

WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE

THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 23, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879
VOLUME V, NO. 39 [WHOLE NO. 135] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1932 PRICE 5 CENTS

MILITANT SUB DRIVE Our Club Plan

HALF YEAR SUBS FOR 50 CENTS

A half year sub of 26 issues of *The Militant* costs \$1. But from now on it will be 50 cents—that is, provided you send them in clubs of four or more. Any comrade, sympathizer, worker can get a half year sub to *The Militant* at the reduced rate of 50 cents by getting three other workers to subscribe with him. All they have to do is fill out the blank provided below and send it in to us at 84 East 10th Street. We will enter them on the mailing list and they will receive the *Militant* for the twenty-six weeks following the receipt of their club plan blank.

Any worker in a position to get subs on this basis can have, free for the asking, a number of blanks like the one below, for his use or for distribution. Just write in to ask for them and we will shoot them out. Of course this reduction in the subscription rate applies only to four half year subs sent in at the same time on one club blank. Half-year subs sent in singly or in less than four will still be one dollar per sub.

MILITANT BUILDERS

From now on only those comrades and sympathizers will be considered *Militant* Builders who send in one or more of these club plan blanks—filled out. Each builder will publish a standing of the weeks. And we expect it to be long, and the standing close. Past performances are no guarantee of leading honors in this drive. Everyone is placed squarely on his merit. It will be nip and tuck from start to finish.

IMPORTANCE OF THE DRIVE

Comrade Carmody writes from the coal fields that the miners are reacting to *The Militant* very favorably. They read our point of view on working-class problems and our policy on the present strike, and are very favorably impressed. A number of them would become subscribers but for one thing: they have been on strike since April and cannot afford a subscription.

With our new club plan we expect that a number of these wishes will be translated into subs, not all of them, to be sure but a number that we could not get otherwise. Our organizers in the field will see to that.

This club plan lends itself to our activities in the class struggle. Illinois is one example. The Spartacus Youth Club of New York is active in the Rex metal workers' strike, on the picket lines and in the strike hall. No doubt they will be able to use the offer of a fifty percent reduction in the sub rate to get a number of subs from the workers.

This increase in subs is what is needed to complement the steady rise in bundle orders. Every day's mail brings us new bundle orders and increases in the number of copies per bundle order. This side of the story affected us first because workers waking up to the bankruptcy of the Stalinist course and to the correctness of ours probably went from stand to stand looking for the *Militant*. As we know the *Militant* is on, comparatively, so few stands that the search for it is a modern version of the story of Diogenes.

Many of these workers will no doubt take advantage of this reduced rate. It will certainly pay them to do so. On the stand 26 issues will cost \$1.30. By the club they will cost \$50. The trick is to reach the workers with the offer. Today that is not difficult.

BUILD THE FIRST STOREY

For almost four years, now, we have poured forth a steady stream of Marxist-

(Continued on page 4)

MINERS! Read

LEON TROTSKY
ON

The Trade Union Question

Communism and Syndicalism

Paper Cover: 64 pages: 15 Cents
0 Cents in bundles of five or more.
Orders from our literature agent in Springfield, Illinois—Joseph Angelo; from Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Street, St. Louis, Mo.; or direct from

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

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

SPARTACUS AFFAIR

On Sunday, September 25, the Spartacus Youth Club of New York will get together for an all day good time affair. A ball game and other outdoor sports will be played. All sympathizers and members of the club—come out and let's get better acquainted. Bring your own lunch as this is an informal affair.

The place is Tibbetts Brook Park. Time, from 10 A. M. on. Take I. R. T. Woodlawn-Jerome Avenue line to last station, Walk to entrance of park. Comrades will be there to direct you until 12 o'clock.

The Militant Appeals Urgently for Aid from All Its Supporters

Once more we appeal to you, our comrades, sympathizers, and friends, for financial assistance. We declare to you that this is no mere appeal for money. The financial crisis against which we have been struggling has assumed such a threatening aspect that we are forced to sound a serious note of warning: Unless we can raise money immediately we cannot say whether we will be able to get out the next issue of the *Militant*.

We have tried every possible means of economy; every twist and dodge open to us. But despite our efforts on the fronts the crisis has made on us have affected us so badly that we have been drawn deeper into the bog of debts. These weigh on us now with terrific pressure. It seems that when difficulties arise creditors dun us with merciless insistence.

On top of all this a series of technical troubles on our press, arising directly from our poverty, have presented us with a number of problems. To solve them we have had to make terrific efforts. Such troubles may arise again unless we are able to get the minimum of equipment necessary to turn out our books and our papers.

We must have money at once. We are fighting on the financial front with our backs to the wall. With our fight is bound up the question of whether the voice of revolutionary internationalism, the clarion of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky will continue to be heard regularly.

With the tide of revolution rising all over the world, with the maturing of the great events that are on the order of the day, with ever greater historic tasks and responsibilities being placed on us by the development of the international revolution we must not retrench to a semi-monthly. We cannot miss even a single issue. To lose a day is a setback. We must continue to appear regularly. We must go forward.

We look to our friends everywhere to help us. Who will be the first? Start the ball rolling! Let every worker sympathetic to our cause contribute what he can. Make this a demonstration on a nation-wide scale of the fact that the cause of Marx and Lenin, the cause of the International Left is not without friends ready to support it and make sacrifices for it.

Rush funds at once to THE MILITANT at 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

Chicago Stalinists Echo Barbusse

CHICAGO.—

Another example of the efficacy of the Stalinist method of fighting against the war danger occurred here today. In a beautifully appointed, luxuriously carpeted lodge room in the Masonic Temple there was held the Chicago sequel to the Amsterdam farce. The audience was entirely composed of well-dressed pinks, liberals, social workers and other well known lovers of the human race. After listening to the disgusting pacifist diatribe one could only be glad that such was the composition and happy that the workers were conspicuous by their absence.

The meeting was opened by the soft-spoken preacher chairman representing the Abraham Lincoln Center. After a churchy exordium he introduced the first speaker, Rabbi Friedhof, "as one of the foremost fighters against all wars."

The Rabbi who went as far back as the Greeks for his inspiration, addressed himself entirely to the liberals. The only way to abolish wars, according to him, was for all liberals to band together and "will" the nasty wars out of existence. He questioned: "Will the overthrow of capitalism abolish war?" and he answers his own question by asserting that "the proletarian revolution is no guarantee against militarism." All that is required is that "the greatest agencies of propaganda be directed in the channels of creating the good will which will abolish all wars."

After this nauseating stuff, which was loudly applauded, the chairman introduces "Mr. Eugene Bechtold, an active member of the Chicago Committee for Abolition of Wars who has an interesting

message". For an instant there glimmered a faint hope in the hearts of the couple of Left Oppositionists present that finally some sort of a Communist viewpoint would break through. Comrades all know Bechtold as one of the pioneer Communists in this country and one of the extremely few party members left who have more than a bowing acquaintance with Marxian principles.

However, after the first few words our hopes were dashed, for the eloquent "Mr." Bechtold's mission was not to answer the liberals—but to take the collection! Not one word of criticism.

Next was introduced Mr. Malcolm Cowley, editor of the New Republic and American delegate to the Amsterdam Conference. His speech consisted of anecdotes of the conference and what this or that pacifist luminary said. He mildly insisted that the cause of wars was economic and showed by League of Nations figures how the cost of armaments was growing apace. When it came to the method of fighting for peace his was no different than Rabbi Friedhof's.

The meeting ended by the reading of the "pledge to stand against war" as the audience stood. Not a few had their heads bowed in the attitude of prayer. The reading of the solemn invocation was ended and the lips of many naturally and perceptibly moved to an Amen. No discussion was held.

On the way out the writer expressed his disgust to Bechtold standing in the back. Bechtold apologetically replied, "this is not a Communist meeting, we don't want to scare them away." "This is what Stalinism has wrought."

—J. GIGANTI

League to Open School

First Four Courses Will Begin in New York City Next Month

The Communist League of America has carried on extensive propaganda in the United States for the Marxian position of the International Left Opposition. We have been laying a solid foundation of Marxian principles. Upon this base we have developed, and upon this base the International Left Opposition continues to grow while the Right wing disintegrates as the Stalinists move deeper into contradictions of their own creation.

With this foundation, with our growth and with the increasingly favorable situation in the United States the Left Opposition can now take another step forward. The extension of our propaganda activity into greater class activity. One part of this activity is the transformation of the New York study classes into a school—the INTERNATIONAL WORKERS SCHOOL.

The INTERNATIONAL WORKERS SCHOOL is now a reality, and as a modest start we are opening an enrollment campaign for four classes to begin October 17. Just as fast as possible we will organize other classes equally as important as the first four.

By October 15 we will have a new headquarters for the Left Opposition and class rooms for the International Workers School. There will be office rooms, class rooms and a Hall for our regular Friday Forums. The first four classes will be:

The History of the American Communist Movement—James P. Cannon, 8 lessons every Monday from Oct. 17 to Dec. 5.
State and Revolution—Jack Weber, 10 lessons every Monday from October 17 to Dec. 19.
The History of the Comintern—Max Shachtman, 8 lessons every Wednesday

from Oct. 19 to Dec. 7.
The Theoretical System of Marxism—Hugo Oehler, 10 lessons from Oct. 19 to Dec. 21, every Wednesday.

Registration for each course is \$1.00. The teaching of Marxism cannot be carried on in the class rooms abstracted from the world-shaking class struggles of the proletariat. Communist classes cannot be carried on by self-styled individuals and study groups divorced from the class struggle. Nor can the members of the non-Marxian or revisionist currents of Marxism in one degree or another conduct study classes in Marxism. Only the Bolsheviki-Leninists who translate the class events into correct theory as a guide to class action can carry on Marxian teachings. The role of the International Left Opposition in the class struggles places a task and duty of developing a national training center for the American Communists. The International Workers School is another step forward in this field by the Left Opposition.

We are determined to carry through this plan. To do this we need your help. We need a fund of \$300.00 to launch the School and new headquarters. The followers of the Left Opposition throughout the United States must help in this. The burden rests upon the New York comrades but all help, all donations and contributions from any city to lay the foundation for a national training school is needed.

The New York workers must come in the office and enroll at once. Registration is \$1.00 per course. ENROLL NOW. Call or write for our catalogue. Mail all contributions, and registration fee to: J. Weber, Administrator, 84 East 10th Street, New York City.

Terror Rules in Illinois Coal Field

Official Party Leaders Forced to Abandon Sectarian Attitude Towards New Union

Significance of N.M.U. Offer of a United Front

The National Miners Union, officially, through its secretary, Frank Borich, has addressed a letter to the Progressive Miners of America, at Gillespie, Ill., voicing the unanimous deep concern of its national committee and its membership for the heroic struggle of the Illinois miners and proposing some measures of unity of action. It proposes a conference to be composed of representatives of both organizations to discuss the following points: "What can the National Miners Union do to help the Illinois miners to defeat the wage cut, and the strike breaking Lewis-Walker machine?"

This represents a complete round-about turn on the part of the official party leadership at the head of the affairs of the N. M. U. It is a change to be welcomed. But while this one instance is still far from an open acknowledgment of a necessary change of attitude in general on the vital policy, it is nevertheless possible to say that, if followed up correctly, this beginning can become of enormous importance to the American labor and revolutionary movement. Those who set themselves up as the high priests of a so-called new "revolutionary" theory of a "united front from below", which, of course, is no united front at all, have become compelled, not by virtue of their own theoretical conclusions to be sure, but at least by force of the realities the class struggle, to take a step toward a change in the right direction. The logic of the development of working class forces in motion compelled the official party leadership to begin to draw the conclusions which, on the basis of its false theoretical position it was incapable of arriving at.

What the N. M. U. Can Do for the Strike

It is quite clear that the pitiable position of the N. M. U., its organizational weakness, its isolation and disrepute suffered due to the strangulating bureaucracy imposed upon it, resting upon a false tactical foundation despite the heroic struggles that union has conducted, is in the main responsible for this change of front. Hence it is much more necessary for the Communist voices to continue relentlessly until this change becomes the true beginning toward a genuinely conceived working class united front policy.

In this present condition of the N. M. U., it must be admitted that there is not so much it can do directly to help win the Illinois strike and defeat the strike breaking Lewis-Walker machine. But as a representative of the Left wing forces there is much it can do. The N. M. U., despite its present shortcomings, expresses the ideas of the Left. It is a Left union. As such its essence embodies the essence of future unionism in the United States. It is in this light that the question of correct policy assumes its enormous significance.

It is a quite well known fact that the leadership of the Progressive Miners of America contains many elements whose ideological base is an outright reactionary one. There are opportunist elements and timid elements who particularly fear any contamination with "Red" issues. It is most likely that all these will unite to oppose the overture made and the hand extended by the N. M. U.—if not as yet in a direct sense, then at least indirectly for the time being, until they may feel themselves more ready to thwart the rank and file desires. And this is precisely what needs to be guarded against. There need not be any doubt that the Illinois rank and file miners, to the very deepest core of their ranks, genuinely and seriously desire an honestly conceived unity of action in this fateful moment and for the future of their new union.

However, this proposal made by the N. M. U. represents only one small step. The Illinois miners' strike and the defeat of the Lewis-Walker machine—there is only one side of the question. To what that must be added the one of the future of unionism, of uncorrupted unionism, of militant unionism resting on a class struggle basis, throughout the mine fields. That much the miners understood today. But how to attain it? That is the problem.

We are convinced that in this respect we have made and fought for the correct proposals, both by propaganda in these columns as well as through the direct and loyal activities of our comrades in the field. We can conceive of no better way than to follow up these proposals and we therefore take the liberty to advise the militants in the Progressive Miners of America to fight for their realization. To accept the invitation from the N. M. U. honestly and sincerely, but to broaden its base by proposing a conference to which shall be invited also the Miners of America that was Virginia and other sections which have broken with the Lewis machine. To propose that this conference consider ways and means of a united front of these various organi-

zations in the struggle for wages and working conditions, in the struggle against the remnants of the Lewis machine as well as ways and means toward complete unity of militant unionism in the mine fields. —THE MILITANT.

Frame-Up Challenge Stays Unanswered by Party

Central Executive Committee

Communist Party of the United States:

The *Daily Worker* of August 23, contained a direct frame-up charge of murder against the Communist Left Opposition. This was repeated by you in a number of leaflets issued as well as in subsequent issues of the *Daily Worker*.

We could consider this only as a vicious attempt to incite a black hundred pogrom campaign against us in lieu of the failure on your part to answer politically a single one of our arguments on vital working class problems. We so branded it in our public declaration published in *The Militant* of August 27. We also declared our readiness to have the facts of the situation, which you turned into a dastardly frame-up, fully investigated at a public working class hearing. To this effect we addressed a letter to the following central organizations:

Communist Party of U. S. A.
Trade Union Unity League
American Civil Liberties Union
Conference for Progressive Labor Action

Communist Party (Majority Group)

Industrial Workers of the World

You failed to answer this letter, and so did the I. I. D. and the TUUL which you direct. The other organizations declared themselves ready to participate in a public hearing. To us this is the most convincing proof that you were not at all prepared even to make an attempt before the eyes of the working class to make good your charge. You found that your foul attempt of incitement did not succeed and you were compelled to back down.

In view of this retreat from a false and unsubstantiated position on your part we intend not to make any further request upon the other organizations mentioned for a public hearing. Your fear of meeting the issue squarely before the working class has therefore closed this phase of the incident.

We do declare, however, that this contemptible effort on your part, stooping to the worst methods of reaction, served to open the eyes of many serious Communist workers and render them more willing to listen to what the Left Opposition has to say. Of this we have received ample proof by growing sympathy for our ideas. We shall not fail in the least to continue our political hammer blows for a return of the Communist Party to a Leninist basis.

Communist League of America (Opposition)
—ARNE SWABECK, Sec'y.

Progressive Miners Union Under Severe Attack

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—

The Progressive Miners of America, the new union in this district, came into being as another sell-out was being perpetrated by the traitorous leadership of the old U. M. W. A. headed by John J. Walker and John L. Lewis in their attempt to force the miners to accept another 25% reduction in the already reduced starvation wages of the miners.

The leadership of the P. M. A. is composed of varying shades of political opinion. There are republicans and democrats, S. P. and Musteltes with Communists in a very small minority, whilst official Communism is not represented in this great struggle of the miners.

Confusion Sowed

The various shades, expressing their opinions at mass meetings, sow confusion in the minds of the miners who are decidedly militant and class conscious. The rank and file of the bituminous area are rampant and voice in true militant spirit that resentment engendered by the corrupt and degenerate leadership of the U. M. W. A. The miners have always been in the front ranks of the American class struggle and today they are showing the road which the entire American working mass must follow in this particular phase of the class struggle.

This new union, born on the eve of the betrayal by the reactionary misleadership, is not going to surrender to the bosses' agents, Walker-Lewis, without a merciful struggle. Those miners who have been months on the picket line are very watchful of the men they have chosen to lead them in this strike. The first false move of the leadership toward capitulation to the new scale proffered by the bosses will mean that the rank and file will again choose men who will not sell out their very meager demands.

The miners know that this fight is the initial start of the general defense which the entire working class is taking up against the onslaughts of American capitalism in its attempt to place the burdens of the crisis on the backs of the workers. In order to break the strike and have the mines guarded by the state militia, Lewis and his henchmen are pulling off some old tricks. East Sunday morning the offices of the Taylorville Breeze, an organ of the bosses, and the sub-district office of the U. M. W. A. were dynamited, a provocation to cover up Gov. Emmerson's willingness to bring the state troopers into action. Now at Taylorville there are two companies of artillery, working under orders from the Peabody Coal Co. and Lewis, prevent picketing and mass meetings. But the mines remain closed.

A Reign of Terror
The state, Peabody, and Lewis, have their major concentration in Franklin Williamson and Saline Counties. Here their heavy artillery is brought into play, (Continued on page 3)

Barbusse-Stalin Congress

Stalinists and Opposition

Twenty-one hundred delegates participated in the Amsterdam Congress. All around the Congress large inscriptions in chalk covered the sidewalks: "Long live Trotsky!", "Free Rakovsky and the deported Oppositionists!" These were the immense signs which met the delegates.

The opening speech by Barbusse was a pathetic eulogy to the "manifestation of the strength and sincerity of the Congress", logically hailed as a decisive stage in human history. In greeting this assemblage "above the parties", Barbusse nevertheless promised a "thoroughgoing discussion and study" of all the proposals. The declaration of Romain Rolland to the first session addressed itself to "the army of men and women of the whole world" coming "to declare, to impose, peace upon the world." This appeal by Rolland, declaring that it does "not call into question the doctrines and tactics of the parties", raised as a principle that "each front has its own freedom of action". These declarations set the tone from the outset for the whole of the Congress.

The election of the presidium took place in the atmosphere of passive unanimity to which the Congress was delivered bound hand and foot. It was composed of a heterogeneous succession of personages chosen for their renown. Cachin and Mme. Duchene, Barbusse and Fonteny, wearing the rosette of the Legion d'Honneur, the leader of an association of radical veterans, Muenzenberg and the General Baron von Schoenbach, Katayama, Patel and Mme. Sun Yat Sen. Behind them were called a few worker militants. In this manner was the show-front of the Congress constituted

(Continued on page 2)

The Amsterdam «Charter»

The Amsterdam Congress came to an end on August 29 with the vote for a scandalous manifesto which is to serve as the "charter" of action for those who adopted it. The fourth of September, that is, a week afterwards, this manifesto has not yet been published anywhere, (in the United States, it has not yet been published.—Ed.). Why?

L'Humanite (central organ of the French Communist Party) of September 4 speaks of the "putting into effect of the Congress decisions". Which decisions? It is eight days since the reports of the Congress have been made, but the essential part of them—the "charter", the manifesto, the "decisions"—has not been made public.

Can it be that the text, after the vote, is still being retouched?

However that may be, a text was submitted to the Congress (in four languages: French, German, English and Dutch). A few changes of detail were made in the text distributed through the Congress, changes known from the reading of the final text by Barbusse.

On the vote the floor was refused to us in spite of our vehement insistence. It was accorded, however, to Mr. Patel, the former president of the Indian National Congress, who explained his objections at length even though he had voted for the "charter". The presidium refused to put our text, regularly proposed, to a vote. It even refused to take the negative, to ask who was opposed to the Barbusse manifesto. We had to intervene violently to record our vote Against.

In L'Humanite of September 1, Cachin, speaking of the manifesto, writes: "On capital for us, no reservations were for-

(Continued on page 2)

What Happened at the Barbusse Congress?

(Continued from page 1)
 mulated by a single Congress delegate. Quite the contrary." He lies deliberately. The delegates of the Left Opposition refused to make themselves accomplices in the criminal confusion of this manifesto, they refused to grant their confidence for the permanent struggle against war to a committee composed of Gandhists, Barbusseists, Fascists and Stalinists. The Official Bulletin of the Congress records our vote as follows: "The manifesto is adopted amid delirious enthusiasm of the Congress by more than 2,100 votes against 6 votes of the French Trotskyists." And further: "In the same way, the list of the members for the Permanent Committee of the Congress against War was adopted by more than 2,000 votes against the 6 votes of the French Trotskyists."

Let us now examine briefly this character on which the Centrists at least made no reservations.

The idea of class is totally absent from this manifesto. In our view, in the view of the Marxists, the question of war is a class question, and the role of the proletariat in war is determined by the class character of this war. We are against the imperialist war, for the civil war. We support certain national wars. Each case requires a specific analysis. In the manifesto, nothing of the sort is to be found. Its language is vulgarly democratic.

The Congress, it says there, "does not deny the existence of ideological and political nuances which may divide the elements composing it" . . . Thus, between the Indian bourgeoisie, between the Western petty bourgeoisie and the revolutionary proletariat (all represented at the Congress), there are nothing but . . . ideological nuances! After that, nothing stands in the way of unanimity for hollow generalities, devoid of any class sense.

Precisely, the whole of the manifesto is a laborious assembling of paragraphs carefully doctored to give satisfaction to everybody, and they bear the indelible mark of Centrism.

The Indelible Stamp of Centrism

One finds a very vague analysis of capitalist disorder and of the way in which it engenders war, which concludes as follows: "The Congress proclaims that out of this whole state of affairs it is the human (?) masses who are and who will be its victims. By the effect of the crisis of over-production and the defective (!) distribution of production, derived by the action of an increasing unemployment, etc. . . the multitudes of labor are crushed, those who were cut down by the last war and who for the last fourteen years still bear the sorrows and wounds of it."

Then the manifesto comes out against "the maintenance of artificial (sic) frontiers imposed by the peace treaties", it asserts that "article 217 of the Treaty of Versailles incriminating Germany with the sole responsibility, constitutes a crying untruth (sic) which, exploited by a play of demagogic mysticism has in part provoked the Fascist reactions of Germany" . . .

It is not possible for us to dwell upon each of these phrases. They contain a whole world of confusion. Let us mark out simply the passage that for the Congress the frontiers of Versailles are "artificial". Are there, then, "natural" frontiers? According to the manifesto, there are; that is it sinks fully into petty bourgeois nationalism which simply reproaches the Versailles negotiators with having "badly cut up" the map of Europe!

Finally, the manifesto takes up its tactic of struggle against an imperialist war. Here is literally what it says on the subject: "Determined to stand up as much as it is humanly possible against this march to the abyss which involves all living beings, the Congress sees salvation only in the concerted action of the workers, the peasants and all the exploited and oppressed of the world." And that is all. Immediately afterwards, is added: the Congress "declares that no other means of struggle against war is sufficient."

What does this mean to say? We defy any sincere comrade, whoever he may be, to explain this paragraph. Is there in it the slightest serious explanation of the methods of struggle against war? Isn't it a purely social democratic hollow phrase? "Concerted action"—What action? Concerted among whom and whom? By means of which organizations and to what end? etc. . . All these questions must be answered!

After this, the manifesto adjures the "conscientious objectors" to renounce their tactics. It speaks of "noble dreams", of "unfortunately useless sacrifice", of "splendid moral attitude", of "heroic methods". Who can explain the meaning of this phrase: "To the men of character and courage who preach heroic methods and by accepting for themselves the very grave consequences, it asks to be also (!) with the others (?) in order to build up, stone by stone, from the bottom, a massive and collective barrier" . . .

Finally, the last paragraphs must be quoted: "The Congress turns towards the innumerable proletariat whose sovereignty depends only upon conscious organization (and not upon the overthrow of the bourgeoisie—a purely social democratic thesis).

"Strong with the mandate confided to it by a multitude of persons risen from all the horizons of the universe and different tendencies, but united in the sincere and ardent desire for peace; strong

with the profound conviction that the struggle against war is not upright except to the extent that it is effective and weighs down on affairs. "It urges the mass, the only invincible power in the tragical disorder of our times, to enter with disciplined ranks into this disorder and make its voice heard there loudly!"

And right after that, is added: "It is in this sense (but what sense? has any of it any sense?) that it intends to have the Committee of Struggle against War, which it has formed, work to extend this labor front throughout the world."

Here comes the grandiloquent oath that was taken in common, without the least reservation, by the Patels, the Fontenys, the Monnets and Bergerys, the General von Schoenichs, the Muenzenbergs and the Cachins:

Cachin's Pledge and . . . Patel's

"Each of us here takes a pledge and we take it all together:

"We pledge that we will never allow the formidable unity which has been established here among the exploited and victimized multitudes to be broken up. "We pledge to fight with all our force and with all our resources against capitalism, purveyor to slaughter-houses.

"We pledge to dedicate ourselves with all our strength and all our resources to the immediate and urgent tasks, standing up against . . ." Here follow the general slogans:

Against armaments, against the preparation of war by the "public powers which rule us", against chauvinism, against Fascism "which organizes the civil war", against war budgets and loans to Fascist states, against the campaign of incitement against the U. S. S. R., against the dismemberment of China, against the exploitation and oppression of the masses of colonial peoples, for the struggle for national and social liberation, for the support of the Japanese workers, for the support of the transport and munitions workers, for the struggle by "all means" against the "impending catastrophe."

This is the substance of the manifesto which was adopted unanimously save for 6 votes, amidst general confusion and without a SINGLE COMMUNIST SPEAKER HAVING EXPRESSED THE SLEIGHTEST RESERVATION OR AMENDMENT ON THE SUBJECT:

And now, let us put these questions: 1. Why hasn't this manifesto, this "charter", this "basis for action", which is to "orient" the struggle of the party against war, been published to this day? What does this silence conceal? What alterations, after the fact, are being prepared for it?

2. What organizations, what Communist meetings, gave a mandate to and authorized the Communist leaders to vote for such a text without reservations? How should the vote without reservations for the Barbusse platform be designated except as a swindle against the ranks of the party?

3. This confused text was adopted by the licensed representatives of the big bourgeoisie, of the "social Fascist" LEADERS, of the petty bourgeois pacifists, etc., who find nothing in it different from the resolutions of their own parties. To vote jointly with them without reservations, doesn't that mean to make an UNPRINCIPLED BLOC from above, in the dark of the moon?

In the whole manifesto, one single paragraph makes allusion to revolutionary methods of struggle. It is the following: the Congress "asserts that the Japanese workers have already showed by heroic examples how the struggle against the imperialist war should be conducted, by standing up against their own bourgeoisie, by endeavoring to oppose the production and transportation of munitions, and by opening the eyes of the soldiers themselves as to the rapacious character of this war." Naturally, this paragraph was inserted to "satisfy" the Communists. But in spite of this, it sows confusion for it does not say that it is a question of utilizing the war to beat the bourgeoisie, to overthrow the capitalist regime, to substitute the proletarian dictatorship for the bourgeois dictatorship. As it stands, the paragraph may lead to the belief that it is simply a matter of a "pressure" upon the national bourgeoisie to bring the war to a halt. And it is just for that reason that Monnet and Planche, who vote for the war budget of Herriot-Boncour, also voted for this resolution in all tranquility!

Take the text of the recent resolutions of the Second International in Zurich. Do we not also find there the slogan of the defense of the U. S. S. R., of the sabotage of munitions transportation, etc. . . Don't we know that those are hollow phrases which only serve, in the last analysis, to dupe the masses?

How could the Communist party rally to these hollow phrases without a word of reservation, of amendment, of criticism! At the inevitable moment when the Patels, the Fontenys, the Monnets, etc. will show that they stand in the long run for the interests of bourgeois democracy rather than those of the proletarian, revolutionary struggle against war, what will be the attitude of the Centrists who united with them on the same platform?

The bloc, without conditions or limitations, without clarity, serves only confusion, opportunism, that is, in the last analysis, the social democratic and treacherous petty bourgeois leadership.

Against that, the party must be warned, as well as the revolutionary vanguard who have been caught in the snare of ambiguity and confusion.

It must be asserted loudly: this mani-

fest, this "charter", this platform, will be an obstacle to the struggle against war. The party, the trade unions, the various committees, will be unable to engage in a real struggle against war except by trampling upon this text, by rejecting the advice of the International Committee, by fighting fiercely to put through in every meeting a precise, limited program of action of the united front with all the workers' organizations. There is no other way.

For where in this "charter" is there anything precise and serious about the methods of struggle, on the revolutionary struggle, on the tactic and strategy of the struggle against imperialism? Nowhere. You find nothing but badly blatted literature!

The party leaders refuse the honest united front, that is, one based upon limited, precise proposals, made by the party with full independence, discussed by the party and responsibly adopted by it, addressed to the responsible reformist organizations which embrace hundreds of thousands of workers. Instead of this, they camouflage themselves behind pseudo-united front committees, in confusion, and they are led to make a bloc from above with the enemies of Communism! These are the facts which no insults, no quibbling, will conceal from the eyes of the vanguard. And the inevitable conclusion is this: for the moment, Centrism profits by this indefinite current started and exploited by it; but in the long run, it is opportunism, the social democracy, which will profit by it, in the hour when the proletarian Communist vanguard will be obliged to extricate itself from the morass of the Patels and the Monnets, and when the social democrats will exclaim: "There you see how insincere they were; they are now breaking up a bloc which they made without expressing any reservations, without outlining the limitations, without foreseeing the future!" And at that moment, the workers will feel the brutal effects of Centrism confusion. They will see that the Left Opposition was right.

Still another feature of the manifesto should be emphasized. The text reviews the international situation and the war danger spots, but NOTHING IS SAID ABOUT THE GERMAN SITUATION! You do find this enormity, that it is Article 217 of the Versailles Treaty which is responsible for the rise of German Fascism, but not a line can be read which denounces the Hitlerite Fascist reaction as the greatest war menace to the U. S. S. R. The whole manifesto is vague in this respect. In spite of the war which is tearing up the Far East, the decisive threat, the knife which is being wielded over the throat of the German, Russian and International proletariat, is the Fascism of Hitler, the crushing boot of bloody capitalism which is writhing in convulsions. The mute Stalin compels his international apparatus to remain silent about this fact. That is why the Congress directed by Muenzenberg, one of the leaders of the German Communist Party, was able to adopt a manifesto which passes over in silence the critical hour through which the international proletariat are passing in the class struggle in Germany, a struggle which today entirely dominates the problem of peace and war.

Not a minute was granted the Opposition to say this. And yet, we do not want to see socialist deputies, who vote the war budgets of Boncour, who approve the tactic of treachery of Severing and Braun, applaud Muenzenberg when he evokes the sacrifices of the proletarians of Germany—we want positions to be taken on this point, clear engagements, so that everyone knows where he is going and how he will get there.

Such a manifesto we rejected with indignation. We deposited with the president our own declaration demanding that it be put to the vote. They refused. Yet it substituted for the pacifist-Centrist hotch-potch the clear thoughts of Marxism. It concretized the limited, definite program upon which a temporary united front (and not a permanent bloc) could be offered and pressed before the responsible reformist workers' organizations.

Let every party comrade reflect upon it. Let those who greeted the speech of the social democrat, Nicole, with cries of "Unity!", who acclaimed Rolland, Barbusse, Fonteny, Patel and Co. as their leaders in the struggle against war, ponder again: the facts will open their eyes. They must demand in the party the renunciation of this manifesto. They must force the apparatus to uncover its double game. They must demand an independent declaration of the party. Let them adopt the position of the Left Opposition, contained in our manifesto. Right now, the best elements will understand us. And tomorrow, it is the whole party that we will succeed in snatching out of the Centrist combinations which ruin the Marxist doctrine of the proletariat in the vital question of war and peace.

—P. NAVILLE.

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 84 East 10th St., N. Y.
EDITORIAL BOARD
 Martin Abern James P. Cannon
 Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
 Arne Swabeck
SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1932
 Vol. No. 39 (Whole No. 135)
 Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year, For-
 eign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.
 Single rates, 3 cents per copy.

THE LEADER OF THE HINDU BOURGEOISIE OPENS AND CLOSES THE DEBATES

(Continued from page 1)
 Special mention should be made of the speeches of the former president of the Indian National Congress, Patel, chief of the Hindu bourgeoisie, leader of its Right wing. Patel came to this congress for good cause, he knew the political benefit he could gain from it to cover himself before the toiling masses of India, to obtain in Europe points of support for the negotiations of the Hindu bourgeoisie with English imperialism and to stifle the revolutionary class movement of the Indian workers and peasants. He cared very little, about being a spike in the Congress. He played his politics. And this policy should be known to the Communists for whom the tragic experience with the Kuo Min Tang is still alive. In India, the Congress of the Hindu bourgeoisie and, at its head, Patel, have already committed acts of class repression against the proletariat and its revolutionary militants. And Patel himself did not fail to mention it from the tribune of the Congress. Notwithstanding, the Congress answered him with a unanimous chanting of the International!

In his appeal, R. Rolland, apologist for Gandhi, the man who is disarming the Indian workers and peasants, saluted India which "is pursuing with its own weapons of Satyagraha, its silent, its invincible struggle of liberation". In his exposition, Patel, after expressing regret, amidst the applause of the Congress, over Gandhi, "whose place would be so distinguished at this Congress" (that's all that was missing!), declared that as for himself India was the central point of the imperialist war danger and, to the idea that "the end of capitalism is the condition sine qua non of the end of all wars", he opposed the central idea of "the end of the domination of England over India", which he interpreted in the sense of the Hindu bourgeoisie.

Patel indicated that he repudiates Communism and spoke of the attitude of the Indian National Congress towards it. On the eve of the Congress, during a preparatory meeting, Patel had demanded for himself a speaking time without any limitations whatsoever, else he would quit the Congress with a statement for the press. At no moment during the Congress did he lose sight of his own policy. Patel served up to the Congress the policy of the class he represented.

When the Congress had concluded with the vote carried by the whole apparatus for the final manifesto, Patel demanded and again obtained the floor to show that he is in no way altered his position and that he still rejected violence. The English delegation had to rise against his declaration. Neither this final speech nor this protest were translated to the Congress.

Pacifist Speakers and Communists

As soon as Patel had concluded his remarks, the theater front to whom the chairmanship had been entrusted, Miglioli, former Catholic deputy from Cremona, let loose and gave the floor to a new celebrity. From then on the fate of the Congress was sealed. No serious agenda was worked out. The Congress was compelled to confine itself to a succession of general speeches, of greetings indifferently delivered by literati, militants, politicians or by genuine fighters from the proletarian front. Amazing speeches were delivered: the autonomist, Dahlet, demanded that the League of Nations declare it a duty, not to divide in case of war. Echoes of the real struggle of the revolutionary proletariat were nevertheless heard from the tribune in the course of the heterogeneous and sterile procession: the voice of an Invergor-don sailor, the voice of a striker from the Belgian mines, of a revolutionary seaman, of Balkan revolutionists, of colonial militants. But all these speeches were included in an endless chain of others punctuated by revolutionary songs with which the Congress too frequently greeted irresponsible literati.

A pacifist speaker proposed as against the Sacred Union of War, to constitute a Sacred Union of those who do not want war.

Pressed to explain themselves about this confusion, the militants of the Communist party and the revolutionary trade unions showed their passive skepticism or else replied: We've got to win them over. We are not here as Communists.

THE COMMUNISTS ON THE TRIBUNE OF THE CONGRESS

Several Communists orators intervened. Among the French, Cachin and Racamond delivered long expostions, and on the whole these speeches appeared to be of organization and of action, transformation of all formulations, the total absence of conclusions in principles, of organization and of action, transformed these speeches into embroideries on Communist themes: that is, into un-Communist acts. For Communist speeches are distinguished by their conclusions in principles, by organization and by action: they were wanting in the appeals of our representatives. How could things have been otherwise in a Congress held 'outside of parties'? Also, in place of the precise assertion on the principle line underlying the Communist party's actions, on the concrete platform which it should have proposed for the mobilization of workers' organizations, Cachin ended his speech with this vague remark: "We proclaim that sectarianism here would be a crime against the proletariat itself." Under these conditions,

with these diplomatic, impersonal and abstract conclusions, what purpose could have been served by Racamond's speech on the necessity of "destroying the nervous system of preparation for war?"

In the Presidium, the "social Fascist" deputies Monnet and Planche fraternized with Barbusse and the organizers. After the categorical declarations of refusal to sit at the same table as the "social-Fascist murderers of the proletariat", the Centrist representatives showed that at the table of Barbusse and Monnet, they themselves were contributing nothing less sterile, nothing more capable of efficiently serving the interests of the proletariat and of causing its revolutionary vanguard to advance.

THE INTERVENTION OF THE REFORMISTS AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

Among the pennants carried in the Congress hall, one bore the inscription: **Fight the international socialist reaction.** On the second day the word "Socialist" on the banner was obliterated. About three hundred of the delegates belonged to the Second International. They stood up against the cynical boycott of action against imperialist war by the Adlers and Vanderveldes. But they were summoned to speak only on the confused basis of Barbusse's speeches and manifestos.

The director of the Geneva social democratic journal, the Left socialist Nicole, intervened in a more significant way, politically. He used the language of a Left socialist with the borrowed scraps which that language has taken from Communist ideas: On the basis of such a speech he was able to declare himself in perfect accord with Marcel Cachin's speech. At the same time he urged the political unity of the proletariat and the reunion of its parties. Extraordinary as it may seem, these declarations were received with great enthusiasm by the French Communists. Muenzenberg had to make some remarks on this demonstration immediately. But such Congresses are not called to dissipate the confusion in which Centrism throws its good working class elements.

Similarly, an intervention by Rosenfeld, leader of the German Socialist Labor Party, remained unreproached.

MUENZENBERG'S SPEECH

However, Nicole's intervention demanded a reply from Muenzenberg, upon whom, in fact, rested the whole burden of the Congress. Muenzenberg's intervention had the job of bringing the whole discussion to the point. But in such a Congress, the discussion can be brought to the point only at the cost of a radical transformation of the Congress. And it was exactly this which Muenzenberg did not want.

Besides, despite several vigorous passages, Muenzenberg, who was announced as one of the leaders of the 3rd International, did not speak the language of the 3rd International. "Today I do not speak here in the name of the 3rd International, but in the name of the Congress, whose sentiments I am sure I express." Furthermore, the recollection of the socialist leaders' treason in 1914, the ambiguous reference to the French delegation's outburst with reference to Nicole's intervention, the necessity that "the promises given should be followed by actions", remained hollow phrases without class content, without the party conclusions. To Patel, Muenzenberg merely replied that non-violence serves the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie; he refuted it with several literary phrases.

Muenzenberg also replied to the Left Opposition.

He said literally: "It is the Trotskyist fraction which is most active in this Congress." He rejected our proposals in a few sentimental phrases about devotion to the party, and the only thing with which he reproached Trotsky was his alleged consideration of himself as higher than the party. In reality he tried to defend this confusionist Congress against our criticisms, and our comrades protested vigorously when he distorted our position.

The Opposition at the Congress

For the balance of the Congress' duration, the six delegates belonging to the International Left Opposition fought energetically. They made themselves heard despite the Bureau's obstruction, they held conversations with the workers, summoning the Communist party to define clearly its line of principle and action, and proposing concrete objectives of common struggle to the responsible workers' organizations.

From the opening of the session, when it became obvious that the Congress was engaged in an endless stream of greetings, one of our comrades, after having vainly asked the Presidium for the right to speak on the agenda, demanded from his seat the privilege of intervening so that the Congress might determine its proceedings in a fruitful manner, consider the various doctrinal positions, and conclude with serious results. But when he had gained the tribune, he was brutally driven off it by the strong-arm squad, while Miglioli and Gibarti tried to lecture the Congress against these "anarchistic methods."

Starting with that moment, and during the entire Congress, the united apparatus defended the proceedings of the Congress from our persistent efforts, straining ceaselessly and in every way possible way to gag us. The Miglioli-Gibarti-Muenzenberg trinity redoubled false promises, alternating with threats, to oppose the constant interventions of our comrades, and to try to keep the Left Opposition from uttering the opinions of the Opposition to this Congress.

Literature of all tendencies and from all organizations was distributed to all delegates at the Congress. The Daughters of Peace and the Women's Peace League distributed their pamphlets. The anarchists distributed a leaflet against the Congress.

But the distribution actively undertaken by our comrades of the "Declaration of the Bolshevik-Leninists" in German, English and French, twice caused incidents of such great violence from the functionaries of the Dutch, French and German parties, that they necessitated the intervention of the Congress apparatus which, finally, refused us and us alone, the opportunity to distribute the writings of the Left Opposition.

Our Indo-Chinese Comrade Speaks

On the first day, the floor was given to comrade Ra, delegate of a group of colonial workers; we here reproduce the essence of his speech:

"In the imperialist epoch capitalism cannot avoid conquering and fighting with guns over the colonial countries, which are tremendous sources of raw material and markets for the capitalist states.

"In the colonies capital creates a proletariat and a peasantry which it exploits harshly. The exploited colonials organize and struggle. Their desperate struggle in China, Indo-China, India, Africa, already honors the names of Shanghai, Canton, Yen Bay, Vinh, Chauri-Chaura. To the raising of the Indo-Chinese workers' standard the imperialists oppose machine-guns, airplanes and the guillotine, and unite to crush the vanguard, the colonial Communist parties. Of this type are the decapitations at Yen Bay, the repression at Vinh, the arrest, followed by their death, of N'Guyan Ai Quoc.

"These bloody colonial wars are inevitably accompanied by class war in the colonies themselves. In this class conflict imperialism guarantees itself, by means of the 2nd International's fakery, the aid of the native bourgeoisie and part of the petty bourgeoisie. The Tonkin socialist section demands bloody measures of repression against the Indo-Chinese revolutionists, at the same time that the Sararuts and Leon Blums are urging the French government to rationalize the exploitation of the colonials.

"Among the reformist tendencies of the native bourgeoisie, those which the workers have bitterly experienced are Sun Yat Senism and Gandhism. Sun Yat Sen states in his Memoires that in his suppression of revolts he assured himself the aid of French and American bankers. After him the Kuo Min Tang, with its leaders, Chiang Kai-Shek, Wang Chin Wei and even Sun Yat Sen, fulfilled its mission as imperialism's valet in the massacre of the workers in Shanghai and Canton as well as in the coups d'Etat of March 26 and January 27. In India, Gandhi, by his concept of non-resistance, takes his share of responsibility for the peasant massacre at Chauri-Chaura. The colonial bourgeoisie, linked to imperialism in the exploitation of workers, in spite of their antagonisms, have interests which ally them to imperialism in the wars of conquest and the wars of liberation.

"The struggle against war can only be led by the working class with its vanguard, the Communist International, in the direction of the dictatorship of the proletariat allied to the peasantry. The struggle against war has no meaning outside of the fierce battle for the overthrow of the imperialist regime. This struggle can be led only in opposition to the ideology and influence of the imperialists' valets and supporters—the 2nd International, the native bourgeoisie, and (I hope I don't hurt R. Rolland's and Barbusse's feelings); all the petty bourgeois pacifist ideologies.

"In this fight for liberation the colonial workers are assured the active aid of the world proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat in the U. S. S. R. is a vital source of help for them. A victory of the workers in the metropolis will give them inestimable support and vice versa. Here too the Comintern Centrist leadership's national reformist conception of 'socialism in one country' is revealed as anti-Communist. The colonial workers will fight this wretched tendency and will set their sole vanguard, the C. I., on the road of the world revolution, without which the realization of socialism is impossible and peace is Utopian.

"At this period, when the crisis of the bourgeoisie and its class contradictions force the German bourgeoisie to unleash Hitler's Fascism against the German proletariat, the struggle against war remains a dead letter if the C. I. does not realize a fighting united front of workers' organizations to crush Hitler's Fascism and defend the U. S. S. R. on a class basis."

In concluding, Ra hailed the fight undertaken by the International Left Opposition and its leader, Leon Trotsky. The applause which first greeted our comrade, whose tendencies were still unknown to any one, gave place to the booning of the Communist functionaries. The speech was not translated for the other delegates who came in numbers to ask why the end of the speech had been hissed. Its appearance in the "honest" Congress Bulletin is carefully expurgated and completely distorted.

On the second day, the efforts of our comrades caused the apparatus to grant several minutes to comrade Molinier, who had credentials from the Greek organizations. He said, in substance:

(Continued on page 3)

Weisbord's Reply to Trotsky's Letter

(Continued from last issue)

On the general question of Centrism, we feel that our differences are not very great and in some respects are only of a formal character. In giving the name "centrism" only to those groupings which occupy the place between the official camps of reformism (social democracy) and the official camp of Communism, we have used the term precisely as Lenin used it. However here the whole question seems to be one of name and we do not wish to quarrel over that.

What we emphatically deny is the implications in your statement that "we were concerned to efface the difference between the official party, the Right wing fraction (Lovestone group) and even the American League" and the further statement. "This makes it easy for you to remain in an eclectic position and defend your right of a bloc with the Lovestone group."

First of all, it is not true that we do not distinguish between the Right wing and the Party. We consider ourselves a fraction of the PARTY and not of the Right wing. In the very beginning of the organization of our tendency, in January 1931, in his debate with one of the American League, our representative declared:

"It is true there is a difference between the Communist party (Stalin-Browder-Foster faction) and the Communist party (Majority group) Bucharin-Brandler-Lovestone faction. These differences can be summarized broadly as follows: 1. The "official Communist party" has more members, more good militant fighters who must be won over, has more influence in the radical movement, etc. 2. The opportunism of the Communist party takes on a different form from that of the C. P. (Majority group). 3. The tempo of development of their opportunism differs. These differences the Communist League (Opposition) must take into consideration. Its tactics must be to stress the winning of the ranks and file of the Communist party for there are the principal ranks of the militants today."

What we wish to affirm is that Stalinism, or "Bureaucratic Centrism" is also on the whole a form of centrism that is to the right of Leninism, in spite of ultra-Left zigzags, and is moving toward Reformism. The fact that Stalinism rests upon the Soviet bureaucracy still tied to the workers by the frame of the proletarian revolution in the Soviet Union means that on the one hand this centrism has a more permanent base than the ordinary forms of centrism which are by their very nature ephemeral and transient, and that, on the other hand, it will be a tendency capable of movements of yielding to the pressure of the working class and thus having leftward zig-zag peculiarities.

If we ask whether Bureaucratic Centrism is more to the right or to the left of the Right wing, our answer must depend on a concrete analysis of the given time and place and set of circumstances and not on an abstract generality. Certainly it would be most mechanical and formalistic to declare, as the American League has done, that everywhere Stalinism is a tendency between us and the Right wing. The problem is not quite the same in Sweden as in Russia, in Germany as in America. A dialectical approach to this question must be a concrete one.

In regard to the question whether the Right wing of Communism is dynamically further away from Marxism than Left Socialists this depends on concrete circumstances in which we must examine (a) the direction, (b) the tempo, (c) the distance covered by the different groups, on the roads which they have elected to travel. You yourself declare that under a normal regime in the Comintern, Right wing Communists would not be expelled from the Communist party, and it is a moot point to be determined concretely whether the fact of the expulsion of the Right wing, etc., has forced it into such a position that it can no longer be taken back into a Communist party or considered nearer to us than Socialists.

And here we must emphatically emphasize the fact that we have never proposed a BLOC with the Right wing (Lovestoneites), meaning by a bloc a general value alliance. In our general thesis we wrote: "In the meantime the Communist League of Struggle must try to effect a united front so that all Communist groups can work together on concrete issues on the basis of the recognition of the Communist character of each group. This will also help to re-establish mass work, to resist the violent tactics of the party officialdom, and to place the Communist groups on a correct path."

When, some time later, Lovestone issued a call for "Communist Unity" we replied (Class Struggle Vol. II, No. 4, April 1932). "But first of all we want to ask Lovestone: FOR WHAT do you want to unite? To fight the organization of the unorganized as you are doing everywhere? To destroy the new unions such as the textile? To cover up the fakers such as you did in Paterson and elsewhere? Is it for this that you want unity? . . . Are you not like Kautsky and the other opportunists in your shouts for unity without specifying in what program and on what basis? . . ."

It is not clear, from these quotations, that in our struggle against the terrible disintegration taking place within the ranks of the Communists, that we proposed a united front not with the Right wing alone but with all Communist groups, and not a general vague alliance, but only on specified concrete questions? Further it is recognized by everyone here that in a number of instances we alone actually fought against the Right wing when the Communist League of America was not even present.

We are in accord with you when you write "To conclude a bloc with the Lovestone group would mean to augment its

Statement of the Communist League of Struggle

general authority and by that to help it to fulfill its reactionary historic mission." We are also of the opinion that it is not for us to raise into prominence the question of a united front with an organization such as the Right wing which in America is barren and without masses. However, it is quite possible that circumstances may arise where it will be advantageous for us to form a united front including the Right wing even where the Party refuses to join or even fights it. Here again it is the concrete circumstances that decide. The fact that the Communist League of America finally was forced to organize such a united front (Marine case) is proof of the correctness of our position.

In our general thesis we have declared that the Communist League of America also was a Right wing organization. We reached this conclusion on the basis of its first thesis and actions. Since the time of our criticism the Communist League of America has made some steps in correcting its past errors but its general practice, its methods of correction, its last general theses, its present unprincipled internal factional fight, etc., show that it has a long way yet to go really to deserve being part of the International Left Opposition.

We wish to raise the general question: Is it impossible for a group to agree to certain formulae of the Left Opposition and yet fill these formulae with such a Right wing content as to nullify them? Such a situation can readily result from the present general weakness of the Left Opposition. Under such conditions it is quite possible for groups to sign general international declarations and yet annul them in their national practice.

It is not correct to say that our serious charges against the leadership of the Communist League of America, which we believe are based on facts and which we stand ready to prove when necessary, and our criticism of the Communist League of America made us an enemy of the International Left Opposition. Quite the contrary, it was because we wished to further the interests of the International Left Opposition that we made this criticism. Certainly comrade Trotsky, you must recognize that without a congress, without a strong and authoritative political bureau, the International Left Opposition has not pressed its sections sufficiently to carry into effect its principles that the sections must behave as Communist sections in the struggles of the workers, and that propaganda must be put forth not in a sectarian manner but on the basis of active participation in the entire life of the proletariat.

In this respect permit us to state that we have endorsed the organizational statutes worked out by our representative, comrade Weisbord, during his discussions with you and that we are sending you further a special report on the condition of the sections of the International Left Opposition embodying certain recommendations that we believe can aid the situation.

Finally we must declare the actions of the Communist League of America have materially contributed to the sharpness of our criticism. Our collaboration has been steadily rejected, no aid given us when our class enemies attacked us, we have been ridiculed in a most vulgar

and low manner, our headquarters has been raided and partially wrecked, we have been denounced as agents for the police, etc. Do you believe we could reply to these provocations without sharpness? On the other hand never have we taken a sharp tone to the views of the International Left Opposition itself, although the Secretariat, under Mill, behaved toward us in an extremely hostile and unwarranted manner.

It is on the question of mass work, a most important question to us active Communists used to field work, whose very life medium is the working class to which we are indissolubly bound, it is on this question that we most heartily welcome your statement: "I am ready to admit that your group would be able in that respect to complete the work of the American League." What an enormous difference between this statement and the attitude of the leaders of the Communist League of America? It was this false view of the leaders of the Communist League which more than anything else, we believe, has alienated many honest workers and Communists from the Left Opposition of the U. S.

In this connection permit me to stress the fact that the leadership of the American League in pursuing the sectarian policies (sectarian in the worst sense of the word) has been guilty not merely of failing to apply principles which it did not "theoretically" deny, but of gross theoretical errors as well, errors totally in disharmony with the Left Opposition and which only strengthened its false line.

In agreeing with you that we can complete the work of the American League we do not wish to deny that in the course of existence we have made some serious errors both in our general program (for example on the Labor Party question, our mistake in allowing the impression to get abroad that we wished a bloc with the Right wing, and our mistake in ignoring on certain questions the great critical activity already done by the Left Opposition, etc.) and in our practice. However we do affirm that you must recognize that on the whole we are part of the Left Opposition and belong inside it.

You write that we "must keep clearly in mind that the road to the International Left Opposition leads through the American League." We have always fought for closer relations with the American League. As long ago as December 31, 1931 we made the following proposals to the American League:

"1. That joint membership meetings be held to discuss the differences between both organizations . . .

"2. That special place be allotted in both the Class Struggle and the Militant for articles from representatives of both groups . . .

"3. That opportunity be given in the Forums conducted by both groups for speakers of each group to state their positions . . .

"4. That both organizations cooperate as closely as possible in all united front activities and rally to mutual defence when attacked by capitalist forces . . . In all united fronts it is necessary not only to separate Communism from Menshevism as a whole but to separate the Communists of the right from those who adhere to the views of the International Left Opposition. In all united fronts where other labor organizations are present, both groups should strive to effect a unified policy agreeable to both groups and to act as a unit."

We believe that in the framework of the Left Opposition we shall be able, in a loyal and helpful way, to struggle for that viewpoint which can round out the work of the American Section and help it live up to its historic mission. We ask that you and the various sections of the Left Opposition aid us in this task.

We cannot close without expressing our warm appreciation for the hospitable and friendly reception given our representative, and for the autographed photograph and greetings which you have sent us. We are confident that our discussions will substantially contribute to our formal entrance into the ranks of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

—Communist League of Struggle.

P.M.U. Under Sharp Attack

(Continued from page 1)

here clubbings, beating of women and children and intimidation of all kinds are rife, a reign of terror similar to Britain's Blacks and Tans during the Irish revolution. The bosses well know that to lose these counties will change the picture of the miners, will bring the miners from the defensive to the offensive and open up a new phase of the class struggle. In all towns, mass meetings are being held and when the speakers call for a return to Franklin Co. there is vociferous applause.

The Leland Hotel in Springfield is the headquarters of Lewis and his open gunmen who are imported from all parts of the country. Six striking miners were shot by those thugs at Braidwood Thursday as they were sitting by the roadside. In their frenzy at the growth of the new union the bosses stop at nothing.

From New York, while Lewis was negotiating with the anthracite operators to put over a 25% reduction in the wages of the hard coal miners, he sent a telegram to one Charles Bohanan, hand picking him as president of a local here. The telegram was most laudatory of Bohanan's rare qualities, honesty, integrity, and loyalty to the U. M. W. A. Only it didn't work. Bohanan came with the telegram to the P. M. A. headquarters saying that he couldn't be bribed. Lewis has but few tricks left.

The Militant is playing an important role in this battle. It is the only revolutionary organ with a correct policy in the field. The more militant and Left wing miners peruse it and fight for the policy it proposes, one that the new union must follow if it is going to march on the road to victory by broadening the united front as proposed by the Communist League of America. The Left Opposition is continuously gaining in prestige because it carries the banner of Communism aloft. The task would be easier but for the blunders of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Despite everything we forge ahead.

RUSSIAN BULLETIN

The two latest issues of the Russian Bulletin have just arrived. These are numbers 28 and 29-30. Both numbers are extremely important ones, dealing with the latest developments in Soviet economy, the situation in the Communist International and the activities of the

We ask all comrades to send their orders in immediately, since there are only a limited number of each issue on hand. Orders for copies of the Russian Bulletin should be accompanied with cash. The price per bulletin is twenty-five cents.

Congress at Amsterdam

(Continued from page 2)

"1. The comrades of the Greek organizations, because of police and financial difficulties, had to forego sending one of their own active members to this Congress: they sent their credentials to comrades of their political tendency, and it is in the name of the thousands of workers grouped around them that we express ourselves here.

"2. On the question of the fight against war, the Greek veterans, the wounded, the revolutionary workers have a doctrine based on the revolutionary action of those among them who, when sent in 1917 and 1918 into Soviet Russia, fraternized with the Red Army which breathed life into the Communist anti-imperialist war into a civil war, under the guidance of Lenin and Trotsky.

"3. On the convocation of this Congress, we consider that it can have positive results only to the degree to which it can disengage itself from these debates, we think that peace depends on civil war, that civil war depends upon the proletariat's capacity for action, and that this capacity for action depends basically upon the unity, the strength and the correct orientation of its vanguard. That is why we assert that it is the duty of the C. I., which was born in the struggle against the socialist betrayal of 1914, to take the initiative in summoning a common congress of all proletarian organizations, in order to make the masses deceived by social patriotism and pacifism come over into the camp of defeatism and civil war. This road outlined by Lenin and Trotsky is the road we urge.

"4. In the series of debates, this Congress has uncovered fatal wants. Pacifism must be condemned and those who intend to defend the U. S. S. R. with their lives must be separated from those who seek notoriety by talk about its defense. The weakening of capitalism, the proletarian dictatorship, the true defense of the U. S. S. R. are subordinated to that.

"5. The organizations we represent asserted their concept by giving their credentials to this Congress to two men whom the repression against their intransigent revolutionary struggle has denied admittance to this Congress.

"One of them was for several years Soviet Russia's ambassador to Paris; but French imperialism, the bloodhound of the counter-revolution, demanded his recall because Christian Rakovsky signed a manifesto urging the conversion of imperialist war into civil war.

"The second was Lenin's companion in arms in the decisive moments of 1917—Trotsky, who vitalized the proletariat's answer to war by organizing and leading the Red Army to victory.

"These two names, the names of thousands of Russian Bolshevik-Leninists—are the expression of the program we urge upon the Congress—Loyalty to Leninism."

Every word of Molinier's speech was clearly heard. The consistent Communists of the French delegation, who had acclaimed or tolerated Patel and Dahlet could not for long tolerate the voice of the Left Opposition; they drowned out its end with hisses.

The slanderous Bulletin of the Congress relates this speech as follows:

"Molinier, who had credentials from the Greek war veterans, despite every effort of the Presidium members, did not succeed in making himself heard above the uproar which the assembly made as

a sign of protest. Molinier, a French Trotskyist, attempted, by attacks against the 2nd International, to justify his proposal—the unification of the two internationals. Molinier's speech ended in an indignant clamor.

"Dima Kopolov got on the tribunal and announced that Molinier was not a delegate of the Greek war veterans nor of any other organization. He protested against Molinier's speech in the name of these Greek comrades. (Vigorous applause)."

It is well to note that the proposal attributed by a slanderous cynic to Molinier actually was made at the Congress. The proposal was made by Nicole, and it received the vigorous applause of the French delegation. As for Kopolov's provocative speech, it was an impudent slander which had to be disposed of immediately before Miglioli. Justice was dealt out by the Credentials Committee, which could not—and for good reason—contest the credentials of the Greek organizations. After this speech, Barbusse took the floor for a short time and said he was opposed to "the action he had undertaken falling under the power of any party or fraction of a party." This speech, which signaled the obliteration of the Communist party in the anti-war struggle, the French comrades, in their blindness, applauded as hard as they could.

THE CONGRESS APPARATUS RUNS AWAY WITH THE "FINAL VOTE"

On the last day of the Congress, the sequence of speeches was brusquely interrupted by the announcement that the Presidium was going into session. The manifesto drawn by Barbusse, who was convinced in advance that the Congress must close with a unanimous act, had been distributed the night before. The Presidium just barely brought itself to a few stylistic corrections which were to ratify the agreement between Patel and Muenzenberg, between Madame Duchene and Cachin, between Fonteny and Katayama. Barbusse read the document. The Left Opposition's delegation, which had never ceased to protest against the gagging of the discussion and the pacifist confusion of the proceedings, was grouped around the foot of the tribunal, where it vigorously demanded a discussion and the reading of the resolution it had submitted.

It was surrounded by the strong-arm squad, which endeavored forcibly to impose silence upon it. In the tumult, they proceeded to a vote by show of hands. The comrades of the Left Opposition, arrayed in vigorous protest, demanded the negative vote; the six votes of the Left Opposition were the only ones cast against the Barbusse manifesto. The delegation immediately submitted a statement explaining its vote. These votes, delivered before the entire Congress, were recorded in the Congress Bulletin and in Monde. Up to this very day the official party press has concealed them from the workers. This vote is the first wound from which will ultimately perish the paralyzed confusionist apparatus of the action of the proletariat against imperialist war and against the capitalist class that was constituted by the Barbusse-Muenzenberg Congress. Paris, September 1932

VOTE COMMUNIST!

JAPAN

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

By Jack Weber

When Marx and Engels issued the "Communist Manifesto" in 1848, Japan was still in its dark ages of feudalism, shut in as a hermit nation to hold back the threatening inundation by the rising tide of world economy. Today we must amplify the first sentence of the "Manifesto." Less than a century after its issuance, a scant sixty-four years after the beginning of the modern era in Japan, the spectre of Communism haunts Asia as well as Europe. And in fact the spectre has materialized and taken on flesh and stands with a foot in either continent, so that even as Japan reaches maturity as a world capitalist power, world economy already includes within itself at least the framework of a more advanced stage of society.

Under the direct influence of the "independent reality of world economy," Japan, the last of the powers to abolish feudalism, has itself become one of the capitalist powers. The unprecedented speed with which this process occurred has been the admiration of those bourgeois writers who attribute the "success" of Japanese capitalism to the planful foresight of its ruling class. An examination of this planned economy will throw light on the present relation of forces in Japan and will serve to contrast Japanese with Soviet Russian planned economy. A picture of feudal and post-feudal Japan will not come amiss as a starting point.

The Feudal Period

When in 1853 Commodore Perry knocked at the gates of Japan with his cannon balls in the Bay of Uraga, ordering them opened in the name of the rapidly-expanding American capitalism, he found Japan in the rotten-ripeness of a stagnant feudalism. More than two centuries earlier a new shogun (the Emperor's chamberlain) had brought to a close the period of perennial warfare between

the peasant producers. The great feudal lords, the heads of great clans, called daimyos numbered 437 at the end of the era. There were 420,000 samurais or military retainers whose families and servants brought the number of non-producers entirely dependent on the lords to well over one million. The entire population numbered 27,000,000, the vast majority peasants.

Despite the intense exploitation of the peasantry, the daimyos, with few exceptions, could not maintain their establishments without deficits met by borrowing from the rising merchant class. Frequently enough the debts were wiped out by the simple expedient of confiscation of the entire wealth of the rich merchant. The samurais were so deeply in debt that general repudiations of debts were common. Thus the shogun declared all debts of samurais null and void in 1716.

Evidently money economy was growing up side by side with the barter economy. The money economy whose beginnings traced back many centuries in Japan, secured a firm hold through foreign trade, although barter continued to exist side by side with it up to 1875 when the system of expressing wealth in terms of bushels of rice was abandoned. In fact trade had not ceased with the decree of seclusion. Down to 1700 the Dutch exported from Japan a total of 100,000,000 lbs. of copper. At the end of the 18th century they were still exporting 800,000 lbs. a year and the Chinese were then sending to China from Japan 1-2 million lbs. a year. Several "progressive" feudal lords were enriched by engaging in this trade.

The Peasants

Terrible as had been the lot of the peasants before the Tokugawa era their sufferings became indescribable during this period. "Even in normal times, the peasants did not have enough to live on. They ate the cheaper grains and potatoes, and very seldom tasted the rice they produced, for it was taken away as tax, and what little was left them had to be sold to get necessary money." Under feudal economy crop shortages were the most frightful calamity (just as overabundance for the market is the contradictory capitalist calamity). From 1690 to 1840 there were 22 famines—very destructive of human life. The famines

were caused by floods, droughts, frosts, typhoons, volcanoes, insects,—but the suffering was due to the low stage of social organization, a stage in which ease of communication is not desired and roads are made impassable to prevent invasion by neighboring enemies. Desperation often drove the peasants to riot for rice. Fifty such riots are recorded. Five riots of national scope occurred between 1830 and 1846.

Such poverty and misery kept the population stationary throughout this period. It is recorded indeed that during the first decade of the 19th century the peasant population decreased by 1,400,000 due primarily to deaths by starvation, although a small part of this decrease was due to the fleeing of peasants to the towns. Under such conditions infanticide was so common that in many districts only boys were raised and in others it was the custom to kill 2 out of every 5 babies. Near Nagano the large rock still stands where old women past the age of usefulness were exposed to die.

The Restoration

The most powerful rivals of the Tokugawas were the wealthy Choshu and Satsuma clans, both near the seacoast and both of whom has learned more of the arts of the West than any other groups in Japan. Just before the abolition of the feudal system the Satsumas had imported the latest cotton spinning machinery with 6000 spindles from England, thereby starting the first great industry in Japan. These clans headed a revolt for the overthrow of the decadent Tokugawas and for the restoration of the Emperor, nominal overlord for many centuries, around whom had grown the usual numerous myths of divinity. Unwittingly, Com. Perry, by his "visit" helped these clans end the shogunate.

The New Feudalist Bureaucracy Lengthy as this historical outline may appear, it is essential to an intelligent understanding of modern Japan. In the Tokugawa regime, control was exercised by a feudal bureaucracy with the Emperor as a figurehead. With the much heralded Restoration of the Emperor in change in form but remained exactly the same in essence, as it had to since the ruling class had not changed. The Emperor still remained a figurehead for

state religious purposes, the actual power passing over to the new militarists of the successful clans, the Choshu and the Satsuma in particular. The daimyos and the samurais of these clans formed the new bureaucracy that ushered in capitalism under the leadership of feudal lords. Feudalism was abolished but the lords, now peers of the realm, retained most of their land and were compensated by a bond issue for the small part relinquished, and the samurais were granted a state pension as well as a sum of money outright. Feudalism was abolished but military dictatorship remains to this day. To the victors belong the spoils and so from 1868 to 1912 the samurais of the Choshu clan had complete control of the modern conscript army which they organized. Almost invariably the generals have been Choshus. Similarly the Satsumas, who had to play second fiddle because of a premature attempt to invade and annex Korea, ern navy. Almost every admiral has been a Satsuma. With minor exceptions these clans contributed between them the membership of that extra-constitutional body, the Genro or Elder Statesmen, who do not give counsel but dictate his policy to the Emperor. True, elements of democracy exist today in Japan but it need only be recalled that the male workers (over 25) were granted the vote only in 1926, exercising this right for the first time in 1925, to realize the role played by the military bureaucracy at the present time. The shadow government hardly conceals the mailed fist. Under the Constitution the Minister of War practically controls the cabinet. By resigning he forces the resignation of the entire cabinet (or parliamentary administrative body) since no cabinet is permitted to function without a Minister of War who must be either a general or an admiral. No general or admiral will consent to become Minister without the consent of his conferees. Per contra the Minister of War need not resign with the rest of the cabinet. In short the military clique form a class apart, "responsible" only to the Emperor, that is, to themselves. These glaring contradictions in Japanese "democracy" became the focus of attention in the invasion of Manchuria and China.

(To be continued)

Thaelmann's Twenty-One Mistakes

AN ANALYSIS OF THE REPLIES MADE BY ERNST THAELMANN TO A SERIES OF QUESTIONS POSED TO HIM BY FORMER SOCIALIST WORKERS ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY TOWARDS THE PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED FRONT OF ALL WORKERS IN THE PRESENT GERMAN SITUATION

From the Series of Articles in the Forthcoming Book 'The Only Road' :- by Leon Trotsky

IN THE MIDDLE of July appeared a brochure with Thälmann's answers to twenty-one questions by social democratic workers on how the "Red united front" is to be created. The brochure begins with the words: "Mightily does the anti-Fascist united front rush ahead!" On July 20 the Communist party called upon the workers to come out in a political strike. The appeal met with no response. Thus within five days was the tragic abyss revealed between bureaucratic rhetoric and political reality.

The party received 5,300,000 votes in the elections of July 31. By trumpeting forth this result as a tremendous victory, the party showed how greatly the defeats have diminished its claims and hopes. In the first balloting for the presidential election, on March 13, the party received almost five million votes. In the course of four and a half months—and what months!—it therefore barely gained three hundred thousand votes. The Communist press repeated hundreds of times in March that the number of votes would have been incomparably larger had it been a Reichstag election: in a presidential election, hundreds of thousands of sympathizers deemed it superfluous to lose any time over a "platonic" demonstration. If this March commentary is taken into consideration—and it deserves to be taken into consideration—it follows that the party has practically not grown at all in the last four and a half months.

In April, the social democracy elected Hindenburg, who thereupon carried out a *coup d'état* aimed directly at the former. One would think that this fact alone ought to have sufficed to convulse the structure of reformism to its very foundations. Add to this the further accentuation of the crisis with all its frightful consequences. Finally, on July 20, eleven days before the elections, the social democracy drew its tail miserably between its legs at the *coup d'état* of the federal president it elected. In such periods revolutionary parties grow feverishly. Whatever the social democracy, forced into a steel vise, may yet undertake to do, it must drive the workers away from it to the Left. But instead of striding forward with seven league boots, Communism marks time, vacillates, is on the retreat, and after each step forward it takes half a step backward. To exult over a victory only because the Communist party suffered no loss of votes on July 31, is finally to lose the sense of reality.

In order to understand why and how the revolutionary party condemns itself to a debasing impotence under exceptionally favorable, political conditions, one must read Thälmann's answers to the social democratic workers. A wearisome and unpleasant job, but it may enlighten one on what is taking place in the minds of the Stalinist leaders.

To the question: "How do the Communists evaluate the character of the Papen government?" Thälmann gives several, mutually contradictory, replies. He begins with a reference to "the danger of the immediate establishment of the Fascist dictatorship". Then it follows that it does not yet exist? He speaks with complete accuracy of the government members as "representatives of trust capital, of the generals and of Junkerdom". A minute later he says about the same government: "this Fascist cabinet", and concludes his reply with the assertion that "the Papen government . . . has set itself the aim of the immediate establishment of the Fascist dictatorship."

By disregarding the social and political distinctions between Bonapartism, that is, the regime of "civil peace" resting upon military-police dictatorship, and Fascism, that is, the régime of open civil war against the proletariat, Thälmann deprives himself in advance of the possibility of understanding what is taking place before his very eyes. If Papen's cabinet is a Fascist cabinet then what Fascist "danger" is he talking about? If the workers will believe Thälmann that Papen sets himself the aim (!) of establishing the Fascist dictatorship, then the probable conflict between Hitler and Papen-Schleicher will catch the party napping just as the conflict between Papen and Otto Braun did in its time.*

To the question, "Is the Communist Party of Germany sincere about the united front?" Thälmann naturally answers affirmatively, and for proof he refers to the fact that the Communists do not go hat in hand to Hindenburg and Papen. "No, we put the question of the struggle, of the struggle against the whole system, against capitalism. And here lies the kernel of the sincerity of our united front."

Thälmann manifestly does not understand what it is all about. The social democratic workers remain social democrats precisely because they still believe in the gradual, reformist road to the transformation of capitalism into socialism. Since they know that the Communists stand for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, the social democratic workers ask: Do you sincerely propose the united front to us? To this Thälmann replies: Naturally, sincerely, for with us it is a question of overthrowing the whole capitalist system.

Of course, it does not occur to us to conceal anything from the social democratic workers. Nevertheless, one must know the measure of things and preserve the political proportions. A skilled propagandist should have answered in the following manner: "You put your stakes on democracy; we believe that the only way out lies in the revolution. Yet we cannot and we do not want to make the revolution without you. Hitler is now the common foe. After the victory over him we shall draw the balance together with you and see whither the further road actually leads."

The auditors, peculiar as this may seem at first

*These lines were written at the beginning of August, before the negotiations between Hindenburg-Papen and Hitler.

sight, not only listen forbearingly to the speaker but even agree with him many times. The secret of their forbearance, however, rests upon the fact that Thälmann's partners in the conversation not only belong to the Anti-Fascist Action but also call for the casting of votes for the Communist party. They are former social democrats who have gone over to the side of Communism. Such recruits can only be welcomed. But what is deceptive in the whole affair is that a conversation with workers who have broken with the social democracy is palmed off as a conversation with the social democratic mass. This cheap masquerade is highly characteristic of the whole present-day policy of Thälmann and Co.!

However this may be—the former social democrats put questions which actually agitate the social democratic mass. "Is the Anti-Fascist Action a Communist party business?" they ask. Thälmann replies: "No!" The proof? The Anti-Fascist Action "is no organization but a mass movement". As if it were not just the task of the Communist party to organize the mass movement. Still better is the second argument: the Anti-Fascist Action is non-partisan, for (!) it directs itself against the capitalist state: "Karl Marx, in dealing with the lessons of the Paris Commune, already placed in the foreground in all sharpness, as the task of the working class, the question of smashing the bourgeois state apparatus." O hapless quotation! For what the social democrats want, regardless of Marx, is to perfect the bourgeois state, but not to smash it. They are not Communists, but reformists. Despite his intentions, Thälmann proves just the thing he would like to refute—the party character of the "Anti-Fascist Action."

The official leader of the Communist party obviously understands neither the situation nor the political thought of the social democratic workers. He does not understand what purpose the united front serves. With every one of his sentences, he delivers weapons to the reformist leaders and drives the social democratic workers to them.

The impossibility of any kind of joint step with the social democracy is demonstrated by Thälmann in the following manner: "In this connection we [?] must clearly recognize that the social democracy, even when it today mimics a sham opposition, will at no moment give up its actual thoughts of coalition and its compacts with the Fascist bourgeoisie." Even if this were right, there would nevertheless remain the task of proving it to the social democratic workers through experience. However, it is also false in essence. If the social democratic leaders do not want to abandon compacts with the bourgeoisie, the Fascist bourgeoisie, however, does abandon compacts with the social democracy. And this fact may become decisive for the fate of the social democracy. In the passage of power from Papen to Hitler, the bourgeoisie will in no way be able to spare the social democracy. The civil war has its laws. The reign of the Fascist terror will and can mean only the abolition of the social democracy. Mussolini began with just that, so as to be able all the more unrestrainedly to crush the revolutionary workers. In any event, the "social Fascist" cherishes his hide. The Communist united front policy at the present time must proceed from the concern of the social democracy for its own hide. That will be the most realistic and at the same time, in its results, the most revolutionary policy.

But if the social democracy will "at no moment" separate itself from the Fascist bourgeoisie (although Matteotti "separated" himself from Mussolini), don't the social democratic workers, who want to take part in the Anti-Fascist Action, have to leave their party? Thus runs one question. To this Thälmann replies: "For us Communists it is a matter of course that social democratic or Reichsbanner workers may take part in the Anti-Fascist Action without having to leave their party." To show himself free from sectarianism, Thälmann adds: "If you were to stream into it by the millions, in a serrated front, we would greet it with joy, even if a lack of clarity still exists in your minds, in our opinion, about certain questions of estimating the Social Democratic Party of Germany." Golden words! We consider your party to be Fascist, you consider it to be democratic, but let's not dispute over petty matters. It suffices for you to come to us "by the millions", without leaving your Fascist party. "Lack of clarity about certain questions" cannot constitute an obstacle. But, O, the lack of clarity in the heads of the all-powerful bureaucrats is an obstacle at every step.

To give depth to the question, Thälmann proceeds to say: "We do not put the question of party to party, but on a class basis." Like Seydewitz, Thälmann is prepared to renounce party interests in the interests of the class. The misfortune lies in this, that for a Marxist there cannot be such a contrast. Were not its program the scientific formulation of the interests of the working class, the party would not be worth a penny.

Only, along with the crude mistake in principle, Thälmann's words contain also a practical absurdity. How is it possible not to put the question "of party to party" when that is just where the very essence of the question lies? Millions of workers follow the social democracy. Other millions—the Communist party. To the question of the social democratic workers: How shall we today achieve joint actions between your party and ours against Fascism, Thälmann answers: "on a class and not a party basis": stream toward us by the millions. Isn't this the most wretched bombast?

"We Communists," continues Thälmann, "do not want unity at any price." We cannot, in the interest of unity with the social democracy, "disavow the class content of our policy . . . and renounce strikes, struggles of the unemployed, actions of the tenants and rev-

olutionary mass defense". The agreement on definite practical actions is misconstrued into an absurd unity with the social democracy. Out of the indispensability of the final revolutionary assault of tomorrow, is deduced the impermissibility of harmonized strike or self-defense actions for today. Whoever can see rhyme or reason in Thälmann's thoughts deserves a prize of distinction.

The auditors press: "Is an alliance of the C. P. G. and the S. D. P. G. possible in the struggle against the Papen government and against Fascism?" Thälmann mentions two or three facts as evidence that the social democracy does not fight against Fascism and concludes: "Every [!] S. D. P. G. comrade will say we are right [?] when we say that an alliance between the C. P. G. and the S. D. P. G. is impossible on the basis of these facts and also [!] for reasons of principle [!]" The bureaucrat again assumes just the thing that should be proved ultimatum acquires a particularly ludicrous character as soon as Thälmann replies to the question of the united front with organizations which embrace millions of workers. The social democrats must acknowledge that an agreement with their party is impossible because it is Fascist. Can Wels and Leipart be rendered a better service?

"We Communists, who reject any accord with the S. D. P. G. leaders . . . repeatedly declare that we are at all times ready for the anti-Fascist struggle with the militant social democratic and Reichsbanner comrades and with the lower [?] militant organizations." Where do the lower organizations come to an end? And what is to be done if the lower organizations submit to the discipline of the upper, and propose that the negotiations shall be begun with the latter? Finally, between the lower and the upper there are intermediate storeys. And can one prophecy where the dividing line will be between those who want to fight and those who dodge the struggle? This can be determined only in action and not by anticipatory appraisals. What sense is there in binding oneself hand and foot?

IN DIE ROTE FÄHRE of July 29, in a report of a Reichsbanner meeting, the noteworthy words of a social democratic company commander are mentioned: "The will to an anti-Fascist united front exists in the masses. If the leaders fail to take it into account, then I will go to the united front over their heads." The Communist paper reproduces these words without comment. Yet they contain the key to the whole tactic of the united front. The social democrat wants to fight against the Fascists in common with the Communists. He is already in doubt about the good will of his leaders. If the leaders refuse, says he, then I shall go over their heads. Social democrats similarly disposed can be counted by the dozens, hundreds, thousands, millions. It is the task of the Communist party really to show them whether or not the social democratic leaders want to fight. This can be demonstrated only through experience, through a new, fresh experience, in a new situation. This experience will not be gained at one blow. The social democratic leaders must be subjected to a test: in the factory and workshop, in town and country, in the whole state, today and tomorrow. We must repeat our proposal, put it in a new form, from a new angle, adapted to the new situation.

But Thälmann will have none of it. On the ground of the "principle" distinctions shown to exist between the C. P. G. and the S. D. P. G. we reject negotiations from the top with the S. D. P. G.". This shattering argument is repeated by Thälmann several times. But if there were no "antagonisms in principle" then there would be no two parties. And if there were no two parties, there would be no question of the united front. Thälmann wants to prove far too much. Less—would be better.

Did not the founding of the Red Trade Union Organization, ask the workers, signify "a splitting of the organized working class"? No, replies Thälmann, and as proof he cites Engels' letter of 1895 against the aesthetic-sentimental philanthropists. Who is handing Thälmann such treacherous quotations? The R. T. U. O. is created in the spirit of unity and not of schism. Also, the worker is in no case to leave his trade union organization in order to join the R. T. U. O. On the contrary, it were better if the R. T. U. O. members remained in the trade unions in order to carry on oppositional work therein. Thälmann's words may sound convincing to Communists who have set themselves the task of fighting against the social democratic leadership. But as an answer to social democratic workers, who are concerned with trade union unity, Thälmann's words sound like a mockery. Why have you left our trade unions and organized yourselves separately?—asks the social democratic workers. If you want to enter our separate organization in order to fight against the social democratic leadership, we do not demand of you to leave the trade unions, Thälmann replies. An appropriate reply, right on the head of the nail!

"Is there democracy within the C. P. G.?" ask the

workers, passing over to another theme. Thälmann replies in the affirmative. And how! But he immediately adds unexpectedly: "In legality as well as in illegality, most particularly in the latter, the party must be on guard against spies, provocateurs and police agents." This interpolation is not made accidentally. The latest doctrine, proclaimed throughout the world in the brochure of a mysterious Büchner, justifies the strangulation of democracy in the interest of the struggle against spies. Whoever protests against the autocracy of the Stalinist bureaucracy must be declared a suspicious character at the very least. The police agents and provocateurs of every country revel with enthusiasm over this theory. They will hound Oppositionists louder than anyone else: this may divert attention from themselves and enable them to fish in troubled waters.

The flourishing of democracy is also demonstrated, according to Thälmann, by the fact that "the problems are dealt with at World Congresses and Conferences of the E. C. C. I." The speaker fails to report when the last World Congress took place. We will call it to mind: in July 1928, more than four years ago! Apparently no noteworthy questions have arisen since then. Why, be it asked in passing, doesn't Thälmann himself convoke an extraordinary German party convention to resolve the questions upon which depend the fate of the German proletariat? Certainly not because of an excess of party democracy.

So runs page after page. Thälmann replies to twenty-one questions. Every reply—a mistake. In sum—twenty-one mistakes, not counting the small and secondary ones. And they are numerous.

Thälmann relates that the Bolsheviks broke with the Mensheviks in 1903. In reality, the split first took place in 1912. But even that did not prevent the February revolution in 1917 from finding united Bolshevik and Menshevik organizations over a large part of the country. As late as the beginning of April, Stalin came out for the unification of the Bolsheviks with Tseretelli's party—not the united front but the fusion of the parties! This was prevented only by Lenin's arrival.

Thälmann says that the Bolsheviks dispersed the Constituent Assembly in 1917. In reality this occurred at the beginning of 1918. Thälmann is not at all familiar with the history of the Russian revolution and the Bolshevik party.

Far worse, however, is the fact that he does not grasp the foundations of the Bolshevik tactic. In his "theoretical" articles, he even dares to dispute the fact that the Bolsheviks concluded an agreement with the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists against Kornilov. As proof, he adduces quotations shoved under his door by somebody or other, which have nothing to do with the matter. But he forgets to answer the questions: Were there Committees for the Defense of the People throughout the land during the Kornilov putsch? Did they direct the struggle against Kornilov? Did representatives of the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists belong to these Committees? Yes, yes, yes. Were the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists in power at that time? Did they persecute the Bolsheviks as agents of the German general staff? Were thousands of Bolsheviks confined to prisons? Did Lenin hide in illegality? Yes, yes, yes. What quotations can refute these historical facts?

Let Thälmann appeal to his heart's content to Manuilsky, Losovsky and Stalin himself (if the latter ever opens his mouth). But let him leave in peace Leninism and the history of the Russian revolution: for him they are books sealed with seven seals.

In conclusion one must throw into relief still another question, which stands by itself: it concerns Versailles. The social democratic workers ask if the Communist party isn't making political concessions to National Socialism. In his reply, Thälmann continues to defend the slogan of "national emancipation" and to place it on the same plane with the slogan of social emancipation. The reparations—what is left of them now—are just as important to Thälmann as private ownership of the means of production. This policy is as if contrived uniquely to divert the attention of the worker from the basic problem, to weaken the blow against capitalism and to compel one to seek the principal foe and author of poverty on the other side of the frontier. However, now more than ever before, "the main enemy is at home!" Von Schleicher expressed this idea even more coarsely: before anything else, he declared on the radio on July 26, we must "put an end to the dirty swine at home"! This soldier's formula is very good. We pick it up willingly. Every Communist must firmly adopt it as his own. While the Nazis divert attention to Versailles, the Communist workers must retort to them with Schleicher's words: no, before anything else we must put an end to the dirty swine at home!

Prinkipo, August 17, 1932. —L. TROTSKY.

New Sub Drive Launched for Militant

(Continued from page 1)

Leninist propaganda. In these years we have made clear to a number of workers the ideas of the Left Opposition. We have firmly established the foundation of our future work. It is time to build higher. On the order of the day—the first storey! In Illinois we are taking a direct part in one of the greatest fights the miners have waged against their cap-

italist masters. Elsewhere we are active in the struggles of the workers, or are preparing to apply the principles and ideas of Marxism. In this work our central organ must play a leading role. It must become our best organizer. To fulfill this role it must increase its circulation many times. Build the first storey—get subs; use the club plan; spread the MILITANT far and wide. Every

A \$1 HALF YEAR SUB OF 26 ISSUES for 50c in CLUBS of FOUR or MORE. THE MILITANT, 84 E. 10th Street, New York City.

Enclosed find \$2 for which send the MILITANT for 26 weeks to the following:

NAMES	ADDRESSES	CITY	STATE

MILITANT BUILDER Address
City State
Help Circulate a Marxian Paper for Class Conscious Workers

sub from now on is a brick in the building of the first storey. Build it well! Build it quickly!

YOUNG SPARTACUS AID IN PICKETING OF REX STRIKE

More than 200 workers, mostly young, have struck against the attempt of the Rex Products Corporation, to put over the four wage cut in recent times, sometimes amounting to sixty percent of the wages. The workers, in a highly militant mood, applied for aid to the Metal Workers Industrial Union which is now directing the strike.

Members of the Spartacus Young Club voted to participate every morning in the picket line of the strikers and have been down every morning since the decision was adopted. In spite of this demonstration of solidarity with the striking young workers, one of the bureaucrats of the M. W. I. U., one Steuben, has sought to forbid our young comrades from participating in the picket lines and fraternizing with the strikers, giving as his "reason" that "we don't work with people we don't know."