

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

VOL. II, No. 21

NEW YORK, N. Y., Saturday, December 21, 1929

PRICE 5 CENTS

Illinois Miners on the March!

Accorsi Frame-Up Is Smashed

The crude frame-up against Salvatore Accorsi has been shattered. After being out for 18 hours, the jury in Pittsburgh returned with a "not guilty" verdict in the case. With this verdict ends an attempt by the coal and iron kings of Pennsylvania to add another name to the long list of working class militants who have been legally murdered by the American capitalist class.

Accorsi was arrested and tried for murder in connection with a mass meeting in Cheswick, Pa., on August 22, 1927, to protest against the impending execution of Sacco and Vanzetti. While the workers were gathered at the meeting, a troop of state cossacks rode mounted into the meeting and began beating men, women and children in a most bestial manner. Scores of the workers were severely injured and many of them disabled. Not a single one of these uniformed thugs was ever called to account for the attempted massacre of the workers. But Accorsi, who had been at the meeting and later on moved to Staten Island, New York, was apprehended and held for the alleged killing of one of the state troopers, Downey by name. The chaos created by the charge of the troopers had, of course, made it virtually impossible to identify any one who might have killed Downey. But the vengefulness of the Pennsylvania master class thirsted for a victim, and sought to send Accorsi to the electric chair.

Evidence Is Too Shabby

The "evidence" against him was so obviously trumped-up, that it was found difficult to send him on the path of Sacco and Vanzetti. The release of Accorsi is no sign at all of a softening of capitalist class brutality or "justice" in Pennsylvania or any other part of the States. The fact of the deportation proceedings against John Topalchanyi, of Herminie, Pa., for the sole "crime" of belonging to the Communist Party, is sufficient to undo that notion.

Nevertheless, the victory gained in the Accorsi case should be followed up rapidly and with greater efforts in a country-wide campaign to release the rest of the class war prisoners. The imprisonment of Mooney, Billings, the Centralia I. W. W., the threat that hangs over the heads of the Gastonia militants, Malkin, and numerous others call for united action.

Prosperity As Usual

A decline of 13 percent in women's wages in American cotton manufacturing is shown to have taken place in the period from 1924 to 1928 by the annual report of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor at Washington.

In 1928, the average full-time earnings per week of 38,000 women in 158 cotton mills in the eleven states included in the survey by the bureau ran to the magnificent sum of \$15.66. This figure does not even pretend to take into account the fact that thousands of these workers are never employed an average of a full week during the year, thus cutting their miserable wage down further.

"Not one of the 12 occupations for which women's earnings were reported in 1928 escaped a decline from the 1924 figure," a summary of the report says. "The more than 10,000 spinners showed a decrease of 14 percent in earnings, and the 8,100 weavers a 13 percent reduction."

The chivalrous state of Alabama is at the bottom of the list with an average wage of \$11.88, while the noble and cultured state of Massachusetts heads the list of those that declined in percentage, showing a drop of 18 percent in four years.

Prosperity as usual!



Labor Fakers Sold Out Mooney!

Simultaneous with the news that the California state prison board is taking the case of Tom Mooney under consideration, following its reference there by Governor Young, comes an extremely important statement on the role of the A. F. of L. fakers in the historic frame-up case made by Fremont Older, editor of the San Francisco Call, and interested for years in the release of both Mooney and Billings.

Older, who cannot be charged with any Communist "taint", recounts how one governor after another washed his hands of the case, refused to have it reconsidered in spite of the mountain of evidence that the two labor organizers were framed. He then remarks:

Mooney the "Trouble-Maker"

"I think the chief reason for the timidity of the previous governors was the fact that labor, or at least the labor leaders, were against the pardon of Mooney and Billings. They looked upon Mooney as a trouble maker and a disturber, and they feared if he were pardoned he would go about the state and possibly the nation denouncing the powerful people in the labor movement.

"If at any time during these years labor could have been solidified behind the appeal I feel confident that they would have been released. Even now I do not think the labor leaders personally have much use for Mooney, but their organizations are going on record strongly demanding pardon."

"When Gov. Young took office and the Mooney case was presented to him he soon learned that labor was indifferent to what happened to Mooney and Billings, and the powerful capitalistic class was very well satisfied to have them both rot-

in prison. Under these conditions, it could hardly be expected that he would be in any great haste to reach a decision."

"Why was labor opposed to Mooney? He had gone over the heads of the labor organizations in San Francisco and had himself officially empowered to organize the platform men on the street cars by the International president of the Carmen's Union. He made a number of efforts to form them into a union but never succeeded."

The Fakers' Private Opinion

"All he got out of it was the bitter hatred of the labor heads, who, while publicly urging his pardon, privately opposed it. The feeling among the leaders of the labor men was expressed to me by one of them many years ago—'They have got the right men with the wrong evidence.' (New York World, 12-15-29.)

Coming from Fremont Older, the truths he voices in his statement are doubly impressive, particularly since he has been intimately connected with virtually every phase of the Mooney-Billings case for the very first. His remarks prove the contention expressed by the Communists for years that the professional sell-out artists of the A. F. of L. had, to all intents and purposes, just as much of a hand in keeping Mooney and Billings confined in California's dungeons as the Manufacturers Association that framed them up. The chief function of the labor "leaders", from Compers to Green, was to crush every spark of fighting spirit that existed in the ranks of the workers. The continued imprisonment of the two victims is the sharpest condemnation of the miserable and treacherous role of the A. F. of L. reactionaries played in the case.

Cossacks Used, but the Miners Don't Scab

By Arne Swabeck

On the very first day of active strike of the Illinois coal miners, called by the National Miners Union, military forces were at hand to attempt to crush it. At Taylorville the strikers, men and women, led by Freeman Thompson, fought a splendid battle against a combination of the Peabody coal company and their flunkies, the Fishwick-Farrington administration of the United Mine Workers, flanked by six hundred national guardmen with fixed bayonets and machine guns mounted at the mine shaft. Before this battle was over the strikers received encouraging reinforcements from all the members of the U. M. W. of A., employed at four Peabody mines at Taylorville, Tovey, Kincaid and Langley, who refused to go to work while soldiers were on guard. The strike became 100 per cent effective in these mines.

Capitalist Solidarity

The soldiers were brought there from Decatur and Springfield, the latter section traveling in buses furnished by the Illinois Power Company manned by their regular drivers. In this manner the company could show its solidarity with the hard pressed operators.

At Pana, the two mines were closed down tight. The coal diggers had no patience with Frank Davis, whose efforts as the representative of the old union officialdom and the coal operators, went all in the direction of preventing a strike. He was kept out of the meeting where the strike vote was taken. At Auburn, at the Panther Creek mine, at Buckner and at one large mine in the Belleville sub district the miners responded and downed tools, with other points, at the time this is written, expected to follow.

At Auburn occurred the next example of the combination of forces against the strikers. Representatives of the Fishwick-Farrington administration called a meeting of the local U. M. W. of A., of which all the miners are still members. Only the members who were in opposition to the new union were admitted. The vote to return to work naturally carried. Immediately the state government came into action to play its part. Mobilization of two score highway patrolmen was ordered with instructions to clear the roads leading to the Panther Creek mine. The pickets were dispersed and those miners who did return to work thus met no opposition.

Wholesale arrests is but another means used against the miners fighting a desperate battle against desperate conditions. It is not the leading elements alone who have landed in jail, charged with inciting to riot, disorderly conduct, unlawful assemblage, etc. to be let out only under exorbitant bail. No, those arrested have been carried off in truckloads, deportation proceedings to be instituted against all non-citizens.

Prior to the actual beginning of the strike the sheriff of Franklin county issued a proclamation of his intentions to use all the armed forces available against the strike. He recognized only the United Mine Workers Union and its contract with the operators. It chimed in well with the proclamations of the guardians of this notorious contract, signed by Harry Fishwick, assuring all and sundry that in any event the contract would be lived up to. The Illinois Coal Operators' Association has filed affidavits in the courts pledging its readiness and forces to uphold the contract. All of them agree to fight this contract. No wonder that the miners take the opposite view. The

contract represents

Continued

Illinois Miners on the March

Continued from Page 1
 of the sell-out career of the old union of officialdom. It legalized the speed-up, wage cut system and the complete loss of union conditions. The miners knew that before the contract went into effect and they voted against it. A canvass made of 177 locals of the U. M. W. of A. shortly after the referendum vote showed only 14,000 votes in favor with 39,000 against.

This Illinois miners' strike once again demonstrates how quickly the governmental authorities will respond to the call of the employers and order out troops to smash the workers' ranks when they dare to enter into open struggle for the needs of their daily life. Particularly is this the case when the workers' militancy is feared. There is not the slightest lack of unity between those who have common interests: the coal operators, their fellow capitalists, their government, and their faithful lieutenants placed as officials in the union corrupted by them, the U. M. W. of A. But this time also the Taylorville struggle showed a remarkable display of working class solidarity: the rank and file members of the U.M.W.A. refusing to work while troops were mounted against their brothers in the National Miners Union.

The response of the coal miners to this strike, known in advance to be against heavy odds, shows their temper, which has been steeled under conditions growing constantly worse. Mechanical mining has definitely established the worst features of the speed-up system and mass unemployment. Added to these features are reduced wages, all made possible for the benefit of the capitalists by a corrupt bureaucracy of the old union. The miners are beginning to see the only way out of this dilemma is through struggle. In growing numbers they welcome the new union. It has great possibilities.

Strike Shortcomings

With the heavy odds against the strike, in spite of which the conditions for further extension are favorable—because of the splendid fighting mood of the miners—the absolutely inadequate preparation prior to the strike call falls back upon the leadership as a heavy responsibility. Lack of preparation in this instance is the greatest handicap. Calling of a general strike is a serious matter even under the most favorable conditions. It requires first of all a concentration on the issues of the strike in such a way that not only the most militant workers know what the fight is about but so that the broadest strata can be

aroused to active participation. While all the demands made in this strike certainly represent the needs of the miners there can be no question that with a concentration on a couple of the most prominent points a broader basis would have been provided, making it much more possible that the workers employed in the heavy coal producing territory of Franklin Williamson and Saline counties, could also have been brought out, thus creating a real basis for victory.

Ever since the present squabble for the division of the spoils between John L. Lewis and Fishwick began, the favorable possibilities for establishing militant unionism and building the National Miners Union have increased manifold. It presented the opportunity for organization and strike preparation. It required the establishment of correct tactics and real solidarity. This opportunity was squandered by putting up straw men to be knocked down. All efforts were concentrated on fabrication of false issues against the national president of the N. M. U., John J. Watt. This brought about a practical split situation at the Belleville convention just when the building of solidarity should command all attention. For this the leadership of the Communist Party is fully responsible animated purely by its false theory of complete mechanical control of all organizations in which it wields an influence. The results so far have been failure to prepare as conditions demand, and if continued can be nothing but a disastrous narrowing, not only of the basis of the present struggle, but also of the organization itself.

Rally All Support!

However, despite all shortcomings the struggle is on and is not merely the concern of the miners but of the whole working class. It demands their support, and particularly does it demand the support of all class conscious workers. Relief for the strikers must be furnished. It will come only from the working class. To be effective, such relief action must be organized on a broad united front basis endeavoring in this manner to bring in large number of workers to understand the need of solidarity with the struggling coal miners.

The Illinois coal miners are struggling against the combined forces of the capitalist powers and corrupt traitorous union officials. They are struggling for the building of militant unionism. Real working class support will bring victory so much nearer.

The Auto Show and the Auto Slaves

NEW YORK—With a somewhat hesitating step and ill at ease—as a proletarian is likely to be when he approaches the fair of the owning class—I entered the great ball-room of the Hotel Commodore where the classic of the automobile world is annually held. The Automobile Salon is distinct from the ordinary automobile show, for it caters only to the upper crust of society, and the place it is held in and the nature of the wares there exhibited automatically excludes the mob.

The contrast between the Commodore ball room and the East Side, where I usually hang out when not in the shop, was so great that I was for a moment dazed at my own audacity in being there, and was further dazzled by the brilliant light from the crystal chandeliers reflecting itself in the dress shirts and diamonds (?) studs of the high-powered salesmen all about. These gentlemen were rushing about—if anything in a white collar may be said to rush—explaining to numerous society ladies overburdened with jewelry and paint and tired business men the superior merits of their respective cars.

Cars for the Leisure Class

Determined not to be overawed by any salesman, or any bourgeois present, male or female, I braced myself mentally and looked about. There were cars of all shades and for all purposes needed by a leisure-class family, at prices running from a mere five thousand to a bagatelle of thirty thousand and perhaps more. Here was a smart-looking town car exhibited by Hibbard & Darrin, Paris, that will no doubt be eventually used by some feminine parasite for her shopping tours or to take her pet dog out for his daily airing in Central Park. There stood a Duesenberg roadster just waiting the masterful hand of the collegiate son of some millionaire. In

another corner is a beautiful cabriolet by Brunn just made to set the eyes of a pampered mistress of a captain of industry to glittering.

I was in another world now; I had almost forgotten the slum where I betake myself when the boss has wrung a day's measure of toil out of my carcass; I felt as if I, too, were on top of the heap instead of the bottom when, glancing over the assembled crowd I discovered the familiar faces of a few other workers who had had like myself, the audacity to hark in on the show. They, mind you, had merely built these expensive specimens of the coachmaker's art, and it was only by the gracious permission of their respective bosses that they were allowed the privilege of looking at the fruits of their toil in surroundings appropriate to their grandeur.

I saw them in their threadbare overcoats timidly stealing about, instantly crushed by the stern look of a salesman if one of them dared to finger the shining sides of the thing he had built.

"Look at this Mercedes sedan. Isn't it stunning?"

Yes, young lady, and the man who built it was also stunned when the boss laid him off on completion of the job, to face a winter of unemployment and hardship.

And that Packard sedan your companion admired. I know all too well every piece of wood in it! For weeks I toiled and sweated to build it and now it is ready for some parasite to enjoy while I who made it pound the pavements in search of another master.

Exhibition by Fleetwood: beautiful cars, yes—but built by men working 60 hours a week for a bare subsistence.

Exhibition by Le Baron: Obscure toilers putting in 54 hours a week turned them

out.

And so on down the line—marvelous cars all, built, says the souvenir catalogue, by High-sounding Name & Co. . . . Rotten hypocrisy! They are the product of unknown proletarians, toiling long hours for small wages in unsanitary shops under hazardous conditions and the jaundiced eye of the boss.

Who, though, in this gay assemblage cares? They don't know, and they don't want to know, that automobile workers have been laid off by the thousands. "You've done your work as a good servant should. Now go and hide your misery in the slums. You're not wanted here, making a nuisance of yourself." That is the attitude of those who ride in \$20,000 cars toward those who built them.

The automobile industry, though the second largest in the country, is practically unorganized. Men in it work from 54 to 60 hours a week, the only exception being New York City, where a small union has been able to maintain itself and hold a few of the bosses down to 44 hours a week. In all shops, the conditions are practically the same as they were 20 years ago with the addition of a highly developed speed-up system. At several conventions of the American Federation of Labor resolutions were passed to organize the automobile industry, but like most resolutions they were voted for with a great hurrah, and then shelved until the next convention when they get their annual dusting off. Hell will freeze over before the A. F. of L. bureaucracy will bestir itself on behalf of automobile workers.

No, fellow workers in the automobile industry: if you want better conditions and shorter working hours, don't wait for some A. F. of L. Moses to lead you out of the

present wilderness. Nor for Mr. Ford to give them to you on a silver platter. His lately published story of higher wages is the bunk.

You start with a minimum wage of \$7 a day—just enough to keep the wolf away—then after a couple of years you are to get an increase. But here's where the trick comes in. There never are a couple of years to follow; you never get that increase, for after six months, or, at the most, one year in that slave mill, you start on your way to the Home for Cripples, or worse yet, the Home for the Feeble-minded. Your successor will start at the bottom, where you did, and repeat the process. It's like a treadmill: when you step up one you go down one.

Ford's "Paradise" for Labor

And don't forget the annual laying off by Mr. Ford or General Motors. At the present time thousands upon thousands of auto workers are walking the streets unemployed. They worked too long hours and produced too much. The market is glutted with cars and there comes a stoppage to the whole industry.

Organize and fight for better conditions, is the slogan of the moment. Are you an auto worker? Do you by chance live in Detroit? There is a small union there. Join it and demand an industrial auto workers union.

Do you live in New York? There is a union here—Automobile & Vehicle Workers' Union 18065. Join it and demand a united front for all auto workers. Help build the union and in the end we'll get what we want. Gene Debs once said "The workers build fine cars, but do they ride in them?" The answer to that must one day be: "They certainly do!"

—PETER HANSEN

Opposition Group Formed in Argentine!

Buenos Aires, Argentine.

A few days ago some of us decided to send out some invitations to about 25 comrades, including members of the central committee, for a meeting and discussion on the subject of the International Situation and the Russian Communist Opposition. Another comrade and I were called by two members of the executive committee and told that we couldn't be allowed to hold the meeting in a comrades house, nor have any discussion unless permitted, and the E. C. couldn't permit any discussion of that kind in the party. (The reference is to the group split off from the official C. P.—the Penelon group.—Ed.) Of course, that was going too far. It meant that the members could read and study certain things but couldn't open their mouths to speak to one another unless the E. C. gave permission. So that we are now out of the Party.

We are now receiving literature in four languages—the Militant, La Verite et Contre le Courant in French, the Bulletin of the Opposition in Russian, and Volkswille in German. But the main thing for South America, some organ in the Spanish language, we have not got. Books by L. Trot

sky there are, but only a few buy and read books. Of course, later on we will do our best to get something, even if it is only by the mimeograph. The main thing right now is to organize some groups for Opposition propaganda.

I must not forget to mention that when we said we thought it would be advisable for the party members to discuss the international situation so as to be ready for the coming party conference, we were told that this point would not be discussed at all at the conference.

—R. GUINNEY.

* * *

The formation of the first South American group of the Opposition marks a great step forward in the international struggle for the regeneration of world Communism. It serves as one more reply to the twaddle about the "decay of Trotskyism". The future will soon show that the step taken by our comrades in the Argentine will be repeated in every other Latin American country. The American Opposition sends its warmest greetings and wishes for victory to our comrades in the Southern continent!—Ed.

Φ

A Reply to the Capitulators

Continued from Page 7

a demagogic move to cover their own sympathies towards the Rights. This is especially true of Radek, about whom there is evidence that, being in exile, he did not hide his sympathies for the followers of Brande. Later on Radek gave some involved explanations of his behavior, similar to those he gave at the time when it was discovered that he, Radek, and no one else, insisted in January 1928 that Trotsky give an extensive interview (it would be more correct to say: extensive political declaration) to the Moscow correspondent of the "Berliner Tageblatt". These pretended enemies of the Right will now try choking the Leninist Opposition, in company with the Rights and the Centrists.

The banishment of Trotsky united the Right-Center leadership with the capitulators. From Bucharin, who voted for the banishment, to Radek and Smilga, a united front has been formed against the Leninist Opposition. We can confidently assert that in accomplishing its Thermidor act, the Centrist leadership expected to facilitate the work of the capitulators. In their turn, Radek and Smilga, in starting a campaign for separation from Trotsky, were coming to the rescue of the party leadership. If the latter had not been sure of the support of the capitulators, it would never have ventured upon such a mad performance.

Hoover's Building Panacea

Right in the face of Hoover's bungo-steering panacea to settle the unemployment problem and industrial depression by a bigger "construction program" comes a crushing blow in the form of the Washington report of the F. W. Dodge Corporation, which shows that the decline of construction contracts from November of this year as compared with October awards for November of this year as compared with October amounted to 12 percent, or \$4,629,800. The decrease as compared with the contract awards for November 1928 was \$80,460,700 or 17 percent. The report says further: "New work reported in the contemplated stage in the 37 states (east of the Rocky Mountains) amounted to \$720,301,000. This total represents a loss of 10 percent from the amount reported in the preceding month and a drop of 23 percent from the amount reported in November 1928."

The workers who expect to have their present difficulties solved by Hoover's good looking blueprints are going to wait a long, long time.

Φ

MINNEAPOLIS A B C CLASS

Thirty-two comrades were present at the last session of the class in the A B C of Communism being conducted by the Minneapolis branch of the Communist League. All workers wishing to join the class are requested to get in touch with the School Committee, Box 45, Minneapolis, Minn.

America's Record in Haiti

Extracts from Dr. Ernest Gruening's Senate Testimony on Haiti in 1925

Haiti's trouble dates from 1905 when a group of American financiers closely associated with the National City Bank of New York, secured a concession to build a railroad. Mr. Joseph P. Grace, president of W. R. Grace & Co. and a director of the National City Bank, invested two and a quarter million dollars, and the National City Bank of New York advanced a further half million, using the bonds of the railroad as collateral. The president of this railroad, a very important figure in the affairs to follow, was Mr. Roger L. Farnham, another vice-president of the National City Bank.

How influential Mr. Farnham was in our Department of State may be judged from the fact that in October 1914, Secretary of State Bryan wrote to President Wilson of "the urgent need of increasing our force" in Haitian waters "at this time when a renewal of negotiations seems probable, not only for the purpose of protecting foreign interests, but also as an evidence of the earnest intention of this Government to settle the unsatisfactory state of affairs which exists."

U. S. Wants Haitian Customs

The unsatisfactory state of affairs which Mr. Bryan alleged to exist was a state of affairs unsatisfactory to the directorate of the National City Bank. In an attempt to render these conditions more satisfactory, several commissions went from the United States to Haiti in 1914 for the purpose of obtaining economic control of that island. These negotiations had been carried on informally for some months. A tentative convention between Haiti and the United States was presented to the Haitian government on December 10, 1914, by the American minister. Its essential provision was the appointment by the United States of a receiver of customs for Haiti. In the Latin-American Republics the chief source of revenue comes from the customs. He who controls them, controls the island's revenues. In this agreement, a tentative reference was also made to a "financial advisor, should one be appointed." They not only wanted to get hold of the money, but they wanted to say how it should be spent.

On December 13, without warning to the Haitian government, American marines landed in the Haitian capital of Port-au-Prince from the U. S. S. gunboat Machias; they marched to the vaults of the National Bank of Haiti and carried away \$500,000 in gold, the property of the Haitian government on deposit for the redemption of paper money....

The Haitian Government protested to Washington against the violation of its sov-

erignty, but no explanation was ever given and the money was kept in the vaults of the National City Bank of New York until some years later when the transfer of the island to the National City Bank had progressed somewhat further....

Two days later (after the election to president of the American-bought Philip Rartiguenave) a draft of a treaty was presented to the newly elected Haitian president. It contained all the clauses which the Haitians had rejected during peaceable previous negotiations, clauses which the United States had subsequently and voluntarily abandoned, and further drastic conditions. It provided for complete customs control and financial receivership. It provided that an arrangement should be entered into by which all the claims of individuals and corporations against Haiti should be settled. It provided for military and police control, in the shape of a constabulary officered by Americans, which was to "have supervision and control of arms, ammunition, military supplies and traffic therein, throughout the country." This clause, as well as several others to follow, was written into the draft of the earliest convention, presented to the Haitian Government over a year previously, namely in July 1914, and rejected by it then, and was now sent by wireless from the Department of State to Admiral Caperton, on August 14. In other words, when they had the Haitians in the grip of the military machine, they were proceeding no longer to negotiate, but to dictate....

Haitian Revenues Seized

By September 2, two weeks later, the 10 principal custom houses had been taken over, thus controlling the entire revenue of the Haitian Republic. The Haitian Government protested in the strongest terms in a series of notes, but in vain....

At the end of this message Secretary Daniels has the following confidential injunction:

"Confidential: It is expected that you will be able to make this sufficiently clear to remove all opposition and to secure immediate ratification."

The admiral did as he was told. He delivered the message which said in effect: If you do not sign, you starve. If you do not sign we are going to stay right here until you do sign. After resisting over three months, they signed.

Now, in the 10 years, almost 10 years, that have intervened since that time, Haiti has been under martial law and newspapers have been suppressed for the slightest criticism of the occupation. Editors have been put in jail. I don't know whether

there are any in jail at this moment, but I know there have been some in jail the last few months.... The blame for the killing of between 2,000 and 3,000 Haitians in five years by methods that were nothing but massacre rests right here in the administrative offices in Washington.... On November 18, Admiral Caperton sent the following report: "Fort Riviere captured by forces under Major Butler. All avenues of escape had been previously closed so that none escaped. Fifty one were killed.... no casualties our forces."

That was not warfare, that was murder! A little later they began using airplanes to drop bombs on Haitian villages. They didn't do this very long, however, for this reason, as testified to by Major Turner. "We never got enough Haitians together to make it worth while to drop bombs." Think of it. How many people in this country knew during this time when we were fighting to make the world safe for democracy, we were dropping bombs on Haitian villages? Yet, subsequent to our entry into the world war over 2,000 Haitians were killed. They were killed because they opposed the invasion of their country. Because peaceable by nature though they were they rebelled against the treatment accorded them.

Slave Laws by U. S. Marines

In 1918, the American military forces resurrected the old Haitian law of Corves. This was an old law requiring Haitians to work for a few days each year on the roads in their immediate community to keep them in repair. This was precisely the same kind of a law as one might find in the form of a municipal ordinance, here in the United States, requiring one, let us say, to keep the snow shoveled off one's sidewalk. But the military occupation determined to build a military highway running from north to south through the island by forced labor. Even the moderate Haitian

law had been in disuse for some time. Now, while there is a difference of opinion as to the extent of the abuses committed under the law of Corves, it is clearly proved, admitted and shown in the Senatorial report that the Haitians were taken from their homes, transported to different parts of the island, compelled to work under guard for weeks, herded in compounds at night, subjected to physical violence if they resisted, and shot if they attempted to escape. The Navy Department testimony admits that many were thus killed. The exact number is not known. It is also definitely proved that this system of violence was continued in certain sections after it had been ordered discontinued by brigade headquarters....

The bandits developed after we went down there, and they were precisely the same kind of bandits General Washington commanded at Valley Forge (continues to read from Senatorial white-washing report):

"The inhabitants are leaving the mountain forests to cultivate the central plain—less disturbed than they have been within the memory of living man. It is impossible to determine in exact figures the number of Haitians killed in this 18 months guerrilla campaign. A fair estimate is about 1,500. The figure includes many reports based on guesses made during combat and not on actual count. The casualties, whatever they were, undoubtedly includes some non-combatants. The bandits were found resting in settlements where they were surrounded by their women and children, or in villages where they camped and were tolerated by the inhabitants through fear or friendship. When encountered they had to be instantly attacked. These conditions largely account for the deaths of the bystanders...."

Now you understand why women and children had to be killed in Haiti.

How Time Does Fly in the Russian Party!

"But Bucharin has committed, in comparison, only an insignificant mistake, and he has not violated a single decision of the Central Committee. How to explain that, in spite of this, they still continue to hunt Bucharin? What do you want of Bucharin? They demand Bucharin's blood! That's what Zinoviev demands, sharpening the question in his concluding speech.

You demand Bucharin's blood? We shall not give it to you, know that well!" (Applause. Cries of "Very good!") . . .

"We are against the policy of expulsion; it is an abomination to us."

—From the speech of Stalin at the 14th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, December 1925.

* * *

"This double political bookkeeping is a characteristic feature of the Right opposition; its policy constitutes, so to speak,

a permanent maneuver against the party. We have witnessed the maneuvers and duplicity of the Trotskyist opposition in its day, for example, the hypocritical renunciation of factional work. Nevertheless it must be said that the Trotskyists conducted the struggle against the general line of the party more or less openly. But the conduct of the Right opposition is already 100% duplicity. The five year plan is recognized but at the same time documents diametrically opposed to this plan are also recognized, such as "Notes of an Economist" or "The Political Heritage" (by Bucharin). It is only those who cynically disrespect the party, its politically educated cadres, as well as the whole working class supporting the general line of the Party, who that can adopt such an equivocal position."

—Stalin, in Pravda, November 10, 1925

"UNANIMOUS!"

A Meeting of a Party Conference
By MICHAEL KOLZOV

"THE session will be continued," the chairman declared. "Comrade Bolotnov has the floor to report on the activity of the fraction in the provincial committee."

The Party conference becomes attentive. Someone at the door quiets the chattering delegates, for the workers were eager for the remarks of the chairman. Interesting how he'll put the thing over, they whispered in the hall. Sh-sh-sh.

The reporter: "The area of our district in its established boundaries is equal to 50,105 square kilometers or 5,010,000 hectares or 4,586,500 desjatines. According to area, our district takes second place in the province and forms 33.8 percent of the total area of the province. The temperature in Winter is 5 degrees below, in Summer, 16 degrees above."

(You see, his hearers whispered knowingly to each other, he begins with figures too.)

"The temperature in the vegetation period can be figured at 13 degrees on the average, its duration—135 days. On the basis of rainfall, which is reported at 400 millimeters, our district belongs to the dry belt. Considered generally, the largest part of our district belongs to the Northern latitude and is counted among the regions that lie high above sea-level."

(Now he's getting more specific—they whisper in the presidium—he's undoubtedly indicating something, only we don't know what he means by it.)

"The Southern part of our district is counted among the regions that do not lie so high above sea-level". The workers are amazed, they don't understand what all this is for . . . but the incorrigible reporter continues further: "We have 9 postal departments in the district and 5 radio stations; 486 kilometers of waterways and 1,198 kilometers of highways."

Here the reporter drinks a bit of water and immediately continues his remarks. He reports how many railroad stations, how deep the rivers were in 1909 and so forth.

The conference grows more restless. Still, it is clear to all the delegates that the chairman has worked out an elaborate report and that the geographical section is only the introduction.

"Here in the woods," bellows the reporter, "we came across various animals, as for example, ermine, fox, squirrels, and so on, not to speak of the innumerable birds."

You're a pretty bird yourself, the delegates were thinking; till you get to the actual subject we'll all kick off here. But . . . Bolotnov runs on briskly. More and more figures come flying along from the speaker's stand.

"I would like to touch briefly on the various branches of industry along the Jalinde, Urkan and Olde rivers. The first were founded in 1866 on the initiative of the engineer Anosov. The receipts from the whiskey trade amounted to 319,210 rubels, which is equal to 14 per cent of the total receipts. We have 79 sheep and nanny-goats and 625 swine." With this, Bolotnov passed over directly to tackling the Soviet administration. "The apparatus of our executive is divided into three departments: the general, which embraces the work of the presidium, political education, public education, war questions, agriculture and public health. Besides that, the taxation, financial and administrative department." Then the chairman listed the various sections and remarked that many women are active in the village Soviets.

HERE the reporter suddenly broke off his arguments, wiped the sweat from his brow and packed his papers into his thick bag. A hardly perceptible disagreement followed in the hall. Someone took the floor: "Comrades, I propose to have comrade Bolotnov continue the report without taking an adjournment for lunch. Then we'll be through with the report today so that we can begin the discussion early tomorrow morning."

From the presidium rings the answer: "Oh! You didn't understand the reporter. Comrade Bolotnov has already finished his remarks. I request the comrades to take the floor." A sigh of relief in the hall.

No one challenged the figures of the chairman on the distances between the various railroad stations, nor did anyone get indignant over the fact that only squirrels and not ostriches can live in the woods of the district. On that point they were in accord. The workers who participated in the discussion, however, only supplemented the

remarks; they added a few details, so to speak.

Detail No. 1: The district committee sold the houses inhabited by the workers to private persons, and drove the workers into the streets in Winter.

Detail No. 2: The district committee received 7,000 boards for the construction of railway bridges. Since the boards were left without any supervision, they were destroyed by a violent fire.

Detail No. 3: A militiaman has a railway line of 250 kilometers to supervise. For the purpose of "supervision" he gets into the train and rides as a blind passenger, since no ticket is put at his disposal. But at the very next station he is driven off by the conductor.

Detail No. 4: Primitive conditions prevail in the public school system.

Detail No. 5: The district committee, in the last year covered by the report, took no interest in the activity of the village Soviets. The chairmen booze and whore around. The peasants don't go to the Soviets because they're afraid of being beaten up.

Detail No. 6: The most violent class struggle is being conducted on the land, wild exploitation of the land workers taking place, and the district committee hadn't a word to say about this, either. And so forth and so on.

THE discussion is closed. The reporter gets the floor for concluding remarks. He establishes with satisfaction that the various comrades really had nothing to protest against the content of the report, and that the correctness of the line is thereby demonstrated. With regard to the details reported, it is self-understood that the work has many shortcomings to show and that is quite natural, since the work cannot produce successes only. In conclusion, he observes that he who never does anything never makes mistakes. (He was probably basing himself on Lenin.)

A two-page resolution was adopted. In it, the political and economic position of the district were approved, the active participation of the workers in the enterprises of the Party and the Soviet power was established. And so forth in the same spirit . . .

"Are there any remarks on the resolution? No! All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? None! Adopted unanimously! I declare the conference closed and propose to the delegates to sing the International."

The workers stood up and cautiously—moving their freezing legs gingerly—at first low, then even louder they sang the International . . .

The Defense of the Soviet Union and the Opposition

Groupings in the Left Opposition

We have established three fundamental currents in international Communism: the Right, the Centrist and the Left (Marxist). This classification does not, however, exhaust the question, since it leaves the ultra-Leftists unconsidered. But they exist, carry on activity, make mistakes and threaten to compromise the cause of the Opposition.

It is true that there are no longer any, or hardly any, ultra-Leftists of that naive-revolutionary, "aggressive" type to which Lenin devoted his well-known book. Nor have many ultra-Leftists of the spirit of 1924-25 (Maslow and others) remained in the Opposition. The experiences of the defeats did not pass by without effect. But far from all of the former ultra-Leftists assimilated the lessons of these years. Some liberated themselves from prejudices and preserved the revolutionary spirit. Others lost the revolutionary spirit and preserved the prejudices. Nevertheless there have remained not a few ultra-Leftists poisoned with scepticism. They freely proclaim a formal radicalism in all those cases where it puts them under no obligation. In practical questions they incline largely to opportunism.

If reformism is an irreconcilable enemy, then ultra-Leftism is the internal disease that impedes the struggle with the enemy. We must be freed of it at any cost.

For many months I attempted, by letters, to attain clarity from the National Committee of the Leninbund on the fundamental questions of Communist policy. Nothing came of it. The differences of opinion proved to be too great. There is no other way than to bring them out into the open and submit them to a serious examination. All the more so since the beginning of such a discussion has already been made by the editorial board of the journal of the Leninbund, when, in connection with the conflict between China and the Soviet Union, not only serious but positively decisive differences of opinion resulted in the Left Communist Opposition. In connection with this question, groupings have already arisen. Personal shiftings will of course, also follow. One group of comrades, who have adopted a false standpoint, will correct it. Others on the contrary, will deepen their mistakes go to the extreme, that is, they will end with the complete surrender of the Marxist position. That is how it always happens with deep-going differences when the as yet undefined differences of opinion are controlled by great events.

Every evil also has its virtue. There is too much spiritual stagnation and routine in the various Opposition groups. Exhaustive scrutiny of the great political events makes it possible for the vital elements and groups of the Opposition to find their right place more easily and to accelerate thereby the spiritual crystallization process around the real, and not the imaginary axes.

Formalism instead of Marxism

In the question of the conflict between China and the Soviet Union we have two fundamental viewpoints that are bound up with the most important problems of the international revolution and of Marxist method.

The most consummate expression of its kind of the formal-Leftist viewpoint was given by Louzon*. According to his whole manner of thought, it was also easiest for him. Louzon is no Marxist, but a formalist. He handles geography, technique, statistics much better than the materialist dialectic of class society. A great deal can frequently be learned from his articles, only one cannot learn anything politically from them. Louzon is much more occupied by abstract, national "justice" than by the real struggle for the liberation of the oppressed peoples. Louzon points out in detail that the Chinese Eastern Railway was built by czarism for the purpose of robbery and plunder. He shows on the map that this railway runs through Manchuria. He proves by statistical data that Manchuria has been colonized by Chinese peasants for the last decades. In this way, we have a Russian railway on Chinese soil next to the railways of the imperialist states. Where does the difference lie? asks Louzon. There is no difference, or practically none—he concludes. The treaty of 1924 was an imperialist treaty. Lenin would surely have returned the railway to China. Louzon knows this quite definitely.

In order to demonstrate whether a pol-

*Louzon is one of the editors of *La Revolution Proletarienne*, organ of the Syndicalist League of France.

By L. D. Trotsky

icy bears an imperialist character, it is enough, according to Louzon, to establish: "What people lives in this province?" If Northern Manchuria is populated by Russians—then the policy of the czar and the Soviet Union is legitimate; but if it is populated by Chinese, then this policy means nothing else but robbery and subjugation." (*Revolution Proletarienne*, August 1, 1929). To read these lines one cannot believe his eyes. The policy of the czar and the policy of the workers' state are considered exclusively from the national viewpoint and then completely identified. Louzon declares the policy of the czar in the Russian regions to be legitimate (legitimate). For us, however, the policy of the czar was no less criminal, thievish and enslaving in Siberia than in Manchuria. The policy of the Bolsheviks, whether good or bad, carries out the same principles in Manchuria, in Siberia and in Moscow. Comrade Louzon! Apart from nations there are still classes. The national problem outside of class relations is a fiction, a lie and a noose for the proletariat.

Louzon's method is not Marxism but naked schematism. It finds its punishment in the fact that the social democratic papers almost without exception develop the same line of thought and come to a similar conclusion. The decision of the Second International, made under the direction of Otto Bauer, covers itself precisely with Louzon's ideas. And how could it possibly be otherwise? Social democracy is necessarily formalistic. It feeds upon analogies between Fascism and Communism. To it, all those who "deny" or violate democracy are equal. Its highest criterion (in words) is "democracy", which the reformists place above the classes. That is exactly how Louzon proceeds with the principle of national self-determination. That is all the more remarkable since Louzon, as a syndicalist, is rather inclined to repudiate democracy formally. But it frequently happens with the formalists that they reject the whole only to bow to the part. National self-determination is an element of democracy. The struggle for this right, as for democracy in general, plays a great role in the life of the people, especially in the life of the proletariat. Whoever does not understand how to utilize the institutions and forms of democracy, among them also parliamentarism, in the interests of the proletariat, is a poor revolutionary. But from the proletarian standpoint, neither democracy as a whole, nor national self-determination as an essential part of it, stands above the classes, nor does it form a higher criterion of revolutionary policy. That is why we regard the social democratic analogy between Fascism and Bolshevism as a swindle. On the same grounds, we also characterize as a gross error the comparison, on the basis of the laws of symmetry, of the treaty between Soviet Russia and China of 1924 with the imperialist treaties.

To whom would Louzon have wished to give the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1924? To the Peking government? But this government had neither arms with which to take it nor legs with which to reach it.

The Peking government was a pure fiction. Marshal Tchang Tso-Lin, the leader of the Chun Chu-sen, the dictator and hangman of Manchuria, the paid agent of Japan, the mortal foe of the national revolutionary movement which broke out violently in 1925 and transformed itself in 1926 into an expedition of the South against the North, and finally against Tchang Tso-Lin—he was a reality. To surrender the railway to the Manchurian Marshal would mean, in reality, to enter into an alliance with him against the Chinese revolution which was developing. That would have been better in no respect than the delivery of cannon and munitions to White Poland in 1920 during its war with the Soviet Republic. That would be no fulfillment of revolutionary duty, but the most disgraceful treason to the Chinese revolution, the real one that is being accomplished by classes, and not its abstract shadow that lives in the head of Louzon and formalists like him.

Lost in contradictions, Louzon goes so far in his contentions as to reprove the Soviet government for the fact that, on September 20, 1924, it signed a treaty with Tchang Tso-Lin, "the most reactionary of all militarists that ever ruled in China." True, the most reactionary. Instead of concluding a treaty with him, which protected the railway from this worst reactionary, we should rather according to Louzon, simply have made him a gift of it.

Of course the treaty of 1924, which abolished all the imperialist privileges of Russia, gave no absolute guarantees

against Tchang Tso-Lin, for the latter had troops in Manchuria while the Soviet troops were a great distance away. But however far they may have been, they existed. Tchang Tso-Lin sometimes took the offensive, sometimes he beat a retreat. He demanded, for example, that the railway unquestionably convey his counter-revolutionary troops, but basing itself upon the treaty, the railway made all sorts of difficulties for him. He arrested the director of the railway, but then beat a retreat. Quite rightly he did not rely upon his forces alone. But Japan, for various reasons, decided not to support him openly and remained on the watch. All together, this was a great gain for the Chinese revolution which developed from the South to the North.

Revolutionary Aid or Imperialist Intervention

So as to illuminate even more glaringly the barrenness of Louzon's formalism, we would like to consider the question from another side. It is well known that the imperialists, in order to intrench themselves in a backward country, frequently arm one tribe against the other, one province against the others, one class against the others. That is how, for example, the United States systematically proceeds in cutting its road to South America. On the other hand it is well known that the Soviet government rendered far-reaching aid to the Chinese national revolutionary army from the first days of its formation, especially during its campaign from the South to the North. The social democrats of the whole world howled with the bourgeoisie over the military "intervention" of the Soviet Union in China and wanted to see in it only the revolutionary veiling of the old policy of czarist imperialism. Does Louzon agree with that or not? This question is also directed to all of Louzon's imitators. We Bolsheviks, on the contrary, believe that the aid rendered the Chinese revolution—through ideas, men, money, arms—was the elementary duty of the Soviet government. That the Stalin-Bucharin leadership inflicted political injuries upon the Chinese revolution that far outweighed the value of the material support, is a special point we will yet speak of. The Mensheviks accuse the Soviet government of imperialism, not because of the Menshevik line of Stalin-Bucharin in the question but because of the intervention in Chinese affairs and the aid rendered the Chinese revolution. Was this intervention a crime or a service of the Soviet government, comrade Louzon? It is really hard for me to speak here of a service, for the intervention was only the fulfillment of an elementary duty which arose as much out of the interests of the Russian revolution as the Chinese. Now I ask: Could the Soviet government, while it assisted the South with its left hand, hand over the Chinese Eastern Railway to the North with its right hand, to the North against which the war was directed?

Our answer will be: Since the Soviet government could not transfer its railway from the North to the South in order to facilitate for the revolution the attack against the militarists of the North, it had to retain the railway firmly in its hands in order thereby to prevent the imperialists and militarists from transforming it into a weapon against the Chinese revolution. That is how we understand revolutionary duty in the genuine struggle for the genuine right of national self-determination of China.

At the same time there was still another task. The policy towards the railway had to be so fashioned that the Chinese masses, at least its advanced sections, could clearly understand the liberating aims and tasks of the Soviet government with regard to China. I have already spoken of this when I cited the decisions, formulated by me and adopted in April 1926, of the Commission of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. The essence of those decisions was: We regard the Chinese Eastern Railway as a weapon of the world revolution. More directly: of the Russian and the Chinese revolutions. World imperialism can of course, directly or indirectly, openly or concealed, tear the railway from us. So as to avoid serious consequences, we might reach the point of having to surrender the railway to imperialism, as we were compelled to sign the Brest-Litovsk peace. But so long as we have the power and possibility, we will protect it from imperialism and hold it ready to be handed over to the victorious Chinese revolution. Towards this end, we

are already establishing schools for the Chinese railwaymen, striving to train them not only technically but also politically.

That is precisely what arouses the wrath of the Chinese reactionaries. Reuter's Telegraphic Agency carried the following declaration of Wang, the present Chinese Foreign Minister: "The only path for China is the unification of all nations to resistance against Red Imperialism, otherwise China will perish in the clutches of Communism". It is not, as we see, a question of imperialism as such. On the contrary, the Chinese government appeals to imperialism against "Red Imperialism", which it identifies with the peril of Communism. Can one wish for a clearer, more precise, more deliberate formulation?

Louzon sought to demonstrate that the sympathies of the imperialist states are on the side of the Soviet government and against China. In reality, he only showed that the attitude of the imperialists towards the Soviet republic is a conflicting one in certain questions. Where imperialism bases itself upon the inviolable right of property, it is compelled to concede this right to the Soviet state as well. Were this not the case, then even trade, for example, between the Soviet republic and the capitalist countries would be impossible. But should it come to war, then the occasion for the war, that is, the issue of the possession of the railway would fade into the background. The imperialists would consider the question only from the standpoint of the struggle against the danger that they call "Red Imperialism", that is against the international proletarian revolution.

In this connection, it is not superfluous to recall the conduct of the White emigrants in the Far East. Even the New York Times wrote: "Here (in Washington governmental circles) the possibility is conceded that the White Russians may have provoked the incidents (the clashes at the border) on the Chinese side, which would hardly have happened otherwise" (August 17). According to Louzon, it is a question of China's national right to self-determination. Chiang Kai-Shek embodies democratic progress, the Moscow government—imperialist dominion. The White emigrants are nevertheless, for some reason or other, on the side of the right to national self-determination of China and against Russian imperialism. Doesn't this fact alone show what a hopeless mess Louzon got himself into by supplanting class politics with geography and ethnography? The White bandits who kill Red Army men at the Chinese frontiers are much more at home, in their fashion, in politics than Louzon. They do not get tangled up in secondary matters, but reduce the question to its essence: the struggle of the world bourgeoisie against the revolution.

Pacifism instead of Bolshevism

By giving up the class standpoint in favor of the abstract, national standpoint, the Ultra-Leftists necessarily slide down the revolutionary to the purely pacifist position. Louzon tells how the Soviet troops captured the Siberian railway, and how then the "Red Army in conformity with the anti-imperialist policy of Lenin, carefully (seignement) called a halt before China's frontiers; no attempt was made to reoccupy the territory of the Chinese Eastern Railway." (*Revolution Proletarienne*, page 228). So then, the highest duty of the proletarian revolution consists in this: carefully to lower its standards before national frontiers. That is where the essence lay, according to Louzon, of Lenin's anti-imperialist policy! One is ashamed to read this philosophy of the "revolution in one country". The Red Army called a halt before the frontier of China because it was not strong enough to cross this frontier and face the inevitable attack of Japanese imperialism. Had the Red Army been strong enough for such an attack, it would have had the duty to undertake it. Its abandonment of the revolutionary attack upon the forces of imperialism would have been a surrender of the interests of the Chinese workers and peasants and the proletarian world revolution and would not have meant the fulfillment of Leninist policy, but only a shameful betrayal of the A B C of Marxism. Wherein lies the misfortune of Louzon and his like? In the fact that he substitutes national-pacifist for international-revolutionary policy. That has nothing in common with Lenin.

TO BE CONTINUED

Max Shachtman will speak on the Hoover Program at the open forum of the N. Y. Communist League branch on Saturday, December 21, 8 p. m. at the Militant Hall, 25 Third Avenue, Room 4. All workers cordially invited.

Throughout the World of Labor

The State of Mind of the Capitulators

I am sending you a specimen of Radek-ist panic, which is also a psychological explanation of his desertion. It seems to me that Radek is repeating his sorry experiment of 1923. At the decisive moment he is overcome by cowardice and hands the leadership over to the Centrists.

Here is a conversation between exiled comrades and Radek on his trip to Moscow in June 1929 on the platform of a railroad station (Smilga was sick and remained in the train):

Radek: "The situation is a very difficult one now, the country is passing through a 1917. The situation in the Central Committee is catastrophic. The Rights and Centrists are preparing arrests for each other. The Right-Centrist bloc has collapsed and an embittered struggle is being conducted against the Rights. They are strong. Their 16 votes can be doubled and trebled. There is no bread in Moscow. The dissatisfaction of the masses grows, which can degenerate into an uprising against the Soviet power. We are on the eve of peasant uprisings. This situation compels us to go back to the party at any cost. Our deliberation will proceed from the estimation of the general position of the party and the establishment of the split of the Opposition with the plea to be taken back into the C. P. S. U."

Question: "How is your attitude towards comrade Trotsky?"

Radek: "I have broken completely with Trotsky. From now on we are political enemies. He revises Lenin. Why did he bring up the permanent revolution again? And if we make no concessions to the peasants tomorrow will he frighten us again with the peasant and cry about Thermidor? We have nothing in common with the contributor of the (the name of a paper follows)."

Question: "Will you request the repeal of Article 58*?"

Radek: "Under no circumstances. For those who will go with us it will be repealed by itself. But he will not repeal this article for those who carry on a destructive work in the party and organize the uprising of the masses. We brought ourselves to exile and prison. The youth who have now come to the Opposition have nothing in common with Party and Bolshevism. It is simply an anti-Soviet youth. The struggle must be conducted against these with all means. A third of the Party members will now go with us and those who remain have nothing in common with Bolshevism."

Question: "How can such a rapid transformation from even your Tomsk theses be explained."

Radek: "A party conference took place which led the Party back on the Leninist path and on the other side a League of the Bolshevik-Leninists was organized. That's a second party—the party of the counter-revolution."

"Our platform stood the test splendidly. From a fighting document it became the platform of the party. What can you say against the theses of Kalinin? Against the five year plan? In connection with this the question of withdrawing our signatures from the platform is of secondary importance."

The agents of the G. P. U. did not let us talk further. They drove Karl (Radek) back into the train on the grounds that he is agitating against the expulsion of Trotsky from the country. Radek cried out of the train:

"I agitate against the expulsion of Trotsky! Yes, indeed! I agitate for the comrades to go back into the Party."

Karl turned to the agents of the G. P. U. with the words: "Let them alone. Let them reflect! Don't sharpen relations!" The agents of the G. P. U. listened in silence and dragged Karl further back into the train. The train started up....

(The comrades who sent us this letter make the following comment):

This letter is from a comrade well known to us, one of the outstanding young Bolsheviks. The letter gives a remarkably clear picture of the psychological motives for capitulation. The correspondent says that the reason for it is cowardice. This formulation may seem to be too simple. At bottom, however, it is right. It is self-un-

*The article in the Soviet criminal code dealing with counter-revolutionary activities, which Stalin and Bucharin disloyally applied to crush the Bolshevik Opposition through imprisonment, exile and banishment.

derstood that we speak here of political cowardice. The personal factor is not important. It is true that not infrequently the two fall happily together. We once characterized the strongest quality of Radek as extraordinary impulsiveness. That was a very mild, very careful and well-wishing characterization, which, so to speak, still kept a certain credit open for Radek. There was no need for us to hurry, for even though we knew Radek we were still undecided to predict at what stage the impulsiveness of Radek would be transformed into political perfidy. Now it can be said that the process has come to a complete end.

The situation that Radek depicts is a picture of complete hopelessness. But that is fortunately a false picture.

That is the picture of a frightened citizen. But if the situation were really as Radek paints it as a justification for his capitulation, then the capitulation would be doubly senseless. The Rights are overwhelming. No bread. All classes are dissatisfied. Radek is anxious to save the revolution. But unfortunately, the saviour is transported to the scene of his heroic deeds under the accompaniment of the G.P.U. and at the moment when he is overcome with the greatest rage at Trotsky's bloc with Chamberlain, he is yanked back into the train by the agents of the G. P. U. From the pen of Gleb Uspensky, there is a story of an old woman—a petty bourgeois—who asks the police to bring her son to her so that she may still embrace him before his death. Radek, who is led to the arms of Yaroslavsky under guard of the C. P. U. repeats the story of Uspensky in political form.

What is typical in the conversation of Radek is undoubtedly his declaration that our platform has stood the test splendidly. Therefore? Therefore, we must break with it. But Marxism has also stood the test throughout all modern history. Shall we not therefore also break with Marxism? Smilga, on the eve of his capitulation, even wrote a peculiar document, "On the Defense of the Platform of the Bolshevik-Leninists". Smilga defended the platform against Trotsky. But after an especially urgent request from Yaroslavsky, Smilga not only broke with Trotsky but also with the platform.

Shall we quote here our friend Sosnovsky, who, calling to mind a religious rite, recommends in such cases to whisper into the ear of the next to die, and say to him with the necessary emphasis: "Don't forget: you are already dead".

Φ

Hugenberg's Victory

at Kassel

The Kassel convention of the Deutsch nationalen Volkspartei (German National People's Party) came off extremely monotonously. Although for weeks previously—during and after the campaign on the "popular referendum"—deep-going differences of opinion on the expediency of this referendum and on the policy of Hugenberg in general had appeared in the Deutschnationalen ranks, these differences were looked upon as non-existent at the convention.

The socalled "opposition" was entirely unsuccessful in shaking the position of Hugenberg as leader of the Deutschnationalen party. This opposition proclaimed its ability and its will to fight the Deutschnationalen newspaper king much more by the fact that its most prominent representatives, Treviranus, Lindener-Wildau, Lambach, etc., either left Kassel before the opening of the convention or else did not even appear.

The convention of the party expressed itself, as the Hugenberg press triumphantly announces, "with unbroken unanimity" for the hitherto prevailing policy of the party leaders, which includes therefore the policy of alliance with Hitler. The fact that the biggest bourgeois parties, despite all the losses incurred precisely at the last elections through the alliance with the National Socialists (Hitler's Fascist Party), play with the armed struggle against the working class by open fascism, characterizes the growth of tendencies in the camp of the German bourgeoisie which consider it more expedient to execute the new offensive of capital against the German proletariat with open fascist terror. The party delegates, who responded without discussion to Hugenberg's report with the unanimous approval of his line of action, as well as the plenum of the convention, placed themselves on his political line. This fact is to be explained, naturally, not merely by Hugenberg's position of financial power

in the Deutschnationalen Volkspartei. When the Kolnische Zeitung counsels the party that it "would perhaps be still more clever were it to reject his (Hugenberg's) secret financial means and be on the lookout for a real leader", it only illuminates one side of the question.

Taken in essence, Hugenberg expressed in clear words, in his long speech at the convention, the readiness of the Deutschnationalen to participate in any government in which the social democrats are not represented, and thereby, in spite of the reservations on the Young Plan conditioned by the impending date of the plebiscite, cleared the road for the change to come after the adoption of the Plan. Hugenberg pointed out, among other things, that a collaboration of the bourgeois parties might be realized much "more easily" if the Young Plan were not adopted, that after its adoption, on the contrary, "almost" insurmountable difficulties opposed such a collaboration. Every German government will be confronted with the alternative of fulfilling the obligations it has assumed either at the expense of the living standards of the German workers or other professions or by the ruin of German industry. Only the conscious will to freedom (!) can open a way out for Germany. The domestic policy of the ruling Marxists (!) is no less ruinous than its foreign policy. Only when a conscious and clear attitude of struggle against Marxism is taken simultaneously in the Reich and in Prussia, will Germany again reach positive, constructive work.

In these sentences from Hugenberg's speech, the complete demagogic of his "struggle" against the Young Plan is plainly expressed. After the adoption of the slave pact, the opportunity for the collaboration of the bourgeois parties is, it is true, "almost" impossible, but still only "almost", for the "Marxists" participating in the government (and that can be only the social democracy) need only be removed and the road to "collaboration" of the Deutschnationalen is opened after the adoption of the Young Plan, even if it does "enslave three generations."

The speeches of the other Deutschnationalen convention representatives do not even deserve mention, so colorless were they in their tone—obviously delivered on Hugenberg's orders. At best, the remarks of the Deutschnationalen "labor representative," the Reichstag deputy Hartwig, deserve quotation, because they allow a comparison of the "equality of rights for the workers in the bourgeois state" with the efforts of the reformists that run in the same direction. Hartwig said, among other things:

"Not domination over other classes, but equality of rights for the working class in the state, economic and cultural systems is what you have to demand on the basis of the Christian code of morality."

This "equality of rights" is reflected in the eyes of Hartwig, in distinction from that aspired to by the reformists, only by its "Christian basis".

The "unanimity and firmness" of the Deutschnationalen convention existed, in reality, only in appearances. Hugenberg himself, if his remarks are considered basically, left all doors open; he can continue to drive towards Hitler in a strengthened degree, or else he can, as the remarks cited above indicate, take his place in the ranks of the "big bourgeois front." The further development of the discussions in the Deutschnationalen Volkspartei may be expected. Until the plebiscite the hands of the Deutschnationalen are tied. The big internal differences behind the scenes, which may be seen from the open insurrection against Hugenberg of a decisive part of the Deutschnationalen press, behind which stand the Land League and parts of Deutschnationalen finance capital (Deutsche Tageszeitung and Boersenzeitung), will sooner or later lead to the collapse of the Deutschnationalen. What forms the unity of this opposition with the Volkspartei and other grouping of the decisive section of German finance capital will assume for the purpose of insuring the execution of the Young Plan, cannot yet be predicted in detail.

But, on the basis of the convention speech of the "victor" Hugenberg, there is one question on which there can no longer be any doubt, even for the unenlightened: His "struggle" against the Young Plan, just like that of his partner, Hitler, has been openly exposed as a fraud.

—VOLKSWILLE

Berlin, November 27, 1929.

The Movement in South America

Broadly speaking, the social movement of the South American republics has been stationary, beating time, for the last five years. There are various reasons for it, such as the growing impoverishment of the working class with the consequent enrichment of the capitalist class; the gradual establishment of dictatorial, fascist governments in a majority of the South American states (excepting Argentina and Uruguay, all the rest of the S. A. republics now have either a frankly fascist government like Chile or a personal dictatorship like Peru, Bolivia, Venezuela, etc.); the failure of the Communist Parties—mainly due to the so-called "Bolshevization" forced upon them by the Stalin clique—to attract the masses; and the absence of any great upheavals in Europe. This last is not the least.

As secondary causes may be mentioned the "Americanization" of the big cities—more electric light, more advertising signs, more moving pictures with their constant suggestion of luxury, lust, crime and worship of wealth, more football, prize fights, races, etc. (a hundred men listening at a labor meeting, forty thousand at a football match) and the growth of a labor aristocracy; the slow but sure work of the Roman Catholic Church among the rich and the middle class. The influence of the Catholic Church as a religious institution among the masses of the people is nil, but as a social organization it has a certain amount of success—more so now that its union with fascism enables it to spend more money on entertainments, clothes, automobile rides, etc., for some of the poor. Its work is confined to a few big cities: it never touches the country, the farming population—perhaps because there is no money in it.

The position of the trade unions shows a decline of the anarcho-syndicalist element with a slight increase in the reformist unions. Some months ago, the official Stalinist party formed a new trade union federation—and made a mess of it. There was a terrific beating of drums, the country was flooded with wall propaganda (such as "800,000 revolutionary workers join the Red International of Labor Unions"), a trade union congress was held in Montevideo, where they were glad to welcome one Rafael Greco who previously was deported from Russia as an agent of the capitalists. One hundred thousand Argentine pesos were spent and the result was a fake federation with a real membership in all of South America of—848 members, resentment and antagonism of the union members of other colors, and unpopularity for the Communists in general as the dividers of the trade unions. As for the unofficial Communist Party (Penelon group) it is between the devil and the deep sea. It fights the official party tooth and nail but is mortally afraid of offending the E. C. C. I. As for the international situation, the Russian Communist Opposition, Stalin, Bucharin, etc., etc.—Mum! "There ain't no such animal".

The revolutionary instinct of the masses here can't get over the deportation of Trotsky. We've seen something like it in South America. The fascist Ibanez deported some Communists to Peru, Peru deported to Ecuador, Ecuador sent them back to Chile and the Ibanez sent them to the isle of Mas Afuera—the island of Robinson Crusoe—and we have heard no more about them.

—R. GUINNEY.

Buenos Aires,
November, 1929.

The BULLETIN of the Russian Opposition

The latest number just received contains articles by L. D. Trotsky, Christain Rakovsky, V. Kossior, M. Okudjava, N. Muralov, F. Dingelstaedt, and others.

INVALUABLE FOR A KNOWLEDGE OF THE RUSSIAN SITUATION
25c each 18c in bundles

Order From
THE MILITANT
25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Lovestone and the Russian Revolution

The attitude of the Lovestone group, as well as the Right wing in the International Communist movement, towards the present position of the Russian revolution is one of the most accurate tests of the distance they have put between themselves and Communism in a brief period of time.

Why is the Russian revolution still the best touchstone for the revolutionary movement? Its place in the history of the epoch makes it that.

The Bolshevik revolution in 1917 came at the end of three years of war and social democratic betrayal. It cut the first big breach in the hitherto solid walls of world imperialism. In one country, at least, the revolutionary movement had become the revolutionary state against which the rest of the world tore with venomous hatred. So far as the class conscious workers were concerned, its existence was a command to choose: either the side of the Soviet republic and world revolution, or the side of the national bourgeoisie and world imperialism. The years that followed the Bolshevik revolution sifted the ranks of the proletariat and its representatives into black and red. The intermediate color of Centrism was wiped out in the course of struggle. There remained as the two main streams in the working class: Communism, the fighters for Russia as the first fortress of the world revolution, and social democracy, the agency utilized by imperialism in the ranks of labor against the world revolution. These two main currents still exist and struggle.

The Revolution and the International

The command to choose between red and black was made additionally imperative by the foundation of the Third International. It may be said that it came out of the ruins of the Second International or the carnage of imperialist war. But without the Bolshevik revolution, which inaugurated a new era in world history, the formation of the Communist International would have been highly improbable, if not actually inconceivable. The proof of this can be found, inversely, if one will imagine the overthrow of the Soviet Union. The Communist International—at least in its present form—would be smashed, even as the First International after the fall of the Paris Commune. In brief, the broadest and most substantial foundation of the Communist International, which brought new life, hope and spirit of struggle into the ranks of labor, has been and remains the Soviet Union. Their fates are inextricably combined.

The main argument in 1919-21 of the social democratic leaders, particularly of the semi-Left type, against affiliation to the Comintern was based on the ingenious theory of the "separability" of the International and the Soviet republic. From Hillquit to Bauer they argued in this manner:

"We are and will be supporters of the Russian revolution. It is an event of tremendous historical import. But Marx said How they could quote Marx!) that the struggle of the proletariat is a national struggle, that is, it must deal with its national bourgeoisie first. The Bolsheviks are excellent fellows and the Mensheviks have undoubtedly made many blunders. But that is a Russian question. How can we in New York or Chicago—thousands of miles away—presume to take a final, decisive position on issues that have been moot problems for more than a decade in the Russian movement itself and about which we have so little information? Why should we become the tail to the kite of one of the factions in the Russian social democracy? Let the Russian comrades solve their own problems. We will solve ours. We will affiliate neither to the Third nor to the Second. In fact, to avoid being tied either to the Bolshevik or Menshevik faction, we may (and they did) form an intermediate International which will support (?) the Russian revolution and even endorse the Soviet form of government and the dictatorship of the proletariat."

"A Tail to a Russian Kite"

The refusal to "become tail to the kite of one of the factions in the Russian social democracy"—whatever the "good" reasons given—was in actuality, as later events demonstrated, a refusal to take the side of the Russian working class and its leaders, the Bolshevik Party, in order, in the end, to fall into the arms of the Mensheviks, who represented another class and another order of society.

The Russian revolution and the issues it raised so sharply in the movement were the knives that cut between the Hillquits, Bauers, MacDonalds, Longuetts, Weises, and later the Frossards, Levis and Newbolds—on the one hand, and the Communists on the other. That knife has become a huge steel wall dividing them permanently.

Today, the test in which Hillquit and

Co. failed in 1917 and 1919, is applied, under changed circumstances, in the Communist movement itself. This time it is the International Right wing that is failing it is Lovestone who is traversing the well-worn path of his social democratic predecessors.

That Lovestone protests a thousand times his praise for the Soviet Union and its socialist progress, that he announces a thousand times his opposition to imperialist intervention, does not mean very much in the case. Oswald Garrison Villard, the prince of liberals, says the same thing. He is also pleasantly astonished at the socialist progress of the Soviet Union; he also opposes intervention. That is not the essential test of the revolutionary.

The test appears in Lovestone's statement on the capitulation of Bucharin which is entirely in accord with the position of the Bandler and other Right wing groups in Europe: "Our struggle has never been nor can it be an appendix to any individual or group in the C. P. S. U., victorious or defeated. Indeed, the Russian questions never became issues in our struggle. Never at any time was any attempt made to provide trustworthy official information on the Russian question nor were the Parties ever requested to take a stand on these questions on the basis of actual information."

Lovestone Wants "Information"

It may be said, in passing, that this "lack of actual information" never worried Lovestone for the five years during which he was in the front ranks of those who heaped the mud of vileness and slander on the heads of Trotsky and the Russian Opposition. In the struggle against them, Lovestone was quite willing to be an appendix first to Zinoviev, then to Stalin and finally to Bucharin. The "Russian questions" were exceedingly important "issues" in Lovestone's struggle then! So important, in fact, that at the last Party convention he was able to turn from supporting Bucharin to introducing a motion to denounce him; then go to Moscow and acclaim him; then to turn back to the United States and, today, renounce him! But more on this some other time.

What is the significance of Lovestone's (and Bandler's) refusal to "be an appendix" to any group in the Russian Communist Party? It is a renunciation not only of the right, but of the fundamental duty of every Communist in every period. Why? Simply because the class struggle raging in the Soviet Union today is reflected and expressed through the con-

tending groups in the Bolshevik party, not quite as plainly as between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in 1917 but just as surely. The political monopoly of the Communist Party inevitably transfers the struggles of the classes in Russia (proletariat, peasantry, Nepmen, Kulak, etc.) into the Party itself. The groups that have been formed represent various class interests: The Leninist Opposition (Trotsky), the most conscious sections of the proletariat; the Right (Bucharin-Rykov), the interests of the Kulak and Thermidor elements (capitalist restoration); and the Centre (Stalin) which flounders in between. When the Right wing washes its hands of this struggle by refusing to participate actively against the forces represented by the Bucharin faction, it is washing its hands of the fate of the Russian revolution. And that irrespective of all its good wishes.

But one does not wash one's hands of a Russian revolution so easily! It exists, it fights, it commands a choice. Lovestone, who formally repudiates "all" Russian factions, does so in order to be able more easily to build a national "Communist" movement like Stalin and Bucharin build socialism—in one country alone. But Lovestone's repudiation is one of convenience and formality only. Every line he writes on the Russian situation breathes the viewpoint of the Bucharin group "about which we have so little information."

The Choice Must Be Made

The international revolutionary movement has again been called upon by the Russian revolution to make its choice. To attempt to have a correct policy nationally without a correct international basis is the very essence of social-democracy and the antithesis of Communist internationalism. Wash your hands of the "Russian issues" upon which the fate of the revolution depends, and you wash your hands of the International Communist movement which would be smashed simultaneously with the collapse of victorious Bolshevism in Russia. That is Lovestone's path. We go the other way. The Stalinists have a foot walking in each direction.

Let the philistines and "national Bolsheviks" make the proud announcements of their liberation from the control of a "Russian faction", as Hillquit did not so many years ago. As for us, we are an inseparable part of an international faction, led by the Russian Opposition. In our support to this Opposition we express our struggle for the heritage of Bolshevism and the October Revolution.—M. S.

Friendly Advice to

We refer, of course, to this man Browder, who has become theoretician, practitioner and general master of ceremonies in the great ideological war against "Trotskyism" in the United States. And our friendly advice to him is to quite writing on a subject that requires stronger heads, and turn to fields that are less dangerous, require less falsification and less understanding. We hasten to assure Browder, lest he succumb to a baseless vanity at his own prowess which would be ignoble in such a leader, that his "heavy assaults" cause us no sleepless nights. Our advice is motivated only by an anxiety to preserve him and his reputation for the future.

If Browder will only reflect for a moment he will see that our advice is sound and free from all questionable motives. There have been Trotsky-killers galore in the past, veritable armies of them, and one by one they have disappeared from the scene or gone to that side of the barricades where they accused Trotsky of being. It is quite clear that a gruesome fate accompanies the path of all these anti-Trotsky heroes.

Remember Mr. Bessedovsky

Take Bessedovsky. He expelled Trotsky and Rakovsky from the Party. He took over some of the work Rakovsky had been doing as Soviet Ambassador to France. He denounced Trotsky as a counter-revolutionary and an ally of the "Wrangel officer." Then one dark night he slipped out of the window of the Soviet embassy into the hands of the Miliukovs and Kerenskys.

Take Paul Marion, another great warrior against Trotskyism. He was head of the agitation and propaganda department of the French Communist Party. All the theses and denunciations against the Opposition emanated from his office. Even as Browder does today, he used to "prove" the "united front of the renegades". Then one bright day, he slipped out of Russia and joined the reformist enemies of the revolution as an "exposer" of Bolshevism and its "brutality and utopianism." *ff*

Or Tang Pin-San. He was the leader of the Chinese Communist Party and the

same Browder who, on orders from Stalin, labored Bucharin most mercilessly, denounced him as a Right wing seeking a united front with the Trotskyists, must now maintain a discreet and humiliating silence on the subject. A bare 48 hours after he proclaimed the united front of Bucharin and Trotsky, Bucharin actually united with Stalin. The big struggle by Stalin and his chief lieutenant Browder against the Russian Right wing is now over. Bucharin is no longer a renegade.

How does Browder know that he will not get an order tomorrow to quit scolding Lovestone and Co.? To take them back into the party? Anything is possible under the swift tempo of the third period. All Stalin has to do is to make the decision, send the cable, and Browder will have to turn out an article justifying the new right-about-face. That will not be a very enjoyable task, even for so willing an artisan as Browder. The way for Browder to avoid the consequent humiliation is not to write his nonsense now in order to be able to write his nonsense later with less qualms of conscience.

Our advice is given without malice or enmity. It is, as we said, intended only to preserve Browder for the future. As to what earthly use a Browder can be in the future, there is a point, we'll admit. But it needn't be made an issue of now; that bridge can be crossed when we get to it.

Hail the Weekly Militant!

The first appearance of the Weekly Militant, after months of sacrifice, the canvass of hundreds of Left-wing and revolutionary workers, of scraping together and collecting our pennies, signally marks to us the triumph of a fearless, honest Leninist determination in face of the reactionary forces at present in American labor movement.

To us, the Weekly Militant is the living concrete, incontestable vindication of our unshaking confidence that here in the United States, the citadel of world imperialism, there can be founded and built a movement based on the revolutionary experience of history as taught by Marx and Lenin and at the same time sending its roots deep into the soil of the American class struggle.

After our expulsions from the Communist Party it seemed at first that the Stalin course would be completely victorious. The entire prestige and moral authority of the Comintern was wielded in a concentrated attack upon us. But in time, our analysis that Centrism has no consistent principle or policy, but staggers between Communism and reformism, became strikingly clear. Each new zig-zag brings forth more damage and shame to the cause of Communism. The most recent "new line" of the Party is towards the "Left". After the expulsion of the Left Communists, however, this maneuver does not deceive us. It is merely the preparation for a drift of the ruling faction back to the Right—and that in the near future.

By throwing overboard the precious teachings of Lenin and the Comintern on the united front, democratic centralism, the role of the party, etc., the present leadership flounders without landmarks, without a clear course, from one extreme policy to another, sinking still further into the bog of factionalism generated by this lack of principle. This is demonstrated in a multiplying host of abuses perpetrated by the party, from Cleveland and the needle trades scandals to the miners' union and the cooperatives on the Range. The present course, completely eliminated the party as a constructive factor, and, if persisted in, will call for merciless exposure and revolutionary struggle from the Bolshevik-Leninists.

The Daily Worker, once a promising spokesman of American Communism, has now degenerated into a faction paper of the Stalin clique. On the other hand, the straightforward, critical, revolutionary tone and content of the Militant appeals to our shopmates and is winning ever wider support. We must resolutely assume the tremendous task in spite of all difficulties, of winning over to the side of Communism the many millions of the American working class.

In the words of Trotsky: "We stand at the helm of Bolshevism. You will not tear us from the working class.... We will not surrender the October revolution to the politics of Stalin.... The proletariat thinks slowly, but it thinks strong. Our Platform will hasten this process."

And our Weekly Militant will hasten this process. It is a great step towards the victory of the revolutionary unity of our party and of the Communist International.

Minneapolis branch of the Communist League of America

Subscribe - \$2.00

The Russian Opposition Replies to the Capitulators

By Christian Rakovsky

The departure of the capitulators from the Opposition served as an impetus to the formation of a crisis, which was ripening within the Opposition (mass arrests, provocations everywhere, solitary confinement, the hard material conditions of the exiles as a result of the reduction of the allowance by half, the banishment of L. Trotsky, etc., and on the other hand a certain division in the Opposition caused by the "Left course" of the Centrist Leadership.) Without the severe persecutions, the Left course would have pushed new sympathizers into the ranks of the Opposition because it would signify the intellectual bankruptcy of Centrism. But it is just as true to say that without the new course the persecutions would not have had the same effect, which they have now achieved. The "Left course" played the part of fig-leaf for a Centrist decay and opportunism.

Between Two Fires

It is superfluous to characterize the methods of persecution. We'll note only that it manifested itself not in open violence alone but also in depriving the Opposition of the elementary rights of correspondence, and in the "technical aid" of its own particular kind which the G.P.U. extended to the capitulators, reaching the point where the apparatus itself, at least in certain localities, distributed the documents of the capitulators. Some of the capitulators, staying with the Opposition, acted according to the instructions of the apparatus (Istchenko) or according to the preliminary agreement with it, negotiations between Preobrazhensky and Yaroslavsky, or Preobrazhensky and Ordjonikidze) that the "bombardment" of the Opposition will proceed from two shores: the Centrist and the Oppositionists'. The Opposition was caught between two fires. The famous "freedom of correspondence" actually amounted to a real freedom for the capitulators alone, and to an "abstract freedom" for the Leninist Opposition. It must be noticed also that even here a special differentiated postal policy was applied: the documents of the capitulators were not allowed to reach those comrades from whom a definite resistance could have been expected. Answers to the capitulators' documents were suppressed entirely.

The intellectual crisis had begun already a year ago last April. Preobrazhensky and Radek were the inciters of the "revaluation of values". The first with a certain consistency, the second, as usual, wriggling and making jumps from the very extreme Left position to the very extreme Right and back again. Radek, by the way, reproached Preobrazhensky for his negotiations with Yaroslavsky.

Preobrazhensky was writing and saying approximately the following: "The Centrists' leadership is beginning to fulfill one part of the Platform, its economic part; as far as the political part of the Platform goes—it will be realized by life itself. The Opposition has fulfilled its historical mission, it has exhausted its values. It ought to come back to the Party and rely on the natural course of events."

Thus the question of the interpretation of the Platform created two camps: the revolutionary Leninist camp fighting for the realization of its whole Platform, as formerly the Party fought for the whole program, and the opportunist capitulatory camp, which expressed its readiness to be satisfied with the "industrialization" and the collective farming policy, not giving a thought to the fact that without the realization of the political part of the Platform the whole socialist construction might fly up in the air.

Defects in the Opposition

The Opposition, which came out of the Party, is not free, in certain of its sections, from the defects and habits cultivated by the apparatus year after year. It is not free, first of all, from a certain dose of philistinism. The bureaucratic atavism is especially hard to kill in those Oppositionists who used to stand closest to the leadership of the Party or the Soviet apparatus. It is infected partly with the fetishism of the Party book in contrast to loyalty to the Party itself, to its ideals, its historical task—loyalty inherent only in those who still want to fight further for the reformation of the Party. Finally, it is not free from that most injurious psychology of the falsifiers of Leninism, which was cultivated by the same apparatus. That is why each capitulator, running away from the Opposition, will not miss a chance to kick Trotsky with his small hoof, shod with the nails of the Yaroslavsky-Radek factory. In different conditions this inheritance of the apparatus would be easily outgrown. In the present conditions of heavy repression it comes out on the body of the Opposition in

the form of an eruption of capitulators. The sifting out of those who did not think the Platform through to the end, who dream of quiet comfort, naively hiding it under the desire to take part in "grandiose fights" was inevitable. Moreover, this sifting out may have a salutary effect on the ranks of the Opposition. Those who stay in who do not regard the Platform as a sort of restaurant menu from which anyone can pick out a dish according to his own taste. The Platform was and remains the war-banner of Leninism, and only its complete realization can lead the Party and the proletarian land out of the blind alley into which they were herded by the Centrist leadership.

Those who understand that precisely the fight of the Opposition is that "grandiose fight" on the issue of which depends the future of socialist construction, the

circumstances, something altogether different. Which to believe? But even if we accept the first hypothesis, does it not follow from that, that we must sacrifice Leninism to Centrist opportunism? Of course not!

In the brief periods of his intellectual enlightenment, Radek understood this perfectly. Last year, after the July plenum of the Central Committee, he wrote to Rakovsky in Astrachan that Stalin had completely surrendered his position, that the Rights will seize power, that Thermidor is on the threshold, that what the Leninist Opposition has got to do is to preserve the "theoretical heritage of Leninism." A political person must take into consideration the possible variations of events in the future, but his tactics would become risky adventurism if he were to base them only upon confused suppositions. The following small example shows how impermissible it

Concurrently with the drawing up of their declaration, Rakovsky, Okudjava and Kossior drew up an extensive principle thesis in which they characterize the conditions in the country and in the Party, define the meaning and tasks of the declaration of July 22. These theses, in manuscript form, received a wide distribution among the exiles and in the country. After a considerable delay, the two copies of the concluding chapter of the thesis reached us. In view of its size we can only give extracts from it here.

Since some very "radical" critics saw in the declaration of Rakovsky almost a capitulation, we present here first of all that part of the theses in which Rakovsky characterizes the capitulators (Radek, Preobrazhensky, Smilga) and the tendency towards capitulation in general.

fate of the Soviet power, of the world revolution—those will not desert their posts.

As a leit-motif in the theses of the capitulators, the same thought was repeated again and again: We must return to the Party. One who does not know the story of our expulsion from the Party might think that we left it ourselves and voluntarily went into exile. To put the question that way means to transfer the responsibility for our being in exile and out of the Party from the Right-Centrist leadership to the Opposition.

We were in the Party and we wished to stay in it even when the Right-Centrist leadership denied the very necessity of drawing up any kind of a five-year plan, and calmly encouraged "the Kulaks growing into socialism". Still more do we wish to be in the Party now, when—even if only in one part of it—a Left turn is taking place, and when it has gigantic tasks before it to fulfill. But the question before us is of an entirely different order: Will we agree to go off the Leninist line to please Centrist Opportunism? The greatest enemy of the proletarian dictatorship—is a dishonest attitude towards one's convictions. If the Party leadership, imitating the Catholic church, which at his death-bed compels an atheist to be converted to Catholicism, extorts from the Oppositionists a recognition of imaginary mistakes and a denial of their own Leninist convictions, it loses, by this very fact, every right to be respected. The Oppositionist who changes his convictions over-night deserves only complete scorn. This practise develops a clamorous, light-minded sceptical attitude towards Leninism, the typical representative of which Radek has again become, generously scattering to the Right and to the Left his philistine aphorisms about "moderation". The types of Shchedrin* are eternal. They are reproduced by each epoch of social-political relations, with only their historical costumes changed.

Arguments of the Capitulators

One of the favorite methods of the capitulators is to sow panic by representing the present conditions in the country as "pre-Kronstadt conditions" (Preobrazhensky's expression). On his way to Moscow, at the Ishim station, Radek represented the struggle between the Rights and Centrists as similar to that which took place in the Convention on the eve of the 9th of Thermidor (French revolution). He said: "They are preparing arrests for each other." Radek pointed out also that the Rights might get hold of the majority in the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission, although out of approximately 300 members and candidates in the last Plenum, the Rights did not get more than a dozen votes. The same people who, in their declaration of July 13, assert that the Centrist leadership has completely prevented the back-sliding or the "rolling" (as they delicately express themselves so as to save the virginal modesty of the leadership) are now saying, in other cir-

*A famous Russian satirist of the late 1890's.

corruption of Leninism in which the majority is engaged. Instead of a Marxist discussion of the concrete changes that took place in the Soviet state during its existence (its economic, political and juridical institutions and in the relationships of classes in the country), the capitulators began a metaphysical argument about the "nature" and the "essence" of the proletarian dictatorship in general. They imitate the chaff-threshing metaphysicians, scholastics and sophists against whom every page and line of the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin rebel. This, from the standpoint of historical materialism, good-for-nothing argument has nevertheless pursued a definite practical goal. Unconsciously distorting the texts taken from the documents of their adversaries, replacing the terms "Centrism" and "Centrist leadership" with the terms "Soviet government" and "proletarian dictatorship", the capitulators intended to approach, step by step, to the point where they could call Centrism one hundred percent Leninism. To call such methods of polemics anything but theoretical forgery, is impossible.

What Radek & Co. Overlooked

In their document, the capitulators write: "We overlooked (!) the fact that the policy of the C. C. was and remains Leninist." How does it happen that it "was" Leninist, when it was one half enacted by the Rights, against whom the capitulators call for a struggle in the same document? But you cannot demand from people who have accepted the road of intellectual capitulation to be logical. Even before the actual presentation of their declaration, the trio were getting the comrades in exile ready for their "evolution". Already in a letter from Radek to Barnaoul, on May 21, the word "Centrism" disappears and in its place appears a "Stalinist nucleus," which proves to be more Left than the workers' sector of the party. In the document "Questions and Answers"—a commentary on the draft of the declaration with which Preobrazhensky had left for Moscow—the term "Centrism" is already put in quotation marks. But while wearing out the front steps of the C. C. Preobrazhensky lost the quotation marks as well as the term itself, together with his draft of the declaration. Some people assert that there never was but one copy of that draft made. Probably Preobrazhensky did not want to leave any material traces of the swift metamorphoses to which his sociological "nature" was doomed. Neither was anything left of the heroic pose which Smilga, on the trip from Minusinsk to Moscow, assumed against Centrism.

The basic issue between the capitulators and the Leninist Opposition was and remains Centrism. To those whose memory is short, it is necessary to recall how Centrism was defined by the Platform. Centrism, as its name testifies, represents a tendency "to sit on the fence": It does not consistently reflect either the interests of the proletariat or the interests of the bourgeoisie. Centrism is distinguished by its eclecticism. It introduced into Communism its own intellectual substitutes, like the building of socialism in one country, the development—without conflict—of socialist economy, making middle peasants out of the whole peasantry, and similar inventions. The Platform regarded as the basis of Centrism the "upravlenets"—the party and Soviet bureaucracy, breaking away more and more from the working class and aspiring to life jobs, or according to Preobrazhensky in "Questions and Answers"—"hereditary" ones.

The third peculiarity of the apparatus-Centrist group consists, according to the Platform, in its desire to substitute itself for the party in seizing more and more power in its hands, in a haughty and scornful attitude towards the masses—especially towards the unskilled workers and farm hands, in intolerance of discussions and persecution of the Left Opposition ("Fire to the Left!")

The Capitulators Turn to Slander

Powerless to fight the Leninist Opposition with the aid of the Platform, seeing that it is impossible to acquire any considerable number of sympathizers by metaphysical tight-rope walking around the "essence" of power, the capitulators turned to slander—a favorite method of every theoretically beaten movement. They accused Trotsky of playing with the "idea" of a revolt and the "idea of a bloc with the Rights". It is a double hypocrisy when such accusations come from people who know the complete and enduring loyalty of Trotsky not only to the Soviet government but also to his enemies in the party. On their part, accusations of this sort are

Continued on Page 2

LETTERS FROM THE MILITANTS

AN OPPONENT IN BERLIN

Berlin, Germany.

Dear Comrades:

The Party is facing a pretty serious situation. Based on Thaelmann's estimation of the revolutionary ripeness of conditions, the party press is developing ever more and more a "barrikadenphilosophie". At the other end, the social democracy, Seewering, Zoergiebel and Co., are more than meeting the fighting manifesto of the Rote Fahne half way. After the general appeal of the party against the prohibition of the Red Front Fighters, the R. F. wrote that "all that the masses need is arms" and the police would be beaten to bits. At the Red October demonstration in Lustgarten the police answered with fighting cordons of Schupo (police) ready to attack. The nervousness of the police and the increasing boldness of the R. F. lead many outsiders to believe that the party has something up its sleeve, especially since it openly and daringly quotes Lenin's letter of September 17.

But from all that is apparent, the organizational weakness of the party can be felt. The party lost the cable-layers' strike, it failed to organize a militant resistance to the reduction of unemployment insurance and has not at all reacted on the Young Plan. I can't put my finger on anything definite, but witnessing demonstrations and meetings gives me the impression that the German Communist Party is not prepared for the task it seems to have cut out for itself. I hope I have a wrong impression.

To add to this, there are the scandals in which party leaders or former leaders have had a hand. This doesn't increase—*to say the least*—the confidence of the masses in the party. Outside of that there is the struggle in the leadership itself. Neumann and Remmelt vs. Thaelmann. A temporary truce seems to have been established but the whole affair breathes ill omens.

Brandler is developing along the lines indicated by comrade Trotsky in his various letters. He has established pretty firm connections with the Czechoslovakian, the French (Alsace-Lorraine) and the Austrian Right, no doubt with Lovestone too. The strength of the Brandlerists here in Berlin is negligible. In the province there may be a different story. Thaelmann is making a great play for the shaky elements among the party members and the left social democrats with his "national program", which is an opportunist reform platform slightly favored with Leninist phrases. In contrast to the Stalinists, who call it the party of Lenin, the Brandlerists speak of the party of Liebknecht and Luxembourg. This seems significant to me. There lies a grain of their opportunist aims. Further, they bring forth the point that they mean to follow Lenin "in spirit", i.e., the "spirit" of Leninism, not its words (as they saw—the Stalinists do, with their long quotations).

M. N. Roy is their Comintern expert. He writes long and demagogical articles, as equivocal as can be, about the leadership in the C. I. and the C. P. S. U., about democratic centralization, organizational problems, etc. On the first point, he is willing to give the C. P. S. U. a "place of honor" in the C. I. and nothing more. He begins by saying that the C. P. S. U. is quite correct in its line in Russia, only to end up with the old Bucharinist arguments about the collapse of the financial system, etc.

On the second point, he speaks of each party "working out its own national problems and the collective elaboration of the international problems," which means leaving a minimum of points for a program of international action, or a revival of the pre-war Second International. Number three: he thinks that since the parties, according to Piatnitsky's last report, have not been able up to now to build their organizations on a factory nucleus system, they will never be able to do so and ought to give up the idea—which would make room for a broad opportunist policy in the trade unions.

Most generally, the writers in Gegen Strom (Brandlerist central organ) draw the analogy between the crisis in the First International before its disruption and the present crisis in the Comintern. They seem to predict that just as the First International broke up because of anarchism, the Third will break up because of the ultra-Leftism of the present line which, they say, is akin to anarchism. Then they go on to speak of decades of peaceful growth and the need of mass parties "for which the Second International was founded" and so on... The birth of the Fourth great danger of becoming a pure and sim-

International? By the dialectical fates it is thus willed! Already Hausen wants the slogan to be issued: We must become THE party and Thaelmann may shout ten times: "We are only a tendency (richtung) in Communism, but the little speculation about where the present line may end" breathes unmistakably with Hausen's words and spirit.

There is much to write about the Lenibund, but at present I'll confine myself to a few points.

From all appearance, the Lenibund itself and the International Left wing as well are passing through a severe critical period. In such a period it should be the duty of the various Left leaders to strive for clarification, for precision in theory and tactic. Unfortunately, we get no such picture from the doings in the Lenibund.

Aside from the internal weaknesses there is a lack of sharp demarcation from the Rights. In more than one case, articles in the Volkswille might easily have fitted into Gegen den Strom, especially those articles of a critical nature. But to get back to the internal troubles. The muddled theoretical articles of Urbahns in the Fahne des Kommunismus remind me a great deal of the party discussion in the U.S. before the last convention, where the in-

nious "apex" and "exceptionalism" theories were ingeniously balled up. The same sort of hash is served us by Urbahns in his theory of the hybrid state (Zwitterstaat). After the attacks of Trotsky and the Lenibund minority, he has twisted and bent it until it looks like a pretzel. Born to defend the unclear and equivocal position he had taken in the Sino-Russian question, the theory is now the basis of the entire line of the Lenibund majority led by him.

He took Trotsky's theory of the Kerensky up-side-down period as a base. Naturally, we would assume such a period to be one in which government (the representative in this reversed state of the proletariat, as them, the bourgeoisie) is defending "incompetently" the last positions of its class. But Urbahns does not seem to want to think naturally. He leaves Trotsky here and goes back to quote from Lenin against him. Without the slightest understanding and in the best eclectic manner, he draws in the self-evidence argument of Engels, which Lenin discussed in "State and Revolution", viz., that even after the revolution, the classes do not immediately cease to exist, that for a long time the economically stronger class remains the bourgeoisie, because of its international connections, etc.

Combining this with the Marxist theory (in a most blind manner) that the state is the organ of the economically stronger class, he produces his Q. E. D.: Stalin represents the bourgeoisie in truth, but only sways between the classes at present for some mysterious reasons. But if the state is the organ of the economically stronger class, and the bourgeoisie, long after the revolution, necessarily remains the stronger class, we can ask the question, Did not Lenin then also represent the bourgeoisie (in reality)? Which is what the ultra-Leftists actually claimed at the time of the Nep. . .

With revolutionary greetings,
S. GORDON

Φ
STALINIST PROGRESS IN K. C.
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Comrades:

A few weeks ago a news item was published in the Daily Worker, under the heading "Big Anniversary Meeting in K. C." Among other things in this account, there appeared the following: "One of the biggest and most successful mass meetings ever staged in Kansas City was held on the anniversary of the Russian Revolution." But sadly enough, further on we learn that over one hundred workers attended this tremendous mass meeting. Judging from the ability of the Daily Worker writers and editors to exaggerate, it is a safe guess that there were no more than 80 people present. Had there been over one hundred present the account would have been sure to claim over two hundred.

Allowing for the possible ignorance of the story writer, there is no excuse for the ridiculous claim on the part of the editors. Any worker in or around K. C. whose experience in the movement goes back more than a year or two can recall dozens of mass meetings attended by from 300 to 900 workers. Between 1918 and 1925 there were scores of such meetings. Seldom were there less than 250 present during this period and on several occasions the Labor Temple which seats about 1800 was packed.

Kansas City has a tradition in the movement which is second to none and any worker who took part in these meetings during the above mentioned years will never forget the merciless persecution of our movement by the forces of reaction. There were meetings broken up, arrests, jailings, clubbings and frenzied press articles galore. The K. C. police, the Chamber of Commerce, the American Legion, the K. K. K., and the press were as one against us. No fiercer or blacker persecution of our movement ever took place anywhere in America. Truly there was a united front of all reactionaries.

Yet, through it all the militant workers of K. C. steadfastly refused to be intimidated. They stood their ground and fought for their rights. And it is well to remark here that these meetings were mostly conducted under the leadership of those who now stand with the Communist League (Opposition).

Under the leadership of the Lovestoneite Holy Rollers, the Party in K. C. not only made no progress but rapidly disintegrated. Evidently, under the leadership of Bill Foster and his latter-day saints, who were selected by Stalin to wear Lovestone's spurs and high boots and who are now clumsily aping Lovestone's methods, the Party there is faring no better when they are compelled in the 9th period to boast of a meeting of a mere handful. The workers of K. C. have voted against Stalinism with their feet. The job of bringing the many hundreds of progressive and radical workers, who have become disgusted with Stalinism, back into contact with the movement remains for the Communist League.

—JOHN MIHELIC.

Φ
WORKING IN GRAND RAPIDS
Grand Rapids, Mich.

Dear Comrades:

It was away from Grand Rapids for a few months. Now I have returned and found many copies of the Militant and your letter awaiting me. I am glad to read the Militant and distribute it among the Party members.

We are trying to work among some Russian comrades. I have found out that a Russian group was expelled from the Party a few years ago. If you will send me some copies of the Russian Bulletin of the Opposition, I am sure it will help us among the Russian workers. They will be able to understand things better in that way than through my explanations.

Fraternally yours,

FRED. WEDLER

The Fight of the Chicago Cleaning Shop Workers

In the lockout of 2,500 Chicago union cleaners and dyers, lasting for a period of two weeks, during the month of November, the workers clearly recognized the issue as being the one of the continued life and existence of the union. It therefore becomes a rather sad commentary upon the situation to find these workers back at their jobs on open shop conditions pending further negotiations. That this could be accepted with nonchalant ease by the officials is, of course, not to be wondered at.

However, one should not forget that after all, even under open shop conditions the union has what the bosses almost look upon as the whip in the ownership of a large cleaning and dying plants, the buildings of which are just being completed. Ostensibly this plant and the union president were the issues in the conflict, made to appear so by the bosses as a better public front; but the real issue becomes clear when one understands the struggle as it began in 1927.

The Bosses' Anti-Union Drive

At that time the bosses started a campaign to crush the union. The union countered with a threat to establish its own co-operative plant and began active preparations to sell stock to its own members and to those of other Chicago unions. The bosses changed front and signed an agreement granting the workers the 44-hour week with a guaranteed seven months' employment per year, also agreeing to give one week's notice before discharging any worker and to paying an amount equal to 2 per cent of the weekly wages into the workers' unemployment fund.

This agreement was lived up to until six months ago when the bosses again began their campaign to crush the union. Their first act was the employment of an expert union smasher, coming from the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, a certain Clayton Patterson, with a past record in the 1919 steel strike and in the breaking of the telephone operators' strike of St. Louis, Mo. He became the secretary of the Master Cleaners' Association and added some specific features to the new line of policy. New workers were broken into the trade, the bosses going to the extent of paying their union initiation fee of \$25.00, hoping thereby to have one set of workers to rely upon against the older union members. The union countered with raising the initiation fee to \$200.00, a line of action in perfect harmony with the conceptions of narrow craft, job trust unions. A better way would have been to make real union men out of all and then tell the bosses what they could not do.

The bosses stopped any further payments to the unemployment fund and went ahead with preparations of their side of the fight. The union started to build a million dollar plant to be known as the "Super-Method Cleaners and Dyers, Inc.", funds having been realized from stock sales to union members. While workers' co-operative enterprises naturally have great value, it is certainly no solution in a case like this where the life of the union is at stake. Additionally it carries the

ple corporation in which the officials wield all the power and finally have it become to all intents and purposes their private property.

Bosses Declare a Lockout

The lockout was declared, the bosses concentrating their publicity campaign against the new plant and against the union president, Ben Abrams. The bosses demanded his removal; even went to the extent of a cheap police frame-up stunt, the result of which was rather to increase any prestige he might enjoy. To the workers, however, who remembered conditions prior to the advent of the union with a ten to fourteen hour day at \$25.00 per week, the issues of this fight lay much deeper. They know it was a matter of the very life and existence of the union and they stood solid together, Negro and white. About two-thirds of the membership is Negro. It was somewhat strange to have the demand for removal of the officials coming from the bosses, particularly when coming with a lockout notice, "promising" a later return to work without a union.

Ben Abrams is a type of the A. F. of L. official who a little more than ten years ago posed as the Left of the Socialist Party and since went through an evolution to a complete reactionary position; one of the type who will sell the interests of the workers for a consideration, making necessary that the membership watches very closely the negotiations now going on with the bosses. Yet to join in the chorus of the capitalist press to call this whole fight just another racketeering battle as the Daily Worker did, is incorrect. A struggle involving the existence of a union of 2,500 members and their union working conditions is not a matter of racketeering regardless of the performances of the bosses' agents.

In the negotiations taking place after one week's duration of the lockout the bosses showed clearly that their effort was to change the conditions of wages and working hours. With several break-offs, these negotiations are still being continued. The workers are back at their jobs, some of the most militant ones having been discriminated against under the excuse of the slack season. At present the workers have no agreement and practically the only union recognition represented is the fact that there are negotiations on.

Yet the bosses know perfectly well that the union members, during the period of the two weeks' lockout, displayed their solidarity and they did not dare carry their threat through to the end of opening up the plants with scab labor. This makes them hesitant. Nevertheless the struggle is of such a sharp character that only the greatest alertness of the rank and file members can serve as their security. The negotiations must be watched very closely. Only the conscious militant elements combining themselves and fighting as an organized Left wing can guarantee that rank and file interests will really be protected.

A rank and file Cleaner and Dyer.