talk on the history of the struggle for workers' free speech and proletarian democracy and on the significance of the latter in preparing the working class for the overthrow of its capitalist masters. He criticized the party members in a direct but comradely

manner and explained to them how their previous action served a reactionary purpose. All these present listened attentively until he was through. None of the party members took the floor in rebuttal. One of their group even came over to the speaker to shake hands with him. The meeting then came to a peaceful conclusion.

### The "Freiheit" Lies and Slanders As Usual

In the *Freiheit* of Tuesday, October 25, there appears an account of this same meeting, coupled with a venomous, unscrupulous attack upon our courageous and fighting Pittsburgh comrade, comrade Jim Sifakis, leading Greek worker. After warning the Jewish workers on the Hill to keep away from this "Trotskyist" friend, the *Freiheit* correspondent proceeds to tell its readers that the "Trotskyist" speaker nearly provoked a fist fight and wanted to break up the meeting". This is, of course—the *Olgin* sheet true to color. New York workers have long been acquainted with the lying and slanderous character of its attacks against the Left Opposition. By the example of this piece of reporting, the Pittsburgh Jewish workers will have a chance to judge for themselves.

The workers of Pittsburgh, coming towards Communism, will, we fear, yet have many such actions and "reports" before them to be able to decide amply between the Stalinists and the Left Opposition. They will learn that it is the Stalinists who by their bungling, their bureaucracy and their lies, are retarding our Communist party and that it is the Left Opposition alone that will eventually help make it the fighting mass party of the proletariat which it should be.

—B. J.

## New Protest Against Stalin Bureaucrats

### DAVENPORT, IOWA

To all Young Communist League and Communist party members, sympathizers, and friends:

To the Section Committee of the Young Communist League and Communist Party, Davenport, Rock Island and Moline Section:

Dear Comrades:

The fifteenth anniversary of the Russian revolution finds the revolutionary movement in America and throughout the world in perilous straits.

Bureaucracy has its stifling hold upon the throat of the movement, choking all initiative and life from the rank and file. The rights of the membership are disregarded. Important decisions are made and changed without the voice of the rank and file. This results in the inability, ignorance, and the lack of initiative on the part of the rank and file to carry out decisions and continue the progressive work of the movement.

Discussion on theory and practice so necessary for the healthy life of the movement has been replaced by a military-like discipline whose entire substance is bound by the word "obey". There is no objection to discipline—a Communist discipline, a discipline of those who know and understand the decisions, their reason and importance.

There is a great need for study, discussion and consideration by the rank and file to bring out a clearer understanding of the theory and practice of our movement.

The entire movement is kept in a state of ignorance and doubt on the latest developments of the critical situation in Germany, China and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

Bureaucracy bloomed at the expulsion of the International Left Opposition and has since held sway throughout the Communist International in the Communist Party of America and in the Soviet Union. Since the death of Lenin, in the struggle against the Left Opposition, bureaucracy became dominant in the entire apparatus of the Communist International and continues today.

Bureaucracy is necessary for the Stalinist regime to hold sway. When bureaucracy is done away with, the party can return to its former Leninist path. The movement will revive and march to victory as in the days of Lenin.

Comrades, the struggle against the Left Opposition constantly comes up throughout the world and has been brought to our attention locally. It is high time that the rank and file make a thorough study of the Left Opposition, its program and point of view, and then examine the program as drawn up by the present leadership, their point of view and demand a discussion and convention correctly to settle this question by the membership.

Comradely yours,

GEORGE MILLAGE.

E. E. THURSTON.

S. R. CLAUSSEN.

October 25, 1932.

## Utica I.L.D. Fails to Act

### UTICA, N. Y.

I am sending you a leaflet that speaks for itself. I don't know whether or not there has been anything in the *Daily Worker* about this.

I attended the meeting of the local branch of the I. L. D. the other night and found the state of affairs shocking. Six Utica workers were arrested last July, when the police broke up an unemployment demonstration. The men were charged with inciting to riot and assault, and are now facing a ten to fifteen year jail term.

Apparently no real effort is being made to save them from prison. As you can see from the sample enclosed, the I. L. D. approach to the case

is very general. It does not even tell the Utica workers how to organize the fight for the release of the men. Yet here we have a real class-struggle case that ought to be brought to the attention of every worker. It is certainly of sufficient importance to warrant the forming of a special defense organization. It should not be left in the hands of a small I. L. D. committee and lumped in with other cases for general propaganda purposes.

At the time of the six men's arrest, a representative from the I. L. D. was sent here in connection with the case, but soon left the city, after having made the local comrades understand that they must handle the matter themselves, the I. L. D. central committee having too many other matters to attend to elsewhere (!).

The comrades here are all foreign-born, with very little experience in defense organization. Ten members were present at the meeting I attended, and they appeared to be very pessimistic in regard to organizing a broad united front for the defense. Two of these arrested are still in jail, the other four being out on \$5,000 bail each. They have a lawyer, but he has notified them that he will drop the case unless he receives more cooperation.

The defense committee gave in their report at the meeting, and several members then spoke on the report. Their

speeches consisted largely of questions, such as: Why don't we get more support? Why doesn't the I. L. D. grow? Why do the workers desert us? Why can we not build a broad united front? Why are we so isolated from the workers? Why is the I. L. D., which is supposed to be a mass organization, only composed of party members whose meetings are mere duplications of branch meetings?

These were all significant questions, coming from sincere workers willing to learn and to do something for their class—a real good proletarian element, I thought. So when they were through putting their questions, I got the floor and attempted to give them an answer. I gave a little history of the I. L. D. and an outline of the party's mistakes. In contrast to what would happen in New York, where I. L. D. members have been poisoned against the Opposition, I was well received and was even appointed on the defense committee. I proposed that a letter be drawn up and sent to the secretaries of all unions and working class organizations in Utica, and that an open letter be distributed to the members of these organizations to insure that the letter to the officials should not be "forgotten".

I don't know how long I will be able to stay in Utica to follow up the work, as I haven't got a job yet, but I will do all I can while I am here.

—GADFLY.

## The Pittsburgh Hunger March Conference

(Continued from page 1)

half-hearted and lame arguments, all of them calculated and discredited. The Opposition and all certain to reflect more surely on the stupid and servile character of those who made them, as the every day struggle continues to prove the correctness of the Leninist position of the League. Finally, the discussion was summed up by Myerscough, who softly side-stepped all the political issues, and, forced to defend himself for forgetting altogether about the great lessons of the Chicago incident resorted to picking up the cheap slanders of those who preceded him. No votes on policy were taken. Resolutions were relegated to the last point in the order of business.

29 to 1—An Insufficient Majority for the Bureaucrats against the Leninist Opposition

Next, the conference proceeded to elect an executive committee. Comrade Jim Sifakis, of the Pittsburgh branch of the C. L. A., was nominated among others. Immediately another flurry started among the party members. The committee was supposed to consist of 25 members. 25 were nominated and accepted and a vote was in point. But Sifakis was among the 25 and it was impossible for the bureaucrats to stomach even this lone Left Oppositionist on the conference body. The "leaders" immediately got into a huddle and hit upon this clever maneuver to keep the League out of the committee: There were not enough women workers on the committee! And with this, nominations were once again opened. Once the nominations were reopened, representatives of the National Student League, the Musteite Citizens Council and any number of other organizations were asked to add their representatives to the committee. And then the fight against the Opposition's nominee began in earnest. The Stalinist representatives did not shrink from the worst methods of slander, provocation and demagoguery in this fight, in which the security of the Stalinist "line" was threatened—on a committee of 30—by a single Communist League militant! Significant enough.

Comrade Sifakis took the floor to defend his candidacy. Again the Leninist policy of the Left Opposition was brought before the conference, our comrade re-

mind the delegates, many of whom knew him from the past, of his long record of militancy in the Pittsburgh revolutionary workers movement. The party speakers, under Stalinist influence, were then forced to grasp—as to a last straw—on the word "Opposition" in the official name of our organization, to make a demagogic appeal to the sentiments of the audience, stressing that "Opposition" means—a desire to disrupt.

Comrade Gordon again took the floor, to tear down the veil of demagoguery and to bring the discussion once more up to a political plane. He reiterated the Left Opposition's unemployed platform, stressed again our loyal desire to cooperate in the work of the conference committee, in any case, and called upon the delegates to put the Communist League to the test in actual every-day struggle, to judge it and its policies on that basis.

Myerscough once again summed up the discussion. Forced at first to argue politically, he repeated the Stalinist myth of the "united front from below" as against the Opposition's Leninist united front policy. Heckled and forced to retreat, he stopped to an attack upon our Illinois comrades. Interrupted in his slanders there, he finally resorted to sterile demagoguery borrowed from the previous Stalinist speakers, revolving around the slander about the word "Opposition". This closed the discussion and a vote was taken. In spite of all the efforts of the Stalinists, they were able to obtain only some 30 votes against Sifakis, most of the others abstaining and 7 voting for the Left Opposition candidate.

In spite of all these provocations, the Left Opposition was the first to pledge a definite sum in financial support of the Unemployed Conference. The conference then adjourned with a hasty reading of resolutions. Others wanting to propose resolutions were magnanimously invited to bring these to the committee's headquarters.

The Left Opposition's action at the conference will not remain without effect on the revolutionary workers of Pittsburgh. An important wedge for the Leninist regeneration of the Communist movement and for the progress of revolutionary labor movement in Pittsburgh has been driven.

—S. G.

## Des Moines, Iowa - A New Battleground For the Left Opposition

### DES MOINES, IOWA.

Another pillar-albeit a very diminutive one—of the rotting structure of the Stalinist system has just fallen. In Des Moines a good half of the membership—11 to 12—are in revolt against lies and bureaucracy. They refuse to be bullied or terrorized, insist upon their rights, are studying the cause of the Left Opposition calmly and objectively. A few others are in the process of becoming convinced but all vigorously protest bureaucracy and demand our reinstatement into the party. Already we two, Barach and Gottlieb, have been expelled, with one other Gay. Three whose probationary periods expire this week, will no doubt be expelled. And with these a larger group of about 6 or 7. To the party functionaries it looks, indeed, as if the members are intoxicated, have gone mad, or else are excessively "weak" and so have succumbed to our "wily demagoguery" (although why they—the great almighty Poobahs with all the power of the apparatus and their overwhelming correctness of principle should not be able to more than counteract this, is left unexplained). But the members themselves feel not in the least intoxicated, mad, or "weak" but rather as if they were just shaking off the spell of fake promises and glittering appearances and have at last seen and experienced the perfidious, disgusting essence of Stalinism.

Comrade Barach and myself were unanimously admitted into the party on Sept. 12 by Unit 2 even though in our statement we stated clearly that we were Oppositionists and would remain so, but still would obey party discipline, etc. It was due to the fact that we had worked along with them in the mass work, arranging for and speaking at meetings,

distributing leaflets and in our speeches and conversations explaining Communism and the tasks of the work, that they could see that we were proletarian revolutionists and therefore should be in the party.

Helping this out was the newness of the party in the city (6 months), so that the bureaucracy was not yet developed and strong, the members were not poisoned by slander against us, arguments of reason accordingly exerted some force. Lastly members, still uncorrupted, had a lively sense of workers' democracy and justice to which we could successfully appeal.

However, 5 days later, 2 days before the next unit meeting, we received the following note under a personal signature from Heinz Schroeter, the section organizer: "Your application for membership into the party with your statement denouncing (literally) Trotsky's theories and tactics in the U. S., has been received. You are refused admission into the Communist party". This note, which provoked outspoken resentment among the members, was characterized in a resolution of the unit as containing an "open brazen lie (that we denounced, when we upheld), an insolent attempt to usurp authority (refusing us membership under a personal signature), a bureaucratic overriding of the proper procedure and will of the unit." And Schroeter, its author, on the strength of this and some similar misdeeds was censured and condemned and was warned "that if his behavior weren't corrected, more drastic steps would be taken." He was removed from his position as delegate of Unit 2 to the City Central. It's been a long time since a unit has asserted itself like this. Just think... a loyal Stalinist functionary so sharply reprimanded! The

## Our Club Plan MILITANT BUILDERS

### SECOND PHASE OF THE CLUB PLAN

The *Militant* is still desperately in need of financial assistance. If it is to appear regularly as a weekly we must build a sounder financial base under it. This is primarily a question of circulation. That of course rests on political factors. For the moment we are leaving these aside. We are concentrating on the question of promotion, of building a larger circulation.

It is in this connection that we want to introduce here the second phase of the club plan. You will frequently run across workers and people sympathetic to the Left Opposition who are subscribers themselves, have all our literature and who are willing to donate money to us but are unwilling to give money without getting something in return.

It is our idea to put them to work through the club plan to increase the circulation of the *Militant*. How can this be done? Very simply. We have on hand one thousand cards ready to ship when ordered. These cards sell for fifty cents apiece. Across the top runs this legend: Exchange this card for one half-year sub to the *Militant*. Sample below.

Anyone who sends in one of these cards with his name and address filled out will be entered on the *Militant* mailing list as a subscriber. How does he get this card? In this way. Suppose you approach a worker and ask him for a donation of two or more dollars. He says: O. K., but I want something for this money. I have a sub to the *Militant*. I have all of your literature. What are you going to give me?

To this comrade we say: "Very well. We understand your feelings and we have just the thing you want. If you give us two dollars we will give you four of these paid sub cards. Each one is good for a half-year sub to the *Militant*. Now you can do whatever you want with these cards. You can sell them to workers and people you know, one at a time; or you can give them away to workers who can then send them in to the office and be entered as subscribers; or you can sell them en bloc to workers' organizations. It is up to you to dispose of them as you can and please.

Now what are the advantages of this arrangement? First: the *Militant* sells these Paid Sub Cards ONLY on a cash basis. Thus we get money in advance. This is a very important point as all can see. Second: these Paid Sub Cards are sold by the *Militant* in blocs of not less than four at one time. This makes the minimum sale \$2. The purchaser can resell them according to his opportunity on blocs or singly. When he succeeds in selling them he can reorder more from the *Militant*. Third: workers get a fifty percent reduction in the price of a half-year sub. Everybody gets something and the *Militant* gets a boost on its upward climb toward a bigger circulation.

### PAID SUB CARD

Exchange This Card For One Half-Year Sub to the Militant

50c Good for One Half-Year Sub to the Militant \$1.00 a Half-Year without this card)

A Marxian Paper for Class Conscious Worker

THE MILITANT, 126 E. 16 STREET, New York City

Please send me THE MILITANT for 26 weeks.

Name ..... Address .....

City ..... State .....

Militant Builder .....

Now some points about the idea. The cards are known as Paid Sub Cards. They are sold by the *Militant* only on a cash basis. They are sold by the *Militant* in blocs. The minimum number in a bloc is four. There is no maximum. These cards apply only to new subs. They do not apply to renewals. The worker who has one of these cards given to him or sold to him has only to fill in his name and address and send it in to the *Militant* to be entered as a subscriber. Nothing more is required from him. A comrade who buys a bloc of these cards is a *Militant* Builder.

As we said we have 1,000 of these cards. In money that means \$500. How long will it take us to convert these potential assets into cash? Let us see. We will keep a record in these columns. Now who will be the first?

### THE STAFF TO DATE

Comrade Vomas is no longer the undisputed leader of the staff. The Chicago Friends of the *Militant* Club shot in 8 subs on two club plan blanks and shot into a tie for the leadership. That is the way we like to see it go. A cut and dried affair has no interest in it. This looks like a lively race. We shall see.

Chicago Friends of the Militant Club	12
P. Vomas	12
B. Morgenstern	8
V. R. Dunne	8
H. Nash	7
W. Krehm	6
H. A.	4
H. Capelis	4
M. Gottlieb	4
J. Hamilton	4
W. Konikow	4
O. Coover	4
S. Lessin	4
J. Sifakis	4
A. Joel	4
E. McMillen	4
A. Miller	4
J. Weber	4
J. Ross	4
C. Shechet	2

The record by cities also was changed from what it was two issues ago. Minneapolis is no longer in first place. Chicago has outstripped it. But this is not for long, say our comrades up there. Queen babe as the Spanish say? We shall see this too.

Chicago	24
Minneapolis	20
Pittsburgh	16
Toronto	10
Boston	10
Philadelphia	8
Montreal	7
St. Louis	4
Des Moines	4

As we foretold New York is moving up. Slowly, you say? Right but what counts is who crosses the tape first at the end of the race; and things which have great bulk and travel long distances pick up speed as they go along. Watch our dust.

members, you see, had not yet been introduced to the culinary art as Stalin practices it....

This incident, it is true, is in itself comparatively unimportant, especially seeing that the letter condemned itself by its tone and substance anyway. But what kind of a party is it many asked, which has leaders who can attempt such little "maneuvers"? Can functionaries of this sort gain the confidence and respect of the workers of Des Moines, can they lead those workers through difficult battles, and stand those acid tests and tense strains when they are of such a puny moral stature? And this isn't the exception, the comrades knew. Weren't the higher-ups notified and was Schroeder reprimanded or recalled?

Incidents of a similar order followed in quick succession. The unit meeting of Sept. 19 admitted us despite the protest of Schroeter, who disrupted the meeting and walked out when he was outvoted. The following evening a special unit meeting was called by the City Central, out of which we were violently ejected, while another comrade, Gay, was expelled by the City Central which met before the unit meeting—a City Central in which sat and voted Schroeter, who had been recalled the day before. Ten other members, protesting this use of violence and bureaucracy walked out after Gay and us.

The following week, in a more or less packed and hastily called meeting of the entire Des Moines membership, Enlick, the 100 percenter railed and stormed for an hour and a half with a long summary, and her supporters granted her another 50 minutes while we were just granted a meager 40 minutes (they first wanted to make it 20). We were expelled with Gay, 3 others put on probation and the rest warned, and all this, despite the packed meeting and lack of time, by only a slim majority of one—10 to 9. "Do we not have democracy in the party?" Erlich protested, "do not the members elect the functionaries at con-

—M. GOTTLIEB



# Class Trends in Elections

We return to the election for the purpose of discussing the class motion revealed by the election. We have already dealt with the results on the basis of the partial returns. What we are interested in is the relation of forces behind the democratic and republican parties. The relation of reform and revolution and the motion of the working class caused by the prolonged crisis.

Throughout the country and particularly in New York and New York City there has been a tendency of the voters to cross regular party lines. To cut up and down the ballots. To protest against the unbearable conditions. Tammany was hard hit by the protest vote for Hillquit and McKee.

The capitalist papers uphold the opinions of the capitalists, uphold this protest because they desire a reduction of tax and more drastic measures against the workers who menaced their return to "prosperity". The workers, says the capitalists, want a "dole" and a "bonus" and a better living standard—that "cannot" be paid if markets are to be obtained on a lower level of world competition.

The capitalist papers spoke of this protest and cutting across party lines as a return to a "sane vote" of men and women who vote for the "best man". The economic trend has swallowed up the bourgeois "individualism" and this return to voting for the best man gives the capitalists the impression this is a return to their happy past and a relief from the present which is already very unsatisfactory.

This is the bourgeois concept of the problem, but it is incorrect. In reality it is the expression of the capitalists' desires. When party lines of reaction break, the safest thing for the two party system is to talk about voting for the best man. The capitalists will always see that the democratic or republican party, or if necessary the socialist party, will have the "best man", when the beginning process of the motion of the class shifts the workers to the Left, into the stream of class struggle.

The protest vote of the election, the cutting across party lines considering the many forms of disenfranchisement and counting out of the Communist party shows that the motion of the class in the last three years is to the Left. An ideological change in the class is taking place following the economic changes. The capitalists desire to hold the working class into safe channels is well served by the best man theory.

The ideological hold reaction had upon the workers has been shaken. Large layers of our class have cut themselves loose. They are grouping for a way out. The molecular process has started. The crystallizing pole of reaction has lost its power. The political lag of the class is being narrowed by the present events. Roosevelt, the "best man" was a suitable net to hold in check the bulk of discontent. It has slowed the process to the left but has not stopped the process and the centrifugal force away from reaction. So far, the new crystallizing poles of reform and revolution have not been able to pull the main whirling class motion itself. However, one thing can be said at this stage—that there will be a bitter fight between reform and revolution for the lead in transforming the centrifugal force of the class away from reaction to centripetal forces for reform and revolution. Which of the two poles, reform or revolution, will obtain the decisive lead in the coming period will to the greatest degree depend upon the Communist party, its program and tactics in the class struggle.

It is not a two cornered fight between reform and revolution, with the factions and divisions within each camp as well as between these two camps. Reaction

still has a word. More than once, in their hold upon the masses. But more than once they have been able to transform this centrifugal force into centripetal force, subjecting the American worker ideologically to new bonds. And in this problem of regaining lost ground, the economic factors were not the only factors favoring the capitalists. The inability of the revolutionist to pose the question and answer it by Marxism, in theory and practice has done its share to help the capitalists.

In 1912 "Teddy" Roosevelt's "revolt" was able to prevent the molecular process of our class motion from moving to the next stage, to crystallizing channels. The war played its role and then in 1924 LaFollete and the "independent political actionists" repeated this service for the capitalists. F. D. Roosevelt plays his part today, as the "best man". In this latter period, after the war the American Communist were taking steps forward, but with the warped concept of Farmer-Labor party and slogan of a Labor party we helped reformism build a wall between the molecular motion of the class to the left and its crystallization into the camp of revolution.

Today the opportunist platform of 1932 of the Communist party repeats this in a different form.

This time reaction will not have such a favorable opportunity. Economics has moved ahead and does not favor the capitalists in the relation of class forces. The contradictions are far too great. The center of the axis is moving to the

left and the educated capitalists know that a regrouping and stop gap at the point of reform is a thousand times better than a crystallizing point at revolution and class struggle.

The Stalinists inability to understand the relation of reform to revolution in the American link of the world capitalist chain, although playing into the hands of reaction, nevertheless is not sufficient for the capitalists to readjust their forces on the same central axis. The driving forces of the economic contradictions are greater than the blunders of Stalinism. However, the Stalinists blunders does not enable us to make a clean sweep from reaction to revolution, rather, it helps the reformers hold these workers between reaction and revolution.

In order to take advantage of the centrifugal forces within the camp of reaction and obtain this motion around our orbit we must have a Marxian program and tactics. Living on the heritage of the October revolution has its power but in the long run cannot replace a Marxian program. If we do not correct these Stalinist blunders, in theory and practice, in time the quantity gain of reformers and the socialist will transform to "quality" for reaction. If we do correct these mistakes a quantity and QUALITY gain for the Communists will drag with it a quantity gain for the reformers but not a quality gain.

The next election like the present election will merely raise the curtain to show how successful we have been in the task of exposing the enemy and building our own structure. The present election does not speak so well for the Communists. It speaks better for social reformism.

# The Stalinist Turn in Chicago

(Continued from page 1)

party workers. It was this policy that isolated the Party from the masses at the time when the party should stand at the helm of working class movement. Then how is it possible for the party which maintained up to the Chicago conference and continues to maintain even now, officially and nationally, the policy of the "united front from below", to enter into a genuine movement of this character, to negotiate with the "leaders of these organizations". How did it come about that the Socialist party which has always stood in the way of genuine united actions of the working masses, like organization of the Chicago united front movement? The explanation is to be sought in the worker-members of these organizations who put pressure upon the leaderships and demanded an end to the trifling with their problems.

**Workers Respond to Call**  
The call for the conference signed by the three organizations met with a huge response everywhere. The masses reacted as never before, and the conference bore testimony of this fact. 750 delegates representing 350 organizations made up the conference. Included in the conference were over 40 church organizations composed entirely of unemployed workers, the Farmer-Labor Party, the A. F. of L., fraternal organizations, the TUUL. Upon the invitation of the Workers League, the Chicago branch of the Communist League sent two delegates who were seated, quite obviously only because of the presence of such a

wide variety of organizations and workers who resented any effort on the part of the party to unseat us.

The Conference had hardly convened when difficulties arose. This was to be expected. A gathering composed of so many conflicting organizations and political movements could not but go through deep antagonism and struggle. What was clear from the outset was the development of a Left wing group under the leadership of the Communist party and a Right wing group headed by the Socialists. The Left wing was in the great majority. But from the very beginning the party made the error of desiring to "capture" the conference, although it was quite clear that by virtue of numbers alone the Left wing dominated the conference. The election of a chairman brought the conference into its first crisis. Having previously agreed upon Karl Lochner, representing the Unemployed Councils, as secretary, the organizing committee referred the election of the chairman to the floor of the conference. The non-party elements proposed the election of a temporary chairman until such time as the credential committee reported on the number of delegates. The party insisted upon a permanent chairman from the outset, and for whom everybody present at the conference, whether delegate or not, supporting the party, cast a ballot during the first vote. The farce was too obvious and upon protests from various delegates a revote cut the number of "delegates" in half. Even then the Left wing vote was in a majority.

The conference organized itself. Discussion opened. With a party member in the chair, the efforts of our comrade Edwards to take the floor were thwarted almost until the adjournment. The party was prepared to prevent our comrade from speaking and presenting our point of view to the conference.

In the main the position of the Left wing was correct at the conference. It was correct for them to warn the workers against betrayals, against vacillation and to urge a militant struggle. But when John Williamson, while speaking continued to declare that this united front conference, which included not only workers, but their organizations and their leaders, was a "united front from below" it marked a shame-faced attempt of the party to maintain its previous stupid position on the united front in the midst of a right-about change toward the correct position. In the presence of this great number of delegates, Williamson declared that "we do not unite with leaders, we unite only with the workers" while seated around one table were Lochner and Weber (the District Organizer of the Party), Karl Borders, representing the Socialist party, and Dixon from the Workers League.

**The Demonstration**  
The organization of the demonstration brought out the sharpest differences in the conference. The party was absolutely in the right when they insisted upon drawing the political lessons of this protest. And they were right when they insisted upon carrying banners for Foster and Ford. Had the party agreed to march without carrying banners in support of their presidential candidates, or in presenting political slogans, that would have marked a capitulation to the Right wing and the reactionaries. The issue as to the degree that the party wished to give the demonstration a political character, has no real bearing on the discussion. But that it was absolutely correct for the party to insist upon this point is indisputable. And here we must declare that the Workers League in lending their support to the Socialist party, which opposed any political conclusions to be drawn from the whole situation, capitulated before the Right wing and themselves became party to the splitting tactics of Borders and the Socialist party. In turn the party introduced once again its petty Stalinist methods by proposing in the executive committee, that the conference return the money donation made by the Left Opposition because the "Trotskyists are a counter-revolutionary organization".

In spite of a dreaching rain, the day of the demonstration brought out between 35,000 and 50,000 workers. The demonstration was militant in character and displayed the immense possibilities inherent in the situation. Quite naturally, the party dominated the march because of its militancy, if by nothing else. The workers present recognized that only the Communists could give leadership to them in their struggles. Without doubt the party gained considerably in prestige during the demonstration.

But what is of greater importance is to draw the lessons of the united front. First of all it must be established that the party made a right-about face on the question of the united front, notwithstanding the fact that it was brought about primarily because of the pressure of the unemployed workers, and in spite of its conflict with the official party position which heretofore opposed such movements.

The Opposition marched with its own banners containing the slogans: Immediate Relief for all Unemployed; Six Hour Day and Five Day Week with No Reduction in Pay; For Social Insurance, The Extension of Long Term Credits to and the Recognition of the Soviet Union. (To be continued)

—ALBERT GLOTZER.

# The Arrest of Comrade Chen

(Continued from page 1)

K. M. T. is a Fascist party in its relation to the workers and poor peasants. But Chiang no longer trusts the K. M. T. and is compelled to lead an independent political existence. This is symptomatic of the fact that the K. M. T. is in the process of disintegration. Therefore the edge of the "Blue Shirts Association" is directed more against Chiang's political opponents inside the K. M. T. This association has its "blood and iron groups" in Nanking, Hankow and Shanghai, to initiate the "movement of extermination of opponents" or the "blue terror". They make secret arrests and assassinate attacks. The cadres for this "blue" movement, Chiang Kai-Shek draws from two sources: (1) the former Whampoo cadets; (2) the students from Moscow. Chiang Kai-Shek often gives high pay to those renegades and Moscow students. He often puts the question to them: How did Stalin eliminate Trotsky? His press openly advocates that he should apply the same tactics to his political adversaries as Stalin did to Trotsky, or Mussolini to Nitti. There are now more than 300 Moscow students in Chiang's service. They are fighting for the non-capitalist development of China and the land to the peasants. Of course, not only Chiang Kai-Shek but other groups of the K. M. T.—under one cover or another, social democracy, peasants' and workers' party, etc.—draw recruits from the renegades from Communism. Owing to the absence of mass movement, these attempts have not come out into the open but group themselves around various magazines.

The entry of these renegades into the K. M. T. is the outcome of the Stalinist school of education. The Stalinist school suppresses free speech and free thinking, obligates the students to memorize the Marxian-Leninist catechisms mechanically, without understanding their inner connections, without remodeling the mind, only disorients the best elements in our own ranks, facilitates it for

alien elements to adopt protective colors, and at the decisive moment,—they turn against us. The Stalinist school does not educate the new generation from the point of view of Communism, i. e., of permanent revolution, but from the point of view of vulgar democracy, i. e., class collaboration. Stalin's policy is always directed towards weakening the position of the C. P. and strengthening that of the enemy. It is disastrous indeed that during the revolutionary ascent, the Chinese party as a whole was put at the disposal of the K. M. T. and during the counter-revolutionary triumph, a part of its forces serve the K. M. T. as traitors. Re-education is needed to turn us into genuine Communist but under the blows of reaction and the prejudices sown for years, this is an extremely difficult task, which accounts for the slow progress the Chinese Opposition has been making.

**Chen's Record of Struggle**  
Comrade Chen has been the most prominent figure in the Chinese revolutionary movement for the last fifteen years. Born in 1879 of a rich Mandarin family, he carried on revolutionary activities from the time of his youth, mainly in the literary field, as the editor of newspapers and teacher of middle schools. He was abroad in Japan several times. At that time the revolution was directed at the Manchu dynasty, and it was national and democratic. The revolution of 1911 ended in a failure, in the setting up of the military dictatorship of Yuan Shi Kai and then Tuan Chi Jui. The former capitulated before Japanese imperialism on the "21 demands"; the latter was a notorious puppet of Japan.

Comrade Chen, in distinction from the quasi-revolutionists of that time, of the Sun Yat Sen type who aimed to overthrow Yuan Shi Kai and Tuan Chi Jui by military adventures, set himself the task of winning the youth by devoting himself to propaganda work. He founded the monthly called "La Juensee" (The Youth), which played a most im-

portant role in the history of Chinese culture and social movement. In the name of science and democracy, he waged a merciless war against the teachings of Confucius which, as a tradition for 3,000 years, hindered the development of revolutionary thought among the youth. "La Juensee" also contributed to the reform of the Chinese language, to replace the old dead language in literary composition by the spoken language; this had the same significance as the replacement of Latin by the vernacular languages in Europe in the 16th century. Since then, writing is no longer for a small number of scholars but rather for the masses. This period (1916-1919) called the period of "ideological revolution and literary revolution" paved the way for the development of the mass movement, beginning with the anti-Japanese student demonstration on May 4, 1919. During this period, comrade Chen, as dean of the Literature Department of the Peking University, was forced to resign because his literary activities aroused strong opposition among the conservative circles, just as they aroused the mass movement and revolutionized the mind of the youth.

It is characteristic that the Kuo Min Tang, at the head of which stood Sun Yat Sen, even at that time looked upon the ideological and literary revolution with suspicion, met it half-way, and followed it when it became popular. Needless to say, the K. M. T. government tries every means today to restore the dignity of Confucianism and to spread the use of dead language in writing.

At the height of the student anti-Japanese movement, comrade Chen, a former professor but an ardent revolutionist, wrote a leaflet denouncing the traitorous Tuan Chi Jui government and he—the only one to do so—distributed the leaflets in the streets of Peking in order to direct the movement against its internal foe. He was thereupon arrested and put in prison for several months. After his release, he went to Shanghai and

there he founded the Communist party in 1920, with several comrades, most of whom later became renegades and went into the K. M. T. He was arrested twice by the authorities of the French concession in 1921 and 1922. The last time he was released only because the authorities bowed to the pressure of many mass organizations.

**Chen and the Epigones**  
In 1922, he attended the Fourth Congress of the Communist International as the delegate from the Chinese party. Later on, a leading comrade told me that he made remarkable progress when he returned to China. What an immense development he would have experienced and how easily the tragic fate that was suffered, might have been averted, had there been a correct leadership in the Comintern! His role in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27 is well known. I only wish to remind here that up to May 1927, at the 8th Plenum of the C. I., Stalin and Bukharin still defended comrade Chen's policy against the criticism of the Opposition. The Chinese Communist Party was called a model. But several months later, when the defeat of the revolution was too evident, Stalin and Bukharin suddenly threw all the responsibility upon comrade Chen. Even if their contentions were true, that comrade Chen in opposition to the "correct" directives of the C. I. had conducted a false policy, the act of Bukharin and Stalin who came out to attack him only when the revolution was approaching its tragic end, greatly resembles a Chinese expression: "Let one fall into the well and then throw stones at him". Comrade Chen was a member of the Central Committee and the general secretary of the party since its foundation and up to August 7, 1927, when he was deprived of work and made the scapegoat of the Stalin policy.

After the defeat of the Chinese revolution, comrade Chen declined the repeated invitations to go to Moscow, knowing that he had nothing to learn from the epigones. Only in 1929 did he begin to make the acquaintance of comrade Trotsky's writings on the Chinese revolution and he convinced himself of the correctness of the Opposition. Owing to such convictions and his refusal to fight against "Trotskyism", he was expelled from the party in the Fall of 1929. Since then he became the leader first of one of the factions and then of the united Opposition. He contributed all his energy, his time and his means (modest though they were), that is, all that he possesses, to the movement. The K. M. T. government put up a high reward for his arrest, but he lived in the workers' district of Shanghai, attended many meetings and directed the work, wrote articles and appeals and even supervised the technical work. In recent months, he was seriously ill, confined to bed.

**A Heavy Blow**  
The K. M. T. has finally achieved its aim, utilizing the traitor in our ranks. He has been transferred to Nanking, and we do not know what fate is to befall him in the end. The K. M. T. government is not lacking in its desire for revenge. It is out of the question that the masses will speak, because they are in an amorphous state. But there are many influential intellectuals, scholars, professors and journalists who, in view of his past services to Chinese culture, to the revolution, and because of his emigration, urge leniency towards comrade Chen. There are slanders being deliberately spread against him by the KMT as if he had requested to see Chiang Kai-Shek. The first to "believe" such rumors are the Stalinists.

Comrade Chen's revolutionary and literary activities for the last 15 years reflect his epoch with both its strong and weak sides. It was the period of the national awakening of the petty bourgeois students and the young proletariat, and many currents of socialist and revolutionary thought of the post-war epoch found their way into China. Events developed too rapidly to allow political fighters a systematic and serious study

In the midst of these cross currents, Comrade Chen developed to Communism in a series of stages, therefore with some inconsistencies. Being limited by the fact that he knows only the Japanese language (he knows English poorly), he was hampered in obtaining a thorough Marxian education. He had to lead the Chinese revolution at the time when the Comintern leadership had already passed into the hands of the epigones. His development was not supplemented and assisted in due time. He is characteristic of the constant striving for progress but the remnants of old thought also weigh upon him. At a time when the Opposition urgently needs his leadership and his political experience, when his defects might be overcome under comrade Trotsky, he has been snatched away from our midst by the KMT government—the greatest loss sustained by us in the last two years. October 27, 1932.

—NIEL-SIH.

## THE MILITANT

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

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th St., N. Y.

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

SATURDAY NOVEMBER 26, 1932  
Vol. V, No. 48 (Whole No 144)

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year, Foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.

# JAPAN

## Its Rise from Feudalism to Capitalist Imperialism and the Development of the Proletariat

By Jack Weber

### Japan in Manchuria

Manchuria is twice the size of Japan proper but it has one-half the population. In resources it resembles closely Canada with its wide prairies, suitable for the growing of wheat and other grains. Only one-half the arable land of Manchuria is under cultivation and yet Manchuria is already the great food granary of the East. Its cattle, timber, minerals are vastly important to Japan's economy. For this reason 77 p. c. of the total Japanese capital invested in China, is invested in Manchuria. The South Manchuria Railway and its allied concerns absorb 54 p. c. of the Manchurian investment. Its control of the economic life of Manchuria is undisputed.

In any conflict between Japan and any other power—the U. S. or Soviet Russia—Manchuria and its control would prove vital to Japanese defense. But it is also the base for further Japanese aggression. Once her power in Manchuria is consolidated, she would then penetrate into Inner and Outer Mongolia, and into the Far Eastern regions of the U. S. S. R. With utmost care, the Japanese generals are preparing for the conflict they see as inevitable with Soviet Russia. They have utilized the present crisis, when America and England are occupied with their internal woes, and when the Soviet Union is completely absorbed in its Five Year Plan, to take the first preparatory steps. Not an unimportant part was played in their decision by the growing Chinese immigration to Manchuria. In his 1927 document Premier Tanaka stated: "The num-

ber of Chinese grows so rapidly in South Manchuria that our political and economic interests sustain losses. We are compelled in the circumstances to take aggressive measures in North Manchuria in order to safeguard our prosperity in the future. But if the Chinese-Eastern Railway, belonging to Soviet Russia, develops in this district, then our new continental policy will receive a blow which will inevitably bring about conflict with Soviet Russia in the near future.—The Chinese-Eastern Railway will become ours and we shall seize Kirin just as we seized Dairen. It seems that the inevitability of crossing swords with Russia on the fields of Mongolia in order to gain possession of the wealth of North Manchuria is part of our program of national development."

### Strategic Railways

Japan's feverish activities in Manchuria center about the building of three important railways, important strategically and economically. These railways are designed to permit quick concentration of troops in Manchuria as well as effective mobility in warfare. The plans for these roads were made years before the actual invasion of Manchuria. They are designed to undermine economically the Chinese-Eastern railway and to facilitate the immigration of Koreans into Manchuria. How these Koreans are to be used as tools is made abundantly clear by Tanaka: "If the Koreans come to this district we must offer them financial support through our trust societies and other financial organizations. These organizations must have property rights,

and the Koreans will be limited to the right to work upon the land. Formally, however, the Koreans must have property rights. . . Thus we shall, unnoticed, gain the control of the best rice plantations which our immigrants, i. e., the Japanese, must receive. They will have to displace the Koreans, who in their turn, will seek new lands which, in the future, will also come into the hands of our people."

### What of the Chinese Revolution?

The Japanese can succeed in their blood and iron policy aside from the jealous intervention of the other imperialists, only when the Chinese revolution fails utterly, that is, if the Chinese workers fail to take the power in the near future, leading the peasantry in revolt. The repercussion of such a revolution on the Japanese workers and peasants would, under present conditions, be instantaneous and profound. This problem will require our attention in a later article.

### Japan and the U. S.

In its policy of imperialist expansion Japan has come into direct conflict time and again with all the other imperialist powers. But particularly is this the case with respect to the U. S. since the Russo-Jap War. Today the question of war between these two imperialist states is openly discussed in the press of the entire world. The problem of imperialist war is frequently posed by Communists in such a manner as to posit a race between the outbreak of this U. S.-Jap war and war against the Soviet Union. The Stalinist method of approaching the problem of defending the Soviet Union, taking into account this imperialist rivalry (incorrect so!) has led however to such inopportune and dangerous expedients as that of having the U. S. Communist party demonstrate before the Japanese consulates with the demand for expulsion of the Japanese representatives. Such a method of approach is best calculated to mislead the working class.

The population of Japan, static for

the two hundred years preceding the Restoration, has doubled during the last sixty-five years. The birth rate of Japan is so extremely high that despite the high death rate there is an annual increase of population of 750,000. Of this number less than 10 percent have been annually absorbed into industry, leaving the remainder to find a place ultimately in an agricultural economy already overburdened under the present system and unable to provide food for the people of Japan. The Japanese government has been forced to approve, tacitly, of measures for birth control and to encourage emigration. Those who emigrate, particularly to Brazil and other South American countries are given 300 yen, providing they agree to renounce their citizenship and not to return to Japan. But these measures have not helped. Nor has there been much of a movement to colonize Manchuria where the climate is too rigorous and the food too different from that to which the Jap is accustomed. The Japs prefer warmer lands where rice is readily grown. Hence their great interest in the 7,000 islands making up the Archipelago of which the Philippines form a part, sparsely populated compared to Japan itself. The Japanese government has designs also on the thousands of islands (five times the area of Japan) in the East Indian Archipelago.

### The Philippines

These islands, seized by the United States at the same time that China was being threatened with partition among the European powers in 1898, form the first obstacle to Japan's "place in the sun". The islands contain iron ores but no coal, these ores now forming one source of supply for Japan. The United States is interested in exploiting the Philippines for the production of rubber, so as to break the irritating monopoly of the British and Dutch. Furthermore, the Philippines form the outpost for U. S. imperialism in the Far East. (To Be Continued)



STALINISTS TAKE MEASURES

The Expulsion of Zinoviev

The Lessons of the Second Expulsion of the Capitulators

ZINOVIEV o Now the situation has changed at the root. True, the newspaper articles explaining the expulsion proclaim that because we have grown economically extremely strong, and because the party has become a...solutely monolithic, therefore we cannot tolerate "the slightest conciliatory spirit." But in this explanation the white threads that baste it together, stick out all too clumsily in open view. The necessity for the expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev, for an obviously fictitious reason, testifies quite on the contrary to the extreme weakening of Stalin and his faction. Zinoviev and Kamenev had to be liquidated post haste not because of a change in their behavior but because of a change in the background. Khrushchev's group, independently of its actual activity, is dragged along, in the given instance, in order to garnish the service. In the foreknowledge of the fact that they may be soon brought to account, the Stalinists are "taking measures."

In general, one cannot deny the fact that the judicial combination of the Rights, who inspired Stalin's policies in 1923-1928, of two actual or supposed former "Trotskyists" and of Zinoviev and Kamenev, guilty of knowing but not informing—that this, to repeat, is a product entirely worthy of the political creativeness of Stalin, Yaroslavsky and Zagoda. A classic amalgam of the Thermidorian type! The goal of the combination consists in mixing up the cards, disorienting the party, increasing the ideological confusion and thus hindering the workers from making out what's what, and muddling the way out. The supplementary task consists in politically lowering Zinoviev and Kamenev, former leaders of the Left Opposition, now being expelled for "amity" toward the Right Opposition.

Zinoviev's Game with History Inevitably a question arises, how is it that old Bolsheviks, men who are wise and experienced in politics, gave their opponent an opportunity to deal them such a blow? How could they, who renounced their own platform for the sake of remaining in the party, when all is said and done, fly out of the party because of a fictitious connection with a platform foreign to them? One must perforce reply that this result also did not come about accidentally. Zinoviev and Kamenev tried to play tricks with history. Of course, they were motivated, first of all, by solicitude for the Soviet Union, for the unity of the party, and not at all for their personal welfare. But they posed their tasks not on the plane of the Russian and World revolution but on a much lower plane of the Soviet bureaucracy.

In those most difficult hours for them, on the eve of capitalism, they adjured us, then their allies, "to meet the party half-way". We replied that we were prepared to meet the party all the way, but in another and a higher sense than was required by Stalin and Yaroslavsky. But was that not a split? Was that not a threat of civil war and of the downfall of the Soviet power?—We replied, if it did not encounter our opposition, Stalin's policies would inevitably doom the Soviet power to ruin. And this is the idea that is expressed in our platform. What conquers are principles. Capitulation can never be victorious. We shall do everything in our power so that the struggle for principles be led in consonance with and after consideration of the entire situation, both domestic and foreign. But it is impossible to foresee all the variations of development. Nevertheless it is absurd and criminal to play hide and seek with revolution, to use trickery in dealing with classes and diplomacy with history. In such complex and responsible situations one must be guided by a rule so excellently expressed by the French in the proverb, *Fais ce que doit, advienne que pourra!* Perform your duty, let come what may!

Zinoviev and Kamenev have fallen the victims because they did not keep to this rule.

If one leaves aside the absolutely demoralized part of the capitulators of the type of Radek and Piatakov, who, as journalists or functionaries, will continue to serve every victorious faction (under the pretext of serving socialism), then the capitulators taken as a political group, represent in themselves moderate intra-party "liberals" who, at a given moment, rushed too far to the Left (or to the Right) and who subsequently took to the road of coming to terms with the ruling bureaucracy. But the present day is characterized by the fact that this conciliation, which appeared so final, has begun to crack and to explode, and thereto in an extremely acute form. The tremendous symptomatic significance of the expulsion of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Uglanov and the others originates in the fact that in the new clashes at the "tops" there are reflected the profound surges in the masses.

The Basis Under the Capitulations What political prerequisites were there that conditioned the period of capitulations in 1929-1930? They were: the bureaucratic turn of the helm to the Left; the successes of the industrialization; the quick growth of collectivization. The five year plan absorbed the working masses. A great perspective was opened up. The workers were reconciled to the loss of political independence in expectation of near and decisive, socialist successes. The peasant poor awaited from the collectives a change in their future. The standard of living of the lowest layers of the peasantry rose higher; it is true, to a considerable measure, at the expense of the basic funds of rural economy. Such

were the economic prerequisites and the political atmosphere of the epidemic of capitulation.

The growth of economic disproportions, the aggravation in the situation of the masses, the growth of dissatisfaction, of the workers as well as of the peasants, confusion in the apparatus itself—these are the prerequisites for the revival of all, and of every kind of Opposition. The sharpness of contradictions and the intensity of alarm in the party push ever more onto the road of protest the moderate, cautious and always-ready-for-compromise, party "liberals". Driven into a blind alley the bureaucracy immediately replies with repressions, in a large measure preventive.

We do not as yet hear the voice of the Left Opposition in the open. Small wonder! Those same bourgeois papers that relate about the favors presumably in store for Rykov and Bukharin, simultaneously report "new mass arrests among the Trotskyists". The Left Opposition in the USSR was subjected in the course of a number of years to such fearful police persecution, its cadres were placed in such exceptional conditions that it is infinitely more difficult for it than for the legal "liberals" openly to formulate its opposition and to intervene organizationally into the developing events. By the way, the history of bourgeois revolutions reminds us that in their struggle against autocracy, the liberals, utilizing their legal prerogatives, always came out first in the name of the "people"; only the struggle between the liberal bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy cleared the way for the proletariat. Of course what is concerned here is merely a matter of historical analogy; but we still think that it does explain something.

The resolution of the September plenum of the C. E. C. boasts out of time and out of place that having crushed counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, having exposed the anti-Leninist kulak essence of the Right opportunists, the party...has attained at the present time decisive successes.... The nearest future, one should expect, will make clear that the Left and the Right Opposition are not only neither crushed nor annihilated but, on the contrary, that they alone exist politically. It was precisely the official policies of the last three or four years that prepared the conditions for a new

upsurge of the Right-Thermidorian tendencies. The striving of the Stalinists to lump into a single pile the Lefts and the Rights is facilitated to some measure by the fact that the Lefts and the Rights speak of a retreat for the time given. This is inevitable: the exigent need of a regulated retreat from the line of adventurist leap ahead has become the vital task of the proletarian state. The Centrist bureaucrats themselves dream of nothing else but the possibility of retreating in order, and without losing face completely, yet they cannot but recognize that a retreat in the face of the need for foodstuffs and for all other things may cost them all too dearly. For this reason they are retreating by stealth and by accusing the opposition of tendencies toward retreat.

The actual political danger consists in the fact that the Rights are a faction of permanent retreat and that they have now been given the opportunity to claim, "we have always demanded this". The twilight in which the party lives does not allow the workers to make out quickly the dialectics of economic processes and to appraise correctly the limited, temporary and conjunctural "correctness" of the Rights, along with the erroneous of their fundamental position.

The Importance of Our Policy All the more important, therefore, becomes the clear, independent, and looking to the far future, policy of the Bolshevik-Leninists. Follow carefully all the processes in the country and within the party! Appraise correctly different groupings according to their ideas and the social ties! Do not become frightened at isolated tactical coincidences with the Rights! Do not forget, because of tactical coincidences, the antagonism of the strategic lines!

The political differentiation in the Soviet proletariat will occur along the line of the following questions:—How to retreat? What are the limits of the retreat? When and how to pass over to a new offensive? What should be the tempos of the offensive? No matter how important these questions are in themselves, they alone do not suffice. We are not building policies for one country. The fate of the Soviet Union will be resolved in an indissoluble jointure with the world development. It is necessary to place again before the Russian workers the problems of world Communism in their full scope.

Only the independent emergence of the Left Opposition and the joining together of the basic proletarian kernel under its banner can resurrect the party, the Workers' State and the Communist International.

Prinkipo, October, 1932. —L. T.

protest vote became entirely undistinguishable from the conscious capitalist vote. Hence also the support of the Socialist party and the Communist party is the only material expression of opposition to the capitalist parties, recognizing, however, the limitations of a parliamentary elections in actually registering the working class sentiment. Moreover, when we speak of the support to the Socialist party in this sense, it is particularly important for us to remember that, while this was undoubtedly in the main a working class support, it could be recorded for its ticket also primarily because of the failures of the official Communist party leadership to indicate clearly the revolutionary direction. In this instance the reformists gained at the expense of the revolutionary party. Historically, this can only mean in opposition to the revolutionary party.

But in the United States today the economic basis for an ideological and political regrouping of class forces is already established. American politics will become Europeanized. It would at this moment be difficult to forget that the decisive economic factors which have long ago pricked the bubble of national self-sufficiency are also very strongly expressed in politics. As one small example we might mention the claim made by the various debtor nations, immediately after the elections, to get in on "the new deal". They want a suspension of the present payments due and a general downward revision of debt payments to the United States. This, of course, only testifies to the increasing

role played by American imperialism in world affairs. Its struggle for hegemony, its struggle to supplant the bourgeoisie of the other capitalist nations and simultaneously its efforts to save the whole of the capitalist system from the further extension of the October revolution, will in the main be determining for future political developments at home.

But within the United States the dialectics of class relations, resting upon the economic basis already created, is also at work performing its task of transforming the political backwardness of the working class into its opposite. There need be no doubt that on a historical plane the traditional two capitalist party system holding exclusive sway, will give way to parties contesting along class lines with a working class acting politically independent of the capitalist parties. That we know will be the direction. But it is not yet decided to what extent and for how long it may assume forms of social reformist political action. In that decision the Communist vanguard will play its part. And it is in consideration of this that the support recorded by the Socialist party deserves serious attention.

There have been tendencies before in the United States toward a break-up of the two party system, horizontally and along class lines. We had the various blocs of which the farm bloc and the "progressive" bloc became the most outstanding. They represented mainly the middle class elements from both parties seeking a way of combination against the big bourgeoisie. This is temporarily

arrested by all of these forces more or less being corralled behind Roosevelt as far as the elections were concerned. It is quite clear that the majority of the workers still followed this leadership of the middle class. But it is just as certain that the process of break-up cannot be arrested for very long.

Then will not the Socialist party become a more formidable political contender? Its growth is significant, not merely by the votes recorded which appear to be less than what was recorded by the Debs candidacy years ago; but it is significant from its position of almost non-existence a couple of years ago up until its ability today to enlist the support of considerable sections of the Leftward developing workers. It is taking on political form and its leaders are more skillfully manipulating the issues.

Problems of Social Reformism This has its important bearing upon the question which still confronts us namely, to what extent social reformism in general will develop in the United States and how to most effectively combat it and turn the tide in a revolutionary direction. We are not making any futile attempt at guessing whether social reformism will actually come into power, but merely concerning ourselves with its prospects of sway for a time within the working class. And in this respect, considering the general trend as well as the position of the Communist party, it would be difficult to deny such prospects. It is necessary to acknowledge the objective possibilities for social reformist developments, and to take them into account in our revolutionary strategy. Whether they will assume the form strictly speaking of a labor party, based upon the trade unions, or the Socialist party actually mustering the forces under its banner, is not yet certain. That depends upon many factors of future developments. But that social reformism will exist only as an opposition force to Communism is as certain as the fact that the rapidity of developments of capitalist contradictions will also serve to limit its existence.

As an imperialist power the United States faces the problem of further expanding its productive forces within a decaying capitalist world. Its very first steps in attempting to issue out of the crisis its reorganization and greater concentration of industry, its greater centralization of capital, its intensified exploitation of labor and general lowering of the standard of living narrows the margin of concessions which can be given to social reformism. And social reformism can in the final analysis exist only on such concession crumbs its possibility of functioning in the United States at all as a historically progressive force are becoming enormously lessened. The solution which American imperialism is seeking, in a historical sense, becomes at best a breathing spell which itself increases the social antagonisms. This embodies greater prospects for the revolutionary party. It is our task to fight at every step of the road against social reformism.

Rakovsky pointed out this reason of reasons more than two years ago.... "The reason for the increase in breakdowns, the reason for the falling in labor discipline, the reason for the need to increase the number of workers", he wrote, "lies in the fact that the worker is physically incapable of bearing up under a load that overtaxes his strength."

(To Be Continued)

LEON TROTSKY

Soviet Economy in Danger

(Continued from last issue)

The administrative hue and cry after quantity leads to a frightful lowering of quality; low quality undermines on the next stage the struggle for quantity; the ultimate cost of economically irrational "successes" surpasses as a rule many times the value of these same successes. Every advanced worker is acquainted with this dialectic not through the books of the Communist academy (alas! more inferior goods) but in practise, through experience in their own mine-shifts, factories, railroads, fuel stations, etc.

The consequences of the frenzied chase have permeated in all their entirety the sphere of education. Pravda is compelled to admit that, "by lowering the quality of preparation, by skipping scientific subjects, or by passing over them at "cavalry trot", the VTUZI (Highest Technological Educational Institution) that took this path instead of aiding industry, injured it." But, indeed who is responsible for the "cavalry trot" in the highest educational institutions?

If we were to introduce a corrective coefficient for quality into the official data, then the indices of the fulfillment of the plan would immediately suffer substantial drops. Even Kuybishev was forced to admit this more than a year ago. "The figures relating to the tremendous growth of industry become relative," he announced cautiously at the session of Supreme Soviet Economic Council, "if one takes into account the variations in quality."

Rakovsky expressed himself much more lucidly, "If one does not take into account the quality of production then the quantitative indices represent in themselves a statistical fiction."

Capital Construction More than two years ago, Rakovsky warned that the scope of the plan was beyond the available resources. "Neither the scale of the growth of production specified by the plan, "he wrote," nor the specified plan of capital construction were prepared for...The entire preceding policy in the sphere of industry reduced itself in reality to the forced exploitation of old fixed capital...without the slightest concern for the future."

The attempt to compensate for lapses by a single leap ahead is least realistic in the sphere of capital construction. The resources necessary for the fulfillment of the plan "do not obtain in the country, and will not obtain in the nearest future." Hence the warning: "the plan of the capital construction will be broken

down in a considerable measure."

And this prediction also has been completely substantiated. In the sphere of construction the lag was extremely great as early as 1931. It has grown still more in the current year. The transport construction program for 9 months was fulfilled 38 percent according to the estimates of the department itself. In other branches the matters relating to construction are as a general rule even less favorable; and worst of all is the sphere of housing construction. The material and monetary resources are divided between altogether too many constructions which leads to the low effectiveness of the investment.

Sixty-five million roubles were expended on the Balhashaysky copper factory, the expenses continue to grow from day to day—factually all for nothing! in order to continue work it was necessary to transport in the course of a year 300 thousand tons of freight, whereas the ready transport provides all told only 20 thousand tons. Examples of a similar kind, though not of such clarity, are too many.

The poor quality of materials and of equipment react most cruelly on the capital construction. "Iron for roofing is of such rotten quality," writes Pravda, "that it cracks when once handled."

The shocking lagging behind in the sphere of capital undertakings automatically undermines the foundations of the second five year plan.

Domestic Disproportions and the World Market The problem of the proportionality of the elements of production and the branches of economy constitutes the very heart of socialist economy. The tortuous roads that lead to the solution of this problem are not charted on any map. To discover them, or more correctly to lay them—this is the work of a lengthy and arduous future.

The entire industry groans from the lack of spare parts. Weavers' looms remain inactive because a bolt is not to be had. "The assortment of articles produced," writes E. J., "in the line of commodities of widespread consumption is haphazard and does not correspond to...the demand."

"One billion roubles has been immobilized, 'frozen' by (heavy) industry, in the course of only the first half of 1932, in the form of stocks of materials, unfinished products and even finished goods in factory warehouses." (For Industrialization,

September 12, 1932). Such are the expressions in terms of money of certain disproportions and discordances according to the official estimate.

Major and minor disproportions call forth the need of turning to the international market. Imported goods to the value of one chervontz can bring out of its moribund state home production to the value of hundreds and thousands of chervontz. The general growth of economy, on the one hand, and the sprouting up of new demands and new disproportions, on the other, invariably increase the need of linking up with the world economy. The program of "independence" i. e., of the self-sufficient character of Soviet economy, discloses more and more its reactionary and utopian character. Autarchy—is the ideal of Hitler, and not of Marx, and Lenin.

Thus the import of ore from the inception of the five year plan multiplied five times in volume and four times in value. If within the current year this article of import fell off, it was exclusively on account of the foreign exchange. But on this account the import of factory machinery grew excessively.

Kaganovich in a speech on October 8 asserted that the opposition, Left as well as Right, "proposes to us that we strengthen our dependence upon the capitalist world." As if the matter concerned some artificial and arbitrary step, and not the automatic logic of economic growth!

At the same time the Soviet press cites with praise the interview given by Sokolnikov on the eve of his departure from London. "In England there is increasingly spreading the recognition of the fact that the advanced position of the Soviet state in industry and technology will present in itself a much wider market for the products of British industry." As a sign of the economic progress of the Soviet Union, Sokolnikov considers not the weakening but the strengthening of the ties with the foreign market, and consequently the strengthening of the dependence upon world economy. Is it possible that the former Oppositionist Sokolnikov is trading in "Trotskyist contraband"? But if so, why is he being screened by the official press?

The Position of the Workers Stalin's speech in July 1931 with its salutary "six conditions" was directed against the low quality of the production, the high basic cost, the migration of laboring forces, the high percentage of waste, etc. From that time on there has not appeared an article without reference to "the historic speech". And in the meantime all these ailments which were to be cured by the six conditions have become aggravated and have assumed a more malignant character.

From day to day the official press bears witness to the downfall of Stalin's prescription. In explanation of the falling off in production Pravda points out: "The decrease in labor power at factories, the growing migration, the weakening of labor discipline" (September 23). In the category of reasons for the extremely low productivity of the Red Ural combine, "For Industrialization", alongside of "the shocking disproportions between the different parts of the combine" lists the following (1) "the enormous migration of labor forces"; (2) "the underhead-ed policy of the working wage" (3) "failure to provide (the millworkers) with some manner of liveable quarters"; (4) "indescribable food for the millworkers"; (5) "the catastrophic falling off of labor discipline." We have quoted word for word. As regards the migration, which "has grown beyond all bounds", this same paper writes, "the living conditions (of the workers) are ghastly in all the enterprises of non-ferrous metallurgy without exception."

In the locomotive factories, which failed to provide the country with about 250 locomotives for the first three-quarters of the year, "there is to be observed an acute insufficiency of qualified workers. More than 2,000 workers in the course of the summer left from the single Kolomoensk factory." The reasons? "Bad living conditions." In the Sormovsk factory—"the factory kitchen is a dive of the worst sort." (For Industrialization, September 28) In the privileged tractor factory in Stalingrad, "the factory kitchen has fallen sharply in its work" (Pravda, September 21). To what a pitch the dissatisfaction of the workers must have risen in order to force these facts into the columns of the Stalinist press!

In the textile industry, naturally, conditions are not better. "In the Ivanovsk district alone," E. L. informs us, "about 35,000 qualified weavers left the enterprises." According to the words of this same paper, there are to be found enterprises in the country in which more than 60 percent of the total force changes every month. "The factory is turning into a thoroughfare."

In explanation of the cruel flop of "the six conditions" there was for a long time a tendency to confine the observations to bald accusations against the management and the workers themselves, "incapacity", "lack of willingness", "resting on their laurels", etc. However, for the last few months the papers more and more often point out, mostly on the sly, the actual core of the evil, the unbearable living conditions of the workers.

Rakovsky pointed out this reason of reasons more than two years ago.... "The reason for the increase in breakdowns, the reason for the falling in labor discipline, the reason for the need to increase the number of workers", he wrote, "lies in the fact that the worker is physically incapable of bearing up under a load that overtaxes his strength."

(To Be Continued)

The Situation on the Eve of the Second 5 Yr. Plan - - A Marxian Analysis

The 1932 Elections and the American Working Class

The presidential elections have once again rendered devastating proof of the paradox of a politically terribly backward working class in a highly developed industrial country. That is shown on the face of the returns. But it is still necessary to probe a little deeper to enable us to find the trends which are indicative of the future.

Here we have a situation of more than three years of acute economic crisis and yet we have reached no further than the democratic party, one of the very important cogs of the system itself, being able to corral an overwhelming majority on the promise of "a new deal." It is indisputable that the issues of the economic crisis pressed forward, overshadowing everything else in the elections. But the results, insofar as they were expressed in elections, were only the fact that the Republican administration and Hoover received the blame for the crisis and the democratic party marshalled by and large the mighty, but blind protest vote.

Discontent and Radicalization Are we to conclude from this that there is not as yet any visible radicalization of the American workers or any visible Leftward trend accelerated by the effects of the crisis? Let us say at the outset that we do not at all proceed from the fundamentally false estimates of radicalization made by the official party leadership. With that we have nothing in common. Nevertheless it would be incorrect to conclude that there are not yet tendencies of a Leftward development of the American workers.

No one could fail to notice the enormous discontentment as revealed by the elections, and revealed clearly also in demonstrations outside the elections. But it is still groping. Politically, in the main, it is still harnessed within the traditional channels, flowing from one capitalist party to another. This is the one side of the picture, on the other there is the growth of support enjoyed by the Socialist party. In this instance that does represent a swing away from capitalist allegiances of the past, despite the fact that its historical meaning becomes something else. Also, in actual numbers, there is a growth of the Communist vote in such instances where the official party managed to get on the ballot. A growth, however, which is entirely too insignificant to be commensurate with the opportunities which were at hand. But that is, as has been said before in these columns, particularly due to the failure of the official party leadership to conduct an election campaign in such a manner and to pursue a policy in the day-to-day struggles which will win for the party at least a measure of confidence of the discontented masses.

Above all one must remember the political background of the American working class. The European tradition of independent political action has not yet been established. The American workers, regardless of their many heroic examples of strike struggles, have not yet learned to act as a class in a political sense. That, of course, is expressed also in the parliamentary elections. Hence its blind

protest vote became entirely undistinguishable from the conscious capitalist vote. Hence also the support of the Socialist party and the Communist party is the only material expression of opposition to the capitalist parties, recognizing, however, the limitations of a parliamentary elections in actually registering the working class sentiment. Moreover, when we speak of the support to the Socialist party in this sense, it is particularly important for us to remember that, while this was undoubtedly in the main a working class support, it could be recorded for its ticket also primarily because of the failures of the official Communist party leadership to indicate clearly the revolutionary direction. In this instance the reformists gained at the expense of the revolutionary party. Historically, this can only mean in opposition to the revolutionary party.

But in the United States today the economic basis for an ideological and political regrouping of class forces is already established. American politics will become Europeanized. It would at this moment be difficult to forget that the decisive economic factors which have long ago pricked the bubble of national self-sufficiency are also very strongly expressed in politics. As one small example we might mention the claim made by the various debtor nations, immediately after the elections, to get in on "the new deal". They want a suspension of the present payments due and a general downward revision of debt payments to the United States. This, of course, only testifies to the increasing

role played by American imperialism in world affairs. Its struggle for hegemony, its struggle to supplant the bourgeoisie of the other capitalist nations and simultaneously its efforts to save the whole of the capitalist system from the further extension of the October revolution, will in the main be determining for future political developments at home.

But within the United States the dialectics of class relations, resting upon the economic basis already created, is also at work performing its task of transforming the political backwardness of the working class into its opposite. There need be no doubt that on a historical plane the traditional two capitalist party system holding exclusive sway, will give way to parties contesting along class lines with a working class acting politically independent of the capitalist parties. That we know will be the direction. But it is not yet decided to what extent and for how long it may assume forms of social reformist political action. In that decision the Communist vanguard will play its part. And it is in consideration of this that the support recorded by the Socialist party deserves serious attention.

There have been tendencies before in the United States toward a break-up of the two party system, horizontally and along class lines. We had the various blocs of which the farm bloc and the "progressive" bloc became the most outstanding. They represented mainly the middle class elements from both parties seeking a way of combination against the big bourgeoisie. This is temporarily

arrested by all of these forces more or less being corralled behind Roosevelt as far as the elections were concerned. It is quite clear that the majority of the workers still followed this leadership of the middle class. But it is just as certain that the process of break-up cannot be arrested for very long.

Then will not the Socialist party become a more formidable political contender? Its growth is significant, not merely by the votes recorded which appear to be less than what was recorded by the Debs candidacy years ago; but it is significant from its position of almost non-existence a couple of years ago up until its ability today to enlist the support of considerable sections of the Leftward developing workers. It is taking on political form and its leaders are more skillfully manipulating the issues.

Problems of Social Reformism This has its important bearing upon the question which still confronts us namely, to what extent social reformism in general will develop in the United States and how to most effectively combat it and turn the tide in a revolutionary direction. We are not making any futile attempt at guessing whether social reformism will actually come into power, but merely concerning ourselves with its prospects of sway for a time within the working class. And in this respect, considering the general trend as well as the position of the Communist party, it would be difficult to deny such prospects. It is necessary to acknowledge the objective possibilities for social reformist developments, and to take them into account in our revolutionary strategy. Whether they will assume the form strictly speaking of a labor party, based upon the trade unions, or the Socialist party actually mustering the forces under its banner, is not yet certain. That depends upon many factors of future developments. But that social reformism will exist only as an opposition force to Communism is as certain as the fact that the rapidity of developments of capitalist contradictions will also serve to limit its existence.

As an imperialist power the United States faces the problem of further expanding its productive forces within a decaying capitalist world. Its very first steps in attempting to issue out of the crisis its reorganization and greater concentration of industry, its greater centralization of capital, its intensified exploitation of labor and general lowering of the standard of living narrows the margin of concessions which can be given to social reformism. And social reformism can in the final analysis exist only on such concession crumbs its possibility of functioning in the United States at all as a historically progressive force are becoming enormously lessened. The solution which American imperialism is seeking, in a historical sense, becomes at best a breathing spell which itself increases the social antagonisms. This embodies greater prospects for the revolutionary party. It is our task to fight at every step of the road against social reformism.

arrested by all of these forces more or less being corralled behind Roosevelt as far as the elections were concerned. It is quite clear that the majority of the workers still followed this leadership of the middle class. But it is just as certain that the process of break-up cannot be arrested for very long.

Then will not the Socialist party become a more formidable political contender? Its growth is significant, not merely by the votes recorded which appear to be less than what was recorded by the Debs candidacy years ago; but it is significant from its position of almost non-existence a couple of years ago up until its ability today to enlist the support of considerable sections of the Leftward developing workers. It is taking on political form and its leaders are more skillfully manipulating the issues.

Problems of Social Reformism This has its important bearing upon the question which still confronts us namely, to what extent social reformism in general will develop in the United States and how to most effectively combat it and turn the tide in a revolutionary direction. We are not making any futile attempt at guessing whether social reformism will actually come into power, but merely concerning ourselves with its prospects of sway for a time within the working class. And in this respect, considering the general trend as well as the position of the Communist party, it would be difficult to deny such prospects. It is necessary to acknowledge the objective possibilities for social reformist developments, and to take them into account in our revolutionary strategy. Whether they will assume the form strictly speaking of a labor party, based upon the trade unions, or the Socialist party actually mustering the forces under its banner, is not yet certain. That depends upon many factors of future developments. But that social reformism will exist only as an opposition force to Communism is as certain as the fact that the rapidity of developments of capitalist contradictions will also serve to limit its existence.

As an imperialist power the United States faces the problem of further expanding its productive forces within a decaying capitalist world. Its very first steps in attempting to issue out of the crisis its reorganization and greater concentration of industry, its greater centralization of capital, its intensified exploitation of labor and general lowering of the standard of living narrows the margin of concessions which can be given to social reformism. And social reformism can in the final analysis exist only on such concession crumbs its possibility of functioning in the United States at all as a historically progressive force are becoming enormously lessened. The solution which American imperialism is seeking, in a historical sense, becomes at best a breathing spell which itself increases the social antagonisms. This embodies greater prospects for the revolutionary party. It is our task to fight at every step of the road against social reformism.

Rakovsky pointed out this reason of reasons more than two years ago.... "The reason for the increase in breakdowns, the reason for the falling in labor discipline, the reason for the need to increase the number of workers", he wrote, "lies in the fact that the worker is physically incapable of bearing up under a load that overtaxes his strength."

(To Be Continued)

Mister Duranty and Comrade Stalin

(Continued from page 1)

before the Soviet Government as a positive menace, because things being what they are, the Soviet Union would be almost inevitably involved. Even if Russia managed to hold aloof, a grave disturbance in Europe, especially a revolutionary disturbance, would work havoc with the Five-Year Plan, which is the keynote and kernel of Soviet policy."

Even passing acquaintance with Stalinist primers of "socialism in one country" will enable anybody to recognize in the above quotations simply a Durantesque popularization for American consumption of the theory of "socialism in one country". At the expense of Mr. Duranty's generously preferred wireless dispatch charge account, "somebody" in Moscow is giving a tip to the "important" readers of the New York Times: This is not Lenin's time; Stalin has come into power. World revolution may have been in the air during the days when Lenin and Trotsky were sowing the wild oats of the young Russian revolution. Today we are interested in one country alone and we don't take the Comintern too seriously (didn't Stalin tell Lominadze that the C. I. would collapse if it were not for the subsidy?). Therefore, orient yourselves accordingly. This is the tip and it is too obvious to require comment, at least on our part. But the New York Times

does not make a comment (and it also takes the tip) which repays quoting: "In Moscow," says its editorial of November 23, "writes Mr. Duranty, there is one menace which is feared above all others, and it is the outbreak of a revolution in Germany or elsewhere in Europe. This is a far cry from the time when Lenin staged the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, not because he was interested in Russia but because he wished to set Western Europe on fire. Today Stalin does not want to set anything on fire. He wants to be let alone to build socialism in Russia. He is afraid of revolution abroad, even if it comes without Soviet aid. A German revolution is sure to be followed by a Fascist counter-revolution, and in the swing-back Russia is likely to be swept along with the rest."

With minor amendments, the comment of the Times editors is fairly keen and warranted. Only one other "comment" is missing: What have the Communist militants to say about the "entente cordiale" in the realm of revolutionary philosophy so affectingly concluded between the former Riga liar and purveyor of the "nationalization of women in Russia" slander, on the one hand, and the "best discipline of Lenin", Joseph Stalin, on the other? It is worth re- flecting upon!

—S.

does not make a comment (and it also takes the tip) which repays quoting: "In Moscow," says its editorial of November 23, "writes Mr. Duranty, there is one menace which is feared above all others, and it is the outbreak of a revolution in Germany or elsewhere in Europe. This is a far cry from the time when Lenin staged the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, not because he was interested in Russia but because he wished to set Western Europe on fire. Today Stalin does not want to set anything on fire. He wants to be let alone to build socialism in Russia. He is afraid of revolution abroad, even if it comes without Soviet aid. A German revolution is sure to be followed by a Fascist counter-revolution, and in the swing-back Russia is likely to be swept along with the rest."

With minor amendments, the comment of the Times editors is fairly keen and warranted. Only one other "comment" is missing: What have the Communist militants to say about the "entente cordiale" in the realm of revolutionary philosophy so affectingly concluded between the former Riga liar and purveyor of the "nationalization of women in Russia" slander, on the one hand, and the "best discipline of Lenin", Joseph Stalin, on the other? It is worth re- flecting upon!

—S.

—ARNE SWABECK.