

WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 23, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME VI, NO. 34 [WHOLE NO. 181]

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 8, 1933

PRICE 5 CENTS

Austrian Fascism and the Paris Meet C. I. Impotence Veils Itself with Parliamentary Cretinism

The strength of Marxism lies in its ability to recognize reality. In the mouth of a Marxist, "parliamentary cretinism" is not an insult but the characteristic of a political system which substitutes for social reality, juridical and moral constructions, a ritual of decorative phrases. The strength of Bolshevism consisted therein, that in Lenin's person it applied the materialistic method of analysis with the greatest theoretical honesty—not permitting any optimistic neglect to speak out what is, not permitting any consoling illusions—to all the problems of our epoch.

In the fundamental questions of revolutionary policy—in the method of this policy—Stalinism signifies not only a negation of Leninism, but also the worst caricature of it. We can see this anew at the present time in the question of the fate of Austria. The prescription of the Communist party which has not called forth any protest on the part of the Austrian workers, should have, it seems, forced the Moscow organizers of international defeats of the proletariat to reflect on the sad results of their previous works. If the legal Austrian C. P., possessing its own press, showed itself to be unable in the least to offer any resistance whatsoever to the purely police repressions of Austrian Bonapartism, how will it oppose the attacks of the Fascist bands? However, the Moscow Pravda sees in the very suppression of the Austrian section of the C. I., which took place unresisted, a "victory," or, at least, the immediate introduction to victory. "The Anti-Fascist movement in Austria is growing every day" (1)—writes Pravda of May 28th. "Despite the sabotage of the leaders of the Austrian Social Democracy broad parades are being made in all countries for the European Anti-Fascist Congress" (our emphasis: L. T.). In precisely the same manner the Anti-Fascist movement "grew every day in Germany" until it disappeared suddenly on the 5th of March, no one knows where. These people not only have learned nothing but they always cut their optimism in the same patterns. They are not revolutionists, but priests who repeat this or that formula, made up of consoling lies, at the bedside of the dying.

However, precisely in what is the anti-Fascist movement manifested? And why does it pass over the prescription of the Austrian C. P. in silence? It was very busy, this movement "which is growing every day," with other more important tasks: the preparation of the Barbusse Congress in Paris. This is an example of parliamentary cretinism which should open the eyes of the most backward workers! It is wrong to think that a parliament is necessary for parliamentary cretinism; in general shaded rostrums are sufficient, forums removed from the arena of struggle from which false speeches can be made, barren formulas paraded, and twenty-four hour "alliances" concluded with journalists, pacifists, outraged radicals, tenors, and baritones.

Big words. The adherents of Hitler in the shops pointed triumphantly to these decrees before the others, who actively or passively reject Fascism. And in spite of, or even because of the barbarous persecution of the class-conscious workers, the latter are still the

ON TROTSKY'S RETURN TO THE S. U.—RUMOR AND FACT

Some two months ago rumors were circulated according to which comrade Trotsky was to become reconciled with Stalin and return to the Soviet Union. No member of the Left Opposition took these rumors seriously. Stalinism is fighting against the Left Opposition more sharply today than ever. Rakovsky has been deported to the ice desert of Yakutsk, the Stalinist press is full of slanders and pogrom incitement against the Opposition, at the Paris Congress our comrades were physically attacked and finally ejected with the aid of the French police.

In addition to all this, Trotsky had refuted this senseless rumor and the denial appeared some time ago in the world press. But only now T. A. S. S. (official Stalinist press agency) comes along and reports:

"The Voss Gazette (Berlin) of June 5 and various other papers report that the Soviet Union has permitted Trotsky's return to Russia, the Voss Gazette making reference to Trotsky's representations to Turkish press representatives. T. A. S. S. is in a position to declare that Trotsky's representations do not base themselves upon the facts and obviously flow from an adventurous desire to misguide the readers. Trotsky was long ago banished as a counter-revolutionist, on the basis of a law put in force on February 20, 1932. The latter is and will remain in force."

Trotsky explained to an American press representative that if the further existence of the Soviet Union should be threatened by any danger, then he will be at its disposal with all his forces. So will the whole Left Opposition, if need be, even against the will of the Stalinists.

(Continued on Page 4)

The paper *Rundschau*, published in Basle by the Stalinist bureaucracy, which seems specially destined to prevent the German workers from drawing the necessary lessons of the catastrophe, quotes the article from *Pravda* referred to above, in its issue No. 17 as a great revelation. Do not lose courage, Austrian proletarians; Barbusse, allied with your Renner (see

Lay Basis for Real Federation of Jobless in Ohio

The main accomplishment of the Mahoning Valley Workers United Front Conference was the endorsement of the Federation of Unemployed Workers Leagues of America and the calling of another conference on July 16 for the purpose of organizing a local federation. This proposal, which was made by Trotsky of the Left Opposition, was accepted unanimously by the conference of 50 delegates who represented approximately 5,000 supporters. The local federation will, of course, be affiliated with the national federation; it will probably be called The Federation of Unemployed Workers Organizations of Mahoning and Trumbull Counties.

Because the conference failed to rally the support of any of the A. F. of L. locals and was therefore composed of representatives of C. P.-influenced fraternal, defense and unemployed organizations, on the one hand, and sections of the Ohio Unemployed Leagues and various labor groups on the other, it was decided to limit the conference, for the most part, to the problems of the unemployed. The lack of time also made such a limitation advisable. But it was agreed that the broader problems of the working class should be brought forward for action in the newly formed federation. However, the usual resolutions in regard to social and unemployment insurance, immediate relief, evictions, endorsement of relief march, struggles to free Mooney and the Scottsboro Boys, etc., were adopted. The conference also hopes to make an attempt to influence the state and national conventions called by the Ohio Unemployed League.

The conference was sabotaged by the A. F. of L., the Socialists, and the Musketiers. (Perkins of the C. P. L. A. sat in as an observer but did not submit a credential or take any part in the discussion, etc.). The L. O., however, played a very active part in spite of its small forces. The proposal for the Preliminary Conference came from an Oppositionist who was chosen to be on the Call Committee. The conference was opened by a member of the L. O. who also acted successfully as an authorized representative of the national office of the Federation of Unemployed Workers League of America. Furthermore, the Communist League of America was the only organization to submit in its own name, a written set of proposals for this particular conference a copy of these proposals was given to every delegate. Newby of the L. O., was chosen to continue with the other Call Committee members to serve on the enlarged committee which is to prepare the Federation Conference.

At the beginning of May, in a Berlin shop, the Free Trade Union shop councilors were "equalized," i. e., put a commissarial shop councilor who had had nothing to do with the shop. The "equalization" itself is carried on as follows: an S. A. storm division occupies the shop, the men are compelled to take part in the organization ceremony of the NSBO, the so-called reporter uncorks some monstrous nonsense, promises paradise and threatens, "Whoever does not immediately enter the NSBO will be regarded as an enemy to the state and arrested." That's all. The Nazi press says, "Again the NSBO was able, after long, patient, comradely clarification to smash the last bulwark of Marxism. The men received the report of our excellent party comrade X. Y. with enthusiasm, and spontaneously entered the NSBO, all except a few unteachable, and them too we shall convince in the course of time of the great ideas of Adolf Hitler. Heil Hitler!"

Eight days later, in the middle of the work, a shop meeting of the NSBO was suddenly called. The Nazi leader, an old foreman, known to be the worst hangman in the company, opened the meeting after first throwing out the non-members, i. e., the class-conscious workers. The commissarial shop councilor (a Nazi leader) took the floor. "The firm faces bankruptcy, it has been operating at a loss for months. Either the men will have to take a wage cut, or the firm will close up and move out of town, where it has been promised free land and also capital, if it establishes a shop there." A commission is chosen to negotiate with the firm as to the amount of the wage cut.

This commission, which, naturally in accordance with the customs of the Hitler regime, has nothing to say, came back with a wage cut. The office employees' salaries were cut 32 1/2 percent the workers' wages 25 per cent. The office employees accepted this dictation. With the workers it was more difficult. Two meetings broke up. The ordinary proletarians understood splendidly how to take away the force of all the objections of the (Nazi) district leadership. Only when the commissarial shop councilor dictatorially ordered the discharge of two fellow-workers who had taken a prominent part in the defense against the wage

(Continued on Page 4)

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U. S. A.

To the District Comm.,
Dist. 2, C. P. U. S. A.

Dear Comrades:

On Wednesday, June 28, an open-air meeting of the N. Y. Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition), at Pitkin and Bristol Streets was broken up by members of the party and the Y. C. L.

Breaking up street meetings of opponent working class organizations is not a working class or Communist practice. It has been condemned by every responsible working class organization. It has been condemned by the Communist International and the Communist Party of the U. S. It can result only in discrediting the people and the movement which practice it. Such tactics will repel workers who are moving towards Communism. Moreover it plays into the hands of the police who are looking for pretexts to break up workers' open-air meetings.

We call upon all party and Y. C. L. members and all workers generally to put a stop to this anti-working class practice. We call upon the District Committee of the C. P. to take the necessary steps to see that the members of the party and Y. C. L. conduct themselves as workers and Communists at workers meetings.

Comradely,
NEW YORK BRANCH,
COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF
AMERICA (OPPOSITION).

C. P. Expels A. Goldman Prominent I. L. D. Attorney Answers Party Charges

The *Daily Worker* recently reported the expulsion of Albert Goldman, long standing party member and leading counsel of the International Labor Defense in Chicago, from the official party ranks. A whole series of charges were filed against him. In a statement issued by comrade Goldman and reprinted below, the expelled comrade discusses the merit of these charges on the basis of fact and his own view of the expulsion. Comrade Goldman has held a public meeting on the whole affair in Chicago, an account of which is given below.—Ed.

Chicago, Ill.—Three hundred party members and sympathizers attended a meeting on June 28, called by comrade Albert Goldman, on his expulsion from the Communist party. The expulsion of comrade Goldman, who has been a party member for many years and whose activity in the courts of Chicago on behalf of the revolutionary workers is the talk of the movement, caused a surprise and resentment, unexpected by the local Stalinist bureaucrats.

The subject of the meeting "Criticism by Expulsion" was an extremely timely one. Comrade Goldman traced the origin of his conflict with the party leadership on the question of the united front and on other fundamental questions relating to the revolutionary strategy and tactics of the Communists. His attempts to iron out these differences within the confines of the party were rendered impossible because of the stranglehold held by the bureaucrats maintain. Goldman pointed out that in every dispute he had with the party, his position was distorted and violated, simply because he was never given the opportunity to make his point of view public so that the membership could understand it.

This bureaucratic control of the Party and the lack of inner democracy or discussion, Goldman pointed out, was not a local phenomenon, but arose directly out of the conditions in the Russian party and can be traced back to the struggle against Trotsky and the Left Opposition, over the fundamental questions of the revolution. Goldman showed that his attempts to invoke a discussion on the question of the united front in general, and specifically on the defeat in Germany, was prevented by the party leadership, that exists by retaining the rank and file in a state of ignorance and blind obedience. The speech had a profound effect upon these present and a lively discussion ensued. In the discussion comrades Poindexter and Becker spoke, together for forty minutes, on the party position. The speeches were a defense of the party bureaucracy. Extremely tragic was their view on Germany—where they indignantly refuse to

America Cracks Whip at London. Ruthless Policy Splits Confab

The current crisis in the London economic conference, brought on by Roosevelt's sharp note attacking the attempt to stabilize the American dollar in the international exchange market, has brought out openly and sharply the fundamental contradiction of the whole conference: the contradiction between the national organization of the bourgeoisie and its international interests. Of all the imperialist powers represented at the conference, the United States is taking the most aggressive measures to concentrate all power in the hands of a small inner circle of the topmost levels of the bourgeoisie, and to interlock the apparatus of the national government with this concentrated capitalist power. Therefore it was only natural that the contradiction between the national and the international organization of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie should find its sharpest expression in the activities of precisely the American delegation at the conference. That is also why the American delegation, which showed superficially such vacillations and uncertainties in its proposals to the conference, was precisely the only which came out with a clear-cut statement on any subject—and that statement was "No" to a project of international collaboration in the stabilization of the foreign exchanges.

It would be inexact to see the contradiction in policy as one of extreme nationalism on the part of the United States, and of internationalism on the part of other countries, or even as a clash of conflicting nationalisms alone. It is a contradiction between the program of meeting the crisis by a concentration of control in the hands of the national bourgeoisie, of coordination and mobilization with the purpose of throwing the burdens of the crisis on to the working class and the petty bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the policy of trusting to the intrinsic forces of recovery of capitalism as expressed in the free interplay of competition on the world markets, on the other.

In the United States, where the crisis has had the most devastating effect, where unresisted contradictions masked by the preceding period of stabilization from 1923-1929 had accumulated the highest, where the transition from a relatively backward pre-war economy to a highly-developed imperialist economy involves the wiping out of the relics of the uneven development of the past by brutal shocks and violent readjustments, the concentration of control in the hands of the "executive committee of the bourgeoisie" has been thrown on the order of the day.

Least of all countries is the government of the United States willing to give up, even temporarily, even in part, any of its rapidly increasing control over the processes of readjustment within its national economy. Roosevelt's statement was quite explicit, that "the sound internal economic system of a nation is a greater factor in its well-being than the price of its currency in changing terms of the currencies of other nations". When he goes on to add, "restoration of world trade is an important partner, both in the means and in the result", he shows clearly that this internal mobilization and concentration of control is directed toward domination of world markets by greater power in international struggle, not by international agreement.

The later statement of the American delegation, amplifying the note struck by Roosevelt, that "We are interested in American commodity prices; what is to be the value of the dollar in terms of foreign currencies is not and cannot be our immediate concern", reinforces the hypocrisy and deception of the Roosevelt statement.

What they say is "First let us carry through our policy in America, then we shall come to an agreement with the rest of the world"; what they mean is, "We want to carry through our policy in America without interference from the rest of the world so that

(Continued on Page 4)

Lays Down Law to Rivals -- Hands Off the U. S. 'Domestic' Problems First, 'International' Questions Later. Roosevelt Ends 'Stabilization' Plans.

It would be inexact to see the contradiction in policy as one of extreme nationalism on the part of the United States, and of internationalism on the part of other countries, or even as a clash of conflicting nationalisms alone. It is a contradiction between the program of meeting the crisis by a concentration of control in the hands of the national bourgeoisie, of coordination and mobilization with the purpose of throwing the burdens of the crisis on to the working class and the petty bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the policy of trusting to the intrinsic forces of recovery of capitalism as expressed in the free interplay of competition on the world markets, on the other.

In the United States, where the crisis has had the most devastating effect, where unresisted contradictions masked by the preceding period of stabilization from 1923-1929 had accumulated the highest, where the transition from a relatively backward pre-war economy to a highly-developed imperialist economy involves the wiping out of the relics of the uneven development of the past by brutal shocks and violent readjustments, the concentration of control in the hands of the "executive committee of the bourgeoisie" has been thrown on the order of the day.

Least of all countries is the government of the United States willing to give up, even temporarily, even in part, any of its rapidly increasing control over the processes of readjustment within its national economy. Roosevelt's statement was quite explicit, that "the sound internal economic system of a nation is a greater factor in its well-being than the price of its currency in changing terms of the currencies of other nations". When he goes on to add, "restoration of world trade is an important partner, both in the means and in the result", he shows clearly that this internal mobilization and concentration of control is directed toward domination of world markets by greater power in international struggle, not by international agreement.

The later statement of the American delegation, amplifying the note struck by Roosevelt, that "We are interested in American commodity prices; what is to be the value of the dollar in terms of foreign currencies is not and cannot be our immediate concern", reinforces the hypocrisy and deception of the Roosevelt statement.

What they say is "First let us carry through our policy in America, then we shall come to an agreement with the rest of the world"; what they mean is, "We want to carry through our policy in America without interference from the rest of the world so that

(Continued on Page 4)

Archbishop Benjamin 'Blesses' USSR FSU Leaders Thank Wrangel Priest

New York, N. Y.—On Friday evening, June 30, a long haired and long bearded Russian priest Archbishop Benjamin, wearing a cassock with a big cross on his chest appeared at the New York Labor Temple on 14th Street and delivered an anti-Soviet propaganda speech, pure and simple. His secretary, appearing in the same attire, translated the speech into English. A White Guard meeting you think? Not at all. You are mistaken.

Paradoxical as it may seem, this meeting was arranged by the "Friends of the Soviet Union". The F. S. U. actually invited an enemy of the Soviet Union to deliver from its platform a speech that was nothing but a slander against the working class government from beginning to end. The Archbishop admitted having been arrested by the Bolsheviks in 1920 and having fled with the counter-revolutionary army of General Wrangel.

For all of this he received thanks and hand-shakings from Dr. LeRoy, who acted as chairman of the meeting, and B. Friedman, district secretary of the F. S. U., both of them members of the C. P.

The auditorium was filled with a mixed audience, mostly workers, a number of whom were party members and sympathizers. The meeting was advertised in the party press and through posters in the Workers Center. There were a number of White Guards present as was demonstrated by the applause given whenever the speaker

(Continued on Page 4)

Pocketbook Strikers Win Demands from Morris White Co. in Struggle

New York, N. Y.—The strike of 4,000 pocketbook workers is the best answer to the demand for open shops of the Industrial Council of Leather Goods Employers Association. In the first week of the strike 25 non-union shops were stopped from work. The response of the workers is excellent. The strikers are picketing the shops daily. What is necessary now is mass picketing and mass demonstrations in the market to spread the strike to the rest of the scab shops.

In the last issue of *The Militant* we wrote an analysis of the conditions in the Morris White shops where the workers are forced to a starvation level. Today we can show that through the militancy of the workers in the Morris White shop in N. Y., this boss was forced to settle with the union and concede to the union demands:

- (1) 40 hour week;
- (2) No reorganization and readjustments;
- (3) One week trial period and the minimum wage scale enforced;
- (4) Unionization of the Bridgeport shop;
- (5) 44 hours for the Bridgeport workers instead of the 49 hours they worked previously;
- (6) A raise in wages for the workers, etc.

The agreement has not been signed as yet. Morris White employs 250 workers in N. Y. and 150 work-

ers in Bridgeport, Conn. Criticism should be made of the union officials for their failure to state specifically exactly how they intend to have the workers of Bridgeport labor under the same conditions as the workers in N. Y. The danger is that the conditions of the Bridgeport workers will not be raised to the level of the conditions in N. Y. The workers in both cities will be seriously affected if such a situation develops.

Another such firm is Resnick Bros., which has a so-called union shop in N. Y. and two shops out of town, in Holyoke and Springfield, Mass. Settlements with these shops and conditions different from those in N. Y. will result in union show that through the militancy of the workers in the Morris White shop in N. Y., this boss was forced to settle with the union and concede to the union demands:

- (1) 40 hour week;
- (2) No reorganization and readjustments;
- (3) One week trial period and the minimum wage scale enforced;
- (4) Unionization of the Bridgeport shop;
- (5) 44 hours for the Bridgeport workers instead of the 49 hours they worked previously;
- (6) A raise in wages for the workers, etc.

The agreement has not been signed as yet. Morris White employs 250 workers in N. Y. and 150 work-

ers in Bridgeport, Conn. Criticism should be made of the union officials for their failure to state specifically exactly how they intend to have the workers of Bridgeport labor under the same conditions as the workers in N. Y. The danger is that the conditions of the Bridgeport workers will not be raised to the level of the conditions in N. Y. The workers in both cities will be seriously affected if such a situation develops.

Another such firm is Resnick Bros., which has a so-called union shop in N. Y. and two shops out of town, in Holyoke and Springfield, Mass. Settlements with these shops and conditions different from those in N. Y. will result in union show that through the militancy of the workers in the Morris White shop in N. Y., this boss was forced to settle with the union and concede to the union demands:

(Continued on Page 4)

AMONG THE YOUTH

Break United Front at Chicago Anti-Fascist Meet

Chicago, Ill.—The Chicago Stalinists, like those of all other cities, following the appearance of the Comintern Manifesto, appealing for national united fronts with social-democratic organizations for the purpose of aiding the victims of German Fascism, issued a call for a local united front. We shan't deal here with the 'vest pocket' nature of this united front nor of its tendencies to dissolve itself into a permanent organization. This body, in line with its work, planned a demonstration to be held in Chicago on June 24th.

Spartacus Speaker Chosen By Conference

The Youth Conference had agreed to support the demonstration of the adult conference. For this the adults promised us a speaker at the demonstration. The Stalinists at the Youth Conference who, we must remember, supported originally the Right wing on every important political question, expected as a reward for this that the Right wing would support their nominations and motions on all organizational questions. For speaker 2 nominations were made—Morris Fine of the Y. C. L. and Nathan Gould of the Spartacus Youth Club.

To the great surprise of the Stalinists the latter was supported by every delegate but the Stalinists and was elected speaker. A motion was promptly introduced which provided that we attempt to have two speakers and that the second speaker be Fine. Accordingly it was agreed upon that, if two speakers of different organizations in the Youth U. F. should speak, they be permitted to represent their respective organization from the Platform.

From the outset the Stalinists broke the United Front. First they revised a leaflet that had been accepted by the publicity committee, without consulting any member of the committee. Second, they attempted to prevent our comrades from selling the Young Spartacus at the demonstration. At the same time they sold Young Workers, Labor Defenders, etc. Third, Y. C. L. members demanded that we leave the demonstration and promised to beat us if we didn't. Of the other and most important breaches we shall speak later.

Stalinist Disruption

To the Stalinist chairman they announced that there was to be only one youth speaker and he was not to be, as the conference decided, comrade Gould, but comrade Fine. After a long argument the chairman agreed to permit Gould to speak, but announced also that Fine would speak. Further, against all decisions of the conference, they placed upon the box George Smirkin of the Y. P. S. L., an organization within the Youth Conference. This conference had made no nomination of Smirkin, nor was he picked by a conference emergency committee (there was none). But without anyone knowing why or wherefore, Smirkin was placed upon the box. This fact, plus the fact that Fine was scheduled to speak, gave Gould the opportunity to speak as a Left Oppositionist.

The thought of an Oppositionist speaking at this 'strictly' Stalinist affair, to almost 5,000 workers, most of whom were C. P. members or sympathizers, threw terror into the hearts of the bureaucrats. John Williamson in his frenzy saw himself before the control commission charged with 'Rotten Liberalism'. The workers listened silently to the first few sentences of the speech. When Williamson was convinced of the Oppositionist nature of the speech he lost control and proceeded to shout like a hysterical woman. Fearing the criticism he proceeded to work up a lynch spirit. 'Counter-revolutionary!' he shouted, 'off with the Trotskyists!' 'He can't attack our party!' 'Enemy of the Working Class!' 'Stop him!' 'Throw the renegades off!' Etc. Thus he carried forth the historical tradition of Stalinism.

The demonstration was in confusion. The Stalinist hecklers were at work. Sluggers formed a cordon around our comrades. Shouts from all corners. Workers demanding the rights of the united front; that the speaker be permitted to complete the speech. Stalinists booing. The speaker will not stop. The loud speaker which had been erected during the course of the speech was opened and suddenly shut off. Threats to the speaker are coming from the bureaucrats around the platform. They did not spare their words at this united front demonstration. Gould was pushed from the platform. The Left Opposition left in a

body after this outrageous affair. Following them were scores of workers who protested the Stalinist violation of the united front. Stalinism fears more than anything the criticism of the Left Opposition. Germany is their vulnerable spot. Rather than allow the L. O. to speak the truth they will smash the demonstration, smash the united front, smash the Left Opposition, annihilate the speaker.

That is the explanation for the program spirit whipped up against us, but more than that it is the explanation for the Stalinist tenacious grip upon the united front from below; an explanation of its non-aggression pact.

It is not because they desire to win the Socialist leaders over to the united front that the Stalinists cater to them on the question of organizational independence and the non-aggression pact. It is the haunting fear of criticism; fear of exposure by the other organizations in the united front. Hence the non-aggression pact; no criticism of organizations in the united front. Hence opportunism, but a splendid assurance for bureaucrats.

To the masses of workers present in the demonstration, the Stalinists can tell no lies. 5,000 workers witness Stalinist fears in the face of criticism by the Marxist wing of the Communist movement. There is nothing like an object lesson to put across a point.

—MAXIMILLIAN.

A Resolution of the Int'l Left Opposition

Declaration of the International Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists) to the Youth Conference at Paris

The workers of the world stand at a turning point. After a series of victories of imperialist reaction, particularly Fascism, the proletariat will yet have to pass through years of hard tests and difficult struggle. The continuity of the revolutionary movement can be assured only on the condition that new phalanxes of convinced and tested fighters emerge from the younger generation.

The social democracy, as its fight before Hitler very clearly shows, is able to educate lackeys, but not fighters. The young workers have nothing to learn in the school of this party. The school of Marx and Lenin, alone, shows them the way to break through the imperialist and Fascist hell into Socialist society.

Although we appeal to the workers to rally around the banner of the Communist International we deem it necessary to clearly point out that the revision of the tenets of Communism and the bureaucratic degeneration of the regime powerfully fetters the influence of the C.I. on the young workers and renders their correct revolutionary education difficult.

The revision of the doctrine has found its worst expression in the theory of 'socialism in one country' which undermines proletarian internationalism and covers up all sorts of petty bourgeois, reactionary, utopian and nationalist tendencies in the workers ranks.

The International Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists), in a series of programmatic documents, on the basis of the experience of the last ten years, has denounced the fatal distortions introduced into the theory and practice of Communism by Bureaucratic Centrism. It is necessary, here, at a youth conference to strenuously protest against the bureaucratic regime instituted in the party which stifles the internal life of the Communist vanguard and closes the road to an independent development of the youth.

Blind obedience is a virtue in a soldier of a capitalist army but not in a proletarian fighter. Revolutionary discipline is founded on collective thought and collective will. A supporter of the theory of scientific Communism does not believe anything on word. He judges everything by reason and by experience. The youth cannot accept Marxism on command, it should assimilate it for itself through an independent effort of thought. This is precisely why the youth should not only have the opportunity to educate itself but to make mistakes in order to rise through its own errors to the Communist conception. Bureaucratic and factitious discipline has crumbled to dust at the moment of danger. Revolutionary discipline does not exclude but demands the right of checking and criticism. Only thus can an indestructible revolutionary soldiery be created.

The young worker needs leadership from the party. But this leadership should not be by command. Where coercion is substituted at each step for persuasion all living breath flees from the organization and with it the living people.

Not only must we rebuff but mercilessly destroy the use of repression, slander and physical methods in the struggle of the different groupings and factions inside the workers' movement. These invidious methods have nothing in common with the arsenal of Communist education and put into circulation during the last ten years by the Stalinist bureaucracy have poisoned the atmosphere of the proletarian vanguard, particularly in the youth, and isolated the organizations from the broad working masses. Here also we must purify the revolutionary doctrines from Stalinism to drain the internal regime in order to set the Communist International back on the path of Marx and Lenin.

Lessons of the Leninist United Front Tactic

THE UNITED ACTION OF THE WORKING CLASS

The confusion within the ranks of the working class on the question of the United Front is primarily due to the present leaderships of the Second and Third International. All leaders who fear a test in action, leaders who fear a comparison of policies, leaders who retain control of their organizations by bureaucratic methods—and those who are the direct agents of the capitalist class within our ranks—fear the united front of the working class. The pressure of the masses through the united front places a heavy burden upon all misleaders and non-Marxist leaders. That leadership which has a correct policy and uses a little common sense will be favored to the highest degree by united action of the working class.

For these reasons, many organizations are systematically kept out of united front action or are mis-educated purposely by leaders who cannot stand the test. Those leaders who fear the test demand either a non-aggression pact (social democrats) or leadership of the movement conceded in advance (Stalinism), where the workers are told to join the united front under Communist leadership. Other forms used by these misleaders and non-Marxist leaders are the united front from below, or the united front of leaders alone, or the united front of leaders in negotiation behind closed doors. All such 'united fronts' are false, are a denial in substance though not in name, in order to cover up and to avoid the test in action which flows from the Leninist united front.

The two most powerful working class organizations in the world, the social democrats and the Stalinists have been miseducating the reformist and revolutionary work-

ing class on the question of the united front. Likewise, the reactionary A. F. L. leadership fear this powerful working class weapon. The most criminal of all in miseducating the working class, are the Stalinists. Why—because we expect nothing else but confusion, opportunism and miseducation from the socialist and reactionary labor leaders; such leaders join united action only after mass pressure forces them into the united front; such leaders openly oppose revolutionary Marxism as practiced in the Russian revolution by the Bolsheviks under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky.

But those who claim to abide by the decisions of the Communist International, as the Stalinists do, and who in reality have systematically revised Marxism, must be exposed for what they are worth, all the more so because they have usurped the October Revolution and have under their influence the greatest number of revolutionists that must be won over back to internationalism to Marxism.

If we consider two periods of the history of the errors of Stalinism on the question of the united front, which by no means was the most harmful error, but which flowed from more basic deviations from revolutionary Marxism, we can realize how great is the confusion contributed to by Stalinism. On outstanding example, in the first stage of the blunders, was the united front with leaders, in the British General Strike and in the Chinese Revolution. In these struggles the Stalinists and their bedfellows, the Right wingers, threw overboard all the lessons and experiences of the Russian Revolution. They violated the A B C of how to make a united front and to set the masses in motion and how to break a united front when the

allies begin to break and openly betray the movement. After a series of such blunders and errors, the defeat of the Chinese revolution had the sobering effect of waking them up. But to wake up and to find the correct path—are two different things and the first without the latter will only lead to new mistakes. After burning their fingers badly while playing around with the leaders, the non-Marxian Stalinists swung to the other extreme, to 'correct' the error without admitting the error, and thereby, the notorious 'Third Period'.

The opportunist Right zig-zag of the united front—from above—had the full support of the Right wing but the Stalinists' ultra-Left zig-zag—to the united front from below—was not consistent with the Right wing opportunist line of policy and the united front with leaders. Whereas, the British General Strike and the Chinese Revolution were the outstanding examples of the Right-Centre (Bucharin-Stalin) mistakes on the united front from above with leaders, the victory of Fascism in Germany is the crowning defeat and expression of the 'united front from below'.

As Trotsky says, Stalinism will go down in history as the leader of defeat. The wrong concept of the united front as well as the defeat is the result of a more basic revisionism of Marxism by Stalinism. Throughout this whole period the International Left Opposition has carried on a fight against the Stalinists and social democrats and other political currents and their position on the united front and since then, history has confirmed the correctness of our position on this tactical and strategical question as well as on more fundamental questions of Marxism.

HUGO OEHLER (To be continued)

A Delegate's View of the I. W. O. Convention

Bethlehem, Pa.—Over two years ago, on the initiative of the Left wing in the Workmen's Circle, the International Worker's Order was organized. Simultaneously a call was sent out to the Hungarian, Slovak and Russian sick-benefit organizations for amalgamation. Each of these fraternal bodies approved the amalgamation proposal in special conventions.

A committee on constitution and by-laws was appointed by the central bodies for the entire amalgamated organization. The results of their labors along with the necessary changes made by the language sections, central and constitution committees were sent to the various branches only two weeks before the convention! Most of the branches called special meetings for the purpose of discussing the constitution and by-laws. The changes made or the approval granted by these branches were again sent to the central committee.

But our great surprise we found, that in the Slovak workers' convention, for instance, a constitution committee of 5 was appointed, consisting of three functionaries and two rank and file delegates by the central executive committee of the Slovak section. This was reported to the convention and, of course, 'approved'—through the use of steam roller methods.

This committee also made some changes so that the delegates now had four different drafts in their hands. Confusion resulted much to the joy of the bureaucrats.

The Chicago Convention

The convention of the language sections lasted for two days. Four days were spent in the joint sessions of all the delegates. More than 647 delegates participated in these joint sessions, making it more of a mass meeting than a convention. The most bureaucratic methods were used to jam through all the plans of the functionaries.

If absolutistic, autocratic centralism is to be used anywhere it will certainly be in the I. W. O. The constitution gives the central committee all the privileges and the rights and the rank and file all the work and duties, without any rights!

Yet, for all its shortcomings, the I. W. O. is a workers' organization and has to be dealt with as such. This cannot be done in the abstract but by joining its ranks, actively participating in all of its activities; by struggle within it, its mistakes can be corrected.

No doubt, all sorts of names and epithets will be hurled at us by the Stalinist bureaucrats. But when we consider that there are about 1 million organized under the direct influence and control of the agents of the bourgeoisie, the reformists and nationalists, we can see how necessary it is to approach them with timely issues and recruit large

The Two Sides of USSR Recognition by the U. S.

The recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States, with long term credits and trade relations is a desirable step and would be a most favorable condition to offset the difficulties and contradictions confronting the Soviet Union, primarily due to the wrong policies of Stalinism. The possibilities of recognition by the United States have been increased due to the difficulties pressing down upon American imperialism. America is by no means intending to change her stripes. It has become profitable for American capitalism to recognize the Soviet Union and unless some new developments upset the present relationship, it probably will.

Diplomatic and trade relations with capitalist nations by a workers' government are born of realistic necessity and constitute for it, a temporary concession. It should not be explained to the workers as a peaceful co-existing of two systems, as Litvinoff does. Likewise, the treaty with Fascist Germany and the latest moves in regard to the Chinese Eastern Railroad can only be understood if one realizes that they are necessary steps due to the mistakes of Stalinism and are a sign of weakness and not a sign of strength or the 'victory of socialism'.

With recognition, America will attempt to use her experts and agents inside of the Soviet Union to undermine the workers' government and to establish relations with the enemies and Thermidorian element. At the same time America, will be forced to help Germany find a way out, in order to save the billions invested there. Germany is already moving in the direction of attack on the Soviet Union, as the path of least resistance.

Imperialist recognition of the Soviet Union carries with it the danger of counter-revolutionary activity within the Soviet Union. Such action is to be expected. Our policy must be to overcome these contradictions carried with recognition by imperialism. It will be extremely difficult to overcome these difficulties with the policies of Stalinism. The Left Opposition must say this frankly. The Left Opposition, while understanding and approving the forced concessions such as the treaties with Fascist Germany, etc., must at the same time warn the world proletariat that the contradictions carried with these concessions cannot be overcome if the policy of Stalinism continues. The criminal policy of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and the C. I. must be replaced with a return to Marxism; the theory of socialism in one country and all that flows from it throughout the world Communist parties must be replaced with the Marxian theory of the Permanent Revolution.

—H. O.

Stalin is most unfortunate in his interviews. Since the international scandal resulting from the publication of his talks with Mr. Campbell, the American giant-farm advisor to the Soviets, he has chosen his interviewers, as Walter Duranty reports, very carefully. He was closeted with Colonel Raymond Robins for an hour and a half. Although the Colonel had promised not to reveal the nature of the discussion, he did let loose the following illuminating remarks: 'In 1913 I saw the first May Day celebration after the Bolshevik revolution—out at Khodinka field—on the personal invitation of Leon Trotsky. Fifteen hundred tattered soldiers of the Red Army, a few thousand 'Red Guards' of the armed proletariat and an inchoate throng of workers streamed past the reviewing stand. 'This year, after fifteen years, I watched in Red Square a parade of 15,000 picked troops of the Red Army with perfect discipline, equipment and every new device of mechanized warfare. 'That first May Day all the stress of all the speeches and slogans was on the world revolution—All together for world revolution and proletarian brotherhood. 'This year there was not one banner or one word of international revolution. It was 'Collectivization: Every collective farm Bolshevik, every collective peasant prosperous'. 'Industrialization: . . . to win, you must gain technique'. . . . 'In 1918 they thought in terms of world revolution; in 1933, in terms of their own effort.'—Reported by Walter Duranty in the New York Times of June 18, 1933.

THE WORKERS FRONT

Millinery Strike Progress in Los Angeles

In the last issue of The Militant there appeared a report on the militant strike now in progress in one of the millinery shops in Los Angeles, Cal. We publish below a press release issued by the Strike Committee on July 1, 1933:

STRIKE BULLETIN

STRIKE ON THE THIRD WEEK FINDS WORKERS OF GOLDEN BROTHERS MILLINERY SHOP DETERMINED TO CONTINUE UNTIL SUCCESSFUL TERMINATION

Los Angeles.—In spite of the brutal terror displayed by the infamous Red Squad against the workers of Golden Brothers Millinery Shop who are the third week on strike for:

- 1. Recognition of a Shop Committee and Shop Chairman.
2. That Golden Brothers take responsibility for the new shop and all agreements with the shop committee include the new shop.
3. That Golden Brothers obey the minimum wage law for women.
4. Equal division of work.
5. No wage cuts and no piece-work.

The strikers are just as determined now as they were on the first day of the strike to continue until a victorious settlement. Examples of the extreme brutality of the Red Squad and the bosses of the Golden Brothers Millinery Shop have been shown by the arrests, frame-up charges and the high bails imposed upon the arrested strikers.

The Strike Committee and the Needle Trades Industrial Union appeal to all workers and sympathizers to give moral and financial support to the strikers.

Bring or mail all strike contributions to the headquarters of the Needle Trades Industrial Union, 755 S. Main St.

STRIKE COMMITTEE OF THE GOLDEN BROTHERS MILLINERY SHOP.

SAM MEYERS, Chairman.

Is the Recovery Act a Fascist Measure

The dictatorial power embodied within the Industrial Control Bill which is now a law has been called by many, including the Stalinists, a Fascist measure. The Stalinists are well known to mislabel everything they take hold of. In Germany the Stalinists called the Brüning government, the Von Papen government, the Von Schleicher government—Fascist dictatorships. And thereby, they helped to disarm the German workers when real Fascism did arrive.

The Industrial Control Bill is not a Fascist measure. Every capitalist government is a dictatorship and just because transitional steps from the democratic form to the dictatorial form are taking place as a reflection of the further concentration and centralization of capital, that in itself is no proof of Fascism or of steps toward Fascism. The concentration and centralization of capital carries with it the centralization of government. Dictatorial measures are only one of the features of Fascism.

The common features between the Industrial Control Law and some of the measures of Italian Fascism lie in the fact that both contain forms of state capitalism. These common features can also be compared to some of the measures in Germany after 1918 when the social democracy introduced State capitalist forms.

As long as there is no serious working class pressure, as long as the working class of America do not threaten the capitalist rule, there will be no danger of governmental and state changes to Fascism. The Stalinist talk about the Hoover commission's Fascist measures and the Fascist measures of today will only disarm the workers to the real danger confronting the working class. We cannot replace the Marxian analysis of the Industrial Control Bill or any other capitalist measure by giving these measures high sounding names. In America the real Fascist danger, if one wants to talk about it at present, lies outside of the governmental structure and in the embryonic Fascist organizations. They will grow with the increased pressure of the working class against capitalism, unless the Communists know how to oppose them effectively.

The best help that Stalinism could render capitalism at this stage is to continue mislabeling as social Fascism and Fascist movements for which they have no understanding and as a substitute for a Marxian analysis. —H. O.

NOTICE

The series of articles on the situation in the Teachers Union has been postponed until September, when the summer vacation will be over.

A Half Year sub to the Militant is \$1. On a Club Plan with three others it is only 50 cents.

Right Wing Excludes Left at Strike Conference of Boston Bakers

Boston, Mass.—On June 26th, the Socialist Party of Boston called a 'united front conference' to help the Jewish bakers who have been out on strike for the last three months. The call was sent to all Right wing organizations; it was also in the press. However, Left wing organizations sent their delegates as well.

The conference was called to order by Arkin, the manager of the Boston Forward, who made a speech explaining the purpose of the conference. Then he proceeded to elect a credentials committee. This started a protest from the floor. Someone declared that it was proper to turn the conference over to the delegates, who would themselves elect a chairman and all the conference committee (i.e. Arkin) agreed to this, but he insisted upon appointing a credentials committee first, in order to see who were the legally seated delegates so that they can elect a legal chairman. His reason for this procedure was obvious; he was preparing to oust the Left wing delegates. Mord protests from the floor saying that Arkin himself had not been legally elected to the chair.

Only Right Wing Seated

But Arkin insisted upon remaining chairman and made a suggestion to appoint a credentials committee. Many of the delegates who did not understand Arkin's reason for wanting to appoint rather than elect a credentials committee, voted for his suggestion and it was carried by a slim majority. Arkin proceeded to appoint his men with such rapidity that it was clear that his machine was well-oiled. The credentials committee went out to check up. It did not take them long for they knew in advance whom to seat.

In the meantime, Arkin called upon one of the bakers' committee to talk. The bakers made a strong appeal to everyone to help in the strike and to save the union. Criticism can be leveled against the bakers' union, which allowed the strike to drag out so long without themselves calling a conference for help. I won't go into details on this matter now. When he ended his speech, the credentials committee reported; recommending that all the Right wing organizations be seated, leaving out the Left wing. It said that there was another section to the report which would be given later, after all the conference committees had been elected. Again protests from all parts of the hall, demanding the full report of the credentials committee. Schlossberg, a delegate from the Workmen's Circle and a sympathizer of the Left Opposition, asked for the floor to say a few words and to make a motion. Arkin insisted that he make the motion first and then speak. Schlossberg finally consented; and after making his motion that the full report be heard, he began to say a few words in favor of his motion. Arkin stopped him, declaring that he was not a seated delegate as yet and therefore could not speak. Other delegates insisted upon the full report, but Arkin now suddenly becoming very democratic, hammered away on the table and insisted that a chairman must first be elected by the seated delegates. Protest was of no avail; a chairman was elected.

Ford Real United Front

Many of the seated delegates did not vote in protest of the procedure. Fineberg of the I. L. G. W. U. was elected and ruling with his hammer went over to the election of the other committees. The delegates again protested and after two hours of fighting with the Forward clique, succeeded in getting the full report of the credentials committee. It was found that the excluded organizations were of the Left wing: The Mothers League, Left wing schools, I. W. O. and Freiheit Gesangsverein. Delegates who were seated protested against this exclusion. They pointed out the united action was the main thing that could help win the main thing that the support of all organizations was necessary; and that this action was a hindrance. They also demanded that a baker get up to say whether he was in favor of splitting the conference. This was not granted for fear that the bakers would ask all the organizations to participate.

When it was seen that the play was for the devil; that nothing could be gained; that the conference looked like a madhouse with attempted fist fights; that it was already 10:45, many of the seated delegates walked out in solidarity with the ousted Left wing, making statements of protest. Amongst them were the delegates of Workmen's Circle, I. L. G. W. U. and others.

Such is the united front of the Socialist party to help in the class struggle. It is now the duty of the Left wing to call a real united front conference to which it will invite the Socialist party and its organizations and show the working class how united action can be achieved to help the bakers.

—A SEATED DELEGATE.

Workers' Pocket Series By Leon Trotsky

In Defense of the Russian Revolution 48 pages 48c
Soviet Economy in Danger 72 pages 72c

by Arne Swabeck
Unemployment and the American Working Class
24 pages 50c
Postage: 1c extra per copy
Pioneer Publishers
84 East 10th St. New York

On "The Fourth of August"

When people cannot answer basic arguments they hide behind secondary ones. The Brandierites as well as the Stalinists, are clinging with their nails at the comparison of the 5th of March 1933 with the 4th of August 1913. If we leave aside the outbursts of moral indignation or mere insults, the objections reduce themselves to the following: (a) In 1914 the social democracy went over to the government of Wilhelm II; the Stalinist bureaucracy has not even given the slightest indication of going over to the Hitler government; (b) The C. P. continues to work, to publish, in a word, to struggle; it would be a mistake to "underestimate" its forces; the social democracy did not die after the 4th of August, it continued to exist, and even came to power.

No historical comparison retains its validity if it does not confine itself to certain legitimate limits. We are very well aware that the Stalinist C. P. G. is distinguishable from the pre-war social democracy, and that the 5th of March—as much by its character as by its results—is distinguishable from the 4th of August. We simply want to say by our comparison: in the same way that the party of Bebel finally terminated its progressive mission on the threshold of the war, so the C. P. G. has finally terminated its revolutionary role on the threshold of the Fascist dictatorship. To complicate this analogy by considerations which have no bearing on the questions means to show oneself incapable of concrete historical reasoning, that is, of dialectic thinking.

Lenin compared the peace of Brest-Litovsk with the peace of Tilsit. It is not difficult to make objections to this comparison by serving up dozens of elementary truisms: for Prussia it was a question of national independence; for the Soviets it was a question of safeguarding a new social regime there the peace was signed by the monarchy, here by the party of the proletariat, etc., etc. But all these respectable commonplace do not tell us anything about the essence of the question which interests us. We were forced to sign the peace of Brest-Litovsk in order not to completely succumb before the enemy but to reassemble our forces for freedom: it is in this sense that one can speak of a peace of "Tilsit".

The same Stalinists and Brandierites rose up against the analogy between the pre-Fascist regime in Germany ("presidential" cabinets) and Bonapartism. They enumerated dozens of features in which the Papen-Schleicher regime differed from classical Bonapartism and always ignored this fundamental characteristic which makes them similar: the preservation of the equilibrium between the two irreconcilable camps. There is nothing worse than that pseudo-Marxist thought which, full of conceits, stops just there where the question first begins. The analogy with Bonapartism, quite concrete, precisely defined, not only clarified the role of the last Giolitti cabinet maneuvering between the Fascists and the Socialists, but also throws a burning light on the present transitional regime in Austria. Now one can already openly speak of the profound, logical necessity of the period of "Bonapartism" transition between parliamentarism and Fascism. The example of Austria demonstrates the enormous importance which an exact delimitation between Bonapartism and Fascism has (or more exactly, should have) for the aims of practical politics, but formalistic thought which, instead of a social analysis, gives an enumeration of ready-to-hand criteria, abandons an analogy very concrete and rich in content for pale platitudes, which do not teach us anything. It is punished for this in every new historic situation like the ox in the Russian fable who always finds himself before a new door.

"The social democracy did not die after the 4th of August". Do the quibblers mean to say that the slogan of a new party, proclaimed after the 4th of August was false? Obviously they do not, but that is precisely the question. The social democracy continued to exist after the Fourth of August, but only as the democratic labor party of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Its historical function had changed. It was that very thing which justified the birth of the Third International.

Do they want to tell us that the C. P. G., despite the catastrophe which has finished it off forever in the minds of the proletariat as the revolutionary party, will nevertheless continue to exist as a mass organization? We think that nothing justifies such a hypothesis: it rests on an abstract and formal analogy with the fate of reformism. The old Social Democracy united within its ranks elements of revolutionary realism with those of opportunist practice. The 4th of August finally cleansed it from the revolutionary tendencies and determined its transformation into a conservative democratic party. The Communist party posed a revolutionary task to itself and to the masses, which it always put forth and emphasized in a bitter struggle against the social democracy. It is precisely in this task that the Communist party proved bankrupt in the decisive test. It will not be regenerated as a revolutionary party. Can it continue to exist under another form with other political functions? If it can, it will not be as a mass organization of the German proletariat, but as the purest type of an agency of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

The Limits of Historical Analogy. A Reply to Some Objections

No other political place remains for it.

Already on the morrow of the 5th of March one could have and should have formulated this prognosis on the basis of an understanding of the catastrophe in connection with the policy that had caused it. The only objection with any value at all in those days could be: perhaps the party will save everything, if, under the influence of the terrible defeat, it clearly and sharply changes its policy and its regime, to begin with, by openly and honestly admitting its own mistakes. On our part we believed even at that time, on the basis of all that has happened, that it was impossible to expect a miracle of a critical awakening; but even if that had happened it would not have saved the Communist party as an organization; there are political crimes which are unpardonable. But it is fruitless, today, to conjuncture on this theme. The test has already taken place in reality. There can be no question of a political awakening of the official party any longer. On the contrary, the last sparks of critical thought have been stifled. Nothing gives a better picture of the collapse of the CPG than the fact that on the morrow of the great catastrophe, instead of making a theoretical clarification of the events, it has exerted every effort to sweep away all the traces of it, by all sorts of insinuation, calumny, incitement and persecution.

In the guise of an objection, the example of 1923 might be cited, where the party also failed but did not collapse. We do not deny the importance and the lesson of this example: it is only necessary to draw the correct deductions from it.

Firstly, the defeat of 1923 is comparable neither in its form nor in its extent nor by its consequences: with the catastrophe of 1933; secondly, the workers do not forget the past; now the party will pay for all its historic crimes among which is also the capitulation of 1923. Finally, from the political point of view this is most important, the C. P. G. required a general renovation of its leading apparatus in 1923. The question is not whether the new C. P. G. was better or worse than the old, but it is a fact that the Presidium of the C. I. was forced to find an issue out of the discontent and revolt of the party by throwing out the Brandierite leadership as a sop to the revolutionary workers. Such a maneuver is not realizable now: firstly, the apparatus is completely separated from the masses and there can be no question of its renovation through elections; secondly, the Presidium of the C. I. is itself too closely connected in the eyes of the masses to the Thaelmann apparatus due to the struggle against the Opposition. The fact that the Stalinist bureaucracy not only denies its mistakes in the defeat, but also the defeat itself only aggravates its mistakes and condemns it to an infamous decline.

Now it is not a question of the reactionary and utopian task of preserving an apparatus cut off from the masses, but of saving the best proletarian elements from despair, from grief, from indifference, and from the morass. It is absolutely impossible to attain this result by vainly trying to inspire hope of a miracle in them, the impossibility of which becomes clearer every day. It is necessary to present an honest balance sheet of the past and to lead the forces of the advanced workers towards the organization of a Bolshevik party for a new historic stage.

Drinkipo, June 4, 1933

—L. D. TROTSKY.

British Group Leaves I. L. P. Statement Supports L. O.

EDITOR'S NOTE—The statement below was issued by comrades belonging to the Left Opposition fraction of the British Independent Labor Party. It was submitted to all delegates of the Bradford convention of the ILP, lished in the Militant several weeks ago.

TO ALL COMRADES OF THE I.L.P.—

At the Eastern ILP Conference, those comrades who have been striving toward a correct revolutionary policy will fight for the adoption of that policy by the ILP as a whole, but, whether they succeed or not, the question of our relations with the C.P. must be squarely faced. The British section of the C.I. is the only existing revolutionary party in this country. The undersigned members of the ILP believe that the place of revolutionary workers is inside the Communist Party. Recognizing that the present policy of the C.P. requires drastic changes, and appreciating fully the weaknesses of its tactics, we maintain that criticism of the C.P. is no legitimate excuse for staying outside.

The ILP, a Social-Democratic body, product of a past era, has its very economic basis from it. Therefore, correctly to criticize the ILP is to leave it, as a Party no longer able to play a progressive role. But the need, the economic basis for the C.I. is merely to attack its subjective policies, but never to challenge the fundamental basis of its existence. The R.P.C. (Revolutionary Policy Committee) accepts the fundamental basis of the C.I., and since new parties are the product of major political events, and cannot be created at the will of individuals, to pose the question of a new party outside both, the C.P. and the ILP is a waste of precious time. The R.P.C. cannot build a substitute for the C.I.

But Marxists cannot, and should not, accept the programme and policy of any party without full and open discussion in the light of current events.

We, having discussed certain aspects of the C.P. policy, have concluded that there are certain weaknesses requiring immediate and adequate attention and discussion:

1. **THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY:** This theory, advocated since 1925, and stating that socialism can be established in Russia independently of the rest of the world, is a travesty of the Marxist conception of world economy, and has led to a completely contradictory attitude towards revolutionary developments in other countries, leading alternately to criminal reformist opportunism on the one hand, and blind, reckless adventurism on the other. This, a complete denial of Lenin's policy, weakens the struggle for world revolution, and is the main source of incorrect C.I. policies.

2. **THE UNITED FRONT FROM BELOW:** This policy, abandoned now at the eleventh hour, has meant in actual practice, no united front at all and its consequences can most clearly be seen in Germany. The change of front on the part of the C.I., although belated, is welcome, and must be supported, but the fact that the change is made without admission of previous error—in fact, with a denial of a change—suggests a possible reac-

tion, with further disastrous consequences.

3. **THE AMSTERDAM ANTI-WAR CONGRESS:** An example of the incorrect United Front from the top—with individuals, leaders, pacifists, clergymen, etc., but not with the Social-Democratic organizations themselves. A hot-potch in which the C.P. is submerged, and takes no independent line.

4. **DETERMINATION OF POLICY:** Within the C.I. and the British C.P., all internal party democracy has been abolished. Policies and decisions come from the top, discussion being confined to their execution. The World Congress of the C.I., supposed to be held every 2 years, has not met since 1928, while during the last 3 years there has been only one C.P.G.B. congress, and that preceded by expulsions and suppression of effective criticism. Correctness is taken for granted, and those daring to question the policy of the centre are slandered and expelled. This is incompatible with the training of revolutionary leadership, and prepares the way for defections and confusions at times of crisis.

On the above points, we cannot accept the policy of the C.P. Nevertheless realizing that it is the only revolutionary party, we intend to enter it, to work as Communists, at the same time seeking, by every legitimate means, to change these points in its policy which we consider wrong.

We appeal to all revolutionary workers in the ILP to adopt the same position. Any comrades wishing to associate themselves with the attitude as stated above should write to the address appended.

—T. KERNOT,
P. SOLOMONS,
J. SAINSBURY,
(Hackney I.L.P.)
M. GIBBS (Clapham I.L.P.)
March 19, 1933
19 Alwyne Road, N. 1.

Browder Criticises John Reed - - for Trotskyism

We quote from one of Browder's masterpieces appearing in the April Communist page 361. Browder told the John Reed Club to read "Ten Days that Shook the World" and comrade X criticized his speech. (Our emphasis.—W. M. K.)

"But I want to reject the criticism made by comrade X. He declared the Russian workers did not need any John Reed. I think the Russian workers did need John Reed. Lenin thought so. Lenin was delighted to have John Reed in the revolution and sometimes, after the ending of the civil war, comrade Lenin went out of his way to cause to be printed in Russian, John Reed's book, and more, he wrote a special introduction for this Russian edition, in which he recommended it to the workers of the entire world. Comrade Lenin did not do that for many books—you won't find many introductions by comrade Lenin. I want to read the introduction. It is important for the purpose of our agreement:

"With the greatest interest and with never slackening attention I read John Reed's book 'Ten Days that Shook the World.' Unreservedly do I recommend it to the workers of the world. Here is a book which I should like to see translated into all languages. It gives a truthful and most vivid exposition of the events so significant to the comprehension of what really is the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. These problems are widely discussed, but before one can accept or reject these ideas, he must understand the full significance of his decision. John Reed's book will undoubtedly help to clear this question which is the fundamental problem of the international labor movement!"

"Here it is necessary for me to say something I wanted to say at the John Reed meeting. I had made a note of it and meant to include it in my speech (and here is where justified criticism comes in because this should have been said at that meeting). It is something I must say here. That is, that there are serious political inaccuracies and mistakes in John Reed's book and some of these were even pointed out by comrade Stalin. There are certain statements which do not correspond with historical facts and which fit in with the Trotskyist distortions of history. I should have pointed these errors out in order to vaccinate the readers against these particular mistakes." (E. Browder, The Communist, April, 1933.)

Lenin sponsors the book first by giving it an introduction, then by "unreservedly" recommending it; finally, by calling it "truthful and most vivid". Stalin and Browder find that there are "serious political inaccuracies and mistakes" and "certain statements which do not correspond with historical facts and which fit in with Trotskyist distortions of history."

How could comrade Reed indulge in these political inaccuracies before Trotskyism was discovered? How could Lenin fail to notice them? Or was he a Trotskyist too? What is wrong with Reed's book then? Why did he please Lenin and not Browder and Stalin?

Read the book and judge for yourself.

—W. M. K.

Sharpening Contradictions of Fascism Increase Danger to S. U.

(Continued from last issue)

As a result of the World War, Germany was reduced to hardly more than the status of a colony, becoming economically controlled and exploited by other countries. Approximately 1,300,000 square miles of colonial territory, with a population of more than 12 million persons, was lost as a result of the Treaty of Versailles. In connection with the production of iron, steel and coal, according to the World Almanac for 1933, the Lorraine fields were permanently taken over by France together with the Saar Basin for a period of fifteen years; Aix-la-Chapelle was occupied by Belgium, and in May 1922, 75.4 per cent of the output of Upper Silesia was lost to Poland.

Following their victory, the Allies demanded huge reparations. Later, when it became apparent that the sums demanded could be secured only at the price of sharpened competition by Germany upon the world market a compromise was effected. A large part of the reparations was renounced in favor of a process that would hold Germany down as an industrial rival.

A mortgage was placed upon its railways and industries in order to increase production costs and thereby lessen Germany's chances as a competitor for world trade. Control of the bank of issue brought about a limitation of credits and high interest rates to further hamper the development of German industry. At the same time the investment of huge sums in German securities brought the more important branches of industry under the direct control of foreign imperialists.

Foreign Interests in Germany

However, while the demands upon Germany have been reduced from time to time as the result of political and economic developments, particularly in the last two years, it is interesting to note that the amount of foreign-owned German bonds was estimated by the Second Committee of Experts at Basle in December 1931, at approximately 400 million Marks; foreign-owned shares and interests in German industries at between 2,500 million and 3,500 million Marks, and the amount of foreign-owned real property at approximately 2,000 million Marks.

The total amount of German foreign indebtedness on February 29, 1932 was estimated by the Statistical Bureau at over 25,800 million Marks (par value, 2382 cents) involving an interest service of approximately 1,225 million Marks per annum. Of this amount approximately 8,592 million Marks are owed to the United States alone, Germany's leading creditor, of which 3,277 million are in short term and 5,125 million in long term credits.

Such figures are interesting for two reasons. On one hand they shed light on the respite granted Germany by the Hoover moratorium and the reparations "settlement." The United States, in its role of the leading imperialist power of the world, granted Germany a breathing spell in order to prevent civil war and, if failing in that, to assist Hitler in his fight against the working class of Germany, thereby aiding in not only averting a political crisis for Cen-

Vienna, Austria.—Several weeks ago the Arbeiterzeitung (central organ of the Austrian social democracy) published an editorial justifying the policy of the social democratic leadership and pointing out that up till then only "outposts" had been evacuated. What do these "outposts" look like? We will attempt to let the facts speak for themselves by drawing up a review of everything the Austrian working class, led and betrayed by the Austrian social democracy, has allowed to be snatched away from it without a struggle in the course of the last few months.

Freedom of Press and Assembly Destroyed

On the basis of the War Powers Act, the press law is revised backwards behind that of 1862 and the law of assembly backwards behind 1867. All of the labor press is submitted to pre-censorship. The holding of meetings must be announced 8 days in advance, a provision which actually stifles the working class in a period of such high political tension as the present. Marches and open meetings are prohibited "until further notice". On the basis of these provisions, the following were banned: 75 party meetings of the social democracy on March 10, the main annual event of the Viennese Free-thinkers on March 18, a meeting of the "Friends of the Free School for Children" on April 26; the annual conference of the social democratic women's organizations of Vienna was dispersed on April 28. In the middle of May, the conference of the Tenants' League was prohibited, etc., etc. On May 9 pre-censorship was also instituted for posters. Distribution of leaflets is made liable to arrest.

Streets Are Made Free... For the Reaction

The "State secretary for the maintenance of safety" announces on April 1: "In view of the demonstrations which have of late taken

A Record of Passivity Before the Advance of Bonapartism

place in the form of street carnivals, especially on the side of the social democrats... the safety authorities are hereby advised to apply the sharpest means provided for by law against all such attempts." The parade of the working class for the First of May (traditional since May 1, 1890) is banned, threats are issued against all attempts.

While the Ringstrasse (main thoroughfare) is shut off for the workers by mounted forces and machine gun detachments on the First of May, the Austrian federal army marches in review down the streets. On May 14 an exception to the law is granted and thousands of Heimwehr men goose-step throughout the town.

Fascism Receives Arms

On April 9, the cabinet decides to form "voluntary auxiliary bodies". These are formed from the "self-defense" organizations already in existence. Into the auxiliaries (auxiliary police) are admitted: members of the Peasant Defense Corps, the Austrian Home Guards and the Austrian Storm Troops. All organizations furnishing auxiliary police are exempted from the law governing the wearing of uniforms. The task of the auxiliary police is evident from its composition.

26 Years of Austrian Trade Union Works Are Destroyed Inside of 24 Hours

On the basis of the War Powers Act the collective agreements of the bank employees are nullified. Wage cuts are instituted for Social Insurance employees. Railroad workers get cuts in overtime reimbursements and in pensions that go as far as 40 per cent among the lower ranks.

Unemployment insurance payment is restricted for the great bulk of the unemployed to 20 weeks (formerly 30 weeks) and for some even to 12 weeks. Emergency relief is to be cut off or reduced drastically by July 1. Young workers up to the age of 25 are to receive no relief at all any more.

Strikes Are Prohibited

Through a "Law for the Protection of Economy against Stoppage of Work", political strikes are altogether banned and economic strikes in the "vital" industrial enterprises including printing plants). The provisions for penalties are much sharper than those of the penal code of 1853. An example: On April 27 the Viennese Bakers' agreement, in existence since 1923, is terminated summarily. The bosses refer to the above law as valid also for the baking establishments (it provides for a strike ban in all enterprises that are "vital" for maintenance).

Prayers Are Ordered

On April 14, compulsory participation in religious exercises is instituted in all schools, like in the old days.

Against the Constitution

The Christian Socialist members of the Constitutional Supreme Court resign their posts on May 23 and the government declares the Constitutional Court as suspended. "Nevertheless the legal basis, upon which the whole state life, and along with it, also the existence of the federal government, rests, has been destroyed... thereby the Austrian federal constitution is in fact invalidated, every door and gate is opened for any and every coup d'Etat." (Arbeiterzeitung, April 24.)

As can be seen from all this, the advance of the reactionaries is a matter of the conquest, not of "outposts", but of decisive positions. The Austrian government has, as it informed the "Austrian people" in its manifesto of March 8, "firmly decided" to "proceed with iron determination and with impassionate but hard perseverance" along the road it has taken.

What did the manifesto of the Social democratic party leadership say on March 9?

"If we do not take up our defense when it is still time, we will slip right into that same Fascism, into that same political disfranchisement which has become the fate of our brothers in the Reich."

One would think it is high time to go further than mere words. But that is not to be expected from the heroes of Austro-Marxism. That task can only be fulfilled by the social democratic workers themselves, provided with a firm leadership in the form of a new and reconstituted revolutionary vanguard.

What did the manifesto of the Social democratic party leadership say on March 9?

"If we do not take up our defense when it is still time, we will slip right into that same Fascism, into that same political disfranchisement which has become the fate of our brothers in the Reich."

One would think it is high time to go further than mere words. But that is not to be expected from the heroes of Austro-Marxism. That task can only be fulfilled by the social democratic workers themselves, provided with a firm leadership in the form of a new and reconstituted revolutionary vanguard.

Workers and friends who read German and are interested in getting first hand accounts of conditions in Germany can do so by subscribing to **Unser Wort**, the illegal organ of the German Left Opposition, published in Prague.

The paper appears every other week. Subscriptions are for a year only and are \$2.00. Subscriptions must be accompanied by currency. Checks and money orders will not do.

Comrades who subscribe must take into account the time element involved. They must allow time for their subs to reach the center here, and ten days for the sub to reach Prague and on top of that ten days for the paper to reach them. In short, the first copy should reach the comrade about three weeks after remittance to us.

Address all subs to **Unser Wort**, care of the Militant, 126 East 16th Street, New York City.

Consumption of raw cotton had declined by 617,000 tons. Yet, during the first two years of the crisis British production had a further decline of approximately 30 percent. Although industrial activity was hardly above the years immediately prior to the war, nevertheless British capitalism was suffering from "overproduction"

Only Avenue of Escape for Capitalism

Due to this contradiction the various national units of world capitalism are compelled to expand. They must find additional foreign markets. This they can do only at expense of some other power and the Soviet Union is the one power all capitalists wish to destroy. They see in an attack upon it not only a chance to destroy a political menace, not only a possibility to shift the much needed reparations from bankrupt Germany to the USSR, but also a chance to obtain a potential field for further expansion—a possible avenue of escape from their present position in an almost blind alley.

However, while the situation points to a probable attack on the Soviet Union by no means does it follow that the Workers' Fatherland will be destroyed. On the contrary such an attack might apply a spark that would consume at least a large part of world capitalism in the conflagration of social revolution.

In conclusion, however, it must be pointed out that Stalinism with its neglect of world revolution (and particularly the German situation) from fear of provoking a capitalist attack, instead of preventing such an attack, has helped to transfer it from the realm of imagination to the sphere of probability.

—SIMMONS,
Kansas City, Mo.

SUBSCRIBE TO "UNSER WORT"

Workers and friends who read German and are interested in getting first hand accounts of conditions in Germany can do so by subscribing to **Unser Wort**, the illegal organ of the German Left Opposition, published in Prague.

The paper appears every other week. Subscriptions are for a year only and are \$2.00. Subscriptions must be accompanied by currency. Checks and money orders will not do.

Comrades who subscribe must take into account the time element involved. They must allow time for their subs to reach the center here, and ten days for the sub to reach Prague and on top of that ten days for the paper to reach them. In short, the first copy should reach the comrade about three weeks after remittance to us.

Address all subs to **Unser Wort**, care of the Militant, 126 East 16th Street, New York City.

ARE YOU A SUBSCRIBER TO THE MILITANT?

If the number on your wrapper is 181 your subscription has expired. If you want to get the Militant promptly every week renew your subscription at once: \$2 per year for fifty two weekly issues; \$1 a half year for twenty six weekly issues.

THE MILITANT
126 East 16th St. N. Y. C.

A Letter from a Worker in E. St. Louis

Comrades:

I received the first issue of the Militant you sent me and after reading it carefully decided to take it regularly. Therefore I am sending you \$1 for a six months subscription.

Being employed for the last two years in the Soviet Union I witnessed blow after blow against the workers by the Stalinist bureaucrats without any resistance on the side of the workers who were given all the power by the October revolution.

The fate of the workers' state lies in the hands of Stalin and unless the workers throughout the world will help their comrades in the Soviet Union to rid the Comintern of the bureaucratic machine the workers and peasants in despair will welcome any aggression and the idea of world revolution will be buried for another hundred years.

The Left Opposition and its organ, the Militant, seem to know their task as how to enlighten the workers on the coming danger.

I have never been in the workers' movement and took little interest in it before I went to the Soviet Union. However conditions have changed the last 2-3 years

and they show more and more clearly that the props of the capitalist system are giving way and Communism shall be its substitute.

Yours comradely,
—J. C.

MINNEAPOLIS PICNIC
Sunday, July 23 Starting 11 A. M.
Riverside Park on South Side

EVERYBODY WELCOME
Nationally Known Speakers
Auspic: Minneapolis Free Mooney Conference

THE MILITANT

Entered as a second class mail matter November 23, 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)

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

Vol. 6, No. 39 (Whole No. 181)
SATURDAY, JULY 8, 1933
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year
Foreign \$2.50 5 cents per copy

C.P. Expels Albert Goldman

(Continued from Page 1)

I was opposed to the joining of the Scottsboro issue with the Mooney issue. I was not given a chance at the Congress to explain my position. The joining of the two issues in such a mechanical manner was harmful both to the Mooney issue and to the Scottsboro issue. But I would have voted with the party had I been asked to attend the fraction meeting and given a chance to make my position clear. But the expulsion had to come. The violation of discipline at the Mooney Congress was but the pretext. My views on the various problems confronting the American movement and the world movement are such that a conflict between myself and the party leadership was inevitable. If the party permitted freedom of discussion, that conflict would run its natural course within the party; but without freedom of discussion a breach of discipline is inevitable.

A typical example of the dishonesty typical example of the dishonesty that characterized the district eight leaders in my whole conflict with them. There is practically not a single, whole sentence in the statement which is not either a downright distortion of the facts or a wilful misinterpretation. Without claiming that there is a sharp line of demarcation between a plain statement of fact or, in plainer English, a downright lie) and an answer, for the purpose of convenience, will deal with these two types of falsehoods under different headings.

The answer does not assume to enter into a detailed explanation of the various problems which I discussed in articles and speeches within the last eight months. It confines itself merely to a simple denial and a short explanation of all the distortions contained in the statement.

I. DISTORTIONS OF FACT

(1) "He (Goldman) was previously expelled from the Party for his opposition to the policy of the Communist Party in the Trade Unions."

I was never expelled from the party for that reason or any other reason. I was not opposed to the policy of the Communist Party in the trade unions, during the years 1920-25 when I was active in the underground party. I was opposed to the policy of some of the party leaders of those days in their tactic of the united front from above with the Hillman-Levine gang of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a tactic which, at that time, killed the Left wing in the Amalgamated and which to a large extent explains its pitiable weakness at present.

The above falsehood has a source which, to those who are acquainted with events of that period, is quite obvious. Undoubtedly the secretariat accepted the word of that ignorant confederate par excellence, Robert Minor. It was he who asked me not to attack the Hillman leadership at the 1922 Amalgamated convention. It was he who was most completely taken in by the shrewd and slippery Hillman. It was he who fought me bitterly at the fraction meeting of the comrades in the needle trades, subsequent to the convention. There was a complete united front between him and Hillman against the Left wingers. As a result of this unholy alliance, Minor took advantage of the vicious frame-up of Hillman and Levine against me, on the basis of which I was expelled from the Amalgamated as a spy.

Rumors pointing the finger of suspicion against me began to be circulated in the party two years after everyone knew about the frame-up and during which time I was very active in the underground party. I demanded an immediate investigation, and refrained from activity in the meantime. A committee to investigate was appointed, and not until the united front between Minor and Hillman was broken up did the committee come out with a statement branding the action of Hillman and Levine as a frame-up to get me out of the Amalgamated. I was then studying law and did not go back to party activity, but I was never expelled.

(2) "...Goldman at that time (during the united front conference held in October 1932 in Chicago) defended the leaders of the Socialist Party against the Communist Party position.

After a stupid and violent attack on Bordets and the Socialist Party leadership by Williamson of the Communist Party, an attack which alienated all the rank and file of the non-party organizations, I was called upon to make a collection speech. I stated that I, for one, would accept the Socialist leaders who came into the united front at their word, and would criticize them only on the basis of their action in the united front struggle. In an article in the December issue of *The Communist*, (an article which was not listed in the table of contents, and which was printed immediately after Williamson's reply—all for the purpose of giving as little prominence to it as possible) I developed my position and criticized my own statement. I refer everyone to this article which will give the lie to the statement that I defended the leaders of the Socialist Party.

(3) "On the occasions he defended the position of the Second International and that of the counter-revolutionary renegade, Trotsky... He slandered the Communist Party of Germany..."

I challenge anyone to find a sin-

gle sentence in anything I wrote or to point to any statement that I made, indicating that I defended the position of the Second International. I have said many things about the united front, and about the German situation which were in agreement with Trotsky's ideas. I do not apologize for that. As there are many party rules saying that one must first find out what Trotsky has said, and then say the exact opposite? The claim is constantly made that Trotsky was expelled for violation of discipline and not for his ideas. If that is so, (and I am not naive enough to believe it) is it not possible to agree with Trotsky and still be a good party member?

In the course of a discussion with the District Committee on my views, I explicitly stated that I do not consider Cannon and Lovestone counter-revolutionaries. I am still of that opinion. By virtue of what rule in the party or the Communist International, is one liable to expulsion for such an opinion? If there is such a rule, let it be made public immediately!

In what way did I slander the Communist Party of Germany? By saying that its united front tactics were incorrect? Let me call attention to the fact that when the party leaders were grandiloquently proclaiming that the Communist Party of Germany will crush the Fascists, I was warning everyone of the impending calamity. It gives me no satisfaction whatever to say that I was right. **The real truth of the matter is that when one criticizes the leaders of the party, it is called slander; and when the party leaders slander everyone who disagrees with them, it is called criticism.**

(4) "He developed a theory that only a united front with leaders is possible."

What a shameful untruth! One must lose all hope in the possibility of a successful Communist movement when leaders can stoop to such misrepresentations. Fortunately we understand very well, that the Communist movement is only temporarily burdened with such "leaders", who depend upon lies and repression for their control of the Communist party. All I can say is, where and when did I say or write anything justifying this slander?

(5) "He persistently resisted the independent role of the party in the united front, objecting to every political criticism of the American Federation of Labor or the Socialist Party leaders."

I did not object to political criticism, but I did object to vile and stupid attacks which had the inevitable result of alienating all the non-party people from us.

(6) "The letter of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, he interpreted as agreeing with his position."

This charge is exceedingly humorous. I did not, as a matter of fact, make that claim. How could I make that claim, when my position was that we should criticize the socialist leaders, but mainly on the basis of the issues involved in the particular united front action, whereas the Communist International came out with its advice to the various parties to refrain from criticism? It seems that many party members were of the opinion that my position was endorsed by the Communist International, and to counteract that opinion, the district leaders attributed it to me.

(7) "At the 'Free Tom Mooney' Congress, he made a speech in which he held the Communist Party and the Tom Mooney Molders' Defense Committee responsible for the absence of delegates from the Socialist Party."

I did not say a word about the

Communist Party. In short, my criticism of the method of calling the Congress was that it was called under the auspices of one organization, whereas it should have been called by a provisional committee representing all tendencies in the labor movement. This very idea was advocated by the party about eight weeks before the Congress. I said that the ones who called the Congress thought of the united front tactic as something which permits one organization to invite all other organizations to its affair. One organization decides to have a congress or a hunger-march or what not, and then graciously sends an invitation to all other organizations to join it. I pointed out that the proper way is to make all organizations feel that they are participating in the calling of the united front conference. Had this been done, we would have been able to swing many more Socialist party locals and American Federation of Labor locals away from the reactionary leadership. The criticism was leveled at the Tom Mooney Molders' Defense Committee and not a word was said about the Communist party.

II. Wilful Misinterpretations

(1) "Goldman developed a theory... that there can be no united front of unorganized workers, therefore laying down a right wing theoretical justification against any activities in the shops where the masses of workers are unorganized."

A real gem of logic, worthy of the leaders of district eight! How the conclusion follows from the premise is a mystery which only the logicians of district eight can solve.

The statement I made in an article which was not published for one reason or other, but which the district eight bureaucrats misquoted and misinterpreted was that the united front presupposed the existence of organizations differing on fundamental principles, but agreeing to act together on some immediate issue; that the necessary attempts to organize the unorganized workers around some immediate issue would not by any stretch of imagination be considered a united front. Where, then, does the idea that there should be no activities in the shops come from? Ask the leadership of district eight! They will tell you that to invite workers to one of our dances constitutes a united front that when Negro and white workers struggle together, it is a united front; and will probably furnish you with similar examples of their conception of a united front. Can we not, must we not, establish a school where district eight leaders and similar leaders could be compelled to attend classes in the A B C of Communism?

(2) "He also developed a 'Leftist' theory against the united front campaign of the Communist party in election campaigns, declaring that in the elections there can be no united front of the workers and the workers already support different political parties..."

He sharply opposed the policy of the Workers' Ticket charging that this is a reformist policy to appeal to the members of the American Federation of Labor and Socialist Party, to join with the Communist Party in the election struggles."

What a jumble of misrepresentations and half-truths! Had the article which I wrote on the subject been published, I could easily refer the reader to it and the whole issue as to what I wrote would be settled. But the article was not published, so that all I can do is to give its leading ideas.

I said in that article that the

united front has as its main purpose the involving of large masses of workers of different organizations in a struggle against the capitalist class on the basis of an immediate issue. I further stated that the main purpose of our parliamentary campaign should be the education of the workers in the principles of Communism; that this can best be done if the Communist party has its own candidates and conducts its campaign on its own platform; that a united front for the purpose of electing someone to a capitalist legislature is opportunistic. I did not altogether exclude the possibility of a united front on the parliamentary field, but very severely criticized the tactics as pursued in Chicago.

Why then deliberately lie in attributing to me as the reason for my opposition to the united front on the parliamentary field, "since the workers already support different political parties?"

Why give the absolutely false impression that my opposition to the Workers' Ticket was based on the fact that this is a "reformist" policy to appeal to the members of the American Federation of Labor and Socialist Party, to join with the Communist Party in the election struggles?"

Of course the lies and distortions have only one reason. To discredit with the workers who will never get a chance to read my reply to the slanderous statement.

(3) "He did not participate in any mass activity, and abstained from work in mass organizations, confining his activity to that of a lawyer, appearing in a number of cases in court, and occasionally as a speaker for the 'Friends of the Soviet Union'."

I do not of course claim that I did the most important work in the party. I did not organize any party units, nor did I organize any unemployed councils or industrial unions. But the statement above quoted leaves the impression that I handled very few cases and did practically nothing else besides.

For the last four years I have handled very few cases and did practically nothing else besides. For the last four years I have handled hundreds of cases for the International Labor Defense. There were times when I appeared in court every day for weeks and weeks. I spoke at least an average of three times a week, before different branches of various organizations.

I do not say this with any feeling that I did a lot for the movement, but simply to show the dishonesty contained in the above statement of the secretariat.

III.

If freedom of discussion were to exist in the party had I been given an opportunity to talk to the membership on the various problems that I raised in my articles; had two articles which I wrote dealing with the united front on the parliamentary field and with the slogan of amalgamation of the unemployed workers' organizations been published; had I felt that the district leaders were honestly opposed to me but were willing to permit me to discuss all the vital issues before the membership, I would now feel extremely vexed at myself for my breach of discipline at the Mooney Congress. I do not think that expulsion would have been merited, but I would feel that almost any other punishment would be well deserved. Communist discipline is something that cannot be taken too seriously. But when Communist discipline is used to trap a comrade who has ideas, it assumes a formal and obnoxious character, far removed from the ideas of Communist discipline as taught by Lenin.

Everyone knew I was a delegate to the Mooney Congress, I am quite positive that the fact that I was a delegate reached the ears of the leaders of district eight before the Congress convened. Why was I not invited to the fraction meeting where I should have been given a chance to present my views on the conduct of the Congress and on the advisability of joining the Scottsboro and Mooney issues? On the one hand, I am kept out of the fraction meeting and on the other hand, if I say anything contrary to the decision of the fraction, I violate discipline. "Heads I win—tails you lose!"

Yes, I violated discipline, but under the circumstances expulsion is not justified, and since expulsion was decided upon, it is obvious that the real reason is not my conduct at the Mooney Congress, but the fact that for the past six months or so I have dared to come out with theories of the united front tactic and with an explanation of the German situation not to the liking of the district eight leadership.

I cannot deny that expulsion would be a terrible blow. No real Communist would take expulsion from the party calmly. On the other hand, no real Communist surrenders the most cherished possession of a revolutionist, intellectual honesty and independence and integrity. Party membership and intellectual honesty should never conflict. If there is a conflict, if the party does not permit freedom of discussion within the limits of Communist discipline, if a party member must conceal his views in order to remain in the party, the expulsion is no longer a disgrace, but a badge of honor.

Was to the party that must resort to repression and expulsion to compel members to agree with the leadership? Has it come to such a stage in the Communist movement? The affirmative indicates that it has. The fact of the expulsion by the Central Committee of the party will prove conclusively that there is no room for a thinking revolutionist within the party.

—ALBERT GOLDMAN.

Perspectives for American Labor

Although American capitalism is entering, or has entered, the upward swing of a new cycle, it is reasonable to assume that the perspectives of the near future point to a growing radicalization of the American masses.

While it might seem as if the United States stands as a refutation of Marxism, due to the fact that it possesses both the most highly developed forms of the capitalist mode of production and the least (or near the least) developed revolutionary working class, in reality this contradiction is no refutation at all. On the contrary, it can be understood to its fullest extent only by means of an analysis based on the larger content of Marxism.

The political lag of the American working class is the result of peculiarities of national development. In the past the consciousness of the American workers as a class rose to a certain level as a result of various stages of American economic development only to subside under the influence of a subsequent period of comparative "prosperity". American historical development (with the opportunities of individual escape from the working class by means of a limited success as a farmer, small merchant or professional man) operated as a safety valve preventing the rise of the American proletariat as a political factor in the social life of American capitalism. The American wage earner viewed himself as a potential capitalist rather than as a member of the working class. His ideology was that of the petty bourgeois and he failed to recognize the desirability of acting as a mass.

But today the peculiar historical conditions which drilled the philosophy of individualism so deeply into the minds of the American workers are no longer present. They are succumbing, or have succumbed, to the march of economic development. The frontier is closed. No longer is it possible for any appreciable number of workers to rise out of their class by becoming small farmers or by entering the permanently over-crowded professions. The small farmer has been reduced to the economic status of the "poor peasant" of Europe. American schools and colleges are turning out thousands of young persons, trained for professional service, for whom there is no employment. The possibility of a success as a small merchant has been reduced to the neighborhood of zero by a rise in the minimum amount of capital necessary "to start in business for oneself" and by the invasion of large scale capital (with its superior technique, greater control over sources of supply and similar advantages, into such hitherto neglected fields as retail distribution, to such an extent that in 1929 it made a total of 21.5 percent of all retail sales.

At the same time, American workers are beginning to realize that their interests and those of the capitalists represent two antagon-

istic poles. They are becoming aware that a rise in productivity does not necessarily result in a corresponding rise in their so-called share of the national profit. And to this the fact that a cyclical recovery will not bring a substantial restoration of the depressed American standard of living and it is easy to believe that the awakening process will continue.

Labor power is a commodity. As such its true value is determined by the value of the physical minimum of requirements necessary to reproduce that labor power from day to day plus certain requirements dictated by natural conditions and by the particular social level of the United States. However, by reason of its being a commodity, labor power is amenable to the invisible laws governing all commodities. It is influenced by the factors of supply and demand, being forced below or carried above its true value according as the available supply of labor power is above or below demand. But with the tremendous technological advance of production in recent years there exists a permanent and relatively growing over-supply of labor power. While a cyclical recovery would cause them to rise slightly above their present level, as a result of the absorption of a part of the over-supply of labor power, from that point they would once more recede.

Thus we are led to believe that the period of "prosperity" existing between 1923 and 1929, as far as the workers are concerned, has passed never to return. It is estimated that improvement of productive technique has progressed to the point where a return to the production levels of 1928-29, which is not likely, could be made today with the re-employment of not more than 50 percent of the 16 million American workers unemployed at present. Thus, the United States will enter any period of cyclical recovery with a permanent industrial reserve army of at least 8 million persons. Nor will this army shrink. On the contrary, it is reasonable to presuppose its further growth. The technological displacement of workers will continue. Each year an influx of young persons who have attained "working age" will swell the ranks of available workers. So take it, all in all, it may be said that the American period of high wages is a thing of the past.

In 1929 the United States definitely joined Europe in a condition of general capitalist decline. Its industrial activity, held up by the export of capital between 1923-29, permanently slackened. The general crisis of capitalism laid it by the heels and today America is confronted by an accumulation of surplus capital seeking investment, excess plant capacity, over-capitalization in expectation of high monopoly profits, restricted markets and other phenomena characteristic of the period of capitalist decay.

However, this does not mean that cyclical variations are excluded. On the contrary, one is beginning to

take place now. But all phases of the business cycle—bull, average production, boom and crisis—from now on will occur on a generally descending curve in contradistinction to a formerly ascending one. They will take place within a restrictive circle dictated by the present stage of development of the international economic and social relationships of world imperialism. Boom will be extremely short-lived and succeeded by crises of unusual length and depth.

(Continued in next issue)

Parliamentary Cretinism

(Continued from Page 1)

Barbusse's paper, *Monde* are keeping watch over you! And, as if to complete the picture of political decadence, the same number of the *Rundschau* prints a leading article on the present relations between Germany and Austria. A revolutionary phitistine relates that "for the first time" (!) in the relations of the two countries, "Hitler has recourse to reprisals against Austria to force measures of internal policy from that government". For the first time in the relations of the two states! The article concludes with the following remarkable words: "The relations between Germany and Austria have never been, since the existence of the Empire, as bad as they are at this moment. Such is the practical result of Hitler's foreign policy." It is somewhat unbearable to read this philosophy which is worthy of a conservative Privatdozent (professor). Hitler is conducting a policy of counter-revolutionary realism in Austria. He wins over the petty-bourgeois masses by digging the ground from under unstable Austrian Bonapartism. With obstinacy and perseverance, Hitler is changing the relationship of forces in his favor. He does not fear the straining of relations with Dollfuss. In that he distinguishes himself—and distinguishes himself to his advantage—from Otto Bauer and from... the Stalinist bureaucracy which does not view the relations between Austria and Germany from the standpoint of the class struggle but from the standpoint of diplomatic cretinism.

Moscow's enthusiasm for the Paris Congress called to replace the revolutionary struggle in Austria, and the indignation at Basle over the policy of Hitler who does not fear, in the struggle against the Austrian masses, to dispute with Dollfuss himself—"there is no animal stronger than a cat", says the mouse—this enthusiasm and this indignation complement each other as two forms of parliamentary and diplomatic cretinism. By a minute part the whole can be judged. In many cases one can precisely determine the sickness by a symptom. These two articles are enough—one in *Pravda*, the other in the *Rundschau*—to say: perhaps the Centrist bureaucracy has adequate means at its disposal to hire expensive halls in Paris and to publish bulky papers in Basle, but Bureaucratic Centristism as a revolutionary current is dead, it decomposes before our eyes and poisons the atmosphere.

—L. TROTSKY.

Prinkipo, June 13, 1933.

London Meet Splits

(Continued from Page 1)

we can more successfully attack the rest of the world".

To help cover up the real policies of concentrated attack on international markets, they set up a utopian nationalistic ideal of high prices, stabilized for a generation, of a nationally managed currency, of broader purchasing power for the masses in the face of rising prices, of improved conditions for agriculture as against industry, of a general return to the "prosperous period" of 1924-1925. The realities, however, are not stabilization but the wildest speculation; not the stimulation of agriculture, but the elimination of the small farmer; not greater purchasing power for the masses, but less purchasing power due to inflation and their tying up of the trade unions, hand and foot, with the ropes of the Industrial Recovery Act.

The combination of open force with sentimental hypocrisy, of ruthless driving toward a fixed goal with apparent vacillation, of an open splitting of the London conference with pious attempts to keep it going, are Roosevelt's distinct contribution to the technique of aggressive imperialism.

—B. J. F.

COMRADE MILICENT SHOOTER

We have received the sad news from abroad that one of the first supporters of the Left Opposition in England, comrade Milicent Shooter, passed away at her home in Helston, Cornwall. Comrade Shooter rallied to *The Militant* with contributions, both literary and financial, from its very inception. We wish to record our appreciation at the excellent Jimmy Higgins work she carried on to the limit of her capacity in Great Britain and our deep grief at losing a faithful comrade-in-arms, who remained with us to her last day.

WORKS BY TROTSKY

- ON GERMANY
 - The ONLY ROAD WHAT NEXT?
 - 100 pages .25 192 pages paper cover .35
 - Postage—.06 extra per copy cloth over .65
- ON RUSSIA
 - PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF U.S.S.R.
 - Price .15 Postage—.01 extra per copy
- ON SPAIN
 - THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER
 - Price .15 Postage—.01 extra per copy
- ON THE TRADE UNION QUESTION
 - COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM
 - Price .15 Postage—.01 extra per copy
- ON THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY AND THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION
 - THE STRATEGY OF THE PERMANENT WORLD REVOLUTION
 - .25 180 pages paper cover .50
 - Postage—.06 extra per copy cloth cover 1.00
 - Postage—.06 extra per copy
- ON CHINA
 - PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION
 - 450 pages paper cover 1.00 cloth cover 1.50
 - Postage—.06 extra per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 EAST 10th STREET, N. Y. C.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

The next issue of *The Militant* will contain an article by comrade Trotsky in reply to the critics of the History of the Russian Revolution.

FROM "LENINISM VERSUS STALINISM"