

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

VOL. II, No. 19.

NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, December 7, 1929

PRICE 5 CENTS

Hoover's Building Plan Swindle

Congress Opens -for the Master

The first regular session of the seventy-first Congress opens this week with a schedule of work and legislation to be adopted that will round out the attack upon the standards of the American workers. What the office boys of capitalist class will accomplish at this session is already outlined in the dispatches from Washington:

A Christmas Gift to the Boss

First will come the sacred, religious duty of making its annual Christmas present to its capitalist master: the insignificant tax cut of \$160,000,000 which the leaders of both Parties in Congress have already agreed to put in the socks hung at the chimney by the starving millionaires of the land.

Then the tariff tangle will be straightened out, following upon the message by Hoover. What it will signify, even in a moderated form, is the jacking up of the United States tariff wall in a desperate endeavor by the American boss class to broaden the basis of their own narrowing home market by keeping out the more cheaply produced goods of Europe, and, inversely, cutting down the meager share they have allotted to the poor relatives across the sea. That the raised tariff schedules will not bring with them any increase of wages in compensation is obvious from the whole past tariff history of the country.

What is clear for the workers is that their wages have been cut, their working day lengthened, their "efficiency" increased by the crack of the foreman's whip, and their unions smashed through, under the hitherto prevailing Fordney-McCumber rates, and that their situation will not be improved one iota under the higher Smoot-Hawley bill. What that bill will succeed in doing—when it is passed, and in most part it will be—is to increase the resentment of the other trading countries of the world, many of which have already protested in one form or another against the proposed tariff. This resentment will only add fuel to the smoldering fires of the coming war, because the new tariff law is essentially a brutally aggressive measure of American imperialism against its world competitors, for which they will try to pay back the U. S. in the same coin.

The naval bill will be put off until the London naval conference takes place next month. The naval construction program is the threat held by the United States against Great Britain primarily, that unless the latter fulfills the demands of the world's banker, the United States will give it such a run for its money as will leave it floating breathless on the sea.

What Congress will do "nothing" about—except to hand out soft slop—is the increasingly obvious tendency towards a deep economic depression which is cutting the ground from under the feet of the American workers. Layoffs, in batches of thousands, are taking place more frequently, particularly in the automobile, the steel and the building industries. These workers are joining the already large army of the unemployed, with no prospects before them but a bleak winter.

The Wage Cut Drive

Congress will do nothing about the wage cut and speed-up drive of the American bosses—except to support it with all its heart. Those workers "lucky" enough to keep their jobs and stay off the bread line will have to make up for those lacking in industry, and they will have to do it by pouring more and more of their energy, physical and mental, into their machines to be coined into profit.

A number of days after the Soviet Union had finally forced the Mukden government to enter into negotiations for the settlement of the dispute around the Chinese Eastern Railway, the United States government, through secretary of state Stimson sent a note to the Chinese and Soviet Government, ostensibly to "urge the two governments to settle the dispute" but in actuality to throw a spoke into the negotiations now taking place in Khabarovsk, Eastern Manchuria. Upon America's initiative, the other imperialist powers, including the "socialist" government of MacDonald, sent identical notes.

Stimson is a "Bit Late"

The Stimson note is a very coolly calculated piece of cunning. So long as the White Guard bandits and the Chinese mercenary bands continued their invasion of Soviet soil, there was no preventive action taken by American imperialism, which has the Chiang Kai-Shek government at its command. When this butcher of the Chinese working class seized the jointly controlled Chinese Eastern Railway, there was again no protest from the United States. When Soviet citizens were arrested, tortured, imprisoned and brutally treated in China, the United States maintained a discreet silence.

But now that the Red Army has successfully repulsed the Chinese and Russian White Guard forces, upon whose activity the imperialists counted since they are not now in a position for active military intervention of their own, and Russia has made Mukden come to the conference table to work out terms of agreement, Stimson suddenly discovers the existence of the Kellogg "Peace" Pact.

Stimson's intervention into the situation at this date—just when the difficulties are about to be settled in Russia's favor—is not for a moment animated by any desire for "peace". Were the American im-

perialists so concerned about the horrors of war and the beauties of pacifism, they might start cleaning their own front steps by withdrawing troops from Nicaragua, the Philippines and other colonies and semi-colonies of Wall Street.

What Stimson Worries Over

What Stimson is concerned with is fear of the prestige and strength that will accrue to the Soviet Union if the conflict is settled by agreement with Mukden (and Nanking's tacit consent) to return the Railway to joint control. What he is further concerned with is to prevent such an agreement, keep the situation at high tension, provoke continued conflicts on the Manchurian border, so that at the proper moment the American government can step in with the "generous" offer to "internationalize" the Railway, that is, bring it under its influence. That is one of the main reasons why Japan which has heavy interests in Manchuria, refused to send an identical note to Russia and China. For the moment in the present situation, Japan fears American influence in Manchuria more than Russia.

Stimson's note is an attempt to throw a spoke into the negotiations now taking place in Khabarovsk. It is a gesture hostile to the Soviet Union. All the more reason for arousing the resistance of the workers everywhere to defend Russia's revolutionary right to joint participation in the Chinese Eastern. It is not to be defended on the basis of "property rights" or "sacredness of treaties", for that way the workers cannot be mobilized. That this is the basis of Stalin's agitation now, makes it necessary to point out more clearly the advantage to the world working class in depriving Chiang Kai-Shek and his imperialist masters of the Chinese Eastern Railway as a weapon against the worker's state.

Disarmament and the U.S. of Europe

1. How Can Europe Be United?

Briand has felt the need of ameliorating the historical fate of the three hundred and fifty million people of Europe, who are the bearers of the highest civilization and yet cannot live a century without a dozen wars and revolutions. MacDonald, in the interest of pacifying our planet, has crossed the Atlantic. The United States of Europe, disarmament, freedom of trade and peace are on the order of the day. On all sides capitalist diplomacy is preparing a big pacifist soup. Peoples of Europe, peoples of the whole world, get out big spoons to swallow it with!

Why this mobilization? Are not the socialists in power in the most important countries of Europe or else preparing for it? Yes, that is just why. However, it is forthwith apparent that the plans of Briand and MacDonald are bringing "peace" in two absolutely opposite directions. Briand wants to unify Europe in order that it may defend itself against America. MacDonald wants to earn the gratitude of America by helping it oppress Europe. Two trains are rushing to meet one another in order to save their passengers...from the catastrophe!

The Anglo-French naval accord of July, 1928 was liquidated by a simple knitting of the brows by America. This fact is a sufficient demonstration of the relation of forces in the world: "Do you imagine, by chance," America intimates, "that I am going to adapt myself to your resolutions made on both sides of the Channel? If you want your negotiations to be taken seriously, then take the trouble to cross

the Atlantic." MacDonald ordered his ticket and that is about the most tangible thing in his pacifist program.

At Geneva the future "unifiers" of the continent felt themselves little more at ease than the bootleggers on the other side of the Ocean: They look with dismay upon the American police. Briand began and concluded his speeches by swearing by all that is sacred that the unification of Europe must in no case and under no conditions be directed against America. God forbid! In reading these declarations, the American politicians must have felt a double joy: "Briand is somewhat afraid of us... but he won't succeed in putting us off the track."

Although he repeated the words of Briand, Stresemann carried on a veiled polemic against him, Henderson polemicized against both of them, but mainly against the French Prime Minister. In fact, the whole discussion at Geneva unfolded according to the following scheme:

Briand: In no case against the United States.

Stresemann: Quite right. But some have mental reservations. American can rely only on Germany.

MacDonald: I swear on the Bible that loyalty and good-will are the exclusive endowment of the British, particularly the Scotch.

That is how the "new international atmosphere" was created in Geneva.

The internal weakness of Europe springs primarily from its economic decay. The economic strength of the United States, on the contrary, constitutes its unity. The question arises: How to proceed so that the unification of Europe is

Continued on Page 4

Lots of Promises to the Jobless

By Martin Abern

President Herbert Hoover is preparing a big swindle for the American working class with his "construction program" to stall off the growing depression. The blustering confidence of American capitalist interests, received a rude shock in the wild crash recently on the stock market. While American capitalists by no means feel that the fall will prove fatal; and while at the same time, they try to minimize its effects, nevertheless, it is clear that the shock to wide strata of people of all classes and groupings, including the as yet largely bourgeois-minded workers, has been severe. The same confidence as before in the status quo is no longer there.

Hoover "Stabilizes Capitalism"

Schemes, or prayers, for "permanent" capitalist economic stability" are forthcoming from all corners. "Prosperity President" Hoover is the champion of most of these hoped-for capitalist stabilizers. Hoover, the pride of the House of Mammon, stepped to the helm to guide the ship of profit.

But lo, in but a handful of months came the Wall Street crash, upsetting faith, bank accounts, business and jobs. All eyes turned to Hoover to speak his and also the wisdom of the House of Morgan. As business begins to tremble; as factories and mills in many large centers begin to shut down; as unemployment, in the beginnings of a cold winter, jumps sharply from its already high figure, Hoover steps forward and trumpets: "Business as usual! There is nothing fundamentally wrong with us (capitalist system)! Let us build!"

The Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Julius Barnes, however, is satisfied with production and says:

"The anxiety... and problem of today is over the maintenance of buying power." But how? President Hoover with true Quaker calmness once said:

What About the Unemployed?

"The primary safety to continued prosperity will be continued willingness of our people to save their enlarged earnings (what, the unemployed?), to resist extravagance and waste (also the unemployed or the Southern textile workers, (?)) to give full individual exertion." Now, the practicality of the situation compels greater concreteness. So Hoover replies to the rumblings of uncertainty, distrust, restlessness by advising a policy, in the main, of public works, road-building, construction, etc. Hoover further proposes that business hereafter plan its activities more carefully, attempt consciously to regulate the business of capitalism in accordance with a laid-out scheme; in fact, to set up-to-date National Business Council, which by its character and purpose hopes to serve as a permanent regulator of capitalism, and upon occasion to spread salve on the sore body of the workers.

It intends further to ignore, as much as possible, its own created instrument, Congress, as now too slow and inefficient for this world of business engineering.

Through this organized National business Council, that great individualism and needed competitive spirit of the "true Americanism", so staunchly lauded by Hoover, takes a back seat. In fact, Hoover, outlines a policy, in socio-political terms, of state socialism, or more correctly, state capitalism, with some added special governmental features—borrowed from Mussolini. But organized production, or its development, is only possible where capitalism is replaced by working class rule, as in Soviet Russia.

The figures adduced by leading capi-

Continued on Page 6

Stalinists Raid the Co-ops

THE PARTY WINS ANOTHER «VICTORY» IN SUPERIOR!

By Vincent R. Dunne

The Communist Party in the Minneapolis-Superior district has just committed the crowning blunder of the long series since the expulsion of the Opposition. Not that it is a district matter alone; far from it. It is merely the scene, because of the location of the cooperative movement in Superior and it makes Karl Reeve, Party district organizer, the official splitter of the movement and places heavy responsibilities upon the comrades of the Communist League here.

As is already known, the Party, because of the Third Period, must secure a stranglehold upon all the auxiliary organizations. The bell has been sounded now for the cooperatives. The Party has therefore mobilized its most reckless crusaders and marched into the North country.

The Hi-Jackers at Work

The professional disrupters and faction agents, Minor and Stachel, were sent together with a host of others to demand that the Cooperative Central Exchange not only donate \$3,000.00 for the T. U. U. L. convention and \$5,000.00 for other Party work, but in addition that a yearly assessment be levied by the Party upon the Exchange to the amount of one percent of the gross sales, which would amount to about \$17,000.00 this year. Also, that all the employees of the Exchange and its member stores should be Party functionaries, that is, the salesmen, truck drivers, clerks, etc., must devote the major part of their time to the organizing of the iron miners and Party units, and in spare time, build the cooperatives.

The Party hi-jackers demanded as a first step that George Halonen ("as the outstanding Right winder") be removed from his post as Educational Director of the Exchange. This suggestion was not well received by the Executive Board. In fact, the Board—of 13, I believe—voted unanimously against it although there are seven Party members on this body. The Board issued a statement for publication in *Tyomies*, the official organ of the Exchange. At that time the Party had somewhat a better (or worse?) crew in charge of the paper who not only refused to publish the statement but came out with a long and vicious statement against the Board in general and Halonen and Ronn in particular.

As its next move, the Executive called seven sub-district meetings of the cooperatives which were, of course, attended by hundreds of members, at which their statement was read, discussed and indorsed overwhelmingly.

Reckless Party Adventure

One might think that these developments would give the Party pause. Not at all. It seems that they were overjoyed. Had not these cooperative comrades proved that they were agents of the capitalists? Of course. Then more pressure, still more pressure! The cooperatives must be saved or destroyed! Reeve, Pobersky, Bernick, Puro, Heikkinen and a dozen more small fry, together with an un-named representative from the Party center, and TWO representatives of the Comintern, were wheeled into position. The conferences and meetings which had been going on almost without number were pushed on to new and higher levels—the situation growing more tense and the Party steadily losing ground.

The Executive Board had in the meantime prepared the *Pyramid Builder*, the monthly organ of the Central Exchange, containing the statement of the Board. The P. B., however, is printed in the *Tyomies* plant. Now it seems that the Stalin men had not thought of this until it was already being run. I am sure that the natural and orderly processess of publication were somewhat hurried by the workers in the plant who are to a man in sympathy with the Executive Board. At any rate, about 3 out of the 5 thousand copies were carried away by individuals in private cars while the Stalin boys were on the lookout for the Executive's truck.

When they finally came to and discovered what was going on, Reeve, with a group of Y. C. L. members and a few others, rushed the plant and succeeded in burning some of the remaining copies. A free-for-all started in which Reeve and the others were driven up the street with heavy losses.

Result: Superior is an armed camp. Guards of the Party are posted in the *Tyomies* and the Hall. The other comrades have

complete control of the Cooperative Central Exchange which is also under armed guard. The Party has lost the control and sympathy of the cooperatives, with their 20,000 members. The control of the *Tyomies* is at best a doubtful one.

The situation is extremely tense and unless the proper steps are taken there can be grievous consequences for the whole labor and revolutionary movement in this section of the country at least. Most of the workers have broken away from the Party essentially because of its wild and devil-may-care policy of arbitrary, mechanical control—or destruction. But the

struggle against this policy of the Party is not sufficient or an end in itself. Unless this movement is enriched with a program which sees the roots of the difficulties in a broader field than the cooperative movement, which sees them in the whole present course of the leadership of the Communist International and its American counterpart, it will inevitably lead in the wrong direction.

No Turning from the Left!

It is not difficult for this movement to become—under the provocations of the Stalinists and the maneuverings of the Allanes and other outspoken Right wing elements—an anti-Communist movement, which will end in transforming the cooperatives into a plaything of the reactionaries and discrediting its leaders. The entirely factional and reckless policy of the Party for years has led up to this climax. The militants have the hard job of preventing a move in this direction and guiding it instead into healthy working class channels.

hold important positions, or a narrow union established only on the conditions of accepting a leadership holding Party membership cards, even if mechanically imposed? The former is the only possible form that can succeed, particularly at this juncture. This is proved by all working class history and by the very response of the miners, whereas the introduction of the latter narrow conception immediately led to a split situation only narrowly averted.

If these methods are persisted in by the Party leadership it can result in nothing but complete forfeiture of the present splendid possibilities; and, what is worse yet, the creation of a situation in which rank and file coal miners in large numbers, who are ready to give their utmost for the triumph of militant unionism will be driven to anti-Communism.

The National Miners Union has not yet reached a point of facing its greatest and most formidable enemy—the coal operators. It is perfectly well known that while the operators prefer their own trusted henchmen from the old union to the N. M. U., they many times more prefer no union at all. No moment should therefore be lost in taking up immediately the struggle for pressing every-day needs of the miners as a means of organizing and preparing them for the bigger fights to come. That will decide the leadership of the union. Only by applying a correct policy can the Communists prove the superiority of their conceptions and make themselves worthy of leadership.

ARNE SWABECK

The Thieves Fall Out in the Miners Union

The destructive fight now ravaging the United Mine Workers Union in the Illinois district between the John L. Lewis international administration and the Harry Fishwick district administration is proving to the hilt all the charges made by the Left wing and progressive forces during the years of struggle against these corrupt officials. One more serious blow is now being administered to the badly shattered remnants of this union, thus indicating a once glorious organization coming to an inglorious end. Now the question of building anew upon the ruins of the old becomes the real burning one.

What this fight really is about is rather difficult to ascertain. There certainly are no principles involved. But the Illinois section still has a dues paying membership bringing in a revenue for which both groups of per-capita absorbers are willing to go to bat. Both administrations have already mutually removed one another expecting the miners to pay the bills out of their starvation wages. Each administration has its paid scribes to edit its respective journal, hurling invectives at one another. In this respect, Oscar Ameringer of the Illinois section so far has the edge with such choice bits as referring to Lewis—"Deadeast duck this side of the milky way; defender of the fat; marshal of the Meal Ticket Legion, sublime keeper of the swag; imitator Mussolini; the dud the carcass of Lewisism; union wrecker; traitor".

Wrecking a Great Union

Nothing could speak more eloquently about the wreckage wrought by John L. Lewis in the U. M. W. of A. than the membership figures emanated from his own office. According to reports submitted by the Federal Bureau of Mines, 153,829 mine workers are employed in the soft coal fields of Pennsylvania (of course not working regularly). The U. M. W. of A. today has a dues paying membership of 1,374. In West Virginia 119,799 miners employed with 77 dues paying members. In Indiana 24,352 with 10,609 dues paying members.

In Ohio 35,543 with 1,061 dues paying members. In Kentucky 64,747 with 77 dues paying members. At the time when Lewis took office as president in 1921 there were a total dues paying membership in the soft coal fields, not including exonerated members nor the districts of Canada, of 365,740. In 1929 this membership in the same territory has dropped to 84,369 of which Illinois has 53,088.

The Fishwick administration in trying to outdo Lewis, now makes an open bid for the support of the operators by charging that Lewis did not have the courage to accept responsibility for an "orderly" retreat such as they claim the economic conditions demanded, but instead, they say, issued his slogan of "no backward step". And yet there have been nothing but retreats and sell-outs, on both sides. In July 1928 Lewis made his infamous decision destroying the last vestige of a national union by ordering each district to obtain whatever terms on working conditions it pleased. In Illinois, Fishwick put through a substantial wage cut with a loss of practically all remaining union conditions and declared it carried in a referendum vote in which a later check-up showed that it was defeated at least three to one. The Fishwick administration is further taking steps toward a new national union of its own.

There could be nothing whatever ever inspiring to the miners no matter

which side wins in this contest, which will be decided by the operators.

However, the pressure of economic conditions, of increased mechanization of the mines with increased speed-up, increased unemployment and deterioration of working conditions and the standard of living, is growing and driving them forward to seek their first solution in the building of a new union capable of fighting for their interests.

Possibilities of New Union

Thus the possibilities for building the National Miners Union are excellent. Yet, as reported in the last issue, the methods pursued by the Communist Party leadership threatens it with being still-born, almost creating a split situation before the union has taken on organized form. The delegates who walked out in disgust from the district convention held at Belleville, Oct. 27, were precisely the most substantial section of the delegates. They were non-Party members, representing mainly the Staunton sub-district which has been in the forefront during this long struggle against the corrupt old union leadership, the territory in which the most militant strike picketing was carried on last year and from which the most substantial locals joined the N. M. U. in a body. Fortunately, these delegates, although they left the convention, are still determined by all means to build the National Miners Union, a decision which members of the Communist Opposition were able to influence in a considerable measure.

What was the issue at the Belleville convention responsible for the delegates leaving. One of principle, program, form of organization, attitude toward the old union officialdom or the coal operators? No, the issue carried to the point of an incipient split was John J. Watt, the president of the N. M. U., known to the rank and file miners as one who earnestly endeavors to build the union and accepts its program. An issue artificially created. Whatever might be said about mistakes made by Watt, one thing is sure; His long time opposition to the entirely false methods pursued by the Party leadership in imposing a complete mechanical control upon this new union movement from its very inception has largely been both a very natural and correct one. It caused him to resign his Party membership about last summer (a reaction which Communists will not endorse). But the retaliation by the Party leadership to this step has become a far worse one; as a matter of fact, one which threatens the interests of the coal miners.

With a situation like the one now existing in the Illinois coal fields, when the main campaign should be the building of the new union on a mass basis, consolidation of its rank and file support, an energetic fight against the Lewis and Fishwick union wreckers, and against the coal operators to recapture lost conditions, the main campaign is made against Watt. To make a case, the *Daily Worker* is resorting to outright fabrications as, for example, that Watt is calling conferences in opposition to those called by the district organization, that the Staunton locals repudiated Watt, etc.

What Kind of a New Union

The question that must be answered by the Party leadership is—what sort of union is intended? A mass organization in which elements who are not Party members but willing earnestly to accept the militant union program, can participate and

trism are doomed to defeat. A purging without real democracy in the Party is transformed into an uproar, a lottery, a farce, and in most cases falls short of its aim. Before jumping out of the window the Bessedovskys pass happily through all the censuses, all the purgings, and all the unanimous votes.

All the Oppositionists who followed Radel and Smilga have fallen to the lowest level. They have no perspectives. The leading capitulators have left either for country homes or for watering places, abandoning the ranks of the capitulators to themselves. Certain of those who left us find themselves being refused work and even unemployment benefits. Certain capitulators are returning to us. Some of the Sapronovists signed the declaration of Rakovsky. I. N. Smirnov is in Moscow. His declaration is finally agreed to, but it has not yet been published in the press; evidently, signatures have to be picked up.

The material conditions of the deportees are very harsh. The high cost and lack of food are very great. The deportees are doing a great deal of theoretical work.

I am informed that a new group of Oppositionists deported from Leningrad (ten-twelve comrades in all) have just passed through Tashkent.

October 21, 1929

P.

Moscow Worker (No. 209, September 11): "In the Fauci and the Marteau factories (formerly Goujon), in the construction shop, the Trotskyists defended their resolution at the workers' meeting, and all the members of the Party and the Youth, instead of accepting battle with them and counter-attacking them in a decisive manner, simply went along. There is still tolerance towards Trotskyism..."

Moscow Worker (No. 208, September 10): "Trotskyism formerly flourished in the Red October factory, and it is not yet stifled today. In the Frunze factory we have examples of hidden Trotskyists issuing leaflets and certain Communists look upon it in a 'conciliatory' manner. 'It's none of my business'."

Moscow Worker (No. 210 September 12): "In the Kamovniki district there are still some Trotskyist elements. During the period of activity that extended from March to September, 27 Trotskyists were expelled. It must not be forgotten that there exist remnants—unimportant, it is true—of Trotskyism." (Report of the Control Commission to the district conference of the Party).

Youth Pravda (August 25): "The remnants of a Trotskyist organization has been uncovered in a few Youth nuclei (Chvorostin, Starostin, Petrovsky and Armature factories). By a decision of the regional committee, 23 members of the Youth have been expelled, among them many members of the committee . . . of the Party formally, and actually of the Opposition. The Bureau of the Petrovsky factory nucleus has been dissolved."

Throughout the World of Labor

The Conference of the German Right Wing

On October 20, the Right wing opposition in Germany (Brandler group) held its second national conference at Weimar. According to the organization report, the group had gathered in one year of work 5,112 members divided into 169 groups. The number of readers of its 8 weekly papers appearing all over Germany is about 25,000.

Launched in spite of and against the always powerful Party apparatus, it is quite a success so far as the figures go. The political estimates of the national conference, however, reflect the impossibility of squaring the circle—the utopia of showing a section of the international proletarian army the concrete road to victory while having an entirely restricted national theoretical basis.

Is it just a reaction against the exaggerated internationalism of the C.I. that the first accounts and articles on the national conference triumphantly announce (Gegen den Strom, No. 43, October 26, 1929) that real Leninism has only just been found at Weimar, through the "discovery" that Lenin pointed out to all the Communists the duty of taking into consideration the "concrete peculiarities" of each country? Or should we not rather attribute a greater importance to the fact that they passed over in silence the necessity, for Lenin and his school, of taking the international point of view without neglecting the "concrete peculiarities" of each country?

What can be the international basis of the platform of the Right wing opposition (which will be published in the coming number of Gegen den Strom and which we will examine a little closer later on)? Thalheimer, the theoretician of the Brandler group, says in his report that the general program of the C.I. is the point of departure for the national program. But Thalheimer and his friends have disapproved of the essential parts of this program. Can a correct national program then be drawn from a wrong international program?

Thalheimer himself, who already dared a lot, will not succeed in that.

Then what are the other bases of the platform, which was the central axis of the Weimar conference? Thalheimer tells us:

"The platform is the result not only of this year of our work, but of 4-6 years of work and struggle of our tendency, of 10 years of revolutionary experience on German and international soil. The discussion on the platform was as lively as it was rich in content. It indicates the great theoretical interest and the maturity of our movement."

"The results of 10 years of revolutionary experience on German and international soil", viewed with a critical eye, means this:

On "German soil" there was the March Action in 1921, the "result" being the theses of Thalheimer-Bela Kun on the theory of the offensive. It is above all thanks to comrades Lenin and Trotsky that these theses couldn't see the light at the Third World Congress. Had this "result" been accepted it would have destroyed the Comintern beneath its ruins. On "German soil" there was also the year 1923. Brandler and Thalheimer were then the leaders of the C.P. of Germany. May we assume that the lesson given us by the attitude of the Party in an acute revolutionary situation finds its "result" in the platform? Thalheimer has for years been announcing the appearance of a pamphlet on the lessons of 1923. The national conference also asked for a concrete attitude towards 1923, for we read in the report: "Ruhau (Hamburg) takes a position in detail towards the reports presented and mentions above all the proposal to publish the pamphlet on 1923."

Does the leadership of the Brandler group really think that it can forever evade the question of the political attitude leaders in a revolutionary situation, a question so decisive for the revolutionary workers? To chant the same rosary all the time on the "ultra-Left Trotskyist legend in 1923" cannot make one forget the fact that they are avoiding the taking of a concrete attitude.

So far as the "result" of the lessons of the Russian Revolution is concerned, we can already foretell a part of it by reading an editorial article in Gegen den Strom (No. 42, October 19, 1929) under the heading "Russian Questions". In this article we get, instead of a concrete attitude towards the questions raised there, the following reply", which is a classic example of the

diplomatic way of evading a question:

"If one wishes to give a concrete reply to these practical questions, one must be in possession of exact data. The Russian comrades have exact data. We have not. That is why we cannot say conclusively whether Stalin or Bucharin is right in these decisive practical questions...."

"So far as the theoretical discussions with Bucharin are concerned, we point out elsewhere the criticism emanating from the Stalinist camp itself. Two young adherents of Stalin, Sten and Schatzkin, have criticized in an extremely energetic manner the methods of struggle employed against the Right in Russia...."

Alas, two minds live in the same body. One does not yet want to burn all the bridges that lead to Stalin, the other is in an enthusiastic glow for the Right wing faction in the U.S.S.R.—the "realistic politicians." There was a time when Brandler, Thalheimer, Frohlich, Walcher, Sievert, Boettcher, Beck and the "sympathizer" Klara Zetkin took an entirely concrete position towards the Russian question, and it was at a moment when Stalin suppressed all the material of the Russian Left Opposition so that the Party would know nothing about it. At the time they voted on and approved the expulsion of Trotsky and the Russian Opposition and had no scruples in acting that way, without pleading the "lack of concrete data" at that time.

No doubt the "concrete data" contained in the pamphlet* of Klara Zetkin were enough for them to approve the "political necessity" of expelling Trotsky from the Soviet Union.

"We will continue as in the past to take an objective position towards the problems of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and not a factional point of view."

That is how the last phrase of the penultimate paragraph in the article just quoted, is worded.

The proof of it is given in the last paragraph, in which "as in the past" a position is taken in a subjective manner and contrary to the truth:

"....The annihilation of Trotskyism in Russia has determined Trotsky and his few believers to capitulate before Stalin, even though it was done provisionally, with certain reservations. Thus Trotskyism, which fought mainly in the unprincipled bloc with Zinoviev, ends with an unprincipled capitulation before Stalin."

After these preliminary labors, the national platform was accepted as a basis at the conference and presented for discussion. In a coming issue we will examine this double-bottomed platform more closely. We will have no trouble in bringing the revolutionary elements of the Brandler group proof that Thalheimer, the theoretician of the pure defensive in 1929, is the antipode of Thalheimer, the theoretician of the pure offensive in 1921.

Berlin, October 1929

F. ST.

Φ

The Aftermath in Palestine

The Palestine situation has by no means calmed down. Feeling has run very high. Very serious violence exists in a potential state.

The Arab Executive Committee met a little while ago and decided upon:

1. A declaration of distrust in the English government.
2. Repudiation of the Balfour declaration.
3. Intensification of the boycott.

This boycott, lasting since the disturbances, seems to have been, in the beginning, a total "non-cooperation"; now, it is only half of that. The Arabs consent to sell to Jews (happily for the latter; without it would die of hunger!) but not to buy from them. It is the inversion of the secular situation: "Jew, you have taken our money long enough, now you won't see it any more and it is for us to take yours!" Apparently this "slogan" is extremely popular. Thus, a few days ago, an Arab tradesman secretly bought two hogsheads of oil from a Jew. The matter became known. Immediately, an army of dockers pursued the "collaborationist" and made him throw the hogsheads into the sea. "Force is the only thing that counts," a young Christ-

* The writer refers to the nauseating pamphlet written at the behest of Stalin and Bucharin to justify the criminal act against comrade Trotsky before the eyes of the workingclass by using the former prestige attached to Klara Zetkin's name.

ian Arab told me, "words don't mean anything any more."

It seems that the Arabian united front is indeed realized. My young speaker, all a-throb with faith, said: "We are 100,000, it is as though we were one." In any case, the working class is marching with the others—and not in the rear: On November 2, there was a general protest strike against the Balfour declaration (it was the day of its anniversary). It was no less general than that of October 16, when the French steamer *Angkor*, arriving that morning at Jaffa, could find neither a docker nor a boatman and had to take off for Beirut as it had come, with its cargo and its passengers.

This strike took place, errors excepted, to protest against the condemnations that followed the disturbances: three to hanging and many to hard labor.

Generally speaking, those who are in business are uneasy; not everyone can have the fine impetuosity of my young Christain Arab: "How now," he said, "they have created an uproar throughout the world over three hundred Jews killed. But what are three hundred Jews? In the first place we have had just as many dead, and then, during the war, when there were all those victims, and boats with 1,600 people on board were sunk, they said: It's nothing. Well? . . ."

To be sure, those who are owners do not view matters so philosophically. What is going to happen? Will Tel-Aviv (the most important of the Jewish cities built by the Zionists) soon look like the Greek quarter in Smyrna (razed by the Turks in 1921 when they drove the Greek army back to the sea), a vast field of cinders and crumbled walls, while ancient Jaffa, like the Turkish quarter of Mount Pagus at Smyrna, continues to be based on the mountain, satisfied with its enormous; picturesque, squalid, gracious and eternal walls? Yes, it is more durable in the high city where the boatmen live with its labyrinths of streets, blind alleys, half-arches and loop-holes than in the wholly modern and not unseemly—really!—buildings of Tel-Aviv where they engage in esthetics, in hygiene and other trifles. The capitalists are certainly idiots: They form leagues against tuberculosis . . . and condemn people to toil and in a country rebelling against imperialism, whose first action will be to raze all imperialist reminders, they give lots of attention to seeing that the houses have enough openings, and are separated and aired on all four sides!

Does the comparison with the events in Asia Minor astonish you? Not at all. In both cases, England tried to achieve the colonization of people in a politically highly developed Asiatic nation. In the first instance it acted through an intermediary (the Greeks), this time it is doing the thing by itself. The difference is very small. What may be asked is why on this Northern side of the Suez Canal it has recourse to the formula of colonizing people. Is it because of the very bad political results produced on the Southern side of the Canal?

In any case, these facts about Palestine are very interesting for us: Since the anti-imperialist movement broke out in the world, it is the first time that, without an official war, it affected colonized people. Palestine, October 30, 1929.

J. PERA.

Φ

Before the Capitulation of Bucharin

* You have acted correctly in signing the declaration of the Saratov comrades (Rakovsky and others). But this declaration must become a point of departure for the struggle and does not signify marking time or decamping. The formula of the "Kerenskyism upside down" is now applied more than ever. The situation appears to me as follows: The present policy will not keep up for long. Here is how its immediate tasks present them-

* This letter was addressed to comrade Trotsky.

selves: a) annihilate Bucharin and his high placed friends; b) pump the maximum of grain by extraordinary measures in the country. Both are necessary so as to be able to straddle the Bucharinist horse, that is, leave elbow room to the possessors of grain and try to regulate the grain market with the funds created by the extraordinary measures. But none of this plan can be executed: the pressure of the possessors of grain, the Kulaks, will outstrip the development of the Stalinist maneuvers. Thence the hysteria, the cramps and the impotence that characterized the measures taken against Bucharin's faction. It is not for nothing that the July Plenum did not take place. The Stalinists themselves are afraid of the instability of the situation they have created. The November Plenum can have a great importance. One cannot fail to note in passing that although the interval of two years since the Fifteenth Congress is coming to a close, no one up to now whispers a word about the Sixteenth Congress. This interval of two years still seems to be too brief. In any case, the Sixteenth Congress will not be convoked until it can be placed before accomplished facts.

If the annihilation of the Right is not accomplished before the necessity matures for a retreat by the apparatus before the Kulak, then it seems to me that a reconciliation between the Stalinists and the Right is not excluded. Stalin can very easily take a step towards Bucharin by disavowing one of his subordinates. It is quite possible. One can imagine the enthusiasm it would arouse among the Thermidorians in and out of the Party, and how the confusion among the functionaries would increase further. These latter, who are already sufficiently worn out, would like very much to take a rest. There are even some among them who dream of seeing Kameniev and Zinoviev disposed to make peace with the Right wing. The significant silence of these two supports their hope.

The point of departure taken by the Thirteenth Congress (1923) in economic questions was entirely correct. If developments had followed this line, we would not have the present monstrous economic contradictions which hit the working class hardest, arousing its discontent. But the position of 1923 was followed by the zig-zag of 1925 and of the brutal turn of the bureaucracy in 1928-29. As a result we find ourselves without the slightest solid political position to solve our economic task. The bare formulae of the five year plan give no solution. It is necessary to have good relations between the Party and the class, between the proletariat and the poor and middle peasants. A new political orientation is indispensable; for that the Party must be delivered from the fetters around its hands and feet. Under the present conditions, the Right wing is automatically reinforced in the objective process. We can strengthen ourselves only on the basis of a correct and public estimation of the whole process with all its contradictions.

A critical appreciation must be given of the present political situation, with all its new features: It is a task that hardly brooks delay, above all for the mobilization of the worker Communists. A small part of the Oppositionists who signed the declaration of comrade Rakovsky are perhaps disposed to await passively after this declaration, the subsequent development of the struggle in order, afterwards, in silence or by renunciation of their ideas with "deference", to be "inserted" into the Party. We cannot, and we will never be able to march along with these elements. There is a movement to the Left in the Party and in the class. But it is possible to enter into this movement only over the heads of the present leaders of the Party. In order that the proletarian masses should not transform their loss of confidence in the present leaders into a loss of confidence in the revolution itself, a public estimation before the whole Party of the past work of the present leadership is necessary.

October 19, 1929.

R.

* The Sixteenth Congress is not spoken of yet. The purging of the Party is no longer dwelt upon very much, for at its conclusion "affairs" were uncovered in Leningrad, Ivanovo, Tver and in many other places. It is still another proof—perhaps the most striking and the most convincing—that all the measures of Cen-

Continued on Page 2

DISARMAMENT and the UNITED S

Continued from Page 1
not directed against America, that is, that the relation of forces does not change to its disadvantage.

The semi-official organ of MacDonald, the *Daily Herald*, wrote on September 10 that the idea of the United States of Europe was "grotesque" and even a provocation. If this fantasy were realizable, Europe would erect an enormous customs wall against America and the result would be that Great Britain would find itself between the vice chaps of the two continents. That is how the *Daily Herald* argued, asking, in addition, how it would be possible to obtain aid from America under such conditions. "To act in this way would be insanity or worse." That is frank enough.

Practically, no one knows just what the United States of Europe means exactly. For Stresemann, it is reduced to a unification of money . . . and postage stamps. That's a bit thin. Briand proposes to "study" the problem, though what it consists of no one knows exactly.

The fundamental program of unification must have an economic character, not only commercial but also involving production. It would be necessary so that artificial barriers no longer separate iron from coal; the system of electrification needs to be given the possibility of developing in conformity with natural and economic conditions and not within the frontiers of the Versailles treaty; all the railway lines of Europe must be united into a single system, etc. All this would be unthinkable without the previous suppression of customs frontiers within Europe and that would mean further a European customs union against America.

There can be no doubt that if the customs barriers were battered down, capitalist Europe, after a period of crises of regrouping and adaptation, would attain a higher level on a new basis of the redivision of productive forces, just as big enterprises, thanks to certain economic conditions, have the advantage over smaller ones. But what we have yet to see is the small entrepreneur giving up his place voluntarily. To make himself master of the market, the big capitalist must first of all ruin the small one. It is the same thing with states. Customs barriers are raised only because they are advantageous and necessary for one national bourgeoisie to the detriment of another, regardless of the fact that the development of industry as a whole is retarded.

Since the time of the convocation by the League of Nations of an economic conference that was to have established the reign of free trade in Europe, customs tariffs have been steadily raised. Today, the English government proposes a two year "customs vacation", that is for the next two years the existing tariffs may not be increased. Such would be the modest guarantees of the United States of Europe. But even that is still only a project.

To defend these constantly heightened customs walls, there stand ready national armies that have also been increased in comparison with the pre-war level.*

The general expenditures of militarism (land, naval and aerial) by the five greatest powers have grown in the last three years from \$2,170,000,000 to \$2,292,000,000. These figures suffice to show what value each national bourgeoisie of the thirty countries of Europe sets by its customs wall. If a big capitalist must ruin a smaller one, then a nation must crush a weaker one in order to tear down the tariff wall that protects it.

By comparing present-day Europe with the old Germany—where dozens of principalities had their customs frontiers—Stresemann endeavored to find in the unification of Germany the symbol of the economic federation of Europe and the world. It is not a bad analogy. But Stresemann only forgot to add that in order to be unified on a national basis, Germany was compelled to go through a revolution (1848) and three wars (1864, 1866 and 1870)—without counting the wars of the Reformation. In addition, even now, after the "republican" revolution of 1918, German Austria remains outside of Germany. Under such circumstances, it is hard to believe that a few diplomatic

*Before the war, Great Britain spent \$237,000,000 on its fleet. Today it spends \$270,000,000. The fleet of the United States cost \$130,000,000 in 1913. Today: \$364,000,000. For Japan, the same expenditure has risen from \$48,000,000 to \$127,000,000, that is, almost trebled. It is understandable that the Ministers of Finance begin to feel seasick in this flood.

breakfasts will be enough for the economic unification of all the nations of Europe.

2. Disarmament a la American

Alongside the problem of unifying Europe, that of the reduction of armaments has just been put on the order of the day. MacDonald has declared that the road of gradual disarmament is the surest way of guaranteeing eternal peace. That is how a pacifist confutes us. If all the countries disarmed, it would obviously be a serious guarantee for peace. But such disarmament is excluded in the same way as the voluntary destruction of the customs walls. At the present time, there is only one great power in Europe that is really disarmed. But its disarmament was accomplished only as a result of a war by which Germany also tried to "unify Europe" under its domination.

The question of "gradual disarmament," if it is examined closely, assumes the aspect of a tragic farce. In place of disarmament, the cessation of armaments is first substituted, in order to end finally in parity of the fleets of the United States and England. At present, this "aim" seems bound to be the great guarantee of peace. That amounts to saying that the regulating of revolvers is the surest way to suppress dueling. To decide the matter, it would rather be necessary to view it in the opposite sense. The fact that the two greatest naval powers haggle so furiously for a few thousand tons, clearly shows that each of them is trying to assure itself in advance, by diplomatic means, the most advantageous position in the coming military conflict.

What, however, does the creation of "equality" between the American and English fleets represent from the point of view

of the International situation? It means the establishment of a great "inequality" between them—in America's favor. And that is understood perfectly by all the serious participants in this game, above all by the Admiralties of London and Washington. If they preserve silence on these matters, it is only out of diplomatic timidity. But we have no reason to imitate them.

After the experience of the last war, there is no one who does not understand that the next war to set the titans of the world by the ears will be at once long in preparation and in duration and not lightning like. The issue will be determined by the respective powers of production of the two camps. This means that the war fleets of the powers will not only be supplemented and renewed, but in great measure, created in the very course of the war.

We have seen the extraordinary place occupied by the German submarines in the military operations during the third year of the war. We have seen how England and America, in the very course of the war, created gigantic new armies and armaments, infinitely superior to the old armies of the European continent. It follows that the soldiers, sailors, cruisers, cannons, tanks and airplanes existing at the outbreak of hostilities only constitute a point of departure. The decisive problem will depend upon the measure in which the given country will be able to create, under the enemy's fire, cruisers, cannons, soldiers and sailors. Even the czarist government was able to prepare, at the beginning of the war, a certain reserve. But what was above its power was to create a new one in the battle.

For England, in case of war with America, there is but one theoretical condition of success: That it be capable of assuring, before the outbreak of war, a

technico-military preponderance in order to balance off to a certain extent the incomparable technical and economic preponderance of the United States. The equalization of the two fleets before the war means that from the very first months of the war, America will have an uncontrollable advantage. Not for nothing did America threaten a few years ago to turn out cruisers in an emergency like so many pancakes.

In the negotiations of Hoover and MacDonald, it is not a question of disarmament or even the limitation of naval armaments: It is solely a question of rationalizing the preparation of war. The type of ships is becoming obsolete. At present, when the great experience of the war and the flood of inventions it let loose are improved only for military needs and usage, the delay in eliminating various kinds of arms of military technique will be infinitely briefer than before 1914. Consequently, the main part of the fleet can be revealed to be obsolete even before it has been put into action. Under such conditions, is there any sense in accumulating ships in advance? Rationalization in this matter requires having such a fleet as is necessary in the first period of the war and which, up to that point, can serve as a laboratory for testing and experimenting with new inventions and discoveries, in view of the fact that in the period of war it would be necessary to pass over to standardized construction and production in series. All the great powers feel more or less interested in the "regulation" of armaments, especially the very costly naval armaments. But destiny has transformed this "regulation" into the greatest prerogative of the economically strongest country.

During these last years, the war and navy departments of the United States have applied themselves to adapting the entire American industry to the needs of the coming war. Schwab, one of the magnates of maritime war industry, concluded his speech to the War College a short time ago with the following words: "It must be made clear to you that war in the present period must be compared with a great big industrial enterprise."

The French imperialist press, naturally, is doing all it can to incite America against England. In an article devoted to the naval accord, *Le Temps* writes that parity of the fleets by no means signifies the equalization of sea power, since America cannot even dream of securing naval bases comparable to those which England has held for centuries. The British naval bases give it an uncontrollable advantage. But the accord on the parity of the two fleets, in case it is concluded, will not be the last word of the United States. Its first demand is "freedom of the seas", that is, a regime that will appreciably limit Great Britain's utilization of its naval bases. The second: "The open door", is of no less importance; under this slogan, America will raise not only China but also India and Egypt against British domination. America will conduct its expedition against the British bases not on sea but on land, that is, across the colonies and dominions of Great Britain. America will put its war fleet into action when the situation is ripe enough for it. Of course all this is music of the future. But this future is not separated from us by centuries, nor even by decades. *Le Temps* need not be uneasy. The United States will take over piece-meal all that can be taken in morsels, changing the relation of forces in all fields—technical, commercial, financial, military—to the disadvantage of its principal rival, and it will not lose sight of the latter's exceptional naval bases for a single instant.

The American press has spoken scornfully of the British acclaim of Snowden when he wrested twenty million dollars at the Hague Conference to England's profit, that is, a sum that the American tourists spend for their cigars. Is Snowden the victor? asked the *New York Times*? "No! The real victor is the Young Plan." that is, American finance capital. Thanks to the Bank of International Settlements, the Young Plan gives America the possibility of holding its hand firmly on the golden pulse of Europe. From the financial irons forged on Germany's feet, there extend strong chains which fetter the hands of France, the feet of Italy, and the neck of Britain. MacDonald, who is now fulfilling the duties of keeper to the British lion, points with pride to the collar and calls it the best instrument of peace. Just think: To attain this aim, it was enough for America to give its "magnanimous aid" to Europe so that it might liquidate the war and to consent to equalize its fleet with that of the weaker Britain.

Browder's Dazzling «Logic»

The specialist, par excellence, of the *Daily Worker* in the exposure of all deviations and the campaign against "renegades", is Earl R. Browder. That Browder has other aims in mind than merely lying about the Opposition in his articles is something that we will leave for another occasion.

As the unfortunate readers of the *Daily Worker* already know, the Stalinists have been making the most grotesque efforts to "prove" that the Lovestone Right wing and the Communist Opposition are one and the same thing, have an identical program, similar aims, and are merely a couple of trenches in the big imperialist front, ranging from Hoover to Trotsky, to crush the mighty ever-growing Communist Party of the United States. The labored arguments made to prove this contention, if laid end to end, or even side by side, would reach from Union Square to the Kremlin.

We will consider here only one example of the dazzling brilliance of Browder's analyses and the profundity of his Marxism and dialectic. In the *Daily Worker* of November 27, 1929, he concludes his "witheringly ironical" article on "The Renegade United Front Against the Revolutionary Unions" with the following "crushing" comment:

"Lovestone does not yet admit the identity of his program with that of the other renegades, but still keeps on his camouflage. Cannon admits it, but explains that he stands for the same thing for different motives. One of the rarest gems of Trotskyist casuistry yet produced in America is the result. Through the pen of Sharitman he writes:

"His (Lovestone's) demand may appear superficially to be similar to ours. But . . . when we demand Party democracy or a correct trade union policy it is for the purpose of strengthening the working class Bolshevik elements in the movement. When it is demanded by Lovestone, it is for the purpose of gaining free play for interests alien to the working class.

Accepting the complete correctness of the description of Lovestone's aim as that of 'gaining free play for interests alien to the working class,' we leave it to the metaphysicians and mystics to explain how the purity of the intentions (!) of the Trotskyists make their common program with that same Lovestone any less injurious to the workers."

It is not metaphysics or mysticism that explains this, but simply Marxism. That Browder cannot fathom it at all—or does he not want to?—is because his training, like that of Foster, consisted in the study of Lester F. Ward instead of Marx.

No, it is not our "purity of intentions"

NT and the UNITED STATES of EUROPE

economic Europe.
erican
unifying of armaments
order of that the
the surest
e. That
all the
ously be
But such
ame way
the custo
e, there
that is
ent was
a war by
nify Eu
disarma
assumes
place of
maments
end fin
the United
this
at guar
saying
is the
To de
the neces
nse. The
ers hag
nd tons,
s trying
plomatic
position

ation of
and Eng
of view

Dazzling «Logic»

of the
ll devia
egades",
der has
ng about
mething
casion.
The Daily
sts have
fforts to
ing and
and the
rogram,
ouple of
t, rang
ush the
party of
guments
laid end
d reach
e exam
Browder's
s Marx
arker of
s "with
enegade
itionary
ushing"

he iden
the other
oufage
that he
different
of Trot
erica is
rtman

appear
But....
y or a
he pur
g class
t. When
for the
nterests

ness of
as that
alien to
e meta
low the
e Trot
m with
ious to

sm that
. That
does he
ng, like
study of
ntions"

Since "purity of intentions" have nothing to do with the question, we will apply Browder's penetrating logic to other fields.

Mussolini runs a dictatorship in Italy; the Communists run one in Russia; therefore, there is no difference between Fascism and Communism. (The "logic" of Kautsky—and Browder.) The German fascists oppose Trotsky's admission to Germany; so do the German Stalinites; therefore, there is no difference between Thaelmann and Hitler. (The "logic" of Hilferding—and Browder.) At a recent meeting of the Party Secretariat, Browder, Johnstone and Dunne demanded that the Party and Left wing policy of staying at work if Schlesinger calls his strike be reversed; the Militant also demanded a reversal of this stupid policy, and Browder, Johnstone and Dunne were accused by Foster and Bedacht of using the same arguments as the Militant (weren't you, Browder?); therefore, Browder is a counter-revolutionary Trotskyist. (The "logic" of Lovestone, Foster—and Browder.) Browder voted (we hope) against Jimmie Walker for Mayor; Thomas voted against him; La Gaurdia voted against him; Enright voted against him; Lovestone voted against him; so did we; therefore, says James Browder Walker, there is a conspiracy and a united front against me ranging from Enright-Thomas-LaGaurdia through to Browder-Lovestone-Trotsky.

For, does not that tombstone to Marxism, Browder, inform us that "It is true that the renegades all have the same program in essentials, especially on the practical questions. This reflects an underlying unity of theory?"

The mechanical empiricism of Lester Ward is hard to unlearn. We will grant that to Browder. But should not the Party see to it that Marxism is taught its spokesmen instead of inflicting upon us the views of an unregenerate Wardite who argues and makes analyses like a befoozled liberal?

of the International situation? It means the establishment of a great "inequality" between them—in America's favor. And that is understood perfectly by all the serious participants in this game, above all by the Admiralties of London and Washington. If they preserve silence on these matters, it is only out of diplomatic timidity. But we have no reason to imitate them.

After the experience of the last war, there is no one who does not understand that the next war to set the titans of the world by the ears will be at once long in preparation and in duration and not lightning like. The issue will be determined by the respective powers of production of the two camps. This means that the war fleets of the powers will not only be supplemented and renewed, but in great measure, created in the very course of the war.

We have seen the extraordinary place occupied by the German submarines in the military operations during the third year of the war. We have seen how England and America, in the very course of the war, created gigantic new armies and armaments, infinitely superior to the old armies of the European continent. It follows that the soldiers, sailors, cruisers, cannons, tanks and airplanes existing at the outbreak of hostilities only constitute a point of departure. The decisive problem will depend upon the measure in which the given country will be able to create, under the enemy's fire, cruisers, cannons, soldiers and sailors. Even the czarist government was able to prepare, at the beginning of the war, a certain reserve. But what was above its power was to create a new one in the battle.

For England, in case of war with America, there is but one theoretical condition of success: That it be capable of assuring, before the outbreak of war, a

technico-military preponderance in order to balance off to a certain extent the incomparable technical and economic preponderance of the United States. The equalization of the two fleets before the war means that from the very first months of the war, America will have an incontestable advantage. Not for nothing did America threaten a few years ago to turn out cruisers in an emergency like so many pancakes.

In the negotiations of Hoover and MacDonald, it is not a question of disarmament or even the limitation of naval armaments: It is solely a question of rationalizing the preparation of war. The type of ships is becoming obsolete. At present, when the great experience of the war and the flood of inventions it let loose are improved only for military needs and usage, the delay in eliminating various kinds of arms of military technique will be infinitely briefer than before 1914. Consequently, the main part of the fleet can be revealed to be obsolete even before it has been put into action. Under such conditions, is there any sense in accumulating ships in advance? Rationalization in this matter requires having such a fleet as is necessary in the first period of the war and which, up to that point, can serve as a laboratory for testing and experimenting with new inventions and discoveries, in view of the fact that in the period of war it would be necessary to pass over to standardized construction and production in series. All the great powers feel more or less interested in the "regulation" of armaments, especially the very costly naval armaments. But destiny has transformed this "regulation" into the greatest prerogative of the economically strongest country.

During these last years, the war and navy departments of the United States have applied themselves to adapting the entire American industry to the needs of the coming war. Schwab, one of the magnates of maritime war industry, concluded his speech to the War College a short time ago with the following words: "It must be made clear to you that war in the present period must be compared with a great big industrial enterprise."

The French imperialist press, naturally, is doing all it can to incite America against England. In an article devoted to the naval accord, *Le Temps* writes that parity of the fleets by no means signifies the equalization of sea power, since America cannot even dream of securing naval bases comparable to those which England has held for centuries. The British naval bases give it an incontestable advantage. But the accord on the parity of the two fleets, in case it is concluded, will not be the last word of the United States. Its first demand is "freedom of the seas", that is, a regime that will appreciably limit Great Britain's utilization of its naval bases. The second: "The open door", is of no less importance; under this slogan, America will raise not only China but also India and Egypt against British domination. America will conduct its expedition against the British bases not on sea but on land, that is, across the colonies and dominions of Great Britain. America will put its war fleet into action when the situation is ripe enough for it. Of course all this is music of the future. But this future is not separated from us by centuries, nor even by decades. *Le Temps* need not be uneasy. The United States will take over piece-meal all that can be taken in morse, changing the relation of forces in all fields—technical, commercial, financial, military—to the disadvantage of its principal rival, and it will not lose sight of the latter's exceptional naval bases for a single instant.

The American press has spoken scornfully of the British acclaim of Snowden when he wrested twenty million dollars at the Hague Conference to England's profit, that is, a sum that the American tourists spend for their cigars. Is Snowden the victor? asked the *New York Times*? "No! The real victor is the Young Plan." that is, American finance capital. Thanks to the Bank of International Settlements, the Young Plan gives America the possibility of holding its hand firmly on the golden pulse of Europe. From the financial irons forged on Germany's feet, there extend strong chains which fetter the hands of France, the feet of Italy, and the neck of Britain. MacDonald, who is now fulfilling the duties of keeper to the British lion, points with pride to the collar and calls it the best instrument of peace. Just think: To attain this aim, it was enough for America to give its "magnanimous aid" to Europe so that it might liquidate the war and to consent to equalize its fleet with that of the weaker Britain.

3. The Imperialist Dictatorship of America

Since 1923, I had to conduct a struggle to have the leadership of the Communist International consent, finally, to take notice of the existence of the United States and to understand that Anglo-American antagonism constitutes the fundamental line of the groupings and conflicts in the world. This was considered a heresy even at the time of the Fifth Congress of the C. I. (middle of 1924). I was accused of exaggerating, of enlarging the role of America. A legend was conceived according to which I had prophesied the disappearance of European antagonisms in the face of the American peril. Ossinsky, Larin and others smeared up not a little paper in order to "dethrone" powerful America. Radek, following the bourgeois journalist, affirmed that an epoch of Anglo-American collaboration is ahead of us, confusing temporary and episodic relations with the essence of world developments.

Little by little, however, America was "recognized" by the official leadership of the Communist International which began to repeat my formulae of yesterday, not failing, of course, to add each time that the Opposition exaggerates the role of America. The correct estimation of America was at that time, as is known, the exclusive prerogative of Pepper and Lovestone.

From the moment when the orientation to the Left was established, the reservations disappeared. Now it is obligatory upon the official theoreticians to predict that England and America are moving inevitably towards war. On this subject I wrote, some time in February of last year, to the deported comrades: "The Anglo-American antagonism is at last seriously recognized. It seems that Stalin and Bucharin are beginning to understand what it is all about. Nevertheless, our papers are simplifying the problem too much when they picture the situation as if Anglo-American antagonisms were becoming continuously aggravated and must lead to war right away. There is no doubt that there will still be a few crises in the course of its development. War would be a too dangerous business now for the two rivals. They will still make many efforts to come to an understanding and make peace. But at the end of all this there is a bloody denouement towards which they are proceeding with great strides."

The present stage assumes anew the aspect of a military "collaboration" between America and England, and even some French journals fear to see the rise of an Anglo-Saxon dictatorship. It is evident the United States can utilize, and will utilize, their "collaboration" with England to hold Japan and France in check with the same bridle. But all this will be a stage not towards an Anglo-Saxon domination but towards an American dictatorship weighing down on the world, including Great Britain.

In this connection, the leaders of the Communist International may repeat that I see no other perspective than the triumph of American capital. The petty bourgeois theoreticians of Populism likewise accused the Marxists of always conjuring up the victory of capitalism. These accusations are worthy of each other. When we say that America is moving towards world domination, it does not at all mean that this domination will be entirely realized in fact, nor that, even should it be realized in one measure or another, it will last for centuries or even decades. It is only a question of the historical tendency which, in reality, will change aspect, find itself outstripped, in order to make way for other historical tendencies. Were the caudillo world able to exist for decades without revolutionary convulsions, then these decades would be incontestable indications of the American world dictatorship. But the matter lies precisely in this: That this process will develop its own contradictions that will be added to all the other contradictions of the capitalist system. America will force Europe to strive towards an even greater rationalization and at the same time it will leave Europe only an ever more reduced part of the world market. A steady aggravation of the difficulties in Europe will result. The competition of the European powers for this reduced part of the world market will become unavoidably keener. At the same time, the European powers, under the pressure of America, will endeavor to coordinate their forces. That is the fun-

damental source of Briand's. Whatever the various stages of movement may be, one thing is clear: growing disruption of the international equilibrium in favor of America will be the essential source of all the crises and revolutionary convulsions in Europe in the coming period. Whoever considers capitalist stabilization is assured for years of understanding nothing of the situation and will inevitably sink, hair, into the swamp of reformism.

If the question is to be viewed in the way it presents itself on the other side of the Ocean, that is, from the stand-point of the fate of the United States, it is clear that here too the perspectives are not at all resemble a peaceful idyl.

Up to the war, the power of the United States grew on the basis of the market, in conformity with a certain equilibrium between industry and agriculture. The war brought forward a crisis in this development. The United States exports capital and manufactured goods in ever greater proportion. The growth of the world power of the United States means that the whole system of American industry and banking is itself in an increasing degree upon the foundations of world economy. Its foundation is sapped and the United States continues to sap it day by day, by exporting merchandise, capital, by building up the most important enterprises in Europe, in making a way for it in China and elsewhere, United States finance capital is with its own hand digging cellars under its own foundations where powder and dynamite are awaiting. Where will the light of the wick? In Asia, in Europe, in South America? or what is most probable in various places at one time. That is ready a secondary question.

It is unfortunate that the leadership of the Communist Internation

A Most Revolutionary

The future historian of the world will in thumbing over the numbers of the National Press Correspondence for example will be impressed by this astounding "Trotskyism" has been killed, has been revived, has decayed, was born again, came a corpse and disintegrated, came to life again, and went through similar incarnations literally dozens of times.

It has been alternately characterized and condemned as 1. A Right wing deviation; 2. A Left wing deviation; 3. A Trotskyist deviation; 4. The product of Trotskyism; 5. The product of impatience; 6. The expression of the middle peasantry; 7. The expression of the labor aristocracy; 8. The result of Kulak pressure; 9. The result of the declassed workers; 10. The result of foreign imperialism; 11. A tendency towards syndicalism; 12. An inverted reformism; 13. An under-estimation (over-estimation) of the middle (or rich) peasantry; and so on ad infinitum. In fact there is no tendency or class expression of a class that has not been expressed at one time or another, in one way or another, by socalled Trotskyism.

So that this corpse of Trotskyism, which the spirits of every class and every stratum in society was embodied, has the most remarkable political career that history has ever known—that those mutton-heads whose gospel contained in the editorial and news columns of the Daily Worker and its replacement in every country. Announcements of the "final decay of Trotskyism" have not come as regular and meaningless official Stalinist press as its proclamation of the mass movements organized by the Party. And this is so because the re-integration of socalled Trotskyism means the disintegration of the foundations of the international Communist movement with which it is synonymous.

Now comes the Revolutionary (No. 3) with an article by W. H. consisting of a fact or two, a few half-truths and a number of lies patched together prove that

"The Trotsky movement all over the world is in a state of severe crisis. Political confusion reigns everywhere and international disintegration is already at an advanced stage....The forces of disintegration of the official Trotskyist movement come from two directions....The

STATES of EUROPE -- by Leon Trotsky

3. The Imperialist Dictatorship of America

Since 1923, I had to conduct a struggle to have the leadership of the Communist International consent, finally, to take notice of the existence of the United States and to understand that Anglo-American antagonism constitutes the fundamental line of the groupings and conflicts in the world. This was considered a heresy even at the time of the Fifth Congress of the C. I. (middle of 1924). I was accused of exaggerating, of enlarging the role of America. A legend was conceived according to which I had prophesied the disappearance of European antagonisms in the face of the American peril. Ossinsky, Larin and others smeared up not a little paper in order to "dethrone" powerful America. Radek, following the bourgeois journalist, affirmed that an epoch of Anglo-American collaboration is ahead of us, confusing temporary and episodic relations with the essence of world developments.

Little by little, however, America was "recognized" by the official leadership of the Communist International which began to repeat my formulae of yesterday, not failing, of course, to add each time that the Opposition exaggerates the role of America. The correct estimation of America was at that time, as is known, the exclusive prerogative of Pepper and Lovestone.

From the moment when the orientation to the Left was established, the reservations disappeared. Now it is obligatory upon the official theoreticians to predict that England and America are moving inevitably towards war. On this subject I wrote, some time in February of last year, to the deported comrades: "The Anglo-American antagonism is at last seriously recognized. It seems that Stalin and Bucharin are beginning to understand what it is all about. Nevertheless, our papers are simplifying the problem too much when they picture the situation as if Anglo-American antagonisms were becoming continuously aggravated and must lead to war right away. There is no doubt that there will still be a few crises in the course of its development. War would be a too dangerous business now for the two rivals. They will still make many efforts to come to an understanding and make peace. But at the end of all this there is a bloody denouement towards which they are proceeding with great strides."

The present stage assumes anew the aspect of a military "collaboration" between America and England, and even some French journals fear to see the rise of an Anglo-Saxon dictatorship. It is evident the United States can utilize, and will utilize, their "collaboration" with England to hold Japan and France in check with the same bridle. But all this will be a stage not towards an Anglo-Saxon domination but towards an American dictatorship weighing down on the world, including Great Britain.

In this connection, the leaders of the Communist International may repeat that I see no other perspective than the triumph of American capital. The petty bourgeois theoreticians of Populism likewise accused the Marxists of always conjuring up the victory of capitalism. These accusations are worthy of each other. When we say that America is moving towards world domination, it does not at all mean that this domination will be entirely realized in fact, nor that, even should it be realized in one measure or another, it will last for centuries or even decades. It is only a question of the historical tendency which, in reality, will change aspect, find itself outstripped, in order to make way for other historical tendencies. Were the capitalist world able to exist for decades without revolutionary convulsions, then these decades would be incontestable indications of the American world dictatorship. But the matter lies precisely in this: That this process will develop its own contradictions that will be added to all the other contradictions of the capitalist system. America will force Europe to strive towards an even greater rationalization and at the same time it will leave Europe only an ever more reduced part of the world market. A steady aggravation of the difficulties in Europe will result. The competition of the European powers for this reduced part of the world market will become unavoidably keener. At the same time, the European powers, under the pressure of America, will endeavor to coordinate their forces. That is the fun-

damental source of Briand's program. Whatever the various stages of development may be, one thing is clear: The growing disruption of the international equilibrium in favor of America will be the essential source of all the crises and revolutionary convulsions in Europe in the coming period. Whoever considers that capitalist stabilization is assured for dozens of years understands nothing of the world situation and will inevitably sink, hide and hair, into the swamp of reformism.

If the question is to be viewed from the way it presents itself on the other side of the Ocean, that is, from the standpoint of the fate of the United States, it is seen that here too the perspectives opened up do not at all resemble a peaceful capitalist idyl.

Up to the war, the power of the United States grew on the basis of the home market, in conformity with a dynamic equilibrium between industry and agriculture. The war brought forward a sharp crisis in this development. The United States exports capital and manufactured goods in ever greater proportions. The growth of the world power of the United States means that the whole system of American industry and banking—that gigantic capitalist skyscraper—bases itself in an increasing degree upon the foundations of world economy. But this foundation is sapped and the United States continues to sap it day by day. By exporting merchandise, capital, by building a fleet, by squeezing England, by buying up the most important enterprises in Europe, in making a way for itself in China and elsewhere, United States finance capital is with its own hands digging cellars under its own foundations where powder and dynamite are accumulating. Where will the light be put to the wick? In Asia, in Europe, or in South America? or what is most probable, in various places at one time. That is already a secondary question.

It is unfortunate that the present leadership of the Communist Internation-

al is totally incapable of following all the stages of this development. It buries the basic facts under an avalanche of commonplaces. Even the pacifist agitation made over the United States of Europe took it by surprise.

4. The Soviet United States of Europe

The question of the U.S. of Europe regarded from the proletarian standpoint, was raised by us in September 1914, that is, at the very beginning of the war. In the pamphlet, *The War and the International*, the author of these lines sought to demonstrate that the unification of Europe was undeniably put in the foreground by its entire economic development but that the United States of Europe was inconceivable except as the political form of the revolutionary dictatorship of the European proletariat.

In 1923, when the occupation of the Ruhr posed anew, in an acute form, the fundamental problems of European economy (primarily coal and iron ore) in connection with the problem of the revolution, we succeeded in having the leadership of the International adopt the slogan of the United States of Europe. But the attitude towards this slogan remained hostile. Not being in a position to reject it, the leadership of the C. I. took the same attitude towards it as to that abandoned child "Trotskyism". After the defeat of the German revolution in 1923, Europe lived the life of stabilization. The fundamental problems of the revolution disappeared from the order of the day. The slogan of the United States of Europe sank into oblivion. It was not included in the program of the C. I. For this new zig-zag, Stalin gave an explanation remarkable for its profundity: Since it is not known in what order the nations will make their proletarian revolution, it cannot be foreseen if the United States of Europe will be necessary. In other words, this means

that it is easier to formulate a prognosis after the event than before it. In reality, it is not at all a question of the order in which the revolution will be realized. There only suppositions are possible. But that does not relieve the European workers or the International in general from the necessity of giving a precise reply to this question: How can European economy be snatched from its diffusion and how can the popular masses of Europe be saved from decay and servitude?

The misfortune is, however, that the economic ground for the slogan of the United States of Europe invalidates one of the fundamental ideas of the present program of the Comintern: the possibility of building socialism in a single country.

The essential feature of our epoch consists in the fact that the productive forces have definitely passed beyond national frameworks, and have assumed primarily in America and in Europe, partly continental and partly world dimensions. The imperialist war was born out of the contradictions between the productive forces and national frontiers. The final chapter of this war, the Versailles treaty, further accentuated these contradictions. In other words, in face of the development of the productive forces, capitalism cannot exist in a single country. Furthermore, socialism can and must base itself upon ever more developed productive forces: otherwise it would present reaction and not progress in relation to capitalism. In 1914 we wrote: "If the problem of socialism could be solved within the frame-work of a national state, it would thereby be compatible with national defense." The term: Soviet United States of Europe expresses the idea that socialism is impossible in a single country. It cannot even attain the fullness of its development within the limits of a continent. The Socialist United States of Europe represents by itself a stage of a historical slogan on the road to the socialist world federation.

It has happened more than once in history that when the revolution was not strong enough to settle historical problems, it was the reaction that occupied itself with solving them. Thus, Bismarck with the unification of Germany after the failure of the 1848 revolution. Thus, Stolypin tried to solve the agrarian problem after the 1905 revolution. Thus, the Versailles victors solved the national question in their fashion, which all the previous bourgeois revolutions had shown themselves powerless to solve. The Germany of the Hohenzollerns endeavored to organize Europe in its fashion, that is, to unite it under its helmet. That did not succeed. It was then that the victor Clemenceau decided to utilize the victory in order to cut Europe into the greatest possible number of pieces. And now Briand, armed with needle and thread, is preparing to sew together the pieces in order to make a single piece, even if he does not know what end to start with.

The leadership of the Communist International, and to an extent the leadership of the French Communist Party, are exposing the hypocrisy of official pacifism. That alone is insufficient. To explain the course towards the unification of Europe solely by the preparation of war against the U.S.S.R. is infantilism, not to say worse, and can only compromise the task of defending the Soviet Republic. The slogan of the United States of Europe is not a cunning idea of diplomacy. It springs from the unavoidable economic needs of Europe which arise all the more acutely as the pressure of the United States makes itself more imperiously felt. It is especially now that the Communist Parties must counterpose the slogan of the Soviet United States of Europe to the pacifist comedy of the imperialists.

But the Communist Parties have their hands bound. The living formula, with its great historical meaning, has been expunged from the program of the Communist International solely in the interests of the struggle against the Opposition. That is one more reason for the Opposition to take it up again and proclaim it with perseverance. With it, the proletarian vanguard of Europe will say to its present masters: "To unify Europe, we must first of all wrest power from you. We will do it. We will unify Europe. We will unify it against the enemy, and that enemy is the capitalist world. We will make it the imposing stronghold of militant socialism. We will make it the cornerstone of the socialist federation of the world."

October 4, 1929.

A Most Remarkable Corpse

The future historian of the movement, in thumbing over the numbers of the International Press Correspondence for example, will be impressed by this astounding fact: "Trotskyism" has been killed, has been revived, has decayed, was born again, became a corpse and disintegrated, came to life again, and went through similar reincarnations literally dozens of times.

It has been alternately characterized and condemned as 1. A Right wing deviation; 2. A Left wing deviation; 3. A Centrist deviation; 4. The product of pessimism; 5. The product of impatience; 6. The expression of the middle peasantry; 7. The expression of the labor aristocracy; 8. The result of Kulak pressure; 9. The reflection of the declassed workers; 10. The agency of foreign imperialism; 11. A tendency towards syndicalism; 12. An inverted social-reformism; 13. An under-estimation (or over-estimation) of the middle (or poor or rich) peasantry; and so on ad infinitum. In fact there is no tendency or class or section of a class that has not found itself expressed at one time or another, in one way or another, by socalled Trotskyism!

So that this corpse of Trotskyism, in which the spirits of every class and stratum in society was embodied, has become the most remarkable political "carcass" that history has ever known—that is, for those mutton-heads whose gospel is contained in the editorial and news columns of the Daily Worker and its replicas in every country. Announcements on the "final decay of Trotskyism" have now become as regular and meaningless in the official Stalinist press as its proclamations of the mass movements organized by the Party. And this is so because the real disintegration of socalled Trotskyism would mean the disintegration of the foundations of the international Communist movement with which it is synonymous.

Now comes the Revolutionary Age (No. 3) with an article by W. Herberg consisting of a fact or two, a few half facts, and a number of lies patched together to prove that

"The Trotskyist movement all over the world is in a state of severe crisis. Political confusion reigns everywhere and organizational disintegration is already in an advanced stage....The forces of disintegration of the official Trotskyist movement come from two directions....The crisis

proceeds in full blast" and so on and so forth.

Where is the crisis? What does it consist of? How has Trotskyism disintegrated? In the answer to these questions is the only original—even if not very clever—contribution to the subject by Herberg. The disintegration of Trotskyism consists in nothing more nor less than the fact that "...the revision which the principles of Leninism and the line of the Comintern are now undergoing is taking place in the direction of the main ideas of Trotskyism." The decay of Trotskyism lies in "the surreptitious but wholesale appropriation of the leading political ideas of Trotskyism by the new leaders of the E. C. C. I." Make sense out of this if you can!

Trotskyism is decaying because it is supposed to have become the basis of the Comintern's line! It is disintegrating because its ideas, its main ideas, are being appropriated by the leaders of the International! In the next issue of the Revolutionary Age there must be an article to prove that the Democratic Party has decayed because it recently won an election

It is difficult to take such "analysts" seriously. A year ago, when it suited Lovestone's factional purpose in the battle against Foster, he yelled himself hoarse about the "growing danger of Trotskyism", in order to embarrass Foster's claims to the precedence of the Right danger in the Party. Today, Trotskyism (in less than a year) has been sunk without a trace by Lovestone and Herberg with a simple wave of the wand. Tomorrow, as necessity requires they will revive it or kill it again.

Outside of the single "unique" contribution made to the subject by Lovestone-Herberg, there is nothing at all original in this thousand and first proclamation of the decay of "Trotskyism". It is plagiarized almost word for word from proclamations written before. It is not only familiar, but it is getting monotonous. And we even know where Herberg's article was taken from: By actual comparison it is copied from the bound volumes of the International Press Correspondence for the years 1923, 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1927 which Lovestone stole from us in his burglary expedition against the menace of the—at that time—"non-disintegrated" Trotskyism. We would appreciate the return of those volumes!

Is the A. F. of L. Becoming Progressive?

By Arne Swabek

In some respects the forty-ninth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor reflected the pressure of growing working class discontent and of developing economic conditions. But only to the extent of taking on a more pacifist face masking the same reactionary policies which become ever more hostile to working class militancy and progress. This is what the Socialist Party and the leading Musteites gloat over as the new born "progressivism" of the A. F. of L.

Characteristically, the convention sessions were held in the fashionable Royal York Hotel, non-union from top to bottom. (The rent of the convention hall alone cost \$60,000.) There was less heresy-hunting than usual because the Communist "menace" always paraded in the past before a frightened audience, has become with the present growing working class discontent, something to be dealt with in a more serious manner. Not that the audience changed. No, it was the same old diamond-glistening fat boys playing the master's game, even to the extent of heavy speculation on the stock market or on the curb. Perhaps many of them are now preoccupied in nursing burnt fingers received in the last stock crash.

Lewis and Woll to the Rear

The two usually most militant spokesmen for capitalist policies, conceded to be the real wire pullers behind the baptist Green, secretly and openly the most adored ones of the payroll brigade, Mathew Woll and John L. Lewis, did not assume the commanding position witnessed at former convention since the death of the "immortal" Gompers. Lewis, in the past always the bellowing star red-baiter, did not perform. The frightful destruction wrought by him in his own union evidently made it unwise to bring him too much to the fore. Woll spoke in somewhat softened tones of how he had been misunderstood in the past, particularly with regards to old age pensions. As a matter of fact he claimed to have always been in favor of it. His connections with the Civic Federation, the high tariff lobby, the employers campaign for compulsory arbitration, etc., were considered perhaps a little too open. Some of them had incurred the displeasure of "progressive" capitalist politicians, liberals, Professor Dewey, yes, and even the Socialist Party.

Anyway the convention showed a change of face and of public front as required by present policies of the big employers and the capitalist government at Washington, D. C. It gave more than usual attention to the south because of the general capitalist fear of the establishment of unions there under left wing leadership. It went on record for old age pension laws to be enacted by the various states. It particularly utilized the stereotyped phrases of the capitalist press of a high standard of living for labor, keeping up consumption, and co-operation in maintaining prosperity. This to soothe the growing dissatisfaction of the workers while tying them more effectively to the murderous speed-up, semi-company union system.

Yet some of the convention actions also reflect the pressure of growing working class discontent and pressure from sharpening industrial conditions. The Executive Council report indicated the fear of growing technological unemployment as it calls it, meaning workers thrown upon the streets displaced by machines, and particularly the fear of rapid disappearance of trade skill in this machine age. Naturally, that would eliminate any last excuse for craft unionism and spells its final doom.

The Scripps Editorial

Nothing, however, excited the delegates as much as an editorial on the failure of the A. F. of L. published by the Scripps-Howard chain of newspapers on the second day of the convention. The weight of its criticism hung like a pall over the gathering. Bluntly it projected the miserable career of the federation stating in part that it will have to report failure to make any gains in membership, being now below 3,000,000 as compared to 5,000,000 and more in 1920; failure to be a factor in the labor awakening in the south; with increasing technological unemployment, failure to obtain a government unemployment or old age pension system; the basic industries entirely unorganized and failure to devise a constructive program to prevent suffering in other industries, growth of the anti-labor injunction evil; handcuffing the unions and helplessness to protect the rights of the workers. Then after citing that these things are happening in the most "prosperous" country, the most "enlightened democracy" and blaming both the country and the A. F. of L. for the workers' misery

and the failure to get "justice", the editorial queries:

"But after all what is the A. F. of L. for?..... The truth is the A. F. of L. is failing miserably in its stewardship. Every year its weakness is more apparent.

"The southern textile situation is a vivid example of that failure, but it is only one of many examples. For thirty years the A. F. of L. has ignored the field except for easy resolutions and a handful of organizers. The job has been left to the Communists. While the hungry southern mill hands are facing alone the organized employers and hostile authorities, beaten by mobs and shot down by sheriffs, the sleek A. F. of L. officials sit twiddling their thumbs at mahogany desks in Washington or are making patriotic speeches to the National Security League or at West Point.

"The A. F. of L. is accurately described

as the aristocracy of labor. All aristocracies are subject to dry rot."

The Scripps Howard papers have a circulation of about fifteen million. The convention felt the lash and squirmed. An inquiry was made by Green whether this represents a set policy with an answer from the editor-in-chief that it was merely friendly criticism. And so it was. It meant in plain words:—Get busy; stop the rebellion now in the offing; try to lead the workers, or the Communists will do the job.

Perhaps on account of this a few extra speeches were made on the problem of organization of the south. McMahon, president of the United Textile Workers, eloquently described the radiant beauty of the southern mill villages, extolled the "splendid efforts" of the A. F. of L., made a slight remark on the low wages prevalent, but said nothing about the struggle—and

HOOVER'S BUILDING PLAN SWINDLE

Continued from Page 1

talist men of almost every known industry and trade, by bank presidents, electric power heads, railroad magnates, automobile barons, and others, to show what business has in mind to maintain "Business as usual", stagger the imagination, certainly those of a layman, and are meant to be impressive and conclusive. The figures run into billions of dollars that are to go for construction, new activities and increased production and maintenance and repairs in almost any sphere of production that one could name. The daily and other papers and magazines are filled each day with these astronomical figures and stupendous proposals that are to be. But their weakness is that the proof of security they are supposed to show are "too conclusive" in some respects. Even casual inspection of these gigantic figures or are supposed to, the immediate needs of a given industry or trade if there is not to be a collapse. Increased figures are meant for realization, but only in rare instances is there shown specifically how the particular job is to be accomplished: how many workers, at what wages, working hours, etc. The figures sound grand—but are hollow, so far certainly for that which they are supposed to portray.

The New York Times is hopeful of Hoover's schemes, but by no means certain. It says (12-1-29): "It will be some time (how much?) before the projected outlays by great corporations can be made concrete in actual employment. In every case preliminary studies will have to be made, blue-prints submitted and each detail worked out." (Is this "business as usual?") Moreover, this mobility of labor is not in actual practice so facile as it is in economic theory, so that time must elapse before workers who may be displaced at one point can find jobs at another. Apparently Mr. Hoover himself contemplates some such slow (!) development of his plans."

Public construction, however wide the program, does not eliminate the features of the capitalist system that make for recurring crashes. True, governors, senators, businessmen, bankers, and also the A. F. of L. factors may "co-operate". But that will not carry on production unless profit is produced; will not hire labor unless there is profit therein. The construction of public buildings, subways, houses, etc., are one way of applying Hoover's proposals. Yet, these forms of building construction have been on the decrease in 1929 and the total values less than in 1928. Hopes for 1930 may be high and good wishes of men expressed in conference but no substantial economist has yet stepped forward with figures to prove a better case for 1930. In the last analysis capitalists seek for the key to unlock the door to profit.

The Public Works Panacea

Governments, national, states, local, may tax for public works. But it will not then be long before the hitherto "publicly enlightened citizens" or capitalists will begin to squeal and will try to do business where their profits will not be affected so much by governmental and political exigencies.

Mr. Julius Klein, assistant Secretary of Commerce and the closest economic collaborator of Hoover may buoy up the spirits of the property and wealth-owning classes with his references to the general and dominating role of American capitalism in capitalist world economy.

He may further point out, that this expansion of American capitalism's influence on an international scale will be on the increase for a time, yet and that this factor will also be of aid domestically. But it is also necessary to point out that this increased aggressiveness of the United States increases the rivalries and difficulties with other nations; that ultimately and quickly these international economic and political rivalries produce national domestic discord—unemployment, rationalization methods, lower wages, increased and sharper class conflicts between the employers and the working class.

All the measure sponsored by Hoover, are only stop-gaps at the workers expense. Others of the enlightened capitalists and their political agents, such as Lieutenant Governor Lehmann and United States Senator Wagner of New York, sense even bigger crashes to come and add their bit in the hope also of "permanent capitalist stabilization".

The emergency brake may work, but each time it is tried again, it works less simply and easily. The working masses are slowly now, and more swiftly in the future, learning that though the roads, are here and there lined with trees and hot-dog stands, the road of capitalism leads over a cliff. They will clamber out, as many already have, and look for another route of socialism or communism. Hoover's "prosperity reserve" is being depleted.

Organize To Fight!

The workers in the United States still have the task in the main to see the capitalist as their class enemy, to organize as a class to defeat the employers. Hoover's waning "prosperity reserve" can only be effectively answered by a new social system which substitutes social production and use for capitalist anarchy and misery. It can only be met now with a militant resistance to his enormous "construction program" swindle, a meaningless palliative for the growing unemployment among the workers, the prospect of heavy wage cuts, of speeding up the already intensive general attack on their standard of living. The Communists must lead in this task of education, organization and struggle.

Φ

THE NEXT ISSUE

Lack of space forces us to omit a great deal of important material. The next issue will contain a very timely article by comrade Trotsky on "Communism and Syndicalism," an opinion on the role of Communists in the trade unions. Very important for the Left wing in this country.

Workers will do well to subscribe now and not miss a single issue of the Militant which will be an intellectual treat for every worker besides being a guide to action.

NEW YORK

* A JAMBOREE :

for the benefit of the

WEEKLY "MILITANT"

SATURDAY, December 14, 1929, at 8

at the

MILITANT HALL, 25 Third Ave.

Musical Program : Entertainment

Auspices: New York branch,
Communist League

of course, nothing about the treasonable record of the U. T. W. leadership.

The Convention and the South

The convention decision to map out plans to organize the South will not serve as an inspiration to the workers. Such convention braggadocio we have become used to. The results have done nothing but serve the employers to prevent organization. Yet today, the National Textile Workers Union has set an example of militant policies and organization in the South. Communist leadership, as far as the issues of the struggle are concerned, has found a response among the workers. The A. F. of L. leaders have been given a task by their masters, the employers, and they will undoubtedly endeavor to organize into "safe" channels to stem this developing tide of militancy.

The Executive Council report recommended the usual policy of "rewarding friends and punishing enemies" among capitalist politicians. As an "appropriate" answer to the appearance of Premier MacDonald, still in his role as a "missionary of peace"—by the way, he was greeted with tumultuous applause—it evidently considered its high strung claims of "labor" control of Congress, set forth in the report as follows:

"The election of members to the House in 1928 resulted in the success of 135 representatives with 100 percent legislative records on measures of interest to labor. There were also 110 members elected whose records were exceedingly fair. It is not generally known, but it is a fact that 39 members of the United States Senate also have 100 per cent labor records... Fifteen other Senators are considered most fair... It will be seen that a majority of the members of the House and the United States Senate, irrespective of politics, are friendly to labor". But, adds the report so as prevent any too great expectations, some of the leaders are powerful enough to prevent remedial measures from enactment.

On the serious problem of anti-labor injunctions the council emerged with a draft for a socalled injunction limitation bill. It represented a stupid effort to accomplish the impossible, namely to devise a bill that could be acceptable to capitalist lawyers and capitalist courts. The debate on this draft revealed a number of long winded "barristers" clashing over the technical intricacies of capitalist laws, practically obliterating all traces of a labor gathering.

Furuseth Bursts Out

The chief performers were Andy Furuseth, Matthew Woll and Victor Olander. The head of the seamen's union, Andy Furuseth, as reactionary in outlook as any of them, got somewhat animated by the debate and shot a few well-aimed darts into the armor of the hidebound stand-patters. At one point, in answer to Woll he said: "Was it a pettyfogging lawyer taking the other side because his case was weak, who used just what he wanted and sopped the quotation where it would not do to continue, or was it possibly the president of the Civic Federation who was defending the equity power in injunctions and labor disputes?" At another point, referring to the convention held in Toronto twenty years ago with its lofty resolve pledging the delegates to go to jail in the fight against injunctions, he blazed forth: "But even the best of you will not. You will not fight." Then again, referring to the shame of Indianapolis—the submission of John L. Lewis to the Anderson injunction against the miners' strike—he related how one judge had exclaimed: "Oh, that miserable coward, that miserable coward!"

However, this time it all happened to fit in well with the slight change of face of this coterie of "labor leaders", who thus hope to serve their masters more effectively. Otherwise the high strung debate and the long, detailed draft of the "injunction limitation" bill amounted to exactly naught. Not the slightest leadership will be given by the A. F. of L. officials to fight the injunction system. For once Furuseth was right.

Naturally it would be entirely useless to expect any change in policies from this upper crust stifling the A. F. of L. This, however, does not in the least alter the fact that the Federation embraces masses of workers and represents today all there is of an organized character. Moreover, history has given ample proof that periods of depression with consequent increasing working class discontent and sharpening struggles will invariably witness substantial growth for unions, even under the most reactionary leadership. There are signs aplenty of such developments here. Yes, even in the South the A. F. of L. will undoubtedly yet become a factor. To the Left wing this should indicate clearly its tasks.

The Communist Defeat in Czechoslovakia

I

The final results of the election in Czechoslovakia are as follows:

	1929	1925
League of Czech Fascist	71,947	0
German Nat'l Soc.	204,588	168,354
Czech Nat'l Democrats	359,825	321,006
Czech Agrarians	1,094,955	1,005,938
Czech People's (Clericals)	623,560	690,832
Czech Industrial Party	291,002	287,269
German Nat'l Party	188,875	240,910
German Agrarians	395,764	569,696
All-German Party	6,669	0
Hlinka (Slov. Clericals)	423,498	487,773
Juriga Party	5,406	0
Polish Jews	104,467	115,288
Hungarian Small Farmers	6,893	0
Czech Soc. Democrats	963,191	631,263
Czech Socialists	767,441	706,504
German Soc. Democrats	506,116	411,682
German Christian Soc.	348,096	314,438
Hungarian Christian Soc.	257,413	99,148
Communist Party	752,560	941,698
Total	7,372,266	6,991,799

The main tendencies are clear. Decrease of a part of the bourgeois parties, decrease of the Communist Party, increase in the reformist camps and the fascists. The social democracy as the leading section of the reformists grew at the expense of the Communists (chiefly among proletarian and petty bourgeois sections). The other reformist parties grew at the expense of the bourgeois parties. The gains of the fascists took place at the expense of the bourgeois camps and party of the Communist Party.

With this, of course, only the most basic regroupings in the political camps of Czechoslovakia are expressed. But even out of that, the breaking off of the petty bourgeois sections from the regular bourgeois parties, in two directions is clear: To the reformists and to the fascists. In addition, we have the movement of the proletarians in the same two directions, but with the difference that these proletarian forces must largely be entered a loss for the Communist Party.

The Shift in Class Relations

The social explanation of the regroupings consists in the shifting of class relations. Under the pressure of finance capital, substantial sections of the petty bourgeoisie are proletarianized and the proletariat is set into motion. The masses set into motion become victims of reformist and fascist demagogic, these twin understrappers of the modern sharpened dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The normal bourgeois parties no longer avail the bourgeoisie, and in Czechoslovakia now it utilizes reformist demagogic. It can all the sooner do this because the Communist movement has no power of attraction for the masses. In spite of the appreciable losses of the bourgeois parties and the new increase in the electorate, the Communist Party has a loss of 189,138 votes to its account.

Parliamentary combinations naturally do not indicate very much. From all indications the parties to form the nucleus of the next government will be the Agrarian and Social Democratic, a so-called Red-Green coalition. Participation in the government will naturally bring the reformist camp to a difficult situation. Should the reformist wing decline because of an eventual strengthening of the Communist Party, the bourgeoisie is taking care of preparing the fascist wing. Since the existence of the Czechoslovakian Republic, the eleventh government is about to be formed, a sign of so-called "stabilization" in the imperialist epoch. The rule of the bourgeoisie is no light matter after the war, yet it surmounts the difficulties thanks to the incapability of the Communist leadership. The Czech social democracy was almost run in 1925; today it has a gain of 50 percent to register. At the same time the other reformist parties grew. A brief summary:

	1929	1925
Czech So. Democracy	963,191	631,263
Czech Socialists	767,441	706,504
German Soc. Domocracy	506,116	411,682

The growth of the Hungarian party, Christian Socialist, National, etc. in Slovakia shows how incapable the Communist Party is of leading the national minorities. The dissatisfied national minorities passed under bourgeois reformist leadership. The German minorities, in their disillusionment, went over partly to the fascists (Swastikas) and partly to the reformists.

The Czech Agrarians who advanced into Slovakia register a substantial gain (89,017) and are the strongest party in general. They have behind them, almost compactly, the Czech and many Slovakian peasants, including the village poor. The following parties also suffered losses: German Nationalists, German Agrarians,

By H. Lenorovics

Czech Clericals, the Hlinka party (Slovakian Autonomists and Clericals).

The Fascists Gain

As a new group, the Czech fascists came to the fore. The disillusioned national and religious voters were captured by reformist or fascist demagogic.

The class situation, according to production relationships, is such that, as against a few hundred thousand capitalists, many more than three million proletarians, almost a million small employees, about 800,000 village poor and poor farmers create a sphere of influence for the proletarian party. It is these data that throw a proper light on the election figure of the "really" mass Communist Party. Matters are far, far worse of course with the Party's ability to act. Yes, one cannot for a moment speak seriously of ability to act.

In spite of the favorable prerequisites for the growth of Communism, the Communist Party has lost 20 percent on the average. Considering the favorable objective prerequisites for vote increases, this twenty percent decrease is a very serious defeat. In the German sections there are some slight gains to register, but in the various provinces we have the following results: The decline in Bohemia, 16 percent; Maenzen and Schleswig, 17 percent; Slovakia, 23 percent; Russian Carpathia, 47 percent. The various industrial centers give the following losses: Vicinity of Prague, 20 percent; Pilsen district, 15 percent; Brunn district, 25 percent; Mahrisch-Ostrau, 8 percent; Tuerneau district, 13 percent.

A still worse picture is shown in the decisive industrial cities of these districts: Prague, loss of 23 percent; Kladno, 37 percent; Pilsen, 37 percent; Mahrisch-Ostrau, 35 percent; Pressburg, 31 percent; Kaschau, 35 percent. Everywhere the gains were made mainly by the socialists; in Prague and Pilsen by the fascists also, at the cost of the Party.

II

In the central organ of the Party, *Rude Pravo* of October 30, one of the authoritative Party leaders, under the pseudonym "t. m.", takes up the election results. He promises Bolshevik frankness (it is funny to hear the word "Bolshevik frankness" from the mouths of these people who pass over a six year crisis of the Comintern in silence) and says straight out what is now seen by every child, that the Communist Party suffered a defeat. But what follows is

anything but frank Bolshevik speech. It is contended that the votes in 1923 were given for a Left social democracy, whereas the present vote is meant for a revolutionary political line. It is true that the Communist Party has social democratic features, but the vote in 1925 was not only received by this Left social democracy but through the effects of the heroic Russian Revolution in Czechoslovakia. The present vote is also a limited remnant of these effects.

A Stalinist "Mass Party"

And the author of this article resumes: "The elections showed that we are a mass Party in the best sense of the word." We Communists always believed that the ability to action is the characteristic of a Bolshevik mass party in the best sense of the word, and here all at once the 752,000 votes are supposed to show that we are a mass party in the best sense of the word.

Absolutely, the vote of the Party sank 20 percent. The Bolshevik frank article declares only 14.2 percent. On the order of the day, according to the same article, is the winning of the majority of the working class. (Just imagine: on one hand the almost four million workers, on the other, 752,560 parliamentary votes and the ideologically disrupted Party incapable of action).

But then the well-informed author of the article says: "The growth of the social democracy and the simultaneous growth of Communist influence is an international phenomenon and to a certain extent necessary: Radicalization does not proceed in a straight line..."

Since when is the growth of Communism an international phenomenon? Hasn't "t. m." even read the reports of the Tenth Plenum? Since when is the growth of the social democracy "necessary to a certain extent" in the epoch of imperialism, of revolutions and wars? Yes, and why doesn't a leader of the C. P. C. say what the reasons are for the international growth of the social democracy? and its continued growth? Not to speak of the fact that this growth was never openly acknowledged, but so to speak smuggled into the minds of the Party. Why? in order to stupify the Party so that it does not ask about the reasons, about the defeats, about the false course of the Comintern on an international scale that was approved at the Sixth Congress.

Investigating the reasons for the defeat, the article says: "Up to last year (?) the Czechoslovakian section of the C. I. was

a Left social democracy with a thin veneer of Communist phrases. The cancer of opportunism gnawed its apparatus through to the bone. The Party was (?) completely rotted and that revealed itself by the growth of class antagonisms in the third period of the post-war development of capitalism."

Good, but where was the leadership of the C. I. all this time? Why did it allow the poor C. P. C. to be gnawed to the bone by opportunism and rot away? Why did it approve its political line at the Fourth Congress (1927), for example? Doesn't the author of the article know that he is actually exhibiting the C. I. in a wretched light? Didn't Gottwald, Gutmann and others hold responsible positions in the Jilek Central Committee? Where were they then?

The Party Masses Are to Blame

Who then is to blame? The Party leadership answers: The Party organization, because it is not at the head of the radicalized masses. The leadership of the Party, it is true, places itself at the head, but by jumping over the lower Party apparatus which consists in part of saboteurs, traitors and do-nothings.

That is how leaders of the Party speak of the worker functionaries. They acclaim themselves and call the worker functionaries "traitors" and "sabotagers".

Now the meaning of the so-called self-criticism becomes understandable. This new invention is now to be tested in the C. P. C.; without infringing upon the leadership, to start out on the basis of self-criticism against the Party apparatus.

Where the Fault Lies

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to ascribe all the blame to the Gottwald-Fried leadership. The present leadership has a heavy opportunist heritage. The final reason for the catastrophic defeats is the false, opportunist course in the C. I. that has lasted for six years. Back in 1925 the elections were only success in appearance, a standstill in reality. The present defeat in the election is the sharp verdict on the policy of Gottwald, Fried, Jilek, Smeral and the leadership of the C. I.

The Communist International and the Parties proceed from a false estimation of forces, therefore the false policy, false slogans, mistakes, failures, crises. The main Parties are willing to acknowledge the great reasons are that neither the C. I. nor the defeats and weakening of the C. I.

Why? So as to conceal the fact that these defeats were incurred by the opportunist course of the leadership of the C. I., that the foundations of the proletarian revolution in Europe and China were not extended. Thence the growth of reformism, the strengthening of the bourgeoisie, the opportunism in the C. I., the driving away of the Left Opposition (Trotsky and his comrades).

Stalin and Bucharin bear the main blame, Smeral and Jilek are accessories in the offense. Gottwald and Fried are also accomplices because at the Congresses they silently approve this policy of defeats of the C. I. This bureaucratic transgression is bearing its fruit in the present policy of the C. P. C.

The cause of the workers needs clarity. An end must be made to the tragicomedy of the Centrists. It is time to uncover the reasons for the decline of Communism, to acknowledge the defeats on an international scale, to evaluate forces correctly, to install a real proletarian leadership. The first prerequisite is the recall of comrade Trotsky to Soviet Russia, and in the Communist International, the readmission of all the Left Communists into the Party. National and international congress must take place with the participation of the Left Opposition, which will give the Parties ideological clarity and Marxist direction.

Prague, November 5, 1929.



Comrades who have extra copies of old numbers of the Daily Worker or the International Press Correspondence are urgently requested to send them to the office of the Militant. Our files were complete at one time until they were taken by the second story men of the central Committee. We are in great need of these old numbers for reference purposes and any responses will be appreciated.

CHICAGO!

CABARET & DANCE
at Stisk's Hall
4021 N. Drake Ave. (3535 West)

SATURDAY EVENING, DECEMBER

14, 1929

Excellent Music Refreshments
Admission: Men 50c Ladies 35c
Wardrobe Free : : Doors Open 8

Auspices: Communist League of America
Chicago branch

A CHRISTMAS GIFT FOR YOU & YOUR FELLOW-WORKER



CHRISTMAS doesn't mean very much to the worker under capitalism except a date on the calendar. A holiday now and then does not make up for the year round of exploitation and misery. But you can make this Christmas the occasion for enlightening some workers on the way out of the anarchy of capitalism. Send your comrade or friend a one year subscription to *The Militant*. Give it to him as a Christmas gift. And if you are not a subscriber yourself, give yourself a Christmas present too! The sub is \$2.00 a year—fifty-two issues of *The Militant*. Fill out the handy blank:

The Militant
25 Third Avenue,
New York, N. Y.
Name
Address
City State
I am enclosing \$2.00 to cover the subscription.

The Capitulation of Bucharin

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS OF THE RIGHT WING NOW?

By Max Shachtman

A week after the Daily Worker announced the action of the November Plenum of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in removing Bucharin from the Political Bureau, and two days after the Revolutionary Age triumphantly informed its readers of the "disintegration . . . of Trotskyism", the press carried the Moscow dispatch on the capitulation of the international leaders of the Right wing. Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky.

The exact wording of the capitulation is not yet, of course, at hand. The Associated Press dispatch, however, quotes the statement of Bucharin in part:

"For nearly two years we opposed the Central Committee in a series of political problems. We consider it our duty to declare that in this dispute the Communist Party and its Central Committee proved to be right and we were wrong."

Bucharin Will Fight the Right!

"Admitting our mistakes, we promise together with the Communist Party to fight decisively against deviations from the Party general line, particularly against Right wingers, in order to overcome all difficulties and assure full victory for socialist construction."

The capitulation is therefore apparently "complete". Not only to the Right wing leaders beat their own breasts in humility and confession, but they announce themselves prepared to beat the heads of all "Right wingers" in addition. The picture of Bucharin, Tomsky and Rykov fighting against the danger of the Right wing is indeed a rare one, comparable only to that of the Catholic Church fighting intolerance or Tammany Hall fighting political corruption. And the Daily Worker can hardly contain its joy at the fact that the Right-Center Bloc in the Russian Party and the Comintern is about to be reestablished for a "strengthened struggle against the Right danger and Trotskyism."

Why did Bucharin capitulate? Does the capitulation mean the liquidation of the Right danger in the Soviet Union? Will Bucharin, Rykov and Tomsky remain in their present, newly-adopted position for a long period to come? The answer requires a word on the nature of the Right wing in the Soviet Union.

The workers' state is today experiencing the accumulated effects of the contradictions of a proletarian revolution in a backward predominantly agriculture country, an island isolated in a capitalist sea, seeking to maintain itself in a period of the retarded world revolution. Since the height of the revolutionary wave in Europe had reached with the opportunity missed by the leaders of the German Communist Party in 1923, the Soviet republic has gone through six years of reaction, a reaction based upon a proletarian state. In this period, national tendencies grew at the expense of internationalism, opportunism at the expense of a revolutionary line. In this period occurred the Menshevik enmities of Stalin and Bucharin in the Chinese revolution, the British general strike, the Pilsudski coup d'Etat, and in the general back-sliding into capitalist channels in the Soviet Union. This period marked the organizational defeat of the Opposition and its expulsion from the Party, its imprisonment and exile.

The Roots of the Right Wing

This period marked the rise of the Right wing danger in the Soviet Union primarily. The social-economic roots of this tendency are always latent in the situation, since, as Lenin pointed out, capitalism continues to grow out of the very soil of the Soviet Republic in Russia. But the policy of yielding to the elements of capitalism, followed by Stalin and Bucharin, created a basis for an enormous growth and confidence of the Right wing. Behind it stood the Kulak, the Nepman, the bureaucrat, the concessionaire and world imperialism. And since these elements cannot legally express themselves politically in the Soviet Union, because of the monopoly of the Communist Party, they found another way:

they exerted such a pressure as built and strengthened a Right wing inside the Communist Party. In other words, the Right wing was the political expression of the new possessing classes in the Soviet Union, of the restorationist elements, of Thermidor, that is, of the carrying out of the bourgeois counter-revolution still under the outward forms of the proletarian state.

For years the policy of yielding to the Thermidor elements in the country was practised by the bloc of the Right wing and the Center (Bucharin and Stalin), a bloc in which the policies of the Right wing prevailed. Precisely because of that

the Opposition, representing the elements continuing the line of the October revolution, was beaten in the Party. It was a sacrifice offered to reaction.

The passivity of the workers during this period of the blows of reaction is now swiftly disappearing. Out of this resurgence of proletarian strength, aided by the persistent fight of the Opposition, came the struggle by Stalin against the Right wing, which has led to the latter's capitulation.

Why was it so easy, comparatively speaking, to deliver a defeat to the Right wing in the Party? Precisely because its strength lies not so much in the basic elements of the Communist Party as it does in the alien class elements outside the Party. Therein lies the peculiar nature of the Right wing. Stalin can mobilize the proletarian forces in the Party against the Right wing not because the workers are so enthusiastic over the bureaucratic indecisiveness of Centrism, but because they are stubbornly hostile to the Right wing and the enemy class behind it. The Right wing cannot mobilize its strength inside the Party to any sufficient strength to challenge Stalin. That was proved in the Moscow and Leningrad Party organizations, both controlled by the Right wing, and both of the cleared of the outstanding Bucharinites in less time than it takes to tell.

How the Right Can Fight

The Right wing will be able to measure swords with Stalin when it gets ready to mobilize the class forces that support it outside the Party. But to set these forces actively into the motion means civil war—no less—and the first step towards counter-revolution. This, and nothing else, is the concrete meaning of what Stalin (only last year) called the "capitalist restorationist" elements represented by the Right wing, and what Trotsky calls the danger of Thermidor.

Bucharin has capitulated for the time being only. That is plain from the social roots of the Right wing, which are such as will press, at a more favorable moment, for a renewed offensive by the Right. Bucharin and especially Rykov calculate: No need of being cut to pieces now by this ignoramus. We will wait. Next year will be a hard one for him. The five year plan will begin to meet its real difficulties. The Kulak will begin to press hard. We may be harassed on the East or West by the

imperialists. Things will get too hot for Stalin. He will hardly know which way to turn. Then we will be right there in the Political Bureau with our program which he will have no choice but to accept. Then we will see.

A New Right-Center Bloc

What can be expected, therefore, is a reconstitution, on a new basis, of the old Right-Center bloc, shattered by proletarian blows and the whip of the Opposition. This foreshadows a veering to the Right by the leadership of the Russian party, and therefore the Comintern. There is no doubt that Bucharin, as a vanquished ally, will have a far greater influence in the councils of the Party than the Bucharin who has for the last few months been the public target for all the official "theoreticians" and bootblacks of the Centrist apparatus. That he will use this influence against the Left, i. e., against the Leninist Opposition led by Trotsky, a hundred times more than against the Right, should be clear to anyone except the hopelessly gullible who swallow Bucharin's declaration of "war" against the "Right wingers".

Another consequence will be a smarting blow at the international Right wing. A few formal cracks at them from Bucharin himself will be more than many of them can stand. The Stalinites will use Bucharin's capitulation to the maximum—and very clumsily and stupidly, if the Daily Worker is any criterion—in order to drive a knife through the various Right wing groups.

Deprived now of an international base, which has become, particularly since the Russian revolution, the most essential prerequisite for orientating oneself in the revolutionary movement, the Right wing will go through a process of differentiation. Some parts of it will go over to the social democracy. Others will capitulate to the Stalin apparatus, a process that will not be halted by the fervid avowals that the Right wing does not support any faction in Russia (see Lovestone in the current Revolutionary Age). Still another section will conclude the process of disillusionment with the Right wing and the Centrist swamp by a reversal of its position and adherence to the Left Opposition. The Lovestone group in the United States which of all the Right wing groups in the International has the weakest ground in principle or tradition beneath it, will pass through this differentiation more rapidly than others. Its leadership stands condemned by its entire past. Its ranks, which contain many Communist workers whom the fear-stricken Stalinite idiots were unable to retain, and whom Lovestone will not keep forever with his fairy tales about the "disintegration of Trotskyism," belong to the Leninist Opposition.

and the Party has now been transformed into a legal battle of lawyers before the very honorable and respected courts of Massachusetts.

In the meantime, the elements previously in the leadership of the order, formed a Committee for Non-Partisanship in the Independent Workmen's Circle. Among the leaders of this group are to be found Left Wingers, so-called Centrists, and some who are undoubtedly connected with the Right wing in one way or another. But the movement has passed beyond its leaders, and represents far more than they speak for. The members supporting this movement are not against the Left wing, but against the arbitrary, narrow, mechanical, bureaucratic methods employed by the present Party leaders. It is quite true that if the Party persists stubbornly in its present course, the Right wing will be able to play cleverly upon the sentiments of the Left wing workers, pull them away from the Communist movement, and strengthen the hand of reaction in the Independent. Against this tendency, it is the duty of every class conscious militant to fight. The welfare of the Independent as a fighting arm of the labor movement, calls—not for a fight against Communism and the Left wing—but a fight for the Left wing, for the strengthening of the Communist movement, against the reawakened Right wing, and against the adventurer policy of the Stalinites. The fact that the Right wing will try to make as much capital as possible out of the present situation, requires the utmost vigilance and resistance on the part of the class conscious workers who built the Independent into a source of strength and pride for the Left wing.

Left Wing Workers vs. C.P.

The "Non-Partisan Committee" movement cannot be ignored. It is not a Right wing movement. It has the support already of the majority of the membership, and the largest branches in the order. Branch 7, Worcester, the largest in the country, Branch 75, Pittsburgh, the second largest, Branch 18, 19 and 27 of Worcester, Branch 24 of Chelsea, 29 of Revere, 40 of Peabody and many, many others that were always supporters of the Left wing, and prominently known as Left wing Committee. More than 50 branches are affiliated with the Committee. If these workers who always cherished the Left wing are steadily won over to the Right in the course of this fight, the cause for it will lie chiefly in the stupid, unpardonable blunders of the Stalinite pupils in this country, who are incapable of winning workers for Communism and constantly create splendid opportunities for the reformists in every field.

The comrades of the Communist League (Opposition) in Boston and in Chelsea in particular are actively engaged in preventing a drift to the Right or away from Communism and the Left wing in the I. W. C. Without giving any endorsements to the leaders of the Impartial Committee, they are conducting a struggle for the retention of the nonpartisan, all-inclusive and Left wing character of the Circle. They oppose the wrong policy of the Communist Party and the efforts of the Right wing to establish its control over the organization, as well as the inexcusable, anti-working class action of the Board of Appeals in procuring a court injunction, which gives the capitalist class an open hand in deciding working class disputes.

The Party's Adventure in the I.W.C.

BOSTON—The collapse of the mechanical control established over the Independent Workmen's Circle by the Communist Party bureaucrats, foretold by us many months ago, is now proceeding at full speed. At the last convention of this Jewish fraternal labor order in Chicago, the Stalinists packed the sessions with delegates from small, newly-formed branches and "captured" the organization with a vengeance. All opposition was ridden down rough-shod, and a series of resolutions adopted which stamped the Independent Workmen's Circle as purely Communist Party from beginning to end. The Daily Worker was endorsed. The Freiheit was given the same O. K. The Left wing unions were officially adopted. The Communist Party was approved. All this was done with ruthless gusto and disregard for any of the consequences.

A Reaction Sets In

So completely did the Party "take over" the organization that a reaction set in among the members. It must be borne in mind that the I. W. C., from its leadership to its membership, has always been considered an anti-Forward and pro-Left wing organization. It has always supported every Left wing institution and campaign. The membership was definitely sympathetic to the Communist movement. The I. W. C. was one of the most fertile recruiting grounds for the Communist Party, particularly its Jewish section, and the latter was gradually establishing its ideological and organizational influence in the ranks.

Not satisfied with this steady progress, and anxious to grab every possible position and keep it under absolute, air-tight Party control, the Stalinites prepared their little adventure which the Communist movement is going to pay for heavily. No sooner had the Party installed itself in power in the organization, than it proceeded to run the I. W. C. like a Prussian drill master. Only those officially approved by the rul-

ing faction in the Party were considered fit for anything; everyone else was denounced as—a yellow social fascist. Workers who had been heart and soul with the Left wing for years were alienated and abused simply because they refused to go along with the ruinous policy of the Party.

The "strategy" of the Party was to issue from its debacle in the Workmen's Circle by a coup d'Etat in the Independent. First, capture the Independent, then split off the Left wing for the W. C., affiliate it to the I. W. C., and thereby come into possession of a larger, perfectly controlled I. W. C. That is, get rid of the "tiresome" struggle against the Right wing bureaucrats in the Workmen's Circle, and lead a life of Left wing peace in the Independent.

This bit of Napoleonic strategy, however, failed to reckon with the host, i. e., with the Right wing in the Independent, dormant for years, unimportant, but always on the lookout for a chance to strengthen itself. The purely arbitrary, rough-riding measures taken by the Party after its capture of the I. W. C. gave the Right wing its long looked-for chance to make a frontal attack on the Communists directly, and indirectly against the whole Left wing. Its control of the Board of Appeals gave it the formal opportunity for removing the Party-controlled National Executive Committee, allegedly for its negotiations with the Left wing of the Workmen's Circle, held for the purpose of working out the ways and means of effecting the affiliation of the latter. The N. E. C. refused to recognize this decision, and, on October 30 it occupied the offices of the organization, put new locks on the door, met, removed the chairman and general secretary of the organization and the whole Board of Appeals! The latter answered with an injunction against the "usurpatory" National Executive, and the whole struggle between the Right wing

LOS ANGELES, Calif.: Belmont News Co., 101 East 5th St.; Western News Stand, Box 604, Arcade Station.

SAN FRANCISCO, Calif.: McDonald's Book Shop, 65 Sixth Street

WASHINGTON, D. C.: Gale's Book Shop, 805 Tenth St. N. W.

CHICAGO, ILL.: Cheshinsky's Book Store, 2720 W. Division St.; Horsley's Book Store, 1623 W. Madison St.; and on various newsstands.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.: Joe Angelo, 431 No. Wesley St.

BOSTON, MASS.: Shapiro's Book Store, 7 Beach St., near Washington.

ROXBURY, MASS.: Goldberg's Store, 536 Warren St.

DETROIT, MICH.: Aidas Book Shop, 1713-24th St.; and on various newsstands.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.: Engelson News Co., 234-2nd Ave. So.

KANSAS CITY, MO.: Buehler's Book Store, 220 West 12th St.

ST. LOUIS, MO.: Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Ave.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.: On various newsstands.

SEATTLE, WASH.: Raymer's Old Book Store, 905 Third Ave.

CALGARY, ALTA., CANADA: Boston News Co., 109-8th Ave. West