

WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE

THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879
VOLUME V, NO. 41 [WHOLE NO. 137] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1932 PRICE 5 CENTS

The Miners' Convention

Ravages of Lewisism; the Position of the Communist Groups

October the third undoubtedly turned the attention of thousands of miners toward Gillespie, Ill. Even from far away Nova Scotia, where the miners have completely broken with the Lewis regime, taken matters into their own hand and organized the Amalgamated Mine Workers, greetings go out to the constitutional convention of the Progressive Miners of America. That is understandable. Illinois represents almost the sole solidly organized miners section of some real substance left in the field. But whether this constitutional convention can make a serious beginning toward the solution of the all important problems, remains to be seen.

The mine fields today in an organizational sense present a picture of frightful devastation. In 1921 when John L. Lewis was solidly entrenched on his throne in Indianapolis the U. M. W. of A. reached its highest point of growth with a total membership of 515,243. By Dec. 1928 the number, including Canada, had been reduced to 172,632, of which 83,446 were in the anthracite and 53,088 in Illinois. Reports from the U. M. W. of A. of actual membership have been very scarce since; but obviously the drop has gone considerably further downward. In other words while in 1921 about 75 percent of all the soft coal hoisted was mined by union labor there is today less than 10 percent of the total tonnage union mined. What a frightful trail of destruction!

How the Miners Were Eliminated
The method of its accomplishment becomes somewhat clear when one recalls how John L. Lewis in the 1922 strike betrayed the 60,000 miners of the Fayette and Somerset counties in Pennsylvania. These miners had just been organized but were in the settlement left to shift for themselves and disappeared as an organized force.

Frank Farrington, who was then President of the Illinois district, charged John L. Lewis with having received bribes to the tune of \$750,000 from interests closely associated with the Pennsylvania and Kentucky operators, to break the strike. This accusation was made in repayment for the Lewis' charge against Farrington of having received \$27,000 to break the 1919 Illinois strike. Undoubtedly both gentlemen were entirely correct. And certainly both instances exemplify, though these alone only in a small measure, what the miners had to endure during this kind of a regime.

To the uninitiated it may appear as if the present break in Illinois occurred purely on the question of the wage scale, that is, the maintenance of the basic \$6.10 a day scale or the sell out agreement of Lewis-Walker for the \$5.00 a day scale. This is only one of the manifestations. To the miners, though, it becomes a quite important difference when one considers that an employed miner in the soft coal field is quite lucky to average about two working days in a week, aside from the large number totally unemployed.

The fundamental cause is naturally far more deep-seated. It is the very question of union organization which is involved, and in that sense thousands of miners may justifiably turn their eyes toward the Gillespie constitutional convention. In that sense also the responsibility of that convention becomes a far greater one.

The Parties and the Miners
It is not at all strange that the Socialist party officially takes the position of neutrality and non-interference in the break the Illinois miners have made with the Lewis-Walker clique. That was to be expected. First of all, and this may be the smallest consideration, that position enables them to have their members in both camps to fish for votes and support in both directions. But essentially this cover of neutrality enables the Socialist party to give its support in reality to the reactionary camp and help stem the Leftward tide of the new movement. That part of its role will become increasingly clear with future developments.

But there should be no less concern over the attitude of the official Communist party. From a letter issued by Joe Tash, the U. M. U. and party organizer in the Illinois field, dealing with the foundation conference of the P. M. of A., we take the following excerpts: "However, it should be obvious just from a glance that the leadership of the conference succeeded in putting over another betrayal of the Illinois miners . . ." And further, "This further means splitting the ranks of the miners and defeating the splendid unity of the Illinois miners. It is the same policy that Walker and Lewis are known for and which smashed the U. M. W. A. as a fighting union . . ." If this be true, then there could be no distinction between the new union and the old gang. In that respect the party is duty bound to change its

THE NEXT ISSUE OF
THE MILITANT
WILL CONTAIN A FULL
REPORT OF THE
ILLINOIS MINERS'
CONVENTION IN
GILLESPIE

attitude. It is duty bound to turn its attention toward the unification and further development of all the progressive forces, maintaining its criticism of the conservative and reactionary elements within them, but to support the movement in its rebellion against the Lewis-Walker crew.

Those Who Condemn a "Split"
The Right wing Lovestone group chips in its bit with regard to the Illinois miners situation. It says in sum and substance in an editorial in the *Workers Age* of Sept. 24, that any idea of uniting the anti-Lewis groups outside of the U. M. W. A. would be false and share the same fate as the N. W. U., and that a new union should not have been organized. In other words, according to this advice the Illinois miners should be driven back again to the U. M. W. A.

Is this reactionary attitude any better than that shown by the Socialist party? Not one whit. The figures cited above, giving the present status of the U. M. W. A., in addition to the well-known long series of betrayals by its officialdom, prove, if anything, that conditions have long been rotten ripe for a definite split away from this corrupt clique. But up till now the subjective factor, the membership itself, was not sufficiently matured to carry it through. Attempts were made, but mostly on a false basis. Now, it appears to be conclusive, and at least with prospects of heading in the right direction.

Unity of the mine workers throughout the field is the essential problem. That can no longer be accomplished within the bounds of the remnants of the U. M. W. A. controlled by a reactionary clique of capitalist agents of the Lewis-Walker types, whose objective is exactly the opposite. The place of the revolutionists is undisputedly with the rebel movement, fighting for its necessary Leftward direction and for unification outside of the deadening grip of the reactionaries.

—A. S.

Illinois Conference Opens

Miners Are Militant but Right Wing Forces Are Organized

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.—
Over 200 delegates, representing at least 22,000 miners of all sections of the state, from the terror-ridden southern counties (Franklin, Williamson and Saline) to the far northern Peoria-Wilmington fields, assembled in a constitutional convention to decide upon the form and aims of the organization of coal miners to replace the shell of an organization left by the Lewis-Walker-Coal operators' combine.

The opening of the convention on Monday, October 3 was marked by a parade of 3,000 coal miners and their women folk. The demand for clean fighting unionism has reached to elements hitherto dormant or nearly dormant. The spirit of the well-organized women's auxiliary is distinguished by its militancy.

The convention heard the secretary of the West Virginia Miners' Union with great attention and evinced their solidarity with that movement there. The applause left no doubt of the position of the Illinois miners on the question of national unity when Shearer, the secretary of the W. Va. Miners Union, raised this point in his speech.

The convention was very jealous of the rights of the membership. As a reaction to the mandatory fashion of the Lewis bureaucracy, this swing to rank and fileism goes to nearly ridiculous extremes. The spirit, however, is very healthy and very vigorous in its extreme care for democracy.

As yet no Left wing has appeared in the convention. The proposal to turn a speaker from the N. W. U. was heard

Saturday: All Out to Union Square For Scottsboro!

The Communist League of America calls upon all its members and sympathizers to participate in the demonstration in Union Square, Saturday, October 8, at 2 P. M. The demonstration is to be one of the many called by the I. L. D. for that day throughout the nation, demanding the release of the Scottsboro boys. The Supreme Court hearing begins October 10. The demonstrations on the 8th must echo and re-echo throughout the land. The voice of the workers must penetrate the Supreme Court walls. The Scottsboro boys must not die! Members and sympathizers of the League are requested to assemble at the Opposition headquarters, 84 East 10th Street, 1:30 P. M. Saturday, so that we can go to the Union Square demonstration in a body. All attend!

Elephant, Donkey and "Socialists" Compete for Election Honors

As the election campaign wears on toward its climax on election day the antics of the elephant, the cavortings of the donkey, and the darlings of the torch more clearly reveal the true nature of the three parties of capitalism as they swing into the final phase of their strategy. The "issues" they pounded so heavily in the earlier stages of the campaign have gone by the board as they scramble madly for votes.

Only a few months ago the Republican band-wagon was assuring the country that if the engineer was not measuring up to the publicity ballyhoo it was not his fault. He was the victim of circumstances over which no man or party could prevail. But a series of dramatic incidents in which the Communists did not play the least role brought out clearly the reactionary character of the administration and its shining light. The Hunger March of last December, the shooting of workers demonstrating for relief in Cleveland, Chicago, Detroit, etc., focussed attention on the vicious resistance of the capitalist class and its servant-engineer to the demands of the unemployed for relief. The nation-wide hunting down and deportation of foreign-born militants; the passage of the Dies

Bill; the nation-wide terrorism against the bonus marchers culminating in the armed eviction of the bonusers from Washington, make up a record of reaction too clear to be explained away as the result of circumstances. The Republican boosters are now prating that Hoover's policies saved the country. That is the only shred of demagoguery left them.

This blind alley into which life has forced the Wall Street elephant has given the Democrats a great opportunity. With windy demagoguery they are parading themselves as progressives. They are appealing to the "liberal element of the community". That is the line of Roosevelt's speeches in Iowa, Wisconsin and Detroit.

The Donkey Brays
How well the donkey is braying this time will, of course, be decided on Election Day. But this strategy is already paying dividends. The New York *Times* of October 3 reported A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, as saying: "I am supporting Governor Roosevelt because I believe his liberal views pertaining to the welfare of the masses will result in general prosperity".

But it is not alone the petty bourgeois strata of the working class, the labor aristocracy, which are singing Roosevelt's liberalism. Senators and congressmen, staunch and not-so-staunch supporters of the Republican machine in "normal" times, are coming out for Roosevelt. They are alarmed at the Leftward drift of the masses, awakening to class consciousness from the illusion nurtured by Hoover and company. A section of their political base, the petty bourgeoisie, is also moving to the Left under pressure of the crisis. These windbags must move along with them or be left behind. And, finally, they see the handwriting on the wall: Hoover and the Republican party are going to get a beating. These new prophets of liberalism have a keen eye for their political futures. They will lose nothing, they calculate, by climbing aboard the band-wagon now.

The indicated success of the Democrats in corraling the "liberal" vote has alarmed the socialist party. They have been making a bid for this vote themselves. In their campaign book just issued, they make it plain, according to the *New York Times*, that they do not advance any revolutionary objectives. They limit themselves to reforms within the limits of capitalism. Their New York state election program reeks with the same reformism. Mr. Fuess of the Republican party hails the socialist party as respectable. In the rush for votes the socialist party leans, not on the working class it claims to represent but whose interests it betrays, but strains itself to the right, to allure the petty bourgeoisie with its specialism.

Socialists and Liberals
To offset the threatened Democratic sweep of the "progressive" and "liberal" vote the socialist party had undertaken a mobilization of the more "radical" liberals. Together with them it has organized the Committee of 100,000 to support the Thomas-Maurer Ticket. The chairman of this melange of philosophers, bishops, editors, and economists, is Paul Douglas, professor of economy in the (Continued on page 2)

VOTE COMMUNIST!

Program of Action of the League on the Unemployment Situation

The unemployment situation, which is growing continually more acute, presents an enormous problem to the American working class. With an ever accelerated speed this situation helps in the process of separating it from its former bourgeois political ideology and allegiances. On the whole the unemployment situation constitutes, particularly by its definite aspect of permanency, an important factor in our revolutionary perspective.

There are no exact figures available as to the size of the unemployed army of the country, but even the conservative American Federation of Labor estimates a total of 11,400,000. There need be little doubt that the actual figure is much larger than this estimate. This is quite well borne out by the Department of Labor index figures of unemployment based upon returns from 89 manufacturing industries. The month of July 1932 registered the lowest employment percentage yet on record. The index figure had dropped to 55.2. The full year of

1926 is reckoned as 100. In this connection it is necessary also to take into account the drop in total payroll for which the recorded index figures are based upon the same industries and with the full year of 1926 reckoned as 100. The July 1932 total payroll index figure was 36.2.

The greater disparity shown by the much greater drop in total payroll gives conclusive proof to the contention that unemployment and wage cuts go hand in hand and that the growing unemployed army becomes a particular incentive utilized by capitalism to reduce the standard of living of the workers. In sum and substance this situation reveals the staggering work class misery accompanying the large scale overproduction of capital. It shows also the picture of arrogant flaunting of the demands of the unemployed workers and brutal suppression of their demonstrations.

Efforts of the American bourgeoisie to issue out of the crisis have not been lacking. There is now beginning a mobilization of capitalist resources to restore confidence, within capitalism, in the continuity of the process of reproduction, to "expand" credits and to restore a profit rate in an endeavor again to resume the cycle of production.

Fundamentally these efforts imply, on the one hand, a greater accumulation and concentration of capital, and on the other, intensified exploitation of the workers and a further reduction of their standard of living. The general results can be only that the unemployed army, in its main composition, remain permanently unemployed with its ranks growing despite any temporary industrial revival.

These are the two outstanding problems: (1) Further attacks upon the standard of living of the working class by wage cuts and speed-up; (2) a permanent, growing unemployed army. This

Scottsboro Case Up In Supreme Court

Only Mass Action Can Save Framed-Up Negro Boys!

The case of the nine Negro boys who were framed in Scottsboro, Ala., by the white southern bourgeois on a trumped-up charge of rape is now approaching a tentative conclusion. On October 10, the Supreme Court of the United States is to review the case. That the case has gone so far is entirely to the credit of the International Labor Defense and the Communist party which have fought in this case with an agitational ardor that is truly admirable.

The Supreme Court is to review the case of only seven of the defendants. In previous trials the cases of two of the boys were eliminated in so far as a Supreme Court hearing is concerned. In the case of one of the boys a mistrial was declared, as he was a minor. In the other case a retrial was ordered. The Supreme Court hearing will, in any event, affect all of the nine defendants.

The agitation carried on in behalf of the boys has not only had a tremendous echo in this country but internationally as well. Agitation for the Scottsboro boys has been carried on in almost every

country of the globe. In Chemnitz, Germany, a number of workers were shot while demonstrating for the release of the Scottsboro boys. The tour of Mrs. Wright, the mother of one of the boys, and J. Louis Engdahl through the countries of Europe on behalf of the International Red Aid has been of tremendous significance in the cause of international working class solidarity. From some of the European countries they were summarily expelled.

No Let-Up!
But there must be no let-up now. The lag in agitation in recent months, as the Communist press now points out, may have been unavoidable. But the point now is to multiply the agitation tenfold. The demonstrations called for by the party for October 8, throughout the United States, must be supported by every class-conscious worker. We must not leave to the so-called impartiality of the Supreme Court the fate of the Scottsboro boys. We must demonstrate in mass for our demand that the Negro boys of Scottsboro do not burn!

Opposition Youth Calls Scottsboro Meeting

The Spartacus Youth Club of New York will hold a special meeting on the case of the Scottsboro boys, whose trial comes up before the U. S. supreme court on the tenth of this month. The dastardly frame-up of these nine innocent boys will be analyzed in detail, a history of other cases of frame-up in the labor movement of this country given, and an investigation of the Negro question presented. Three speakers will handle the different topics, comrades Craine, Bord,

and Capelis.
The date is Friday, October 7, at the Stuyvesant Casino, 9th St., and 2nd Ave., at 8 o'clock sharp. All members and sympathizers of the club are urged to attend this important meeting. Y. C. Lers are especially invited to be there. On Saturday, the Club and its sympathizers will participate in the demonstration called by the I. L. D. on Union Square in defense of the imprisoned boys.
All out on Saturday!

Convict 6th Harlan Miner

5 Now Serving Life Terms While 37 Others Still Await Trial

The sixth miner to be sentenced to life imprisonment by the coal barons of Kentucky has just been announced. His name is Jim Reynolds. The five others who are now serving life terms in the Kentucky dungeons are Jones, Hightower, Poore, Hudson and Elzie Phillips, a Negro miner. All in all there are 43 miners facing life imprisonment on a charge of murder growing out of the battle at Evarts, Kentucky, on May 5, 1931. The case of the six already indicted is under appeal by the state supreme court.

The battle of Evarts came as a culmination of a reign of terror instituted by the coal barons and their hirelings, the police. After trying to break the strike in Harlan, Ky., the mine owners organized a concerted effort to break the picket line. On May 5, when the mine pickets were attempting to stop a truckload of household goods from being shipped to strike-breakers in a nearby town, three auto-loads of thugs were seen approaching. The pickets sought cover in the adjacent bushes and behind rocks. The thugs then opened fire by splattering a hail of machine gun bullets into the bushes and down the hillside. In self-defense some of the besieged miners who were armed expecting just such an emergency, returned fire. When the fighting ceased Jim Daniels, the leader of the gunmen, and two other thugs were found dead. One miner Carl Richmond, was killed by the thugs. Marjorie law was then declared. Forty-three people were arrested and charged with murder as a direct result of the clash. Sixty-three others were picked up and charged with criminal syndicalism.

The trials of the arrested miners have been as indicative of American class justice as any one could hope to cite. In the case of Negro workers brought to trial, race prejudice and race hatred was the dominant key note stressed by the prosecution. In the Negro-baiting South a jury composed of petty bourgeois whites could be relied on to bring in the proper verdict—guilty. In the case of the white workers, class hatred was aroused in the bosoms of the property-loving members of the jury by telling them hair-raising stories as to the deeds of violence these men had committed against property.

The General Defense Committee of the I. W. W. has carried on a courageous struggle for these imprisoned miners. Fighting in the bourbon South for workers imprisoned by the class enemy is no easy task. All in all the General Defense has stood nobly by the imprisoned workers. It has been instrumental in having the indictments against five of the miners dropped.
Not all of the General Defense Committee's activity in the strike however can be placed on the credit side of the ledger. There is at least one important debit to record. The General Defense has relied too much on the legal aspects of the case. In a matter of working class defense before capitalist courts, mass agitation and pressure is at all times of the utmost importance. It should be clear now even to the most die-hard of Wobblies, what with the mock trials in the courts of Kentucky, that extra-legal pressure from without by thousands and millions of workers can be the most effective weapon in fighting for the release of those of our comrades imprisoned by our class enemy.

NEW QUARTERS

On October 15, the League will move into new headquarters at

126 EAST 16th STREET
New York City

THE INTERNATIONAL WORKERS SCHOOL
Will also be located there

OPENING BANQUET

On Saturday Evening, OCTOBER 15

Invited and sympathizers are cordially friends. Come and bring your fellow workers. Help us realize this forward step

(Continued on page 4)

Letters from Militants

All Eyes On Davenport

DAVENPORT, IOWA.—For all Oppositionists and Communists in general, who are interested in the dispute between the Left Opposition and Stalinism, the humble city of Davenport, standing on the Iowa side of the Mississippi River, will become a point of attraction between the hours of 8 to 11 P. M., on Friday, Sept. 30. In those few hours an event will take place such as has been unheard of since the occasion for such an event was created in 1927 by the expulsion of the Left Opposition. For the first time since the expulsion of the Opposition, has the Opposition succeeded in goading the official leadership of the party into debating us, and over the most basic and fundamental principle difference, to wit—over the theory of socialism in one country.

For five years the Left Opposition has thundered a challenge to the Stalinists, openly to debate our differences before the party ranks and the working class; and for five years have the Stalinists refused. Everywhere this challenge was thrown into the teeth of Stalinism—in the capitals of Europe and the great metropolises of the world—and when the challenge was finally accepted, it had to be accepted in Davenport, of all places. Which shows, of course, that in Davenport the party has not as yet been completely "bolshvized" (read Stalinized) in this respect; and which further proves that the district office will have to send many a bureaucrat to Davenport in order to rectify the most "disgraceful" action of one party faction debating the other party faction over a principle difference whose importance is so great that the whole agenda of world revolution is arranged by the stand taken on this difference. But for the present, as long as the district office remains in blissful ignorance of the approaching debate, bear in mind that on Friday, Sept. 30, Jack Wilson, the party section organizer of Davenport will debate comrade George Kapcan, newly recruited into the Left Opposition, over the subject "SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY OR WORLD REVOLUTION." An elaborate agreement as to arrangements and procedure has been drawn up and signed by comrades Sekoy and Perron for the party and Kapcan and Brady for the Left Opposition.

Condition of the Party

The party in Davenport and vicinity is in a most deplorable condition. If one desires to study the evil effects of the Stalinist regime, he should choose the weak sections for his study. For in the same way as all of the contradictions of the capitalist system are most easily discerned in the weak links of the system, so also do all of the contradictions of Stalinism reveal themselves most boldly in the weak links. Open party activity such as open-air meetings and demonstrations are very scarce; all party organizations extremely sectarian; and the ideological level of the membership frightfully backward with no attempts to raise this level. Naturally therefore the party and its auxiliaries are a very negligible factor in the class struggle. (The backwardness of the membership is so appalling that the party member is hardly to be distinguished from the ordinary worker as far as theoretical knowledge goes. But of course this condition is by no means to be blamed on the rank and file, but on the contrary must be attributed to the leadership which, being politically impotent, can only maintain its position as long as widespread ignorance prevails. To mention only two instances from among the many which show the result of the above-mentioned condition: (1) Communists hitching themselves to a plow and plowing up charity land, later selling pictures of this scene. (2) Party members in Muscatine participating in a strike in the button industry, refusing to admit out-of-town Communists to speak to and organize the strikers.

A description of the local situation would not be complete without a description of the section organizer, Jack Wilson. To begin with, his social status is surrounded with very suspicious circumstances. This individual is the acme of Stalinist bureaucracy, ignorance, cowardice, stupidity, rudeness and disloyalty. (When shown a draft leaflet to advertise the debate, a sub-heading of which read "Can Socialism be completed in one country—in the Soviet Union?" he out-Stalinized Stalin by demanding that the phrase "in the Soviet Union" be stricken out, which task of striking out the Oppositionists performed with great alacrity.

All through the Middle West the bureaucratic regime has wrought havoc in the Communist ranks. The most intelligent workers were either driven out or left the party in disgust at the bureaucratic tactics. Paul Cline, the previous D. O. of that district (West of Muscatine), performed such a complete job of destruction that he had to be removed to another district. Before his removal he had managed to cut a wide swath of destruction in the party ranks all through the Middle West.

This territory offers good opportunity for the Left Opposition. Only the Left Opposition can go in and save the Communist workers from utter despair in Communism which they confuse with the bureaucratic administrative acts of Stalinist officials. By persistent work and education, the Left Opposition can gather up the best elements, forge out of these workers good Communists and true, and thus strengthen Communism.

—BRADY.

Free Speech Struggle in Chicago

CHICAGO, ILL.—A new wave of terror has been inaugurated in Chicago by the red squad of that city, in an attempt to place a ban upon free speech, which the working class wrested from the iron grip of capitalism after many years of struggle and sacrifice. It is significant that the attack comes in the heart of the election campaign, when the activity of the Communist party has increased and when the influence of the party extends and grows with a tremendous rapidity.

North Ave. and Fairfield St., has for some ten years been a gathering place for the workers of the northwest section of Chicago to hear the propaganda of the numerous workers' parties. It is this corner that is the first to be attacked.

The leadership of the Communist party has unconsciously paved the way for the recent assault by the police. For three years the party has pursued a policy of disturbing and breaking up of all other meetings on the corner. This developed a state of almost irreconcilable antagonisms between the individual parties who had access to the corner. Much energy which the party should have exerted in its attack upon the bourgeoisie, was expended in antagonizing the rank and file of other organizations, much to the pleasure of the leaders of these groups and to the stupendous satisfaction of the Chicago police. The police saw in the attack of the C. P. upon the Proletarian party, the I W W, the S L P, etc., the division of the working class which is so essential to the bosses if they are to be successful in their struggle against the proletariat. The "victory" of the C. P. in driving all other working class groups from the corner and "monopolizing" it for themselves was short lived. The police chose an opportune moment for the attack.

The P. P., being harassed by the C. P. whenever they attempted to speak, very cravenly approached the police for protection. The P. P. meeting began; the C. P. members heckled and shouted, the police rushed to the "assistance" of the P. P., and smashed the heads of many worker Communists.

A protest meeting was arranged for the following Saturday and the meeting met with a similar fate. The police spared no one. Not even the old militant, comrade Holman, was spared. A number of comrades were sent to the hospital for treatment. The party launched a splendid fight for the corner which continued for almost 40 minutes after which they were forced to retreat.

A third meeting was called for Sat. Sept. 17 on the same corner, 8 P. M. found the four corners lined with people, nothing short of 3-4,000. The police too were very well represented. The roof tops had a scattering of the blue coats who leveled guns at the crowd.

On the S. W. corner a Y. C. L. member began to speak. A small defense corp formed around her consisting of Pioneers, I. W. O. youth members, and some members of the Spartacus Youth Club. How the people managed to leave that corner so rapidly is still puzzling in my mind. The police came, the speaker walked away without resisting and again we were lost.

Some twenty minutes later a battle raged of Communists and workers against the police. Shots were fired (into the air), the crowd was panicky and retreated, sweeping all the militants with them. This was the end of the organized battle. Thereafter the police secretly arrest-

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

Of THE MILITANT published weekly at New York, N. Y. for October 1, 1932, State of New York ss
County of New York ss

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Thomas Stamm, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of THE MILITANT and that the following is to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 4, 1912, embodied in section 411, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:
Publisher: The Communist League of America (Opposition) New York, N. Y.
Editor: Max Shachtman
Business Manager: Thomas Stamm
Post Office Address: 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)
The Communist League of America (Opposition); 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.; Martin Abern, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.; James P. Cannon, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.; Max Shachtman, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.; Arne Swaback, 84 East 10th St., New York, N. Y.;

3. That the known bondholders, mort-

The Parties in the Elections

(Continued from page 1)
University of Chicago. Among the vice-chairmen are John Dewey, chairman of the League for Independent Political Action; Morris Cohen, professor of philosophy in City College, New York; Oswald Garrison Villard, editor of the Nation; and His Grace, Bishop Francis J. McConnell. There are others. They are of the same stripe.

The organization of the Committee from the point of view of the socialist party is easy to understand. But what is the meaning of this combination from the point of view of the committee? It does not stand for socialism or the social democracy. It has issued no statement endorsing the socialist party platform. It is not an auxiliary of the socialist party. It is not subject to it politically or ideologically.

On the contrary it is opposed to socialism. Sitting in onrman Thomas' office on September 23, Paul Douglas issued a statement to the press, in which the New York Times reported him as "frankly conceding his doubts of the ultimate victory of socialism in the United States." "The committee is for a 'third party' but it does not see it in the socialist party; 'A large vote for Thomas and Maurer will consolidate sentiment for a new party'—"

What is the game this band of confused intellectuals is playing? It wants to cajole a few reforms from the Hoovers. Said Douglas in the same statement: "A large vote for Thomas and Maurer . . . will throw such a scare into the old parties that no matter which one wins they will make some concessions." That is the extent of their progressiveness and liberalism!

But these people are also alarmed at the indicated success of the Democrats in capturing the "progressive" and "liberal" vote. They figure that if Roosevelt wins the election as a progressive, they themselves will have no leg to stand on as progressives. But if Hoover gets in this will be a repudiation of Roosevelt's "liberalism" and will have them alone in

ed many of the militants. The fight in itself was less stubborn than the two preceding ones. The Chicago working class suffered a defeat.

Here we have a splendid opportunity for a united front issue with all the workers' parties in Chicago for the Right of Free Speech. This, however, was made almost completely impossible by the activity of the Communist party hit-and-run (i. e., their breaking up of open air meetings of other organizations). A united front can be made between the party and other organizations only upon the conditions that the party repudiates its former position toward the other working class organizations in regards to open air meetings. It can be accomplished only if the party condemns its former policies, recognizes its mistakes in this regard and pledges to conduct a struggle for the freedom of speech for all working class organizations; only upon the condition that the C. P. guarantees to discontinue its hitherto atrocious and non-Communist physical attacks upon other working class groups. In this the party would also be compelled to recognize the correctness of the Left Opposition on this question.

The Left Opposition will continue to fight, as it always has, side by side with the Communist party for the right of the party to present its position to the working class on the street corners and elsewhere. And in this struggle we will raise our voices for a united front, for freedom of speech, and against police brutality.

Chicago, Sept. 21, 1932. —NATHAN GOULD.

gages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the names of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

THOMAS STAMM, Business Manager
Sworn to and subscribed before me this 4th of October 1932.

M. R. KEFFE, Notary Public
(My commission expires March 30, 1933)

the field as the "progressive" opposition. (That is the meaning of Douglas' statements that: "I think that we can get more out of the election of Hoover with a big vote for Thomas, than out of the election of Roosevelt with a small vote for Thomas"; and: "We won't get a Liberal-Conservative line-up till we smash the Democratic party.")

Because of their confusion, of their lack of a clear political program on a class basis, these people are brought to a pass in which they are forced to desire and to lend objective support to the reaction they ostensibly set out to fight.

To be sure we hold no brief for the donkey, any more than we do for the elephant or the socialist party. All three are the handmaidens of capitalism. Each party plays its role in the class struggle. The reactionary nature of the Hoover-Republican line is now clearly established for large sections of the masses and the petty bourgeoisie. The equally reactionary role of the Democratic remains to be established on a national scale. The treacherous nature of the socialist party leadership must also be established.

From every street corner, in every Communist organ the story of this unprincipled combination of the socialist party with the "Left" petty bourgeois intelligentsia must be told and retold.

—T. STAMM.

Tour for Unser Kampf

This Thursday, Oct. 6, comrades Sylvia Blecker and Morris Lewit set forth on an extensive tour that will take them as far West as Minneapolis. The purpose of the tour is to lay a firm foundation for our Jewish organ, **Unser Kampf**. The method the comrades will employ in establishing this firm foundation will be to organize Unser Kampf Clubs where no such clubs exist now. Where Unser Kampf Clubs are already established, comrades Lewit and Blecker will see to it that they are placed on an even firmer foundation.

The first stop on the comrades' itinerary will be New Haven. Then in the order named will come Boston, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, Buffalo, Cleveland, Youngstown, Detroit, Grand Rapids, Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, Des Moines, Kansas City, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Trenton and Newark. The tour is to last two months.

As can be seen this is to be quite an extensive trip. The undertaking at the present time is of tremendous significance. At no time in the brief history of our movement has the needs of a Left Opposition organ in the Jewish tongue been of such singular importance as now.

The future success of **Unser Kampf** rests to a large extent on the results of the tour now undertaken. It is up to the comrades—members and sympathizers—of the various cities that comrades Blecker and Lewit will visit to make of this tour a tremendous success.

New Headquarters Banquet

The drive for the International Workers School has taken another step forward when we engaged the school headquarters at 126 East 16th Street, just off Irving Place. We will open the new school headquarters on the 15th, and between now and then we will have a crew remodeling the place. We are arranging for an office, class rooms and form. Last year we were forced to engage outside halls for classes and forums. This location will enable us to centralize all of our activity for the coming season, until we outgrow the place. The new school headquarters means we are taking another step forward.

Will you help us in this activity. You can do your part. We must obtain a fund of \$300.00 for the International Workers School and the new headquarters. If we do not obtain this fund—our plans will not be realized. We urge you to send in your contributions at once. Enrollment for the classes is now in progress. Send in your enrollment to J. Weber, or come down to the office at 84 East 10th Street.

We are planning an opening affair for the new headquarters. On Saturday, October the 15th, we will have a house warming party. A BANQUET with excellent food prepared by the Greek comrades. Dancing and entertainment will follow. Watch for further announcement.

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 Swaback

Vol. V, No. 40, (Whole No. 136)
SATURDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1932
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year, Foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.

MILITANT SUB DRIVE

Our Club Plan

WE'RE OFF.

A comrade from Chicago who modestly signs himself, H. A., has sent in the first club of four subs. One Militant Builder does not make a successful campaign any more than one swallow makes a summer. But this is only the first green shoot showing its head above ground. Watch the oak tree grow!

Don't only watch. Go out among your friends, our sympathizers, and workers; and fill up a few club plan blanks yourself. That's the way to increase the circulation of our paper.

THE CLUB PLAN

Some comrades seem a little unclear on exactly what the club plan is. The club plan is a scheme to offer workers a fifty percent reduction in the price of a half-year sub in clubs of four or more. The regular price for a half-year sub of twenty-six weekly issues is \$1. In clubs of four or more at one time it is \$.50 per sub.

Look at the blank below. It provides for four names. You can approach a worker and sign him up for a half-year sub. Ask him for only fifty cents. Do not send in the sub yet. Wait until you fill up the blank with the names of three other workers. You should now have \$2. for the four subs. Send it in together with the filled-out, club plan blank. You are now a Militant Builder.

Now see how flexible the idea is, to how many uses it can be put. Suppose one of the workers you approach is a little better off than others. Suppose he can afford to pay a dollar for the sub. Explain the club plan to him and ask him to subscribe at the old rate. Write his name down on the blank for a fifty cent, club plan sub. And enter the name of a worker who cannot afford even fifty cents for a sub, for the other fifty cents.

Now suppose you catch a subscriber who has had a run of work of four or five weeks and can afford a donation of say, two dollars. Ask him for the money and enter the names of four workers who want the Militant but cannot afford to subscribe.

SUBS FOR THE MINERS

Now suppose you do not know four workers to whom you want the Militant

MILITANT BUILDERS CLUB PLAN BLANK

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

GERMANY
WHAT
NEXT
BY
LEON
TROTSKY

192 Pages
CLOTH 65 c
PAPER 35 c PUBLISHERS

PIONEER

Militant Jubilee Anniversary Number

November 15 will mark the fourth anniversary of the appearance of the Militant. Much has happened in the international revolutionary and labor movements since our comrades published that historic document on November 15, 1928, "For the Russian Opposition—Against Opportunism and Bureaucracy in the Workers (Communist) Party of America! A Statement to American Communists by James P. Cannon, Martin Abern and Max Shachtman."

The course of the movement in this country and abroad has been more than a

little influenced by the stinging criticism and concrete Marxian platform of the American League and the International Left Opposition. Its ebbs and flows have been discussed and analyzed in the columns of the Militant.

November 15 will also mark the fourth anniversary of the publication of the first installment of comrade Trotsky's great work, "The Draft Program of the Comintern," now out of print.

The November 12 issue of the Militant which is closest to the 15th will be a Jubilee Anniversary issue. It will be

devoted to a review of Four Years of the Militant.

But the Militant is not only the organ of the American League. It is a part of the press of the International Left Opposition. We expect to carry greetings from comrade Trotsky and our brother sections.

We will also feature greetings from

our comrades, sympathizers, friends and auxiliary organizations, as well as workers' organizations sympathetic to us. The rate for a single name will be \$.25. For a one-column-wide, one-line greeting—\$1 position. We expect to carry greetings from comrade Trotsky and our brother sections.

Send in your name with a quarter at once. Use the blank below.

THE MILITANT

84 EAST 10th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Enclosed find for which please enter my greeting in the Jubilee Anniversary issue, November 12, 1932.

Name Address
City State

League Replies to Weisbord Letter

(Continued from previous issue)
Weisbord denied the existence of Centrist in the Communist movement and characterized the Stalinists and Lovestonites indiscriminately as "Right wing" groups, and then to make confusion worse confounded he placed the Communist League in the same category. That is why he had so much difficulty in deciding which group to join. That is also the principal reason why he demanded that the Left Opposition and the Right wing should "work together", and why he himself tried it, in the "Textile Unity Committee", with such disastrous results.

The present attempt to evade a serious correction of this basic error by denying that it was ever meant that way, or by maintaining that "the whole question seems to be one of name" (as though a precise attitude toward a political tendency is possible without defining it) does not square with the previous programmatic declarations on the subject, continuously repeated in the conflict with us and contrasted with our "sectarianism" in rejecting them. In his article in the Militant for September 15, 1930 Weisbord expounded his theory as follows:

"However, it seems that comrade Trotsky is incorrect in designating the struggle between Bucharin and Stalin (and the national groups around them) as one between Right and Centrist tendencies in the Communist movement. It is in reality a struggle between two forms of the Right. But philosophically and politically the conception of a Centrist COMMUNIST wing is wrong. Centristism can be used as designating Stalinists but not Communists. This was Lenin's usage of the term. Practically, it gives the illusion that the Centrists are more to the Left than the Right and that Centrists are more easily swayed and have no real policy of their own."

It is quite obvious from the foregoing that between this viewpoint and that of the Left Opposition there was no mere difference in words but in analysis, and consequently in the conclusions deriving from it. On the basis of this formulation, as well as the practical proposals repeatedly made, comrade Trotsky was entirely correct in saying to Weisbord: "You are concerned to efface the difference between the official party, the Right wing fraction (Lovestone group) and even the American League. This makes it easy for you to remain in an eclectic position and defend your right of a bloc with the Lovestone group."

The reply of the Weisbord group to Trotsky's letter "emphatically denies the implications" of this estimate, and further denies ever having proposed a bloc with the Right wing. Again the present contention is refuted by the previous declaration and proposals. In this same article in the Militant referred to above there follows from this analysis of the groups the following conclusion: "At the same time all Communist groups must work together on the basis of the recognition of the Communist character of each group. The Communist Majority Opposition group and the Communist League group by working together can help to reestablish mass work and to resist the violent tactics of the party officialdom. They can help to separate the Communist movement as a whole from the Mensheviks and can deal a death blow to the theory of Fascism and social Fascism, thus winning the advanced workers to a Leninist conception of party democracy. Only such a working together of Communist groups (only this!) can raise those fundamental principles of Leninist organization that can reconstitute an International of Lenin."

If this is not a bloc with the Right wing, what would such a bloc look like? How hopelessly the Communist League would have compromised itself before the Communist workers and before the International Left Opposition! It ought to be perfectly clear now to everyone, including Weisbord, that the League National Committee was right in maintaining that such conceptions had nothing in common with the Left Opposition. We saw in this the crux of our conflict with him and still see it that way. Most of the other differences flowed from this. In our reply (Militant, September 15, 1930) we said:

"It is with comrade Weisbord's proposals on the various groups in the movement that the Left Opposition has its sharpest disagreement. Advocacy of such views by a leading comrade is contrary to all we stand for. . . . That is false from beginning to end."

And further: "How can we, the Marxist wing of the movement, unite with the semi-Menshevik wing (a bloc which under present conditions would mean a movement directed against the official Communist movement) in order to 'separate' the Communist movement as a whole from the 'Menshevik'? How can a bloc with the Right wing 're-establish mass work', when it is the whole philosophy of the Right wing that has brought the Communist movement into such isolation from the masses (Chinese revolution, British general strike, India, etc., etc.), into opportunistic swamps from which Centristism is now trying, ineffectively, to issue by means of the ultra-Leftist rope?"

"Such a policy, combined as it is with comrade Weisbord's entirely false estimate of Centrist (his denial of it, in fact), is the shortest road to destruction of the Left Opposition and a disavowal of its historical function."

We print here the final installment of the statement of the National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) on the Weisbord group's reply to comrade Trotsky.

ever against the recurrence of the utterly false conceptions entertained by Weisbord or against the introduction of them into the ideological stream of the League. We consider necessary a more candid and less ambiguous re-statement of comrade Weisbord's position on this point.

THE QUESTION OF MASS WORK
The formula behind which Weisbord continues to take refuge from the attacks upon his false positions in principle, is "mass work". The Opposition has never been and is not today able to agree in any sense or to any degree with the standpoint in this question advanced by Weisbord prior to his recent statement. In Weisbord's conception, the question of the Opposition's work among the masses was an inseparable part of his idea of a bloc between the Marxist Left and the Right wing liquidators. It is for this reason, and not because of our "sectarian opposition" to "mass work", that the League steadily rejected, and still does, the crude program advocated by Weisbord. As Trotsky wrote in January 1931:

"Certain comrades—to be sure, only individual ones (in the literal sense of the word)—speak for a bloc with the Lovestonites in the name of . . . 'mass work'. It is hard to imagine a more ridiculous, a more inept, a more sterile project than this. Do these people know at least a little of the history of the Bolshevik party? Have they read the works of Lenin? Do they know the correspondence of Marx and Engels? Or has all the history of the revolutionary movement passed them by without leaving a trace? Fortunately, the overwhelming majority of the American League has nothing in common with such ideas."

And again, in his recent letter to Weisbord, comrade Trotsky again points out that "mass work" as such does not exist as a question to be disputed in the ranks of the Left Opposition, but is indissolubly bound up with a correct position in principle, which Weisbord did not possess and which, consequently, vitiated his whole conception and rendered it sterile and reactionary:

"Mass work must be on the basis of definite principles and methods. Until the time that, in a number of fundamental questions a necessary unanimity will be attained, disputes on 'mass work' will inevitably remain lifeless."

And several months ago, comrade Trotsky pointed out in his letter to Weisbord, just as we had done in our discussions with him:

"Before one turns to the masses, one must construct a principle basis. One begins as a propaganda group and develops in the direction of mass action." (Militant, November 23, 1931.)

The Communist League at no time opposed mass work as such, but we always considered the question as part and parcel of the means of the organization, its resources, the concrete situation of the moment, the relation of forces and above all, the fundamental principles of our faction. This is evidenced by even a cursory knowledge of the past of the League. In Minneapolis, virtually all our energies were bent upon the ideological and theoretical front, the Opposition even went so far as to present its own candidate for Mayor in opposition not only to the bourgeois candidates but also to the Stalinist nominee, a step taken upon the basis of our estimation of the concrete conditions of the time and place. This holds for several other campaigns undertaken by the League in that locality. In the case of the three indicted New York Marine Workers, despite the active opposition of the official party (and unfortunately, of Weisbord himself), the League took the initiative in organizing the movement for their defense and bearing the largest part of the work in their behalf. In Illinois, not for the first time, the League is even now engaged in its own independent campaign to advance

the views of the Left Opposition among the miners in the present strike and new-union situation.

In the first years of its existence, the League was of necessity obliged to bend all its energies to the task of marking itself off organizationally and, above all, ideologically from all the other currents in the proletarian movement, especially from the Right wing and the Center, as well as from all confusionist and accidental streams. We had acute nature, in order to attain the necessary degree of clarification in principle—against the advocates and tendencies of a second Communist party, against semi-syndicalist elements, and other currents of an equally destructive nature. Especially, these circumstances inexorably and necessarily shaped the main characteristics of the League's activity.

There is no doubt that conditions are now maturing for a turn. The intensive propaganda work carried on by the League has borne fruit in the consolidation of the initial cadre of the Left Opposition which is the pre-requisite for the movement to "develop in the direction of mass action". The latter is an imperative necessity. But it stands in no contradiction to our past concentration upon propagandistic activities; on the contrary, the turn to mass work which must now be made could be accomplished only upon the basis of what has gone before it. As long ago as December 12, 1931, the Militant declared in speaking about the expansion of the press of the League:

"The roots of our movement are spreading wide and going deep. In all these developments we see the proof that the conditions are maturing for a transformation of the form and character of our organization. There is reason to believe that we are on the way toward breaking out of the narrow confines of a purely propaganda body."

At no stage in our development has our aim and perspective been akin to a sectarian absence from the general class struggle, nor was our propaganda work ever conceived as an end in itself. We regarded it as the absolutely essential preliminary means for a successful approach to the masses in a revolutionary sense.

We do not find ourselves in agreement with that part of comrade Trotsky's letter to Weisbord, if it is to be given the interpretation placed on it by the latter, which says: "Let us admit, for a minute, that the American League lacks this or that possibility in mass work, I am ready to admit that your group would be able in that respect (i. e., mass work) to complete the work of the American League." Even in this hypothetical form it is necessarily based upon representations of Weisbord rather than upon our concrete experiences with him.

In this respect, the "Textile Unity Committee", constituted as an anti-party bloc between Weisbord and the Lovestone group, is a shining example. Had the League adopted the insistent proposals of Weisbord for "mass work" as construed by him, it would have discredited itself, blurred the lines between itself and the Right wing instead of making them stand out more clearly and raised the authority of the Lovestone faction. Yet this is precisely what Weisbord did by his T. U. C. against our most comradely contrary advice. The influence he had among the textile workers of Paterson went entirely to the profit of the Right wing partner in the bloc, and under the circumstances, had to go there. The T. U. C. was the springboard for the Right wing to the position it subsequently gained in the Paterson strike. Weisbord bears a share of the responsibility for this, although it must be said that he later broke the alliance and tried, during the Paterson strike in particular, to repair the damage. But the damage itself, and the policy which inevitably produced it, is the important aspect of the whole point.

We do not believe that the Weisbord group has a special formula for work in this field, or a special contribution to make, and we are in general opposed to the conceptions expounded by him on this subject. By this we do not aim to deny

that the addition of the Weisbord group would add to the forces of the League, even if not fundamentally, and by that increase its capacities to expand its activities in direct and more extensive participation in the class struggle as well as in the other phases of its work.

THE TACTIC OF THE WEISBORD GROUP IN OTHER QUESTIONS

Weisbord's letter raises a number of questions which we do not consider fundamental for the present discussion, which is calculated not for a solution of all the questions in dispute, and certainly not those of second and tenth order, but solely for the questions of principle. That is why we omit from consideration or even mention, on this occasion, many of the points dealt with in the letter of Weisbord. It is impossible to permit these issues to push into the background those which we consider primary. Thus, Weisbord raises among what he designates as "decisive questions" of dispute with the Opposition certain points from which we take one as an example: "Is it not 'decisive' that a League should be run by people who voluntarily turn over the names and addresses of members and sympathizers, subscribers to their paper, to the United States government?"

This is a sample of that distorted, indolent and naive "criticism" which muddied up the discussion of the basic questions and heightened the antagonisms against him. What he refers to is the fact that postal regulations require a filing of proof of circulation, etc., with the authorities at the time of applying for convenient second class mailing privileges—which has been done by the entire labor press in this country for decades. Nearly four years ago, at the time the Militant applied for second class status and rates, the initial orders from various parts of the country were presented to the postal authorities in compliance with governmental regulations as proof of circulation. This has been done by all working class papers, without anyone, at any time, having made an issue of it in the labor movement—for such an issue would have met with the ridicule which Weisbord's present accusation justly merits. He could just as logically object to the filing of Communist petitions to put candidates on the ballot, for they are signed, with names and addresses, by thousands of workers sympathetic with the radical movement. We do not like the official regulations, but without the strength as yet to abolish them we adapt ourselves, for the sake of legal agitation, to bourgeois statutes, frankly and without apology.

Similarly with the Negro question, on which we allegedly have no position. This is not true. The League has taken a position on the fundamental aspects of the Negro question. The accusation of Weisbord is "true" exactly, and only, in so far as the League has not taken a stand on one phase of the Negro problem: the slogan of self-determination in the "Black Belt", a subject upon which the League has been conducting an internal discussion and will soon come to a conclusion. It is certainly not the merit of the League that it has spent such a protracted period in arriving at a conclusion on this question, but if Weisbord had used greater deliberation and caution, it is possible that he would not have arrived at so thoroughly false a position as he has in his own thesis. Neither the American party nor the C. I. ever considered this phase of the Negro question here of such decisive importance, from 1919 to 1928, as to utter a single word on it, and it was raised only four years ago by the Stalinist apparatus as their improvement upon the Leninist standpoint.

More important than these secondary, exaggerated or non-existent issues, is such a question as Weisbord's conduct during the Marine Workers' Defense campaign, and toward comrades of his own organization with whom he was in dispute. In the former case, Weisbord took a position which, from the class standpoint, we still hold to be incompatible with the basic principles of class solidarity against the class enemy. His step of bringing his own comrade into court, called forth the sharpest condemnation from the League, and rightly so. From

Archives of the Opposition «Socialism in One Country»

The central theory of Stalinism, around which revolve or from which emanate all the false policies which it defends, is the idea of "socialism in one country". At one time, in the early days of the struggle of the Russian Opposition against the nationalistic revisionism of Marxism, Stalin, when confronted with the socialist classics, admitted that the question of the possibility of constructing a socialist society in one country was first raised by Lenin in 1915. The implication was that up to that time the prevailing conceptions in Marxist circles ran counter to the theory. Since the expulsion of the Opposition from the party, Stalin and his satellites have rid themselves of the need of any apologies for the theory, or of any qualifications. It is now advanced, not as a revelation first handed down from Mount Stalin in 1924, nor even as an innovation first introduced into Marxism by Lenin in 1915, but as an essential foundation stone of Marxism as such.

We have frequently had occasion to present our readers with countless quotations from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin which categorically contradict this utopian—by your leave—theory. Not a few of the pre-1924 writings of Bucharin and Stalin are available which speak as a matter of course concerning the impossibility of constructing an independent, national socialist society. To add to this lengthy collection, we present here a significant passage from the pamphlet by the Russian Marxist, A. Yashchenko, "Socialism and Internationalism", published in Moscow in 1907, and quoted approvingly in the "History of the First International" (page 11) by G. M. Stekoff, the Bolshevik historian:

"From the economic point of view, the characteristic feature of socialist organization is unity in economic relationships, in place of the extent system of production—void of order, plan, and method, entirely uncoordinated to chance, competition and the struggle of interests—socialism will create order and stability. The work of production will then be in the hands of one whole community, as a unified economy; and it will be directed by the central authority. . . . The nearest thing to such a collectivity can only be the State, although even the establishment of an isolated socialist State does not of itself imply the introduction of complete order and harmony into economic life. In that case competition and the economic struggle between the various

States will continue, and this competition will perpetually disturb the internal harmony of their relationships, for under the present conditions of the life of mankind, it is impossible to conceive of a State as economically isolated and independent. In fact, it is impossible to imagine the existence of a national socialist State amid States organized upon the individual system."

Fortunate is Yashchenko that he did not live and write under the Stalinist dispensation! For what he, as well as all Marxists, took for granted as impossible, has not only been made "possible" by decree of the Secretariat, but those who question the correctness of the new theory are free to meditate on their doubts in the prisons and places of exile to which the bureaucracy dispatches the Left Opposition.—S.

On Hopeless Idiots

On August 24, 1919, Lenin wrote:

"Either the dictatorship (that is, the iron power) of the landowners and the capitalists, or the dictatorship of the working class. There is no middle ground. In vain do the lords, would-be intellectuals and petty gentlemen, who have learned badly in bad books, dream about a middle ground. Nowhere in the world is there a middle ground or can there be one. Either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, covered with the pompous phrases of S. R.'s and Mensheviks about the power of the people, the Constituent Assembly, freedom, etc.—or the dictatorship of the proletariat. He who has not learned this from the history of the whole nineteenth century is a hopeless idiot." (Works, Volume XVI, page 306.)

What about the "democratic dictatorship" which Stalin and Bucharin included in the program of the Communist International? It is obvious that the democratic dictatorship, if it differs from the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, must stand somewhere between the two. But Lenin declares to us that "there is no middle ground", that only "petty gentlemen who have learned badly" can dream about a middle ground, or worse yet, "hopeless idiots". Can it be assumed even for a minute that theoreticians of these two categories had a hand in the program of the Communist International?

this we have nothing to retract. The Left Opposition distinguishes itself by a scrupulous adherence to the fundamental concepts of class solidarity under all circumstances and can not tolerate the slightest departure from them in its ranks.

"UNITY" MANEUVERS OF WEISBORD

The partial turn which the Weisbord group has made toward the International Left Opposition, and thereby toward the Communist League, has to a considerable extent been vitiated by the paitry maneuvers in which he has since engaged in the name of unity with us. He began with proposals to us for "united fronts" on single and subsidiary questions when the problem was the clarification of his principled position to be made in a preliminary statement of his group in which, as comrade Trotsky advised, he would "attentively revise your baggage so as to take care to uncover by that not only your manifest political faults but also the historical and principled roots of these faults." Before issuing this necessary statement, he called a public meeting to which members of the League were invited to discuss the question. Without any formal proposals to the National Committee of the League, and before any public declaration of a change in his position, he addressed himself to the branches of the League over the head of the National Committee with the request that he be invited to "discuss" the question of his

directly with them, attempting thereby once more to apply the well-known tactic of the "united front from below". This disruptive strategy which violated the whole essence of the engagements he undertook and the warning of comrade Trotsky that "before everything, you must keep clearly in mind that the road to the International Left Opposition leads through the American League; a second road does not exist"—has very properly encountered the solid rejection of all the branches of the League.

If Weisbord sincerely wishes to approach the League in the spirit of unity, it will be necessary for him to alter this strategy and retrace his steps in this respect. The Communist League is an organization and must be dealt with seriously as such through its duly constituted organs.

The National Committee of the League emphasizes that it is desirous of consummating the unity of the Left Opposition with the Weisbord group with the greatest celerity, of putting no petty obstacles in the road but, on the contrary, of facilitating the rapprochement to the extent that considerations of principle permit. It is ready to have aside small and secondary questions for the moment, and refrain from converting them into conditions for unity, in the sense that within the framework of one organization the normal processes of internal democracy will permit a discussion and satisfactory solution of all the questions which still divide Weisbord from the League. But on the basic questions, the National Committee cannot and does not propose to make the slightest concession which would only militate against the soundness and future progress of the Opposition.

Impelled solely by these considerations, the National Committee views the problem from the point of view that the next step must now be taken by the Weisbord group. This step and what follows from it, we conceive as follows: 1. The Weisbord group, on the basis of the present statement of the Communist League, should reconsider its reply to comrade Trotsky and elaborate such a declaration as ill more seriously and more satisfactorily constitute a revision of its ideological baggage, especially on the questions of Centristism and the bloc with the Right wing. We do not regard its letter to comrade Trotsky as adequate, for the reasons outlined in this statement, and we deem a restatement by the Weisbord group an essential preliminary to further steps of unification.

2. Upon the basis of the statement by the Weisbord group which we propose in the preceding point, the National Committee will request representatives of the "Communist League of Struggle" to be selected for the purpose of holding a joint meeting at which a formal discussion of the respective standpoints of the League and the Weisbord group may be discussed with the aim of arranging both the remaining points of difference—which we hope will be reduced to a minimum at that stage—and any organizational details that may be involved.

—NATIONAL COMMITTEE
COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF
AMERICA (OPPOSITION)

JAPAN

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

By Jack Weber

(Continued from last issue)
II. The Dearth of Raw Materials
Without ample coal and iron reserves no country can aspire to a place of first rank among modern industrial powers. Lacking in adequate home reserves of these essentials, Japanese capitalism is under the imperative necessity of importing them from abroad. In this respect and more generally, Japan ranks with Italy.

Influence of Iron Ores
In 1928 Japan produced 8% of the total iron ores she consumed. Of the 92% she imported 11% came from Japanese colonies and the remainder mainly from China and Straits Settlement. The known iron ores of the Far East, including Japan, Korea, Manchuria and China, are so small in quantity that if Japan were to consume these ores at the per capita rate of the U. S. the entire body of ores would be exhausted in 15 years. Manchuria has reserves whose metallic content is equal to that of Germany or of Great Britain, but these ores are of such low grade that they are hardly reckoned as ores in the U. S. Large outlays are necessary for the extra operation of preparing them for use so that they must first be chemically treated to

obtain a higher concentration of metal. Thus no solid metallurgical basis exists for a steel industry of enduring importance. Nevertheless, despite the cost handicap, Japan maintains her steel industry through tax exemptions, high subsidies and protective tariffs, obviously for armament purposes. The government arsenal founded at Yawata in 1900 produces 1-2 the steel used by industry but operates at a serious loss each year in spite of the high rates charged for the steel products; for example, round steel bars costing \$43 to \$51 per ton are sold in Germany for \$25 to \$30. Japanese capitalists submit quite willingly to this handicap to strengthen imperialist militarism which aims first of all to seize those parts of Asia which can supply basic raw materials and food.

The Problem of Coal
Measured in terms of coal production, Japanese industry is far from an advanced stage. The output is 1-2 ton per capita as compared with over 4-2 tons for the U. S. and over 5 for the United Kingdom. Even if we include hydro-electric power (converted to tons of coal) Japan's position is not improved. The coal reserves of all Japan are only 118 tons per capita, less even than those

of British India, and far below the 4,070 tons for Great Britain and the 27,500 tons for the U. S. To make matters worse the coal that Japan does possess, while good as bunker coal on ships, is unfit for coking and therefore unfit for steel production. The high cost of coke is a major problem for the Japanese steel industry and renders her competition in this field utterly impossible under present technology. The cost of coke per ton of pig iron in 1927 was \$3.25 in the U. S. and \$7.50 in Japan. Only in China (with its 2,200 tons per capita reserves) is there coking coal in the Far East and even there not in large amounts.

Coal mining is far more difficult in Japan than in the other capitalist countries as the seams lie much deeper and are thinner. Less machinery being used, the output per miner is less. Thus each miner produced 1-2 ton per day in 1925 as against 4-1.2 tons for the U. S. Nor is this cost made up by cheaper labor—the output being 1-9 as great but the wages being 1-5 those in the U. S.

Textiles
Barred from rapid progress in the heavy industries by her lack of the necessary raw materials, Japanese capitalism has been forced—for other reasons as well—to turn to the lighter textile industries. Yet even here Japan is forced to import cotton, the raw material of greatest importance to her manufacturing. Supplied with an abundance of raw silk, Japan is nevertheless not a great manufacturer of silk but rather a source of raw material for the U. S. silk industry.

It is above all this poverty in raw materials that makes Japan a debtor nation, hyper-sensitive to world market conditions, unstable financially owing to difficulties of international payments.

III. The Imperialist Struggle for Markets
Japanese feudal-capitalism entered the world arena even later than German imperialism and her struggle for markets commenced at the very birth of her capitalism, particularly in competition with the powers in China. China and India, with half the world's population, form a fabulous market. But India is pre-empted by England. More than any other power Japan depends on foreign markets, for no other country exports so large a percentage of the total production of goods. The desperate effort of Japanese imperialism to subjugate China as a colony to function as market and as source of raw material, is the reflection of the stifling action of capitalist world economy on the further growth of Japanese productive forces. But China is also essential to U. S. capitalism and Chinese capitalists desire to exploit the home market themselves. Young as is Japanese capitalism, it has already passed through many crises and has had to limit its productive capacities again and again due to the competition for markets. Japanese capitalism is faced with the task of carving out its own markets by selling China or by wresting colonies from the established powers. This external struggle manifests the desperate effort of the feudal-imperialist combination to maintain the inner exploitation of the workers and peasants.

(To be continued)

A Picture of the Party from Inside

What the Party Bulletin Says About the «Achievements»

The criticisms levelled by the Opposition against the Stalinist leadership for the organizational and ideological devastation it has produced in the ranks of the party, have never been met by our opponents. On the contrary, from time to time, under the pressure of the events themselves or the discontentment of the comrades in the ranks, the Stalinist officials have been compelled to make admissions which confirm to the hilt every one of our criticisms. A case in point is the official internal bulletin of the New York district committee of the Communist party. We take some excerpts at random from its leading article:

"It is a known fact that the life of the units is very sterile and dead."

Could a more damaging confession be made in a more off-handed manner? The Communist party should be distinguished from all other parties in precisely this respect, that is, in the existence of a virile, productive internal life at its base. In the revolutionary proletarian party there is no class distinction between leadership and ranks, there is no need of a leadership which must convert its followers into dumb, footweary cattle. The absence of this distinction serves as a terrific arraignment of those responsible—the leaders. For how can the life of the party units be other than sterile when the initiative of the ranks is systematically crushed for fear that its unfolding may disturb the papal domination exercised by the bureaucracy? How can the "life" in the ranks be anything but "dead" when the bureaucratic leeches confine their activities largely to bleeding the party of every vital element?

For years now, the party leaders have promised a change in this system by means of the biggest fraud since Barum's white elephant: Stalinist "self-criticism", i. e., the practice of finding scapegoats in the second, third and fourth ranks for the crimes committed by the first rank. But the disease is not rooted below—that is only where its effects are manifested most disastrously; it has its seat at the top. Like fish, the Stalinist hierarchy begins to decay and stink at the head.

"The general understanding of the membership of political and economic events in the District", continues the bulletin, "is at an extremely low level."

Nor can it be otherwise. The Communist party at its birth was to distinguish itself from the social democracy and the syndicalists by vigorously combating that contempt for theory which was practically the only "theory" tolerated in those movements. In the post-Lenin period, the Communist movement was inundated with that "unprincipled practicalism" against which Lenin inveighed so contemptuously, and which has received the acme of its expression in the Stalin faction.

A leadership which has played ducks and drakes with such fundamental tenets of Marxism as its teaching on the class role of the State (China, "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry", etc.), as the independent role of the proletarian party (subordination of Communism to Sun Yat Senism and the Kuo Min Tang, the masquerades of Muenzenberg, Barbusse, Stalin and Co.), as internationalism and its economic and political implications ("socialism in one country")—to mention but a few of the points in which Stalin contributed only revisionist conceptions—such a leadership could scarcely be expected to do anything but bring to "an extremely low level" the "general understanding of the membership of political and economic events."

Can a wolf instruct its cubs in vegetarianism? Can a catholic priest teach his flock the truths of evolution? Can a witch-doctor teach savages the elements of science? Can the man who is up to his neck in a swamp lift another to a safe and higher point? That is how the Stalin school teachers can raise the extremely low level of the general understanding of the membership.

More: the raising of the level of the membership of the party will be accomplished at exactly the same rate that the party bureaucracy is kicked out of the place it has usurped. Between these two forces in the party there is no harmonious link; there is a fatal conflict, a gnawing contradiction which can be eliminated only by an upheaval from below.

"Our trade union work", we read further on, "despite the objective favorable situation is lagging far behind. . . We have not developed any real struggle in the A. F. of L. . . This Bulletin will give concrete aid in this work."

If the aid to be furnished the party members by the editors of the Bulletin and their associates in the leadership, is of the same caliber as the aid given in the past, then the prediction may be freely ventured that next year's Bulletin and the resolutions of next year's Central Committee Plenum will contain the same lamentations about mysterious failures of the party. Here, for example, is the warning given as early as two and a half years ago by the March 31, 1930 Plenum in an obscure reference made in the "Resolution on Party Fractions":

"Party fractions must be established and must be engaged in active work in all A. F. L. unions. All tendencies to neglect work in the A. F. L. unions must be sharply condemned and corrected."

Similar admonitions have not been lacking in the intervening period, nor will they be in the future. Nor, furthermore, will the work of the party in the A. F. of L. be improved one hair's breadth thereby. And that for the simple reason that the naked instructions: "must be established", "must be engaged", "must be sharply condemned", have proved

to be quite meaningless without a fundamental correction of the party's analysis of the trade union problem in this country. The hierarchy may continue to establish and engage, to condemn and correct until the stroke of doom, but the party will not advance one step in the reactionary unions until it proceeds beyond administrative orders of a technical nature and into a political alteration of its line.

Who is responsible for the party's complete isolation in the reactionary unions when the two principal resolutions of the March 1930 Plenum do not by as much as one single word (literally!) mention the need of working within the A. F. of L.? Is such an attitude conducive to the proper functioning of the Communists among the mass of organized workers? In the thesis on the "Economic and Political Situation", we read about "the reformist organizations and elements, some of which (A. F. of L.) are outright Fascist" (page 11); that (only) on the basis of the Trade Union Unity League will the party be able to assume the leadership of these economic struggles" (page 20); that it "has been a mistake on our part (hear, hear! self-criticism!) that we did not sooner clearly analyze and characterize the open Fascism of the A. F. of L." (page 33).

Is there any wonder that with such an analysis and perspective, the party's fractions in the A. F. of L. (they can be counted on your thumbs) "have not developed any real struggle in the A. F. of L."? What progress in this direction could be made by a Communist worker who, in his A. F. of L. local, would have to repeat after the blockheaded these writers: This is an outright Fascist union and we can move ahead only on the basis of the T. U. U. L.?

But have no fear, the marauders are still at work. The doctor who reported that his "patient was improving" until she died . . . of improvements—cannot even compete with the directors of the Party Builder who promise to "give concrete aid in this work". A little more concrete aid of the type they have given in the past and the poor patient. . .

"The struggle against social-Fascism in the district", we note finally, "is in an extremely weak shape. Despite the repeated acts of treachery of the social-Fascist leaders, we have been unable to develop any real struggles and exposures of these people. . . The Bulletin will give leadership and guidance. . ."

One would imagine that after the record rolled up by them in the past, the party chiefs would be more modest with their offers of leadership and guidance. But we are dealing here with people who have lost all sense of proportion and place. The party has now been shouting itself hoarse against all species of "social-Fascism" imaginable. It has fought a furious battle in a vacuum of its own invention. And yet, "despite the repeated acts of treachery", the Bulletin observes with a puzzled air, no real struggle or exposure of the reformists has been developed. Why? The Bulletin scarcely bothers to attempt an explanation, it simply recommends more "persistent exposures" and volunteers its leadership and guidance.

But the question is important and requires an answer. How have the "social-Fascist" demagogues been able to make the steady headway which even the Stalinist sages can no longer ignore? Essentially because of the enormous blunders which the party leaders have chalked up to their account. Especially in the period of the crisis, when the weakened working class feels most acutely the need of all its forces to resist the capitalist offensive, the Stalinists have met their aspirations and appeals with a scornful rebuff. The workers who have not yet developed to Communism increasingly gain the conviction that the Communists plot their own party interests above the interests of the class. To answer them with the trite phrase that the party has no interests separate from those of the whole proletariat, means to substitute what should be, for what actually is.

In this whole period of the crisis, the party had unexampled opportunities to champion the fight for the united front of the working class. By forcing the reformist leaders to the wall in every concrete question of struggle, the party would have had chance after chance to break the workers' present allegiances and win them to Communism on the basis of concrete experiences through which the workers would then pass together with their own leaders and the Communist leaders—experiences which would give them the best possible opportunity to judge which group is superior.

But the Stalinists, who only yesterday lay in the arms of Chiang Kai-Shek and A. A. Purcell, were overcome with such a tremendous wave of remorse, you see, that they now indignantly reject any united front with the reformist organizations or leaders. From the ivory tower of splendid isolation to which they have retired, they choose to hurl down anathema and vocal thunderbolts upon the reformist demagogues. The only trouble is that the mass of the workers shrugs its shoulders, in despair, in indifference, or in contempt. Such exposures have just about the same practical political value as the campaigns of the socialist muckrakers in the pre-war days: they set no appreciable mass of people into motion. The "social-Fascists" continue their "repeated acts of treachery", the struggle against them continues to be "in an extremely weak shape", and the Stalinist balliffs at the head of the party continue to be, we suppose, the very essence of Bolshevik wisdom, strain-

League's Program of Action on Unemployment

(Continued from page 1)

The Conditions of the Movement

There is not yet in the United States a serious unemployment movement of a national character; and hence to set the workers into motion around this issue still remains the task. It imposes a serious duty upon the Communists. But it is precisely in this respect that the official Communist Party has failed despite the fact of masses responding to its early demonstrations. This is entirely due to the false policies pursued. At a time when serious preparations on a broad basis and mass propaganda were required the party frittered away its opportunity in adventurist extremes. The objectives of its demonstrations were characterized by the slogans: "Fight the police" and "Conquer the streets", which almost entirely isolated the Communist vanguard and left the workers disinterested in the party appeals. From this the party swung to the other extreme, to opportunist methods of fighting for unemployment relief, as, for example, the purely parliamentary petition campaign for the social insurance bill, not to speak of the almost exclusive centering of the struggle against petty cheating and thieving of local relief agencies and losing sight of the large objectives.

In regard to the organizational problem the party at first pursued the sectarian method of arbitrarily harnessing the unemployment movement within the extremely narrow framework of the T. U. U. L. It imposed upon it all sorts of bureaucratic limitations. While the force of objective reality and the weight of our criticism have compelled the party to abandon its extreme adventurism and the most sectarian organization methods, many of the above mentioned false policies and bureaucratic limitations still remain. This presents a picture today, in the fourth year of the crisis, where workers who were attracted to Communism have been expelled by the thousands; and where most of the once organized and party controlled Unemployment Councils are non-functioning, some in the process of dissolution and some have entirely disappeared. Many workers who were attracted to the Communist Party have therefore again left its ranks in disappointment.

The Social Reformists and the Unemployed

With the decline of the party controlled Unemployment Councils other unemployment organizations have arisen, mainly on a local scale, under leadership of the social reformists. There are, for example, the Citizens' Unemployment Leagues in the State of Washington, in Superior, Wisconsin, and the miners' employment movement of West Virginia developed under the direction of the Mustelites. There are also the unemployment leagues organized by the Socialist party in some cities. The first mentioned have attracted broad masses on a local scale because of their "practicalness" of securing measure of relief largely by the methods of mutual self-help. All of these movements reflect the pressure of the working class, but being essentially reformist in character, they are taking the direction either of practical parliamentary (reformist) politics or purely mutual self-help societies, in some instances promulgating the false illusions of running the industries for capitalism to create jobs.

While it is perfectly clear that neither direction will lead to a serious fight for relief at the expense of capitalism, and not at all show the way out of the unemployment situation, nevertheless these movements are becoming effective instruments in the hands of the reformists to attract the workers and to contest the Communist party for mass leadership. They are becoming serious contenders. The headway they have made so far is in no small measure due to the false policies and the bureaucratic blunders of the party which, it should be remembered, at first held sway over the movement of the unemployed.

This proves conclusively that the course of the American working class, even its unemployed section, is not at all yet decided in favor of Communism. It flows in both directions, both the revolutionary and the reformist. Inevitably, however, the deception and the impotency of the reformist leadership will stand out more clearly in the more serious and the more decisive situations and therefore constantly offer new opportunities for Communist leadership, provided the party can learn to advance the demands and slogans which will attract masses, set them into motion and lead in a revolutionary direction. But to do that effectively the Communists must also penetrate the reformist unemployment movement to fight for the revolutionary program.

An Unemployment Program of Relief

An unemployment program must of necessity be in harmony with the elementary needs of the situation. As such it must present immediate demands and agitation slogans which appeal to the broad masses by offering means of temporary amelioration. They cannot offer a solution in themselves and should not be so designed. They are by the very

ed twice through chesscloth and silk. The reformists make progress, the party stagnates, the trade union work lags behind, the life of the units is sterile, the work among the Negro masses is at a standstill—but the party leadership is as inviolate and impeccable as the College of Cardinals. Aren't people with such a record of achievement just the ones to complain irritably about the extremely low level of the general understanding of the membership? Thank God somebody in the party is on a different level.

—M. S.

nature of the class struggle strictly limited to the character of a partial help. But they must also become a help to unite the workers on the basis of their common interests and to set them into motion against their class enemy. These demands and slogans cannot solve the problem. There can be no solution to the unemployment problem under capitalism. Its solution can be found only in the proletarian revolution; in our agitation and struggles we must always make this clear.

Approaching the fourth year of the unemployment crisis the question of immediate relief has become a matter of life and death necessity for the American workers. The growing hunger and want has been met only by the miserable, debasing charity rations. This must be substituted by immediate governmental relief, federal, state and municipal. By virtue of its pressing necessity this demand stands in the forefront as one which brooks no delay in organizing the fight for its attainment.

The permanent feature of the unemployed army, however, makes imperative the advancement as an immediate objective also of the demands for a system of unemployment insurance, the cost of which is to be borne by the state and by the employers. That it can be obtained only by mass pressure, by tenacious struggle against and over the opposition of the capitalist rulers, has been made amply clear by all experiences so far. The capitalist way out of the crisis is the opposite one, the one of forcing the working class to shoulder the whole burden. The reformist way of unemployment insurance is the one of all classes alike carrying the cost and awaiting their mutual voluntary consent, which cannot be expected from capitalism. But this is only so much more a reason for the Communists to make this demand a class demand and a fighting demand, one which must bring the broad masses within its scope.

The Problem of the Shorter Workday

The scourge of unemployment threatens all workers and is a problem of the class as a whole. Unity of the employed and the jobless is therefore essential. That must be taken into account in a programmatic sense. When keeping in view the perspectives of a standing unemployed army and a developing workers' struggle resisting the further attacks upon their standard of living, the necessity of advancing the slogan for the shorter workday assumes additional importance. The concrete slogan must be "the six hour workday, the five day week, without reduction in pay."

The workers' struggle for the shorter workday flows from the contradiction between the constantly developing productive forces and the enormous surplus labor power. The employers are now endeavoring to reorganize this relationship at the workers' expense. Hence the bosses and their government are advancing their stagger plan proposals of the shorter workday with a corresponding reduction of the standard of living. This the Communist forces must counteract correctly. The demand for the six hour workday, the five day week, without reduction of

pay is today a propaganda slogan addressed directly to the working class for it to adopt to become a slogan for action. More than any other demand this has the quality both of offering real and tangible improvement of the workers' conditions and of moving them into action. Hence it will meet with serious opposition from the employers. But its advancement today as a propaganda slogan will help to prepare for the struggles of tomorrow. By virtue of this it becomes the slogan of the working class offensive. The demand for the shorter workday is the most fundamental of all immediate demands from the standpoint of class relations. It possesses the quality of welding the unemployed and employed workers alike into united efforts for its attainment and for the advancement of their struggle on a class basis. The Communist forces must take upon themselves particularly the duty of arousing the existing labor unions and workers' organizations and unite them in a powerful movement for the shorter workday.

Large Scale Credits to the Soviet Union

An unemployment program must give correct attention to the world-wide character of the unemployed crisis which embraces the whole of the capitalist world. To that appears the enormous contrast of the Soviet Union teeming with activity of industrial construction, but seriously hampered by the difficulty of obtaining sufficient credits from the capitalist countries with which to buy the materials needed from the world market. This is still a decisive issue before the Communist movement. It involves essentially the question of the international working class objective. It offers the opportunity of definitely uniting the needs of the Soviet Union with the immediate aims and demands of the proletariat in the capitalist countries. Therefore, the proposal of the Left Opposition to demand large scale credits from the capitalist world to the Soviet Union, remains as correct and as imperative as when first advanced.

In the United States this becomes a particularly potent demand. Here is a superabundance of credits available. The further success of the great industrialization progress of the Soviet Union is bound up with the facilitation of an increased supply of machinery and material for the immediate future. The placing of new orders for machinery in the capitalist countries. Therefore, the proposal of the Left Opposition to demand large scale credits from the capitalist world to the Soviet Union, remains as correct and as imperative as when first advanced.

The American Communist movement must unequivocally take up the slogan for the extension of large scale credits from U. S. capitalism to the Soviet Union. It should without delay initiate united front conferences of all working class organizations for the purpose of laying definite plans for the promulgation of this demand on a practical concrete basis.

To sum up we recapitulate our proposed concrete slogans for the unemployment movement as follows:
Immediate Governmental Relief, Federal, State and Municipal.

Unemployment Insurance at the Expense of the State and the Employers.

The Six Hour Workday, Five Day Week, Without Reduction of Pay.

Recognition and Extension of Long Term Credits to the Soviet Union.

It goes without saying that the unemployment movement should generally take up slogans of special local issues and also such concerning evictions, union conditions and dues payments, etc., according to conditions prevailing and in conformity with the general program.

The Organization of the Movement

The existing unemployment situation can be viewed correctly only in the light of its revolutionary perspectives. In that sense the demands advanced today must become stepping stones toward the revolutionary goal, hence it is necessary to preserve their class content and organize the fight for their realization on a class basis. They can become so only when the Communist forces thoroughly understand and practice, in action, the tactics which enable them to become the leading force of ever broader masses and establish the logical unity between the struggles of today and the solutions of tomorrow.

The unemployment situation cannot be considered as an isolated problem separate and apart from the general working class problems, nor can the unemployment movement succeed as a separate and isolated movement. It can remain so only on the penalty of degeneration and impotency. Its objectives must become those of the general working class objectives, its struggles a part of the general working class struggle for the revolution. The potentialities for advance on this basis are growing daily. When the Communist movement begins to employ seriously and genuinely the united front policy the first steps will have been taken to unify the workers, employed and unemployed, in common struggle for their common interest of today as well as toward their ultimate objective.

In this direction it is necessary to reorganize the Unemployed Councils. There should be block councils in the cities, composed of unemployed and employed alike. These should be centralized on a territorial or a citywide basis into delegated bodies fighting for the minimum program of the unemployed. To these central bodies all other workers' organizations should be invited to send representatives for common action for the needs of the unemployed. They should include the workers' political parties, such as the Communist party, the Socialist party, the Unemployment Leagues, where such exist; and above all the trade unions. This is the way to put reformist and reactionary labor leaders to the test. It is the way to establish the working class united front for specific immediate objectives and set the masses into motion for its immediate interests and needs. The duty of the Communist party in such a broad movement is the one of functioning independently, maintaining its right of criticism and of fighting for the revolutionary program to push the movement forward to a higher plane.

We do not consider these first drafts as a finished platform. Without discussion, such cannot be elaborated. The lack of party democracy is a double burden for the Left Opposition. At any rate, we believe that the L. O. of the U. S. S. R. must make haste with the elaboration of a collective opinion, no matter how difficult the conditions are at present.

At the same time, we consider it timely and urgent to declare immediately in the name of the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists) that today as always we are prepared to render every possible aid to the present faction—in the defense of the country against the external dangers as well as in conducting it out of its present economic difficulties.

The Opposition's Attitude

We have more than once declared that the sentiment of revenge—is not a political sentiment. We have not directed ourselves according to this sentiment and have no intention to. But it is to be understood that the serious education of the party requires a serious and open re-examination of the policies in the years of the factional domination of the Stalinists. But we are prepared, on our side, to switch this critical work onto the rails of mutual understanding and agreement.

We are prepared to exert every effort in order to prepare the transition from the present, manifestly unhealthy and untenable regime to the regime of party democracy with the least possible convulsions and dangers, with the least possible loss of our valuable time.

The stoppage of the police measures of suppression against the Bolshevik-Leninists, the liberation and recalling of all the imprisoned, banished and exiled comrades must be the first signal for the rebirth of the Leninist party.

Representing a group of comrades,

Leningrad-Moscow, July 1932.

—N.

—M.

A New Crisis in Soviet Economy

(Concluded from last issue)

Above all, the following unpostponable measures appear to us to be necessary:

(1) To put a decisive stop to the inflation. To stabilize the "chervonetz" on a realistic basis—by the introduction of a budget (industrial budget included) that lies within the frame-work of the actual possibilities of economy. To reinvent the "chervonetz" with the means of playing a role in economic regulation.

(2) To renounce the maintenance by coercion of collectives incapable of an existence. To elaborate a series of practical measures so calculated, that the disintegration of these so-called collectives into individual holdings does not effect the interests of the collectivized village poor and so that it does not burden too painfully the foodstuff and raw material situation in the country.

(3) Formally and openly to liquidate the policy of "liquidating the kulaks as a class", which has already been torn up at the root by a series of decrees in the course of the last two years. But, to keep in mind at the same time that the re-establishment of private trade will deepen and accelerate the differentiation in the village (both between as well as inside of the collectives); to introduce a concretely thought-out system of measures for the limitation of the exploitative activities of the kulak.

(4) To create for the more promising of the collectives, such technical and economic conditions, that they, together with the Soviet farms, will be able to assure the feeding of industry and of the cities.

The Second Five Year Plan

(5) To utilize as a basis for the second Five Year Plan, the actual and not the falsified results of the experience of the first Five Year Plan. To recognize that the economic irregularities, which existed even before the Five Year Plan, have been made more profound by the latter and that they have assumed a menacing character. To make the highest criterion of the second Five Year Plan, the problem of the "smytchka".

(6) On the basis of the actual technical and economic results of experience, but insofar as industry as a whole is concerned as well as with regard to the individual enterprises, to work out realistic possibilities of growth. The most important elements of every industrial and financial plan must be: (1) providing of each enterprise with labor power of satisfactory quality. (2)—providing labor power with normal condi-

The following document arrived from Russia in a foreign language, into which it had been translated for conspirative reasons. The first page was missing. Editorial revision was provided for by the Editorial Board of the Bulletin of the Russian Opposition.

... conditions of life (3)—establishment of certain qualitative standards, without which the process of production is converted into the production of "seconds".

7. A very serious danger for the entire economy is constituted by the deterioration of all forms of calculation and accounting as well as by the decline in the reliability of all statistical data connected with the Five Year Plan and with the economic situation in the country as a whole. The false system of statistics can only be destroyed with the destruction of the whole system of bureaucratic lies. The economic atmosphere can be cleared and cured only by party, trade union and Soviet democracy.

8. Clearly to take into account that the prospective difficult, economic reorientation, which will be inevitable even in the case of a turn toward a correct policy will favor the rise or the temporary consolidation of efforts at a bourgeois restoration. The rebirth of the Bolshevik party as the independent proletarian vanguard will under these conditions become a question of life or death for the proletarian dictatorship. To bring about a change in the economic course, the Stalin regime must first of all be renounced, it is a regime which stifles the party and economy and threatens to destroy the dictatorship.

Capitalist Crisis and Soviet Economy

9. The years of capitalist crisis have been utilized extremely little and unsystematically by the Soviet government in the economic, and by the Comintern in the agitational, sense. As the Left Opposition has more than once affirmed, both sides of this matter can and must be linked up with one another. With a correct approach to world economy the difficulties of the capitalist world could be exploited in a far greater measure to weaken even the sharpest of the disproportionate relationships in Soviet economy, thereby alone raising the standard of living of the masses.

The question of collaboration between Soviet economy and capitalist world economy must be raised as a center of attention for the European and American

working masses and especially the unemployed. It is not a matter of possible credits and orders, but of a developed plan going beyond the borders of Soviet economy and including the capitalist countries. As incomplete as our experience is—it nevertheless permits, for the first time to show with figures and facts in hand, what enormous and at the same time close and immediate possibilities are opened up for planned economy once it extends to the advanced countries.

We do not consider these first drafts as a finished platform. Without discussion, such cannot be elaborated. The lack of party democracy is a double burden for the Left Opposition. At any rate, we believe that the L. O. of the U. S. S. R. must make haste with the elaboration of a collective opinion, no matter how difficult the conditions are at present.

At the same time, we consider it timely and urgent to declare immediately in the name of the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists) that today as always we are prepared to render every possible aid to the present faction—in the defense of the country against the external dangers as well as in conducting it out of its present economic difficulties.

The Opposition's Attitude

We have more than once declared that the sentiment of revenge—is not a political sentiment. We have not directed ourselves according to this sentiment and have no intention to. But it is to be understood that the serious education of the party requires a serious and open re-examination of the policies in the years of the factional domination of the Stalinists. But we are prepared, on our side, to switch this critical work onto the rails of mutual understanding and agreement.

We are prepared to exert every effort in order to prepare the transition from the present, manifestly unhealthy and untenable regime to the regime of party democracy with the least possible convulsions and dangers, with the least possible loss of our valuable time.

The stoppage of the police measures of suppression against the Bolshevik-Leninists, the liberation and recalling of all the imprisoned, banished and exiled comrades must be the first signal for the rebirth of the Leninist party.

Representing a group of comrades,

Leningrad-Moscow, July 1932.

—N.

—M.