

THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. III. No. 34

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 1, 1930

PRICE 5 CENTS

For the Thirty-Hour Week!

No Wage Reduction-For Social Insurance-Against the Petition Delusion-For Credits to Russia

The optimistic pledges of "recovery and stability"—the principal stock in trade of the capitalist politicians—have proved to be empty words calculated to soothe the discontentment of the workers. The crisis, instead of showing signs of let-down, is becoming deeper. It is drawing into its train ever new thousands of workers, and marches hand in hand with the winter months to spread misery, hunger and cold to every part of the land.

The Program of the Bosses

The capitalist class, and its agent Hoover, while doling out their measly charity to a few in order to allay working class resentment, retain their fundamental idea on how to solve the crisis. Their program is: "Deflate labor!" Wage-slashing, the lengthening of hours, the speeding up of labor, the "stagger plan" which means reducing the standard of living of the American workers at least half,—these are the methods by which the ruling class is issuing out of its crisis at the expense solely of the workers.

It is well aware of what we have pointed out time and again. It knows that there will be no immediate recovery. Recovery is possible only by a new assault on the world market, with its attendant conflicts with other imperialist nations. A successful drive on the world market is possible, according to its program, only by cutting deeply into the standard of living attained by the working class in recent years. The Whaley-Eaton Service, a confidential bureau of American industrialists, reports in November, for instance, that "Some of the shrewdest men in Washington, therefore, while declining to say so publicly, believe

... the law of supply and demand will work in the case of labor, and wages will come down . . . It will be the spring of 1932 before conditions begin to be really satisfactory." (Our emphasis.)

No "satisfactory conditions" for eighteen months! In the meantime "wages will come down", and the unemployment army is presumably to remain unfed, unhoused and unclothed. The capitalist class, whose system produced the crisis, seeks to put the burden of it upon the working class exclusively. The job of the workers is to make the capitalist class, bloated by the billions extorted from labor, take the burden.

The frightful position of the unemployed workers must be relieved. But it is not by supplicating pleas to the bosses that relief will be attained. The latter will limit themselves to dribbling hand-outs until they are forced by the pressure of the masses to take some serious steps. The workers everywhere—working and workless—must adopt a program of action. The Communist and Left wing workers, the Unemployment Councils, must take the initiative to set a genuine mass movement into motion.

The central point in such a program must be the SIX-HOUR DAY AND THE FIVE-DAY WEEK WITH NO REDUCTION IN PAY! If the eight-hour day was a slogan of the militants fifty years ago, the thirty-hour week is an even more timely one today, in consideration of the technical advance of industry alone. American industry, given a well-ordered and just economic system, can produce more than enough to satisfy the needs of the masses

if the workers toiled less than twenty hours a week. The bureaucracy in the labor movement sometimes talks about the thirty-hour week. It is up to the militants to put the ranks of the working class into action for this demand.

Credits to the Soviet Union

The need for social insurance—not by "joint contributions" of workers and employers but by employers alone—is a burning one for labor. Social insurance will not come as a result of "promises" by capitalist politicians. It will be produced as a result of unremitting struggle by the workers, by their pressure on the capitalist class, by demonstrating their strength in a solid united front. The A. F. of L. agents of capitalism are opposed to social insurance. They must be run out of the labor movement. Their "progressive" face-savers, the Muste group is for social insurance by the "peaceful" route. They have conceived the "audacious" plan of a national petition, begging Mr. Hoover and his associated labor-haters to "do something more than talk about the question." To turn the movement for unemployment relief, which has already taken the form of mass demonstrations throughout the country, away from militant struggle and into the quiet, respectable and futile channel of "petitioning" is to strangle the movement.

That is why we also vigorously oppose the "petition campaign" of the official Communist Party. The Party is creating the most destructive reformist illusions in the working class by its liberalistic campaign. It announces that its parliamentary "bill" will be backed up—not by the mass power and struggles of the workers, but that "the Bill will be backed up by a million or more signatures of unemployed and employed workers." (Daily Worker, November 19, 1930.) What has happened to the Stalinist fulminations of the "third period", the "struggle for possession of the streets," "revolutionary mass upsurge"? They have all been submerged under the stagnant waters of a "petition campaign."

The demand for social insurance will be realized only by working class struggle, relentless and militant, and not by Musteite or Stalinist petitioning. The Left wing workers must reject the curbing of the

mass movement by petition campaigns and expose their futility and illusoriness at every opportunity.

The third point in the program of action must be the demand for workers' delegations to the Soviet Union to study the Five Year Plan, and for the immediate extension of large, long-term credits to the Soviet Union which will not only aid it in its work to industrialize the country, but will be of immediate value to many of the unemployed workers who will obtain jobs by the re-opening of industries from which the Soviets purchase its machinery with the credits obtained. This demand must be raised in every trade union, in every workers' organization, and pushed through over the resistance of the bureaucrats, on the one hand, and the sectarian prejudices of the Stalinists, who oppose this demand, on the other.

General Unemployment marches now by the side of General Winter. They are ravaging the standards of the working class. Only the united front of the workers, irrespective of political or economic opinions, can put up a militant resistance to their advance. Only the unity of labor, expressed in stubborn struggle and mass action, can bring immediate relief to the suffering millions out of a job. Only their revolutionary action, leading to the overthrow of the bosses' power and the establishment of the workers' power, will bring permanent relief from unemployment, from war, from exploitation, in a word, from capitalism itself.

Mother Jones Dies

The death of Mother Jones at an age past a hundred removes one of the most picturesque figures in the labor movement of the United States for more than half a century, one whose name was associated with some of the most militant traditions of the American working class. Associated primarily with the miners' union, she led one militant movement after another until her name became anathema to the coal barons. It saddened those who had admired and loved her for her spirited and unrelenting loyalty to the militant movement to find her, towards the end, forsaking what she had stood for in the past. At the end, she became reconciled to her once mortal foe, Rockefeller, and contributed some of her last money to the professional labor skates of the Illinois "reorganized" miners' union. It is fortunate that her last actions cannot eliminate the splendid record of devotion she wrote for herself in the annals of American labor history.

TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF AMERICA (Opposition) AND SYMPATHIZERS

All members and sympathizers outside of New York, Chicago, Minneapolis and Kansas City, are urgently requested to send in their names and addresses to the national office immediately. We have a special message for you. Just put your name and address on a piece of paper and state whether you are a member or sympathizer, address your envelope to The Militant, 25 Third Ave., N. Y. C.

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

EVERY SATURDAY NIGHT at the Labor Temple

14th Street and Second Avenue
All Invited : : : : Admission 25c
Auspices: New York branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

Will Release Comrade Malkin December 20

We have just received the welcome news that on December 20, the gates of Comstock, N. Y., Prison will be opened to release comrade Maurice L. Malkin. Comrade Malkin, together with his fellow-prisoner Franklin who was released a number of weeks ago, was one of the victims of the Mineola frame-up a few years ago in connection with the New York fur workers' strike. One of the most active militants in the Left wing and its union, and a foundation member of the Communist Party, he was railroaded to the penitentiary by the prosecution, and began to serve his term almost two years ago.

Comrade Malkin was the first rank and file member of the Party to rally to the banner of the Opposition when the members of the Central Committee that came forward to support it were expelled from the Party. While his imprisonment was still pending, the Party bureaucrats expelled him the moment he demanded the reinstatement of the Opposition. This did not prevent Malkin from becoming one of the most active militants in our movement and remaining an Oppositionist while incarcerated at Comstock. At one time, the Party bureaucrats attempted to extort a capitulatory statement from him through the shameful process of pressure upon his family, but in the long run their efforts proved unsuccessful, and comrade Malkin again issued a declaration affirming his convictions in favor of the views of the International Left Opposition.

The news of his release has been received with enthusiasm by the New York comrades, and preparations are being made to meet him as befits a revolutionary fighter. As he comes to Grand Central Station on December 20, he will be met by a large group of his comrades and fellow-fighters in the needle trades workers' Left wing, who remember him on dozens of picket lines and everywhere else that the struggle

was hottest. In addition, a New Year's entertainment is being arranged in his honor where the New York militants as a whole will have the opportunity of hearing him speak and renewing their acquaintance with a loyal fighter.

We are happy to welcome comrade Malkin back into the ranks of the active fighters for the working class and the Communist Opposition!

Christmas Time

CAN BE TURNED TO

Working Class Advantage

The bourgeoisie have psychologized the workers throughout the world into "giving" at Christmas time so as to further pile up their own profits. We cannot change this condition for years to come, but we can take advantage of the "give" spirit for working class interests. At this time of the year, when everybody loosens up, we can best collect for our cause.

The Militant is the only English paper that prints Trotsky's Marxian analyses of world events and the truth about the present situation in the Soviet Union. It also carries timely political and economic articles of special interest to the American workers.

SUSTAIN THE MILITANT

Buy a Christmas Coupon : 10c : Sell a Christmas Coupon

The Railroad Brotherhoods Meet

By ARNE SWABECK

Recently two events, little known and little noticed, have rendered splendid proof of increasing unemployment pressure by the rank and file, at least within certain sections of the trade union movement, to the point where some officials have felt compelled to endeavor to get into some sort of motion so as to stave off what they consider "something worse." They have, of course, been entirely overshadowed by the din of the noisy charity campaigns to which capitalism has resorted in every city. But they grew from the same cause, the unemployment crisis, and likewise materialized because of the fear of real working class action.

The Railroad Conference

The first event was the national conference of some seven hundred general chairmen and executive officers of the five railroad transportation brotherhoods, the Engineers, Firemen, Conductors, Trainmen and Switchmen, convening in Chicago on Nov. 12 at the fashionable Palmer House, in the gorgeous main ball room, for a two weeks' session to consider the six-hour day. The second event was the meeting of the Chicago Federation of Labor, Nov. 16th, adopting a resolution for the shorter workday for all federal employees.

The Palmer House gathering had a good proportion of paid officials, though some were specially elected delegates, more than fifty per cent being actual workers. It came about entirely as a result of the growing pressure from below, from among the railroad workers for relief in the present heavy unemployment situation. At the inception, the conference selected a committee of 25, representing equally all the five trades present, to work out a program of action. This committee submitted a majority and a minority report. The majority report, which is most significant, recommended a campaign for the six-hour day, without any reduction in the day's pay, to be obtained by all organizational measures possible, tho not the strike weapon. It had the backing of the Firemen, Trainmen and Switchmen. But during the days of sharp debate the representatives of the Engineers and Conductors absolutely refused to go along with this program and instead backed the minority report which provided for a request that President Hoover call the railroad executives, financiers, and bondholders together and endeavor to have them stop their present drastic retrenchment and lay-off policy.

Meanwhile, the Chicago Tribune appeared with editorials paying some pious attention to the stress of the railroad workers but admonishing them not to help tax the industry out of business and thus "kill the goose that lays the golden eggs." The railroad executives also managed, opportunely enough, to make their big splurge about an allegedly new policy of "maintaining and expanding" present employment on the roads, which will eventually turn into the opposite, like all the other "golden" promises. Evidently it helped. On the last day of the conference the five brotherhood presidents, always eager for a compromise and the eradication of class lines, threw themselves into the breach of the sharp differences, proposing that all agree to unite on first trying out the minority plan of appeal to Hoover before the majority project of eventual strike is to be further considered. It carried.

The resolution adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor states that industry is paralyzed, commerce is bankrupt, unemployment is growing due to increased mass production, a situation which can be met only by the palliative measure of reduction of working hours without reduction in the standard of living. It calls attention to the more than one million federal employees working as high as twelve hours a day and places this as a direct government responsibility. From this it proceeds to petition the A. F. of L. to urge President Hoover to proclaim the shorter workday and shorter work week in all governmental employment, national, state and local, adding that this is not a radical measure

but a "hope to inspire confidence in government, respect for law," etc.

"The Capitalist System is Shot"

The animated discussion, lasting a whole session, brought out much sharp criticism of the utter failure of the A. F. of L. executives, conservative delegates exclaiming: "The capitalist system is shot, if we don't do something, somebody else will." Others piped up: "Yes, now we are all radicals and revolutionists" but put heavy emphasis on labor party ballots. Throughout, a sharp undercurrent of pressure, with its reaction, some cunningly contemplating, others merely hesitant, some willingly, but above all a fear of real working class action.

What the actual results will be of the railroaders appeal or of an A. F. of L. request to Hoover for either proposals need not be the least in doubt. Designed purely to prevent what has been named "something worse", it will mean for those workers who may cherish hopes, only new disappointments, but also added experience. Nevertheless, these manifestations of pressure of discontent from the masses and the slight response, no matter what the motive or design of the latter, is significant. It points but further to the beginning of the upward curve of working class struggle in the United States. It also propounds again, rather forcefully, the question of just what part can and must the demand for a shorter workday without reduction in pay play in revolutionary unemployment tactics.

* * *

It is imperative that the tactics of the revolutionary forces at all times correspond closely to the level and to every

stage of development of objective conditions, and be in harmony with the readings of the subjective factors, becoming sharper and bolder with the rise of the level. In this instance, it means the development of the economic crisis and the readiness for struggle of the working class in general and its unemployed section in particular. The curve has been continually downward. The crisis has moved step by step to greater severity, greater unemployment and, at the end of 1930, is still moving in that direction. Unquestionably, general discontent is spreading among the working masses suffering the wants of unemployment with wage cuts and more speed-up for those having jobs. No let up in the capitalist offensive but the workers' discontent so far expressed, in its political sense, is chiefly in the "stupendous" step from the republican to the democratic party. These demands for the shorter workday without reduction in pay are the early signs of their pressure showing concrete manifestations.

The Party's Tactics

The exact opposite of corresponding with these developments have been the unemployment tactics pursued by the Communist Party leadership. It started from the top and coming downward, not increasing in boldness or sharpening its line, but modifying it, turning to the Right and losing its revolutionary basis. The very beginning was made with the organization of unemployment councils—without preparations, without mass propaganda, without mass basis but voluminous in demands. Next came the concentration on the social insurance bill (purely a parliamentary proposal, of the kind which will most likely not even reach parliament and thus at

best be able to move workers only toward a social reformist direction). The third step has now been reached in the complacent settling down to collecting signatures for this bill.

The mass propaganda, which should have preceded organization, was neglected. The councils did not grow out of a movement, did not represent the unemployed, could not gain their adherence and have remained for all practical purposes almost non-existent. The party proceeded from the premise, of a "revolutionary upsurge of the American working masses" and was stunned by the Democratic landslide. Will it now jump back and endeavor to fill the gap; when there should be a sharpening of its line and a greater balance?

Much of the necessary mass propaganda and preparation must still be done. Correct issues, demands and slogans are still to be formulated and undoubtedly the demand for the six-hour day with no reduction in pay can become a powerful lever to help set the masses into motion. A concentrated propaganda campaign now could soon lead to the organizational steps and become real preparations for the coming stage of working class offensive.

* * *

It is well, in this connection, to remember the great movement for the eight-hour day of the Eighties. Following upon a decade of unexampled growth and expansion of industry and immediately upon the heels of a severe economic crisis — very similar to the present moment—it became a sharp offensive struggle immensely advancing the working class movement of those days. The Chicago revolutionists, the Haymarket martyrs—commonly dubbed anarchists — showed their ability to turn this eight-hour day demand into something more than just a reform measure. They gave it militant content and made it an integral part of the general struggle against the capitalist system.

There is much for us to learn from this.

Lessons of the Marine Workers Union Struggle

The developments in the Marine Workers Industrial Union are an instructive lesson in the incalculable harm that can be brought upon the revolutionary trade union movement by a policy and administration of bureaucratic Centrism in the Party, which inevitably exerts its devastating influence upon the Left wing unions. These injuries react upon the Party and upon the movement as a whole. For years now the Centrists have been squandering the capital accumulated by the revolutionary leadership of the early years of the Communist International. More than that, they have been drawing heavily on the future, and even the regenerated movement, purged of the Centrist bureaucracy and its treacherous policy, will be a long time restoring its prestige and repairing the damage done.

The events in the Marine Workers Industrial Union are mainly a repetition of what took place before in other unions under Stalinist direction, with the difference that they were longer in coming to a head and therefore more violent in their explosion. They brought out into clear relief the effects implicit in the situation in all the other unions. The adherents of the Left Opposition in the M. W. I. U. sought from the very outset to keep the revolt of the rank and file militants in Communist channels, and to direct it to the advantage of the revolutionary movement undermined by the bureaucrats. The task was rendered doubly difficult by the provocations of the officialdom and the machinations of the Right wing liquidators who, here as always, fasten themselves on to the reactionary prejudices in the workers' ranks.

The Warnings of the Opposition

Almost a year ago, in writing on the bureaucratic course in the National Miners Union, we warned that one of its dangers would be a recrudescence of syndicalism. "If syndicalism (that is, anti-political party; anti-political action; belief in the labor union as the all-sufficing instrument of the working class) is the punishment meted out to the revolutionary movement for the sins of party opportunism and vulgar parliamentarism, it is also one of the ways in which workers frequently repay

the workers' political party for mismanagement and for dominating the trade union with the rigidity, bureaucratic arbitrariness, mechanical and formalistic transference of the party into the union which is typical of Stalinism. We warned about such an eventuality months ago in our comments on the Belleville conference. The sudden spread of erroneous syndicalist conceptions among the Illinois miners may be put entirely at the door of the Party bureaucrats." (Militant, March 1, 1930.)

Anarcho-syndicalism, Lenin justly observed, is the twin brother of opportunism. At the same time it is the price the Communist movement must pay for opportunist policies and the abuse of Party authority. This phenomenon is revealed classically in the M. W. I. U. The danger was implicit in the whole situation, and what we wrote in the foreword to the "Rank and File Marine Workers' Statement" published a month ago in the Militant, was but a restatement of what we had said many times in conferences with the proletarian Opposition in the Union. In every discussion with them, we insisted that Stalinist Centrism cannot be answered by the reactionary and bankrupt dogmas of anarcho-syndicalism. Our aim was to drive the legitimate protest of the Communist and Left wing workers deeper into the Party and the Union. We insisted on an appeal against expulsion by the Party bureaucrats, an appeal to the Party workers, a resistance to the last of expulsion from the Union, to carry the fight to the last ditch in the organization so as to strengthen its unity on the basis of a correct policy. In short, we stood for a Communist fight against the Centrist bureaucracy.

The Reactionary Role of the Right Wing

At this point the provocations of the bureaucrats were grist to the mill of unprincipled and treacherous elements which calculated upon diverting a number of workers in the Opposition from the path of Communism into the stagnant backwaters of syndicalism. The manoeuvres of the Lovestone adventurers, also facilitated the aspirations of the reactionary syndicalist elements.

How characteristic it is that the Party and Union bureaucrats made no attempt to answer the just and legitimate criticisms and grievances of the rank and file Opposition! On the contrary, hiding their own blunders and protecting their own puppets, they launched the standardized campaign of abuse and slander against the workers.

Lenin did not fight syndicalism by venomous attacks upon the workers who had fallen victim to this inverted phase of opportunism. Instead, he hit ten times harder at the opportunists whose crimes and stupidities were responsible for the manifestations. The tactics pursued by the Party and Union bureaucracy played the game of precisely those elements who sought to alienate the Communist workers from the Communist movement and draw them into a sterile, anti-Communist sect. And who are these elements? Aping the slogans of the Gompers school, they raised the cry of "no politics in the union", meaning thereby no revolutionary politics. They are people who, aspiring to leadership themselves, raised the cry of "no leaders whatever," in order to protect themselves from competition.

But such slogans did not prevent these elements from shady dickerings with the Right wing adventurers, and even other groups less savory, and this, in turn, did not prevent Lovestone from exploiting these reactionary sentiments to combat the efforts of the Left Opposition to hold the movement to a Communist road. Like their brothers-in-arms of the French Right wing, Lovestone & Co. leaped at the opportunity of making common cause with anarcho-syndicalist elements to fight against Communism and the Communist Party.

The False Tactics of the Syndicalists

The Left Opposition was obliged to break with the elements following such a course. We are in no sense interested in forming a united front of everybody against Communism. On the contrary, we aimed to unite the revolutionary workers for a fight to regenerate the Communist and Left wing movement, and thereby to strengthen the unity and resources of the Union. We disagree profoundly and give no support whatsoever to the

Continued at Bottom of Next Page

T.U.U.L. and Amalgamated

By ALBERT ORLAND

The policies of the Left wing in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers have gone through a zig-zag and finally entered a blind alley. With the organization of the Men's Clothing Branch under the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union and the liquidation of the T. T. U. L. group in the Amalgamated after the second convention of the N. T. W. I. U. held last June, the Left wing forces in the clothing industry have been dissipated. Only a very small fraction, consisting of the most docile elements and loyal Stalinists joined the new union. The great majority of the sympathizers and supporters of the Left wing, not in agreement with the new line, were left to shift for themselves.

The Left wing in the Amalgamated has thus completed its last cycle of the "second period." The old leadership of the Amalgamated T. U. U. L. was expelled as Right wingers for their insistence upon maintaining the Left wing in the Amalgamated and the application of the so-called "united fronts." The new union by decision of the convention, pledged itself to the adoption of a more revolutionary form and policy adapted to the "third period", namely, the organization of shop committees and the formation of the real united front from below to conduct struggles for economic conditions under the leadership of the N. T. W. I. U.

However, the work of drawing members into the new union and of organizing the shop committees soon proved too difficult for the weak forces of the Amalgamated Section and the confusion in the ranks of the Left wing and the broad masses of the clothing workers condemned all their attempts to futility from the beginning.

The Left Wing at Low Ebb

The Left wing during its entire period of existence in the A. C. W. has built itself a record of unprincipledness and incompetence through its false and confusionist policies. Its adventurist united fronts with Hillman in the years of its greatest influence in the New York organization and later on with all sorts of careerists who used the Left wing in order to climb on its back to paid offices in the A. C. W., has destroyed the confidence of the workers in it and their hope for a change in their conditions. The activity of the Left wing in the A. C. W. at the time of the organization of the Men's Clothing Section of the N. T. W. I. U. was at its lowest ebb. The new section did not come as a result of the radicalization of the clothing workers and as the culmination of their struggle with the A. C. W. leadership, but was merely an act of servility on the part of the "third period" bureaucrats to the Stalinist apparatus. Indeed, the organization of the Men's Clothing Section was rather belated. Had it not been for the Right wingers in charge of the T. U. U.

Continued from Previous Page)

ever to those expelled to the Communist workers in the Party ranks. Likewise, we can have nothing in common with the standpoint of those who, instead of fighting in the M. W. I. U. to safeguard its unity and correct its course, yield to provocation and run away from the fight against Mink, Johnstone & Co. to form an absolutely artificial organization which has neither a basis in the class struggle nor any possibilities for extended life.

As far as the members of the Left Opposition and their collaborators are concerned, no provocation by bureaucrats can divert them from the course we mapped out long ago. We will continue to fight on the platform of Communism. Any diversion from this path plays the game of the Minks, temporarily at least, for it consolidates their position even if upon the basis of a still narrower union. Their hold, of course, remains a precarious one, for they will run their heads into the wall of their own mismanagement as before, arousing the rank and file revolt which will strengthen the influence of the revolutionary movement among the marine workers and weaken the hold of those who so systematically cast shame and discredit upon our cause. This rank and file movement, absorbing the lessons of the recent events in the M. W. I. U., we will continue to support, and assist to a triumph that is equivalent to the victory of the revolutionary cause over that of opportunist-adventurism.

L. in the Amalgamated, the Left wing would have been abandoned a year before and the Amalgamated members urged to join the new union.

Is it any wonder that under such conditions the work of the Men's Clothing Section could not make any headway in spite of its revolutionary tactics, that their talk about shop committees and united fronts from below have remained empty phrases? Having given up contact with the masses the Left wing deprived itself of the opportunity of regaining confidence among them and participating in their struggles. The few isolated shop committees of picked Left wingers do not reflect the mood of the masses in the shops and are still less capable of stimulating mass struggles.

Here is clearly demonstrated the ruinous effect of the "third period" policy in the trade union movement.

The Workers Do Not Follow

The necessity for the organization of the new unions two years ago was explained by the T. U. U. L. leadership by the readiness of the masses to leave the old unions and their fear of lagging behind the masses. But where are the masses in the clothing industry today? Has there been a sudden change in their ideology or their conditions that they have so cruelly disappointed the bureaucrats? Surely, nothing of the sort happened. Simply, they do not seem inclined to play the game of the Stalinist faction in the Communist movement in the latest change of policies and leadership.

The tactics of working within the old unions that was given expression in the organization of the T. U. E. L., a few years ago was based on the conception of the trade unions as organizations embracing the broad masses of the workers in a given industry. The conservative or reactionary character of a trade union was explained by that very fact, because the workers as a mass are not class conscious as yet. It was the duty of the Communists, as the class conscious vanguard, to penetrate these mass organizations and by participation in their struggle, gain influence and leadership there. This tactic ac-

Social Reformism in the United States

Those who hold the position that reformism must develop in the United States are wrong. Trotsky pointed out that America does not have to pass through a period of reformism but this does not mean America will not. When conditions cause a Leftward movement in America today both reform and revolution gain but the ratio depends to a large extent upon the tactics and strategy of the Communists.

Most likely a period of reform will develop but it will be distinguished from European reformism because historical conditions (decay of capitalism) will limit it to a short duration. Developing capitalism in the past could offer reforms through pressure of the workers and the reformist parties but in this period even American capitalism and its reformist parties have little of material value to offer the workers. Decadent capitalism, internationally characterized by keener competition, intensified contradictions, mass production, rationalization, organic unemployment disintegration of the skilled strata, etc., are the objective conditions which narrow the material base of social reformism. But from this we cannot conclude, as the Stalinists still say, "the 'fascization' of reformism 'socialist fascist' and that the road in America is a sharp line of demarcation of 'class against class', 'revolutionary upsurges' and the radicalization is a continuous Leftward swing.

Reform Parties and Reform

Reform parties and reforms are two different things. Reform parties grow on reforms but the former can outlive the latter just like antiquated structures of the past exist today and will be carried over in the future. Their growth and living force depends upon material conditions but structures, customs and ideologies are used by reaction after the material conditions are swept away and before new conditions and new generations move on.

When Capitalism can not rule as a bourgeois republic it uses reform (Socialist, etc.) as long as possible and when

polices were applied. It was the opportunist application of the united front by the T. U. U. L. leadership of the "second period" that was responsible for the losses in the old unions, but not the idea and the united front policy as such.

The pernicious "third period" policy did not, however, fail to produce—on the other hand—some awakening in the minds of a great many Left wing workers. The Centrist leadership has already realized that its new "revolutionary" policy brought disastrous results and made a swift turn backwards into the opposite direction. This new turn has already been applied in some of the branches of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union and notice of it has been served upon the Men's Clothing Section.

At this writing, the full implications of this turn are not yet clear to us. It has not yet gone through the Party fractions, and is naturally causing new confusion in the ranks. Judging from the past, however, it is to be expected that this turn will be a repetition of the old zig-zag in a new cycle unless an awakening takes place in the minds of the Party members to the real problems involved in changing revolutionary tactics and the trade union movement, and they act accordingly.

The latest turn in the trade union tactics is not an isolated phenomenon in the official Communist movement. It is a reflection of the general turn in the tactics of the C. I. noticeable in all fields and organizations under its control. The "third period" ideology has given way under the stress of reality and forced the official party leadership not only to change policies but gradually to abandon the terminology and the talk about the "third period" itself. But as with all the changes made by the official leadership in the past, without a frank analysis and criticism of the mistake made.

Under such conditions it is difficult to believe that the Party membership will learn anything from their latest experience with the "third period" policies and their origin, and the official leadership will be given a new lease of life to continue on their worn-out zig-zag path that has caused so much injury to the Communist and revolutionary movements. At any rate, this will be the result unless a thorough analysis and a fundamental criticism is forced through in the ranks.

Litvinov at Geneva

The den of thieves and pirates located at Geneva is once more bustling with "disarmament" activity. This time it is the regular meeting of the Preparatory Disarmament Commission, in which, like all its prototypes, the various imperialist powers gather in an attempt to secure by agreement a more favorable position in the armed camp presented by the capitalist world today. No simpler and more final reply to the deceit of these innumerable conferences can be made than the fact that there are more men under arms today than there were before the world war; that bourgeois statement can declare without shocking anybody that Europe is closer to "convulsions now than at any other time since 1914"; that since the above-mentioned commission was established, the five largest imperialist powers have increased their arms budgets by 27 percent.

The Soviet Delegation

At the present session of the Commission, there is a Soviet delegation with Litvinov at its head. We have had occasion in the past to point out the opportunist tenor of the whole foreign policy of the ruling faction in the Russian Communist Party. It rings out brazenly in the conference under discussion. We quote from an "irreproachable" source (Comintern cablegram to *Daily Worker*, November 7, 1930) the remarks made by Litvinov, which would delight the heart of a Left social democrat, or even an honest bourgeois pacifist of The Nation type, but which are repelling to a revolutionist who has learned from Lenin:

"The Soviet Union, Litvinov said, considered the war danger indissolubly connected with capitalism but believed it possible to minimize (?) the danger by real (!) disarmament, and therefore presented two proposals, one of complete disarmament, and an alternative of partial (!) disarmament."

Lenin, while not being so "clever" a statesman as Litvinov, not to speak of the latter's master, Stalin, was nevertheless content with replying to both of them in advance:

"The Kautskyan preaching of 'disarmament', which is addressed chiefly to the present governments of the imperialist great powers, is a vulgar piece of opportunism, of bourgeois pacifism, actually calculated—in spite of the good intentions of the gentle Kautskyans—to divert the workers from the class struggle. For such a propaganda is calculated to inspire the workers with the thought that the present bourgeois governments of the imperialist powers are NOT bound by thousands of threads of finance capital and tens or hundreds of corresponding (i. e., predatory, greedy, preparatory to imperialistic aggression) SECRET TREATIES between themselves." (The Disarmament Cry, *Sbornik Sozialdemokrata*, December 1916).

The Stalinist press, in this country as elsewhere, grows positively purple with enthusiasm at the petty bourgeois conduct and policy of Litvinov-Stalin. Lenin's teachings on the reactionary-utopian slogan of "disarmament" under capitalism, have been entirely lost to the Stalinists. Like the petty bourgeois press, it helps to foster the most dangerous pacifist illusions in the minds of the workers. In "Notes on the Problems of Our Delegation at the Hague"—a document also directed at establishing the Bolshevik conception of the struggle against war—Lenin writes:

"The press of the dominating class obscures the issues by spreading lies about it in vast numbers of copies against which the weak socialist press is entirely powerless, the more so that in the time of peace they maintain a radically wrong attitude towards this very question. The Communist press in the majority of countries also disgraces itself."

The Stalinist course at Geneva, and the panegyrics of the *Daily Worker* do not detract from, but rather emphasize, the truth of these words, all of which, particularly the last sentence, are fresher today than ever.

their duration and even alter their quality. Since the objective conditions favor us, the battle between reform and revolution now primarily rests upon a Marxian party of dialectic revolutionists, not only to explain correctly the conditions but to present the program, and the program of action to remake them, connecting today's activity with our goal. The Communist can only be equal to this task by basing himself upon the program of the Left Opposition and we of the Left must intensify our activity and concretize our program. —OEHLER.

Stalin Grants Two Interviews

By MAX SHACHTMAN

Taking advantage of the unusual interest aroused by the rumor of his assassination, Stalin has availed himself of the columns of the capitalist press of the world to expound his viewpoint on a number of questions of the hour. More than a year ago, comrade Trotsky, placed in a somewhat similar situation by the sensation aroused by his deportation to Turkey, also made use of the capitalist press to publish the standpoint of the Communist Opposition, so as to acquaint the workers of the world with what it really stood for.

In both cases, the utilization of the enemy press was quite justified, for the dramatic interest centering around the individuals in question made it possible for them not only to give expression to the cause they defend, but virtually to compel the bourgeois press to print whatever they said. The Stalinists, at the time of Trotsky's articles in the capitalist press, pretended a virtuous indignation of which they are really incapable. We saw nothing reprehensible in the action at that time, and just as little in Stalin's today. What the revolutionist is concerned about is, **WHAT** is said and for what purpose, for the bourgeois press of the world is still read in preference to the strictly working class press.

What Trotsky Did

Trotsky seized the opportunity to present the revolutionary point of view to the worker-readers of the bourgeois press, to make an ardent defense of the October revolution against the onslaughts of the world bourgeoisie and the sapping work of the Thermidorians in the Soviet Union. His articles constituted a Bolshevik banner, a rallying point, a cry to awaken the world working class to the dangers menacing the proletarian dictatorship.

How do matters stand, however, with Stalin's interviews (New York **Telegram**, November 24, and New York **Times**, December 1)? Their principal virtue—perhaps their only virtue—is the fact that they are an accurate picture of Stalin, his dull empiricism, his vulgar "practicality", his ignorance and contempt of Bolshevik theory and principle. So striking are all these traits, that even the **Daily Worker** does not dare as much as to mention the outstanding point in his interview, while the **Freiheit** editors consider it either so scandalous or so insignificant, that they do not even report it by a single line! A few quotations will make clear the reason.

The International Stalinist strategy in the Communist movement centers around the slogan, theory, and agitation for the "Defense of the Soviet Union against the War Danger." The prevailing theory is that if the Soviet Union can merely prevent **military intervention**, then a self-sufficient socialist society can be constructed within national boundaries. The abstract cry "Defend the Soviet Union" is daily dinned into the ears of the official Communist Party press readers. Stalin—assuming that he intended to direct his remarks to the workers, and not to Messrs. Hoover, Adolph Ochs and Roy Howard—should have emphasized this danger and called upon the workers to ward it off. Instead, he said everything he could to minimize this danger, and even to eliminate it. We quote from the Duranty dispatch to the **Times**. (Duranty is one of the staunchest supporters of the Stalin regime and his reports may be relied upon for accuracy—insofar as he quotes Stalin, at least.)

"Too Late"

"Both of them (i. e., the so-called hot-headed bourgeois and the cautious bourgeois) would readily crush a weak enemy if it could be done with little or no risk, but for the moment no such easy and profitable adventure offers itself. They might have tried it against the U. S. S. R. five or six years ago, but they waited too long. It is now too late."

"Stalin hurled out the last words without raising his voice but with a sudden access of restrained power that had an impact like a blow."

On the same day, the printers in the **Daily Worker** were setting up headlines, some of which read: "Canadian Boss, Deterding and Standard Oil for War on U. S. S. R.", "Latest Steps in Anti-Soviet War Plot" (eight are listed), with a leading editorial to the same effect. But if it "is now too late," if the bourgeoisie has "waited too long" (we believe neither of these "soliciting" opines), why all the excitement about the war danger against the U.S.S.R.?

Not content with this smug assertion,

Stalin continues his remarks, and goes from bad to worse.

"Can capitalist and Communist systems co-exist peacefully," asked Lyons of the United Press.

"It is possible," Stalin replied, "and the best proof is that they have lived peacefully side by side since the conclusion of our civil war and the intervention period." (**Telegram**, November 24.)

To make sure of this incredible declaration, Duranty asked a few days later: "You see, then, no reason why capitalist and Communist systems should not exist side by side without fighting?"

"They have not fought for ten years," said Stalin dryly, "**which means they can co-exist.**" (**Times**, December 1.)

Lenin, who lived neither in the "third period" nor in the period of Stalin's wisdom, was of a fundamentally different opinion, that is, he defended a Marxist position while Stalin defends the standpoint of blind liberalism. One can quote from his writings and speeches a thousand sentences which are a crushing refutation of Stalin's astounding remarks. We take a few at random.

"World imperialism side by side with a victorious onslaught of the social revolution **cannot get along together.**" (Vol. 15, page 175.)

"We do not live merely in a state but in a system of states and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states for any length of time is inconceivable. In the end, one or the other must triumph." (Vol. 17, page 197.)

"As long as we still have capitalism and socialism we cannot live peacefully—either one or the other will be the victor in the end. The obituary will have to be sung either over the death of world capitalism or the death of the Soviet republic. Now we have only a respite in the war." (Vol. 17, page 398.) And so on, ad infinitum.

"The Ten Years of Peace"

Stalin's ten years of "socialist-capitalist peace" cover the period of the Arcos and Peking raids, the attack on the Chinese Eastern Railway, the breaking of relations with Russia by England and France, the murder of Voikov in Poland, the permanent conspiracies of all capitalist countries against the U. S. S. R. (culminating in the very trial now going on in Moscow!), and other facts far too numerous to mention. Obviously, if this is the "peaceful co-existence," what will "war" resemble?

That is why the **Daily Worker**, which quoted much from Stalin's interview (November 5), did not even mention the quotation we made above. Why not? Either it is a mis-quotation, in which case it should obviously be exposed. Or else it is correctly reported, in which case it is of such tremendous importance that it should be blazoned in the headlines. Of course, the simple truth is that neither the **Daily Worker** nor the **Freiheit** dared to reprint these thoroughly reactionary words of Stalin—they were too strong for the stomach. (The **Daily Worker** made up for its whipped-dog silence on Stalin by publishing a hysterical column of pernicious anaemia by Browder, denouncing the Opposition as . . . counter-revolutionists and stool pigeons. And there is nothing surprising in this, for even medical science teaches us that a poisoned organism, like an attack of rabies, always brings foam to the mouth and prevents coherent speech. Browder, we therefore assume, is a subject for treatment by a science other than political, and we do not feel ourselves competent to effect any cures or give any advice in that sphere.)

We learn further from Stalin the exact reason for the disgraceful conduct of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva arms, and even for its participation.

"Stalin has no hope that anything constructive will come out of the Geneva Disarmament Conference. Nevertheless he said he felt the Soviet government could not abstain from any effort (so!), however weak, toward peace. He said **Litvinov might succeed in injecting a few healthy clauses** (now then!) here and there. 'Anyway,' he said, 'it can't do any harm to participate in the conference.'"

But these very same "reasons" can be advanced to justify joining the League of Nations, that is, the Black International which fathers the Disarmament Conferences. And, further, if one finally decides to participate in the "disarmament" conferences, it should not be done in the "diplomatic" manner of Litvinov and Stalin (to which we refer elsewhere in this issue) but

"It can't do any harm." No, none except to create the illusion in the minds of the workers that the League of Nations and its subsidiaries can be reformed step by step by means of "injecting a few healthy clauses here and there," which means, in reality, giving the imperialist war mongers and their machinations a convenient shield from the distrust of the world proletariat.

The Daily Worker Silent Again

Here again, the **Daily Worker** maintains a tight-lipped silence. Not a word of quotation or comment on Stalin's remarks about the Geneva Conference and Litvinov's participation. Isn't it pertinent to inquire about the reason for the omission? Has Stalin one theory of the revolution or working class readers who buy the capitalist press, and another theory for the readers who buy the **Daily Worker**? Which theory does he believe? Which shall we believe? And above all, which theory is believed or should be believed by the workers, who still read a thousand **Telegrams** and **Timeses** to one **Daily Worker**?

There is one more point in Stalin's interviews, the one the bourgeois press underlined: trade with the United States. "If it cannot establish political ties with the United States, the Soviet Union at least desires to strengthen its economic ties with America. And America being a great, wealthy, technically progressive and developed country, must appreciate the advantages of such economic intercourse as much as we do." (**Telegram**, November 24.)

Stalin Catches Up with the Opposition

As it stands, no serious person can have objection to it. But there is nevertheless a contradiction here. A number of months ago, dealing with the state of world unemployment on the one hand, and the difficulties being encountered by the Five-Year Plan on the other, comrade Trotsky advanced the idea that the Communists in the Soviet Union and the capitalist countries should elaborate an international campaign aiming at the extension of large, long-term credits to Russia for the purchase of machinery to assist the Five Year Plan, and to ameliorate to an extent the sufferings of the unemployed by the fact that certain industries would be set going through Soviet orders for machinery. Our readers are sufficiently acquainted with the proposal to obviate any elaboration of it here.

Weisbord's Proposals on Unemployment

A number of inquiries concerning our position on the articles by comrade Albert Weisbord in which he advanced "A Concrete Program on the Unemployed" have been received. The article was printed as a contribution to the discussion. It does not coincide with our point of view.

We are in agreement with those points in Weisbord's articles which deal with the concrete steps to be taken to organize the unemployed workers and their families, that is, into block committees in the proletarian quarters, into a form of tenants' leagues for the purpose of resisting evictions for non-payment of rents, etc., etc. This task has been neglected by the movement up to now and must be carried out. Our divergences with Weisbord occur chiefly at the point where he sets tasks for this movement, where he estimates—by implication at least—the period of development the movement as a whole finds itself in, and where he repeats his proposals in relation to the Party and to the Lovestone faction.

It is false to state that "the whole immediate objective of the unemployment movement is to seize things necessary to live." The acquisition of living necessities and resistance to evictions is indeed one of the principal tasks not only of the unemployed, but of their fellow-workers still at work, but not the "whole" of it. The principal problem is the mobilization of the employed and unemployed into a united movement for a struggle around three principal demands: the six-hour day and five-day week without wage reductions, social insurance, and immediate relief by the state and the employers. The so-called "food riots" are a by-product, and under certain conditions an aid, in the fight for these demands, and require a previous deep-going organization of the masses, the arousing of their sentiments for struggle, and establishment of safeguards against the degeneration of such a movement into petty-bourgeois-anarchist swamps. But they are far from the "whole immediate objective."

Matters are worse with the perspectives of struggle of this movement, which involves an estimate of its state of development. Instead of a criticism of the Party

immediately met with violent resistance by the whole Stalinist apparatus. Browder and the other Jorges poured sulphur and pitch upon it. It was denounced as little, if any, better than "social-fascism." In the first place, it ran counter to the canonized theory of a self-sufficient socialist society in Russia. Secondly, it was a proposal to "help capitalism solve its unemployment crisis." Thirdly, fourthly, fifthly and tenthly, it was proposed by the Opposition which, as every member of the Political Bureau is taught in the Lenin School, is counter-revolutionary. Now the idea has been taken off the index expurgatorious and the official imprimatur affixed to it by the hand of Stalin himself. Listen to how he laughs out of court yesterday's pitiful arguments of Browder and Co.:

"They provide equipment and technical help don't they? And we pay them, don't we, for everything—pay top prices, too, as you and obey know. You might as well say that we are arming Americans and helping to maintain their capitalist system against ours. No," he continued more softly, "**that is nonsense.** That isn't the point at all." (**Times**, December 1.) (What a scathing remark to make about so loyal a servitor as Browder!)

There remains, however, a difference between Stalin's appeal for trade relations and the Opposition's. The first is not only not addressed to the workers, but it does not even mention their role in it, the manner in which the interests of unemployed and employed are so directly connected with the welfare of the Soviet Union and its economic advancement. Instead, it is addressed to the bourgeoisie. It is quite true that they must be spoken too as well, but then Stalin should at the same time apologize to the workers for having permitted Molotov and Manuilsky and their lesser lights to denounce the Opposition because we proposed—among other things—an economic collaboration between the U. S. S. R. and the Mueller government in Germany and the MacDonald regime in England. And we are still waiting for the American Party chiefs to accept the logic of Stalin's statements and the proposals of the Opposition to launch a campaign along the lines sketched in our plan. It is overdue.

or its "third period" absurdities and monstrous exaggerations in connection with the slogan for "fighting the police", Weisbord only deepens its error. The class conscious vanguard is exceedingly small today. It is confronted by a working class virtually everywhere on the defensive, and its main problem is the organization of a defensive resistance to the onslaught of the bourgeoisie. The Party mistakes this defensive for an offensive, and half its blunders are rooted in this radically false conception.

Weisbord, however, even goes further, and arrives at the extremely ultra-Leftist conception of an impending revolutionary situation in the country. No other view can explain such terms as these, in consideration of the present relation of forces in the country: "The Party wants to fight the police. Good." And further: "Here (in proletarian neighborhoods) the fight can spread. The police cannot easily surround it . . . Shops and factories can be pulled on strike and swept into battle. In short, here the police are weakest and the workers strongest. Through the fighting squads organized by the block groups, a whole section of the city could be held." Since cities, or sections of them, are not held merely for the holding, but because the question of seizure of power has been raised, Weisbord's views are not only harshly out of harmony with the views of the Opposition but also with the elementary realities of the situation. Less emphasis on "fight the police" (it is clear, the workers must defend themselves ardently against police attacks and brutalities, but certainly not in an offensive sense, with a view to "holding a whole section of the city") and more emphasis on the practical needs and interests of the movement, which correspond to its stage of development—those are urgent requirements of the moment.

Further, we disagree sharply with Weisbord's ridicule of the proposals advanced by the Left Opposition for long-term credits to the Soviet Union as a means of ameliorating the hardships of the unemployed in capitalist countries and of the Five Year Plan in Russia. Such credits will not only permit Russia to purchase

(Continued on Page 8)

How Stalin-Bucharin Destroyed the Chinese Revolution

(Continued from Last Issue)

About the time the Northern Expeditionary took Shanghai in 1927, what Chiang Kai paid great attention to was the selection of the Shanghai municipal government and how to unite the petty-bourgeoisie (the middle and small traders) for opposing the big bourgeoisie; Peng Shu Chih, Lo Yih Nieng became very angry, and tore it to the Shanghai municipal government was not a central problem. The central problem was that if the proletariat did not overpower the military forces of Chiang Kai-Shek, the petty bourgeoisie would not stand for us and that Chiang Kai-Shek must, under the direction of the imperialists, massacre the masses. The Shanghai municipal government would not only be a phrase then, but a defeat throughout China would take place, for when Chiang Kai-Shek openly betrayed the revolution it would never be an individual action, but the signal for the bourgeoisie in the whole country to go over to the reactionary camp. At that time, Peng Shu Chih went to Hankow to state our opinion before the International delegate and the majority of the members of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party and to consult them on how to attack the forces of Chiang Kai-Shek. But they did not care very much about the coup of Shanghai, but telegraphed to me several times urging me to go to Wuhan, in Hupeh province. They thought that the nationalist government was at Wuhan at that time, so all important problems should be solved there. At the same time, the International telegraphed to us instructing us to hide or bury all the weapons of the workers to avoid the military conflict between the workers and Chiang Kai-Shek, in order not to disturb the occupation of Shanghai by the armed forces. Having read this telegram, Lo Yih Nung became very angry, and tore it to bits. At that time I again obeyed the order of the International and could not maintain my own opinion. Based upon the policy of the International towards the Kuo Min Tang and the imperialists, I issued a shameful manifesto with Wang Chin Wei.

The Proposal to Withdraw from the K.M.T.

In the beginning of April I went to Hankow. When I first met Wang Chin Wei I heard from him some reactionary words, far different from what he said while in Shanghai. I told this to Borodin; he said that my observations were right and that as soon as Wang Chin Wei reached Wuhan he was surrounded by Hsu Chien, Kuo Meng Yu, Chen Pung Po, Tan Yien Kai and others, and became gradually colder. After Chiang Kai-Shek and Lu Chi Shung continually massacred the workers and peasants, the Kuo Min Tang hated the power of the proletariat more every day, and the reactionary attitude of Wang Chin Wei and of the Central Committee of the Kuo Min Tang developed rapidly. At the meeting of our Political Bureau, I made a report on the status of the joint meeting of our Party and of the Kuo Min Tang: "The danger of co-operation between our Party and the Kuo Min Tang is more and more serious. What they tried to seize on seemed to be this or that small problem; what they really wanted was the whole leading power. Now there are only two roads before us: either to give up the leading power or to break with them." The attendants answered my report with silence. After the coup of May 21 at Changsha, in Huhan province, I twice suggested withdrawal from the Kuo Min Tang. Finally, I said: "The Wuhan Kuo Min Tang has followed the steps of Chiang Kai-Shek!" At that time only Yen Pih Si said: "Indeed!" and Chow Eng Lai said: "After we withdraw from the Kuo Min Tang the labor and peasant movement will be freer but the military movement will suffer too much." All the rest still answered my suggestion with the attitude of quiet. At the same time I discussed this with Chih Chiu Bai. He said: "We should let the Kuo Min Tang expel us, we cannot withdraw by ourselves." I consulted Borodin. He said: "I quite agree with your idea but I know that Moscow will never permit it." At that time I once more observed the discipline of the International and the opinion of the majority of the Central Committee and was unable to maintain my own

opinion. From the beginning I could not persistly maintain my opinion; up to this time I could no longer bear it. Then, I tendered my resignation to the Central Committee. The chief reason for the resignation was: "The International wishes us to carry out our own policy, on the one hand, and does not allow us to withdraw from the Kuo Min Tang on the other. There is really no way out and I cannot continue with my work."

From the beginning to the end, the International recognized the Kuo Min Tang as the main body of the Chinese national democratic revolution. In the mouth of Stalin the words "leadership of the Kuo Min Tang" were shouted very loudly (see "The Error of the Opposition" in "Problems of the Chinese Revolution"). So it wished us throughout to surrender in the organization of the Kuo Min Tang and to lead the masses under the name and the banner of the Kuo Min Tang. Up to the time when the whole Kuo Min Tang of Feng Yu-Hsiang, Wang Chin Wei, Lang Lin Chih, Ho Chin etc., were openly reactionary and abolished the so-called three points policies: to unite with the Soviet Union, to allow the C. P., to join the Kuo Min Tang and to help the labor and peasant movement, the International instructed us by telegram: "Only withdraw from the Kuo Min Tang government not from the Kuo Min Tang." So, after the "August 7" Conference, from the Nanchang uprising to the capture of Swatow, the Communist party still hid under the blue-white banner of the Left clique of the Kuo Min Tang. Among the masses it seemed that there was trouble within the Kuo Min Tang, but nothing more." The young Chinese Communist Party, produced by the young Chinese proletariat, had not had a proper period of training in Marxism and class struggles. In the beginning of the founding of the Party, it was confronted by the great revolutionary struggle. The only hope of avoiding any very grave error was the correct guidance of the proletarian policy of the International. Under the guidance of such a continuously opportunist policy how could the Chinese proletariat and the Communist Party clearly observe their own future? and how could they have their own independent policy? They only surrendered to the bourgeoisie step by step and subordinated themselves to the bourgeoisie. So when the latter suddenly massacred us we did not know what to do about it. After the coup of May 21 at Changsha, the method given to us by the International was:

(1) Confiscate the land of the landowners from the lower strata, not to use the name of the nationalist government, but do not touch the land of military officers. (Not a single one of the bourgeoisie, land-

lords, tuchuns, and gentry of Hunan and Hupeh provinces but was the kinsman, relative or old friend of the officers of that time. All the landowners were directly or indirectly protected by the officers. To confiscate the land is only empty words if it is conditioned by "do not touch the land of the military officers.")

(2) Check the peasants' "over-zealous" action with the power of the Party headquarters. (We did execute this shameful policy of checking the peasants' over-zealous action; afterwards the International criticized the Chinese Party as having "often become the obstacle of the masses" and considered it as one of the greatest opportunist errors.)

(3) Destroy the present unreliable generals, arm twenty thousand Communists and select fifty thousand worker and peasant elements from Hunan and Hupeh provinces for organizing a new army. (If we could get so many rifles, why should we not directly arm the workers and peasants and why should we still enlarge the new troops of the Kuo Min Tang? Why could not we establish the Soviet of workers, peasants and soldiers? If there are neither armed workers and peasants nor soviets who and how can we destroy the said unreliable generals? I suppose that we should still pitifully beg the Central Committee of the Kuo Min Tang to discharge them. That the delegate of the International, Lois, showed Wang Chin Wei the instruction of the III International, was of course for this purpose.)

(4) Put new working and peasant elements into the Central Committee of the Kuo Min Tang to take the place of old members. (If we have power to deal freely with the old Committee and reorganize the Kuo Min Tang, why could we not organize Soviets? Why must we send our worker and peasant leaders to the bourgeois Kuo Min Tang, who have already been massacring the workers and peasants? and why should we decorate such a Kuo Min Tang with our leaders?)

A "Revolutionary" Court

(5) Organize a Revolutionary Court with a well-known member of the Kuo Min Tang as its chairman in order to judge the reactionary officers. How can the already reactionary leader of the Kuo Min Tang judge the reactionary officers in the Revolutionary Court?

Those who attempted to execute such a policy within the Kuo Min Tang were still opportunists of Left tendency. There was no change at all in the fundamental policy; it was like taking a bath in a urinal vessel! At that time, if we wanted to carry out the Left policy of revolution, the fundamental policy had to be changed. That is, the Communist Party had to with-

draw from the Kuo Min Tang and be really independent. It had to arm the workers and peasants, as many as possible, establish the Soviet of workers, peasants and soldiers and seize the leading power from the Kuo Min Tang; otherwise, no matter what kind of Left policy was adopted, there was no way to realize it. At that time the Central Political Bureau wired to the Communist International to answer its instruction: we accept the instruction and will work according to its direction but it cannot be realized immediately. For all the members of the Central Committee recognized that that instruction was an impractical method. Even the participant of the meeting of the Central Committee, Fanck (it was said that he was the private deputy of Stalin) also thought that there was no possibility to carry it out. He agreed with the telegraphic answer of the Central Committee, saying: "We can only say so in our answer." After the "August 7" Conference, the Central Committee endeavored to propagate that the cause of the failure of the Chinese revolution was that the opportunists did not accept the instructions of the Communist International (of course, the instructions were the above mentioned one; besides these, there were no instructions!) to change the tactics at once; we did not know how they could change the policy within the sphere of the Kuo Min Tang and who were the so-called opportunists.

Where Responsibility Lies

As the Party has committed such a fundamental error, the other bigger and smaller subordinate errors, of course, would continually take place. I, whose perception was not clear, whose opinion was not decisive, sank deeply in the atmosphere of opportunism, sincerely carried out the opportunist policy of the Third International; I unconsciously became the tool of the narrow faction of Stalin; I could not save the Party; and the revolution. All this, both I and other comrades should be responsible for. The present Central Committee said: "You attempt to put the failure of the Chinese Revolution on the shoulders of the Third International in order that you might throw off your own responsibility!" This statement is ridiculous. Nobody can permanently withhold his right to criticize the opportunism of the Party leadership, or to return to Marxism and Leninism because he has himself committed opportunism. At the same time, nobody can take the liberty of avoiding his responsibility for executing an opportunist policy because opportunism came from high places. The source of the opportunist policy is the Third International; but why did not the leaders of the Chinese Party make a protest against the Third International, but sincerely carried out its policies? Who could remove this responsibility? We should very frankly and objectively recognize that all the past and present opportunist policies come from the Third International. The Third International should bear the responsibility. The young Chinese Party has not yet the ability of itself to invent any theories and settle any policy; but the leading organ of the Chinese Party ought to bear the responsibility for blindly executing the opportunist policy of the Third International without a little bit of judgment and protest. If we mutually excuse each other and all of us think that we have committed no mistakes, was it then the error of the masses? This is not only too ridiculous but also does not take any responsibility towards the revolution! I strongly believe that, if I, or other responsible comrades, could at that time have had a clear recognition of the falsity of the opportunist policy; a strong argument against it, even to the point of mobilizing the entire Party for an ardent discussion and debate, as comrade Trotsky has been doing, the result would inevitably have been a great help to the revolution and would not have made the revolution such a shameful failure, though I might have been expelled from the Third International and a split in the Party might have taken place. I, whose perception was not clear and opinion was not decisive, did not do so after all! If the Party were to base itself on such past mistakes of mine or on the fact that I strongly maintained the former erroneous line, in order to give me any severe punishment, I would earnestly accept it without uttering a word.

(Continued in Next Issue)

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

By **LEON TROTSKY**

A brilliant summary and analysis of the policies pursued since 1923 by the leading group in the Communist International on the most important problems confronting the revolutionary movement « « « An invaluable contribution to the issues of the day and an indispensable part of every worker's library » » »

One Hundred Pages

25 cents a copy :: 18 cents in bundles

ORDER FROM THE MILITANT, 25 THIRD AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

The Life of the Exiled and Imprisoned Russian Opposition

By N. MARKIN

The Fifteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U. (December 1927) placed the Opposition outside of the ranks of the Party and sanctioned the state repressive measures taken against it. In the course of 1928 thousands of Oppositionists were arrested and sent into exile. Despite all that, the curve of development of the Opposition for the entire year of 1928 was vigorously on the ascendant. At the beginning of 1929 the G.P.U. ferociously ransacked the Opposition organizations all over the U.S.S.R. Simultaneously the repression not only increased in quantity but also achieved a new quality: the creation of Solitaries; depriving the deported of their work, transferring them to unhealthy places, reducing their maintenance by half; the expulsion of comrade Trotsky; general provocation and so on. In the economic and political domain, the year 1929 was characterized by the accentuation of the Left zig-zag of Centrism, necessitated by the kulak grain strikes in 1928.

The Crisis in the Opposition

The combined influence of these two factors, the ruthless repression and a certain division brought about by the Left turn of Centrism—placed the Opposition before a grave crisis in the summer of 1929. A wave of capitulation passed over the places of deportation. In August 1929 comrade Rakovsky and others made their well known declaration. This declaration was an attempt to realize a united front with the Party. It established certain modifications of the official course, and based on these, expressed anew the desire to defend and to struggle for its ideas within the frame work of the Party, underlining at the same time that the only serious guarantee for the turn was a change of regime in the Party. Rakovsky's declaration—as was evident—was rejected. This served as an additional test of the Party regime by showing the Opposition elements who were seriously doubtful, all the superficiality and the insincerity of Centrism's Leftward turn. The August declaration of Rakovsky brought into circulation extensive theses and submitted the policy of Centrism to a profound and compact criticism. The response of the apparatus to the declaration of Rakovsky forced the Opposition to declare again and precisely that it will not only continue, but enlarge and intensify its factional work.

In the same period comrades Rakovsky and Trotsky again put forth the question of the Party as the central problem of the revolution. Certain capitulators have deluded themselves (and deluded others) with pseudodialectic arguments, in the sense that the correction of the economic line will of itself entail an improvement of the regime in the Party. "It is an absurdity", comrade Trotsky wrote to the Russian comrades, "to believe that the Five Year Plan can modify automatically the regime of the Party. On the contrary, the change of regime in the Party is not only the premise of ultimate successes, but also a certain guarantee against the dangers which grow more rapidly than the successes." And on several later occasions: "The Party regime constitutes a mortal danger precisely towards economy." Rakovsky and other Russian Opposition comrades wrote in the same vein.

However, the Left course of Centrism began, toward 1930, to transform itself into an ultra-Left policy which expressed itself in the "industrialization course", and "complete collectivization." The Left Opposition did not allow itself to be carried away by the Stalinist "dizziness." On the question of our attitude towards the new ultra-Left course, it reenforced its cohesion, while holding to its previous strategy of collectivization and industrialization. The Russian Opposition launched the tactical slogan: Slow down! Retreat! This slogan was unanimously approved by the Russian Left Opposition. Later on, the new course was replaced by a still newer one, in which the elements of adventurist leaps were joined with those of panicky retreat. It is in such a situation that the Sixteenth Congress met, and brought about a new aggravation of the Party regime. "The preparation of Bonapartism insofar as it concerns the Party, has been accomplished. In the Party the plebiscitary regime has been definitely installed," comrade Trotsky wrote to the U. S. S. R.

For the Opposition, the preparation of the Congress expressed itself in a mad reenforcement of reprisals*. The Opposition presented to the Congress a declaration ("of the 7": Rakovsky, Muralov, Kossior, Kasparova, Grunstein, Zinzadze, Aussem.) All these comrades are Opposition leaders and among the oldest members of the Party. Some time before this declaration to the C.C., to the C.C.C. and to all the members of the Party, a long principle declaration called "The April declaration of the 4": Rakovsky, Kossior, Kasparova, and Muralov. Around this declaration a vast polemic developed in the deportation camps and in secret (in the U.S.S.R.)

The Ideological Life of the Opposition

It must be said that from the day of its birth, the Opposition in deportation began to live an intense ideological life. Not only are timely economic, political, tactical and strategical questions profoundly studied and heatedly discussed, but even the most abstract problems of philosophy. The Solitaries have become revolutionary universities. Numerous serious Marxist works have been produced by the pens of deported Oppositionists. The ideological level of the Russian Opposition cadres may be considered, without any exaggeration, as exceptional. In ridding themselves of the capitulatory ballast, in gaining cohesion under the fire of repression, it is the firmest and most valiant revolutionists who have remained in the deportation.

During this current year, the exchange of ideas has been rendered very difficult by an almost complete postal blockade. That is why the study of questions often does not emerge from the limits of the isolated centers of the deportation.

Certain differences—though not of principle—have been provoked by the following theses in Rakovsky's April declaration: "Before the Party is posed the question of supplying the country with food stuffs and with agricultural raw materials by reinforcing the construction of the Soviet farms, at the same time maintaining the rhythm of industrial development." Some of the comrades found a contradiction to the slogan of "retreat" in these theses. Their argument can be summed up in this: "It is our duty to subject the bureaucratic rhythms to a merciless criticism and not to maintain them. The period of ultra-Left adventurism in the Centrist policy of industrialization is not yet at an end."

On the other hand, the comrades who supported the theses of comrade Rakovsky countered with the following argument: "The period in which the articles and letters of Trotsky and Rakovsky (which called for beating a retreat and not for maintaining the rhythms) belong, is distinct from the period of the declaration . . . In the present period, after the collapse of the 'complete collectivization', it is collectivization itself which is in danger. Not only is the 'five-year plan in four years' threatened but the realization of the 'five-year plan altogether, and to support the slogan of a relaxation of the rhythm in such a situation is profoundly wrong." The Editors of the *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition* have not had the opportunity to express themselves fundamentally on this question, since it had not yet received the April Declaration at that time. They simply stressed that "it is of course understood that we are for the 'maximum rhythms' provided they are economically and politically possible," and that it is not this question—despite all its seriousness—which is of decisive importance at present but rather that of the "methods of economic direction and of the life of the Party with whose aid the rhythms have been elaborated, realized and checked."

The Social Nature of the State

Another question which has provoked a broad discussion is that of the social character and perspectives of the Soviet state, and the question which is bound up with this, namely, of the social essence of the Soviet bureaucracy (or of the degree of the divorce between the bureaucracy and the masses, as some of the comrades pose the question), a phenomenon hitherto unknown in history and which has consequently not been analyzed as yet by Marxist thought. To what degree can the bur-

* We will not stop at this question, which has been sufficiently illuminated in the Opposition publications.

eaucracy be considered as a class, as an embryo of a class? Can it become a class? Such are the questions which are at the center of the analysis and discussion on the Soviet system. Evidently, it is not a question of a rigid, that is to say, of a metaphysical formula, but of the analysis of perspectives and the orientation of living processes. According to the Moscow correspondent of the *Russian Bulletin*, this tendency is indicated by comrade Rakovsky "as being the possible line of transformation of the proletarian state into a bureaucratic state with Communist vestiges."

"The great merit," writes the same correspondent, "of the documents written by comrade Rakovsky since 1928, is the profound penetration and entirely concrete analysis of his process. The new declaration in question, in enhancing this analysis and extending it to the new supplement of the Soviet bureaucracy—the nascent collective farm bureaucracy—interested in preserving the current state of affairs, not only establishes that bureaucratic atrophy threatens to denature the social content of the Soviet system in the U.S.S.R., but outlines in broad strokes the characteristics of the bureaucratic order which can follow the Soviet order, while remaining in the domain of real phenomena."

Concerning the bureaucracy, comrade Rakovsky writes: "Under our very eyes, there has been formed, and is still being formed, a large class of rulers which has its own interior groupings, multiplied by means of premeditated cooptation, direct or indirect (bureaucratic promotion, fictitious system of elections). The basic support of this original class is a sort, an original sort, of private property, namely, the possession of State power. The bureaucracy possess the state as private property" wrote Marx ("Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law").

The colony of deportees at X . . . formulates the question as follows: "We are of the opinion that the bureaucracy is not a class and will never become one. We believe that the bureaucracy, the leading stratum of society, will degenerate that it is the germ of a class which will not be bureaucratic at all . . . The bureaucracy is the germ of a capitalist class which dominates the state and possesses the means of productive collectively."

The Slogan of a Coalition C. C.

Difference in tactics, and partially in principle, were evoked by another question. In one of his letters in May, Rakovsky issued the slogan of a *coalition* Central Committee (Left, Center and Right). Unfortunately, the inadequacy of our information does not permit us to summarize the opinions on this point. A comrade writes: "I believe that this slogan has a foundation (economy is balked, all the factions must take this fact into account and join in following a single tactical line in spite of the diversity of their strategical lines. This slogan can become popular among the masses. It is another question to know if there are any reasons for being optimistic about its possible realization. The general secretary (Stalin) will not join the coalition, and with Party opinion dispersed, it may not be able to exert enough pressure. However, these considerations are not a decisive argument against the slogan. We must work and fight for its realization. In this way we will point out the concrete road—naturally, an imperfect road, but the situation allows of no better one—for the concrete abolition of the political monopoly of the Centrists."

Let us quote an extract from the theses of an authorized comrade, now incarcerated in Solitary:

"The present state of the proletarian dictatorship can be characterized above all by the extreme nature of the bureaucratic degeneration of its apparatus and, so to speak, by the bureaucratic envelopment of the proletarian dictatorship."

The theses say that the economic organs, "seized by panic before the growing elements of catastrophe, seek to overtake this delay by incessantly exceeding the predetermined projects, above all, by excessive increase of the exploitation of the workers and the lowering of their living level. . . . As a result of the super-industrialization, the condition of the workers is worsening. The workers are obliged to adapt themselves to a reduction in real wages and the exhaustion of physical efforts."

The theses define the policy of Centrism in the country in the following manner: "The political consequences of the peasant policy conducted, can throw back the Sovietization of the country for many years and make us return to the old times of War Communism. The whole policy will be discredited, and the most irremediable discredit will affect in principle, even the policy of collectivization and industrialization, that is all the teachings of Lenin."

"The principal misfortune," the theses say finally, "consists in the fact that, while there is a possibility of a reaction, and sometimes even of a decisive influence on the direction of policy by organizing the resistance of the Opposition in the proletarian sector of the Party to the sliding of Centrism to the Right, with the existing regime this resistance cannot take a sufficiently active form to permit making a radical end to this policy of the Right and ultra-Left leaps, and to realize the reformation of the Party leadership."

The Opposition's Growth

The above-quoted theses touch the decisive problem of the Russian Opposition, consequently, the future of the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. All the facts show the sympathy existing in the working class towards our ideas, but the weakness of the Opposition organization prevents the crystallization of these sentiments and their necessary development. "Interest towards us is undubitably growing, we are weak, although we have numerous supporters." In August, we heard from Kharkov: "One feels that a certain additional push is needed, a new experience, so that what is covered with ashes will flame up again. The work must be organized in a more regular and systematic manner, the Bulletin made to appear more regularly, and we need a well functioning internal organization. On this point, comrades in various sections believe that this push is not far off."

In one of his last letters to the Russian Oppositionists comrade Trotsky raises the question in the following way: "Since the mass of the Party is definitely dispersed, then the sole means of heightening the chances for the development of the October revolution and Lenin's Party by the Reformist road, requires the creation of a well-functioning centralized organization of the Bolshevik-Leninists, armed with sufficient technical means for reacting systematically upon the dispersed public opinion of the Party . . . A half-passive policy in the future would mean, not to mention other things, the gradual physical destruction of our best cadres."

The principal obstacle on this road is obviously the repression and above all, provocation. The G. P. U. floods not only our isolated groups of deportees but also the prisons with provocateurs. Provocation is Stalin's main weapon against the Opposition. At the same time, as we have said, the ground for the development of the Left Opposition is very favorable. Facts like the election of a worker Oppositionist as chairman of the factory council, the refusal of the workers to elect another in spite of the rabid pressure of the apparatus, and finally his arrest by the G.P.U. (Mechanical Shops, Kharhov), the successful organization of collections among the workers on the Moscow-Kazan railway, upon their own initiative, for aid to the deportees and their families, the steady torrent of new deportees, the almost daily arrests of new Oppositionists, generally still members of the Party—all this proves that the Opposition is not stifled. And in spite of the incessant arrests, the G. P. U. cannot exhaust the reserves of the Opposition, since they are steadily renewed.

New Deportations

A special and very characteristic phenomenon is the arrest of capitulators, that is, of former Oppositionists who signed the declaration of Radek or Smirnov. Capitulators imprisoned and deported a second time are not isolated cases, but constitute a large phenomenon of their type. It shows, on one hand, that among the capitulators, after the return to Moscow, there is manifested again "relapses into Trotskyism", and on the other, the great fear of the apparatus even for the cadavers of the Opposition—the capitulators.

In recent letters (October), the comrades communicate that these phenomena not only do not cease, but on the contrary increase. Capitulators are mentioned who arrived in deportation in September or October, that is, more than a year after their capitulation.

STALIN AS A THEORETICIAN

By LEON
TROTSKY

(Concluded from Last Issue)

This is revealed with adequate clarity in the question of the peasant's balance of the October revolution. The state as the owner of the land, concentrated in its hands the right to ground rent. Does it realize it from the present market in the prices of grain, lumber, etc.? Unfortunately, not yet. Does it realize it from the peasant? With the multiplicity of economic accounts between the state and the peasant, it is very difficult to reply to this question. It can be said—and this will by no means be a paradox—so that the “scissors” of agricultural and industrial prices contains the ground rent in a concealed form. With the concentration of land, industry and transport in the hands of the state, the question of ground rent has for the peasant, so to speak, a bookkeeping and not an economic significance. But the peasant is little occupied with precisely this bookkeeping technique. He draws a wholesale balance to his relations with the city and state.

It would be more correct to approach this question from another angle. Because of the nationalization of land, factories and mills, the liquidation of the foreign debts, and planned economy, the workers' state acquired the possibility to reach in a short period high speeds of industrial development. On this road, there was undoubtedly created one of the most important premises for collectivization. But this premise is not a juridical, but a material-productive one: it expresses itself in a definite number of plows, binders, combines, tractors, grain elevators, agronomists, etc., etc. It is precisely from these real entities that the collectivization plan should proceed. This is when the plan will be real. But to the real fruits of nationalization we cannot always add nationalization itself, like some sort of a reserve fund out of which all the excesses of the “complete” bureaucratic adventures can be covered. This would be the same as if having deposited his capital in the bank, one would want to use his capital and the interest on it at the same time.

This is the conclusion in general. But the specific, individual conclusion may be formulated more simply:

“Tomfool, Tomfool.

“It were better that you stayed in school”—than to leave for distant theoretical excursions.

The Formulae of Marx and the Audacity of Ignorance

Between the first and third volumes of “Capital”, there is a second. Our theoretician considers it his duty to commit an administrative abuse of the second volume, too. Stalin has to cover up quickly from criticism the present policy of compulsory collectivization. Since there are no necessary arguments in the material conditions of economy he looks for them in authoritative books with the result that he inevitably looks for them every time on the wrong page.

The advantages of large scale economy over small, agriculture included, are proved by all capitalistic experiences. The possible advantages of large-scale collective economy over dispersed, small economy were established even before Marx by the Utopian socialists and their arguments remain basically sound. In this sphere, the Utopians were great realists. Their Utopia began with the question of the historical road of collectivization. Here the direction was indicated by the Marxian theory of the class struggle in connection with the criticism of capitalist economy.

“Capital” gives an analysis and a synthesis of the processes of capitalist economy. The second volume examines the imminent mechanism of the growth of capitalist economy. The algebraic formulae of this volume prove how, from one and the same creative protoplasm—abstract human labor—the means of production are crystallized in the form of constant capital, wages—in the form of variable capital, and surplus value, which is afterwards transformed into a source of additional constant and variable capital. This in turn permits the acquisition of greater surplus value. Such is the spiral of extended reproduction in its most general and abstract form.

In order to prove by what process the different material elements of the economic process, commodities, find each other inside of this unregulated whole, or more precisely, by what process constant and variable capital accomplish the necessary balance in the different branches of industry with the general growth of production, and on the other—enterprises producing articles of consumption. The enterprises of the first category have to supply machines, raw materials and auxiliary materials, raw materials and auxiliary materials to themselves as well as to the enterprises of the second category. In turn, the enterprises of the second category have to cover their own needs, as well as the needs of the enterprises of the first category with articles of consumption. Marx reveals the general mechanism of the accomplishment of this proportionality which creates the basis of the dynamic balance under capitalism.* The question of agriculture in its mutual relation to industry therefore rests on an altogether different plane. Stalin evidently simply confused the production of articles of consumption with agriculture. With Marx, however, enterprises of capitalist agriculture (only **capitalist**) producing raw materials enter automatically into the first category. In so far as agricultural production has peculiarities that contrast it to industry as a whole the analysis of these peculiarities begins in the third volume.

The Process of Extended Reproductions

Extended reproduction occurs in reality not only at the expense of surplus value created by the workers of industry itself and capitalist agriculture but also by the influx of fresh means from the outside: from the pre-capitalist village of the backward countries, colonies, etc. The acquisition of surplus values from the village and colonies is conceivable once more, either in the form of unequal exchange or compulsory expropriation (primarily through taxes, or, finally, in the credit form savings bank, loans, etc.) Historically, all these forms of exploitation combine in different proportions and play a no lesser role than the extortion of surplus value in its “pure” form; the deepening of capitalist exploitation always goes hand in hand with its broadening. But the formulae of Marx that interest us very carefully dissect the live process of economic development, clearing capitalist reproduction from all pre-capitalist elements and transitional forms which accompany it and which feed it, and at the expense of which it develops. Marx's formulae dealt with a chemically pure capitalism which never existed and does not exist anywhere now. Precisely because of this, they revealed the basic tendencies of **every** capitalism, but precisely of **capitalism** and **only** capitalism.

To anybody having an understanding of “Capital”, it is obvious that neither in the first, second nor third volumes can an answer be found to the question of the tempo the dictatorship of the proletariat should adopt in collectivizing peasant economy. All these questions, as well as scores of others, were not solved in any books and could not be solved because of their very essence.* In essence, Stalin in no way differs from the merchant who would seek guidance in Marx' simplest formula M-C-M (money-commodity-money), as to what and when to buy and sell to obtain a bigger profit. Stalin simply confuses theoretical generalization with practical prescription, not to speak of the fact that the theoretical generalization itself is related by Marx to a completely different problem.

Stalin Refers to Marx

Why, then, did Stalin have to refer to the formulae of extended reproduction which he evidently does not understand? The explanations of Stalin himself in regards to this are so inimitable that we are compelled to quote them literally: “The Marxist theory of reproduction teaches that contemporary (?) society cannot develop without annual accumulations, and it is impossible to accumulate without extended reproduction year in and year out. This is clear and evident.” It cannot be clearer. But this is not taught by Marxist theory, for it is the general property of bourgeois political economy, its quintessence. “Accumulation” as a condition of development “of contemporary society” is precisely the

great idea which vulgar political economy cleared of the elements of the labor theory of value which had their foundation in classical political economy. The theory which Stalin so bombastically proposes “to draw out of the treasure of Marxism” is a commonplace, uniting not only Adam Smith and Bastiat but also the latter with the American president, Hoover. “Contemporary society”—not capitalist, but “contemporary”—is used with the object of extending Marxist formulae also to “contemporary” socialist society. “This is clear and evident.” Right here Stalin continues: “Our large scale centralized socialist industry develops according to the Marxist theory of extended reproduction (!) because (!!) it grows yearly in scale, has its accumulations and advances with seven league boots.” Industry develops according to the Marxist theory—an immortal formula:—in absolutely the same way as oats grow dialectically according to Hegel. To a bureaucrat, theory is the formula of administration. But the immediate essence of the matter does not lie in this. “The Marxist theory of reproduction” refers to the **capitalist** mode of production. But Stalin speaks of Soviet industry, which he considers socialist **without any reservations**. In this manner, according to Stalin, “socialist industry” develops according to the theory of **capitalist** reproduction. We see how incautiously Stalin slipped his hand into the “treasure of Marxism.” If two economic processes: anarchical and planned, are covered by one and the same theory of reproduction, which is built up on the laws of anarchical production, then this itself reduces to zero the planned, that is, the socialist beginning. However, these two are only the blossoms—the berries are still ahead.

The best gem extracted by Stalin from the treasure is the above-underlined little word “because”: socialist industry develops according to the theory of capitalist industry, “because it grows yearly in scale, has its accumulations and advances with seven league boots.” Poor Theory! Unfortunate treasure! Wretched Marx! Does it mean that the Marxian theory was created especially as a basis for the necessity of yearly advances and, at that, with seven league boots? But what about periods when capitalist industry develops at a “snail's pace”? For those instances, apparently, Marx' theory is rejected. But all capitalist production extends cyclically through prosperity and crises; it means that it not only does not advance with seven league, or any other boots, but marks time and retreats. It appears that Marx' schema is not suited to **capitalist** development, for the explanation of which it was created, but for that it completely answers the nature of the “seven league” advances of **socialist** industry. Aren't these miracles? Not limiting himself to the teachings of angels with regard to the nationalization of land, and occupying himself at the same time with the basic correction of Marx, Stalin at any rate marches . . . with seven league boots. In the meantime, the formulae or “Capital” crack under his hours like nuts.

But why did Stalin need all this? The puzzled reader will ask. Alas! We cannot jump over stages, especially when we can hardly keep up with our theoretician. A little patience, and all will be revealed. Immediately after the point analyzed here, Stalin continues: “But our large scale industry does not exhaust all of our national economy. On the contrary, in our national economy, small peasant holdings are still predominant. Can it be said that our small peasant holdings develop according to the principle (!) of extended reproduction? No, it cannot be said. Our small peasant holdings . . . do not always have the possibility of realizing even simple reproduction. Can we move forward with an accelerated tempo our socialized industry, having such peasant economy as a basis . . .? No, we cannot. Further on, the conclusion follows: complete collectivization is necessary.

Stalin Discloses the Un-Marxian Village!

This point is still better than the preceding one. From the somnolent banality of exposition every now and then rockets of audacious ignorance explode. Does the peasant, that is, **simple commodity** economy, develop according to the laws of

capitalist economy? No, our theoretician replies in terror. It is clear: the village does not live according to Marx. This matter must be corrected. Stalin attempts, in his report, to reject the petty bourgeois theories on the stability of peasant economy. However, becoming entangled in the net of Marxian formulae, he gives this theory a most generalized expression. In reality, the theory of extended reproduction, according to the idea of Marx, embraces capitalist economy as a whole not only industry but agriculture as well, only in its pure form, that is, without its pre-capitalist remnants. But Stalin, leaving aside, for some reason, handicraft and guild occupations, poses the question: “Can it be said that our small peasant holdings develop according to the principle (!) of extended production? No, he replies, “it cannot be said.” In other words Stalin, in the most generalized form, repeats the assertions of the bourgeois economists that agriculture does not develop according to the “principle” of the Marxian theory of capitalist production. Wouldn't it be better, after this, to keep still? After all, the Marxian agronomists kept still listening to his shameful abuse of the teachings of Marx. Yet, the softest of answers should have sounded thus: Get off the tribune immediately, and do not dare to deliberate on problems about which you know nothing!

But we shall not follow the example of the Marxian agronomists and keep still. Ignorance armed with power is just as dangerous as insanity armed with a razor.

The formulae of the second volume of Marx do not represent guiding “principles” of socialist construction, but objective generalizations of capitalist processes. These formulae, abstracted from the peculiarities of agriculture, not only do not contradict its development but fully embrace it as **capitalist** agriculture.

The only thing that can be said about agriculture in the framework of the formulae of the second volume is that the latter pre-suppose the existence of a sufficient quantity of agricultural raw materials and agricultural products for consumption, for insuring extended reproduction. But what should be the correlation between agriculture and industry: as in England? or as in America? Both these types conform equally to Marxist formulae. England imports articles for consumption and raw materials. America exports them. There is no contradiction here with the formulae of extended reproduction, which are in no way limited by national boundaries, and are not adapted either to national capitalism or, even less, to socialism in one country.

If people should arrive at synthetic feeding, and at synthetic forms of raw material, agriculture would be completely reduced to nothing, being substituted by new branches of the chemical industry. What would then become of the formulae of extended reproduction? They would retain all their validity to the extent that the capitalist form of production and distribution would remain.

Agricultural bourgeois Russia, with the tremendous predominance of the peasantry, not only covered the demands of the growing industries, but also created the possibility of large exports.

These processes were accompanied by the strengthening of the Kulak top and the weakening of the peasant bottom, their growing proletarianization. In this manner, in spite of all its peculiarities, agriculture on **capitalistic** foundations developed within the framework of those very formulae with which Marx embraced the whole of capitalist economy—and **only** capitalist economy.

Peasant Economy and “Socialist” Industry

Stalin wants to come to the conclusion that this is impossible “to base . . . socialist construction on two different foundations: on the foundation of the greatest and most consolidated socialist industry and on the foundation of the most dispersed and backward small commodity peasant economy.” In reality, he proves something directly contrary. If the formulae of extended reproduction are equally applicable to capitalist and socialist economy—to “contemporary society” generally—then it is absolutely incomprehensible why it is impossible to continue the fur-

(Continued on Page 8)

Pollack Case: A Statement of Fact

The Daily Worker of November 15, 1930, prints a statement by the Party Control Commission which announces the expulsion of comrade Sylvan A. Pollack on the grounds that he acted as an agent for the police when, together with four other Party comrades, he was arrested for sedition in Scranton, Pa., last July. An accusation of this kind involving the integrity and membership of a comrade in the movement, must be considered and answered.

Comrade Pollack has been a supporter of the Opposition for about a year now, and a member of the New York branch of the Communist League for almost the same time. The accusation made against him, as an aftermath of the Scranton police raid, was reported to the national committee, which forthwith instructed him to demand of the Central Control Commission of the Party a hearing of the charges and an immediate decision. This was imperative in the case, since it is impossible to have such a question hanging fire for any length of time. If the individual in question is a police agent, every day of his membership is injurious to the movement; if the charge against him is false, every day that it stands without being wiped out impairs the ability of the comrade to function in the movement, and, therefore, is equally injurious to the latter.

Following the publication of the Control Commission statement, the national committee of the League once more considered the question and decided that absolutely no credence could be placed in the charges made against comrade Pollack, for the following reasons.

1. His previous record in the movement, membership in the Socialist party, foundation member of the Communist Party in 1919, active speaker, writer and organized for the Party for 11 years entrusted with numerous posts of importance and responsibility.

2. Previous arrests: during the Palmer Red Raids in 1919, during the needle trades strike in 1925, during the picketing of the Hungarian Consulate, etc., and his conduct in these arrests which was irreproachable and never met with any criticism.

3. Despite the fact that the first and second hearing of the case before the Control Commission occurred at the end of July and beginning of August, no action was taken against him until December. Since July no new material was presented to the Commission to warrant either the delay or the expulsion almost four months afterwards. The Commission, in other words, did not take the charges seriously, knowing that they were made for ulterior motives in the first place. This is demonstrated further by the fact that comrade Pollack was not only allowed to retain membership in the Party, but was permitted to occupy important and responsible posts, as editor of *Solidarity*, official organ of the Workers International Relief, and agit-prop director of that organization.

4. The Control Commission resurrected the Scranton charges only after comrade Pollack was accused of "Trotskyism" through the intermediary of a disreputable individual named Eisenman previously expelled from the Y. C. L. as a degenerate and a white chauvinist. The Commission immediately demanded Pollack's suspension from the post of W. I. R. editor until the "Trotskyism" charges were investigated, a demand it did not make when Pollack was accused of being a police agent.

The national committee of the League therefore declares the scurrilous statement of the Party Control Commission to be a disgraceful attempt at a frame-up to discredit the Opposition as a whole and comrade Pollack as an individual militant. His membership in the Opposition, now of a year's standing, remains unaffected, and he is entitled to the full confidence of revolutionists.

We append here a statement on the simple facts in the case, made before our committee by comrade Pollack.

National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

COMRADE POLLACK'S STATEMENT

The Control Commission charges that I led the police to the rooming house of Slinger and Little. On whose say so are these charges made? At the hearing held in Scranton on July 12, when we were held for the Grand Jury, the Deputy Sher-

iffs who arrested us without warrants so testified. The word of the police is believed in preference to a communist.

It came about this way: The defense attorney had made the police witnesses admit that the arrests were made without a warrant. To justify their actions the police stated they did not need any warrants because when Joe Tash, was arrested the night before the rest of us, he gave them the key to the headquarters where I was taken into custody when I came there the following morning about 8 o'clock. If Tash, gave them the key, they were his "guest", was their argument. To continue their line of reasoning I was hustled into the police car and forced to accompany the police when they went to the rooming house and arrested Slinger and Little. Here they claimed that they were my "guest" and did not need any warrant. At the Control Commission hearing, in an effort to prove that I told the police where the rooming house was located, I was asked what conversation, if any, took place between the police and myself when driving from the office to the rooming house, which is only a distance of about three blocks. I told the C. C. that the only conversation that took place was that one of the deputy sheriffs asked me if I wanted a cigarette and I refused. In the C. C. statement, in an attempt to show that I was friendly with the police it is turned around and made to read that I offered the cigarettes to the police.

After my arrival in Scranton in July to take over the post as International Labor Defense district organizer, I found out for the first time that before my arrival Frankfeld, district organizer of the Party, had the local Party Bureau pass a motion against my being given that position. This was sent to the national bureau of the I. L. D., which refused to give it any consideration. When I arrived in Scranton, Frankfeld was antagonistic from the start, the local functionaries of the Party and Union all being resentful that their protest

was not acted upon favorably. Frankfeld has had a personal dislike for me since 1925 when I was an active supporter of the Ruthenberg group and he as now, a supporter for the Foster group. Therefore, when the arrests took place, Frankfeld saw an opportunity to get revenge. After we were arrested, Slinger, and Little were among the first released on bail. They got out the next morning while Tash and myself stayed in five days. On my release on bail I was informed by Frankfeld that the local Party Bureau, had, on his motion, gone on record that I should be brought up on charges. I went to New York and appeared before a meeting of the National Bureau of the I. L. D., and stated that due to the fact that the local comrades were antagonistic towards me I preferred not to continue to work in that field, especially if I was to be brought up on charges in the Party. Jakira and Darcy laughed at the charges and tried to persuade me to return to the anthracite as organizer. Little also attended this meeting and told of the charges, as representative of the Scranton Party Bureau. He was not taken seriously. This was quite logical. Then I was not known as a Trotskyist.

The next week comrade Gibarti, international representative of the W. I. R., persuaded me to become the agit-prop director of the W. I. R., and in that position I continued until I was brought up on the charges of "Trotskyism."

If it were not that I wish to limit this statement to a simple declaration of the facts in my case, it would be instructive to describe the conduct in this whole affair of such comrades as Freeman Thompson and Dan Slinger, and it would not rebound to their credit. However, this can be reserved for some future and more appropriate date.

—SYLVAN A. POLLACK.

If the number on your wrapper is

59

then your subscription to the *Militant* has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

Weisbord's Proposals

Continued from page 4
urgently needed machinery here, but, by setting a number of industries in motion and thereby providing jobs, will clearly establish the direct community of interests of the jobless workers and the proletarian state.

Finally, we are totally at variance with Weisbord's views on relations with the Lovestone group, stated in his original declaration, and repeated in the articles in question. His insistent demand for a bloc with the Right wing vitiates all his claims of adherence to the tested standpoint of the Communist Opposition. The fact that this demand is carried out in practice by him (bloc with Lovestone in the liquidationist "textile committee") only makes the matter worse. This proposal will continue to meet with as intransigent opposition from us as any attempt to establish it as a platform, or part of a platform, for the Marxist section of the movement.

A DANCE IN CHICAGO

The Chicago branch of the League has arranged a proletarian entertainment and dance to be held Saturday night, December 13, at 1118 W. Madison St. Among the features on the program will be a reading of his poetry by Ralph Chaplin, piano and violin selections by Ernest Moeller and David H. T. Kahn, singing by Miss Edna Kunin, recitals, dancing, etc., etc. It will be, say the Chicago comrades, one of the best entertainments held in the city for long time. In addition, there will be music and dancing, and refreshments for all. Admission is twenty-five cents and all friends and comrades are cordially invited to be present on time so that a full evening's comradely entertainment may be had.

CHICAGO STUDY CLASS

Chicago workers interested in the study of Marxism are urged to attend the class in that subject conducted by the Communist League branch. It meets every Wednesday, at 8 p. m., at 1214 Washtenaw, with comrade Hugo Oehler as director of the class. The question method is the one followed. All are invited.

STALIN AS A THEORETICIAN - : - by LEON TROTSKY

Continued from Page 7
ther development of economy on the very foundation of the contradictions between city and village, upon which capitalism reached an immeasurably higher level. In America, gigantic industrial trusts develop even today, side by side with the farmer regime in agriculture. The farmer economy created the foundation of American industry. It is precisely on the American type, by the way, that our bureaucrats, with Stalin at their head, orientated themselves openly until yesterday: the powerful farmer at the bottom centralized industry at the top.

The ideal equivalent of exchange is the basic premise of the abstract formulae of the second volume. Nevertheless, planned economy of the transition period, even though based upon the law of value, violates it at every step and creates mutual relations between different branches of industry and primarily between industry and agriculture on the basis of unequal exchange. The decisive lever of compulsory accumulation and planned distribution is the government budget. With a further development, its role will have to grow. Financial credits regulate the mutual relations between compulsory accumulation of the budget and the processes of the market in so far as they retain their force. Not only the budgetary, but also the planned or semi-planned credit financing which insures the extension of reproduction in the U.S.S.R., can in no way be summed up in the formulae of the second volume, the whole force of which lies in the fact that they ignore budgets or plans or tariffs, and in general, all forms of governmentally planned influence that establish the necessary regulations over the play of blind forces of the market, which are disciplined by the law of value. No sooner would we "free" the internal Soviet market and abolish the monopoly of foreign trade, than the exchange between the city and village would become incomparably more equalized, accumulation in the village—it is understood, Kulak, farmer-capitalist accumulation—would take its course and it would soon reveal that Marx' formulae apply also to agriculture. On this road, Russia would in a brief period be transformed into a colony upon which the industrial

development of other countries would be based.

In order to motivate this same complete collectivization, the school of Stalin (there is such a thing) has made use of the stark comparisons between the tempo of development in industry and agriculture. Crudest of all, this operation is performed, as usual, by Molotov. In February 1929, Molotov spoke at the Moscow district conference of the Party: "Agriculture in recent years has noticeably lagged behind industry in the tempo of development. . . . For the last three years, industrial production increased in value by more than fifty percent and the products of agriculture—all in all—by seven percent." The comparison of these two tempos is economic illiteracy. By peasant economy they include, in reality, all branches of economy. The development of industry has always, and in all branches, taken place at the expense of the reduction of the specific gravity of agriculture. It is sufficient to recall that metallurgical production in the United States is almost equal to the production of farmer economy at a time when, with us, it is one-eighteenth of agricultural production. This shows that in spite of the high tempos of recent years, our industry has not yet emerged from the period of infancy. In order to eliminate the contradictions between city and village created by bourgeois development, Soviet industry must first surpass the village to an incomparably greater degree than bourgeois Russia did. The present breach between state industry and peasant economy did not proceed from the fact that industry surpassed agriculture too greatly—the advanced position of industry is an internationally historical fact and a necessary condition for progress—but from the fact that our industry is too weak, that is, it has gone ahead too little to have the possibility to raise agriculture to the necessary level. The aim, of course, is the elimination of the contradictions between the city and the village. But the roads and methods of this elimination have nothing in common with the equalization of tempos of agriculture and industry. The mechanization of agriculture and the industrialization of a series of its branches will be accompanied, on the contrary, by the re-

duction of the specific gravity of agriculture as such. The tempo of the mechanization we can accomplish, is determined by the productive power of industry. What is decisive for collectivization is not the fact that metallurgy rose in recent years by a few score percent, but the fact that our metal per capita is negligible. The growth of collectivization is only of equal significance to the growth of agriculture itself in so far as the first is based on the technical revolution of agricultural production. But the tempo of such a revolution is limited by the percent specific gravity of industry. The tempo of collectivization must be combined with the material resources of the latter and not at all with abstract statistical tempos.

"Capital" and Socialist Reproduction

In the interests of theoretical clarity, it should be added to what has been said, that the elimination of the contradictions between city and village that is, the raising of agricultural production to a scientific-industrial level, will mean the triumph not of Marx' formulae in agriculture, as Stalin imagines but on the contrary, the elimination of their triumph in industry. Because socialist extended reproduction will not at all take place according to the formulae of "Capital", the central point of which is the pursuit of profits. But all this is too complicated for Stalin and Molotov.

Let us repeat in the conclusion of this chapter that collectivization is the practical task of eliminating capitalism and not the theoretical task of its development. That is why the Marxian formulae are not applicable here from any point of view. The practical possibilities of collectivization are determined by the productive-technical resources at hand for large scale agriculture and the degree of readiness of the peasantry to pass from individual to collective economy. In the long run, this subjective analysis is determined by the very same material-productive factor: the peasant can be attracted to socialism only by the advantage of collective economy, supported by advanced technique. But instead of a tractor, Stalin wants to present the peasant with the formulae of the second volume. But the peasant is honest and does not want to deliberate over what he does not understand.