



Consolidate the Weekly!

...

New York Gives New Impetus to Expansion Program Fund

...

The last meeting of the National Committee decided to appeal to the members and friends of the Communist League to make up the balance of the two thousand dollar fund needed to finish the expansion program which was laid out for the year. This decision of the National Committee is a timely reminder that we should not forget the practical tasks we have undertaken nor leave them uncompleted. Approximately two-thirds of the total fund has been subscribed and a corresponding proportion of the objectives of the program have already been attained. These results bear convincing testimony to the practical feasibility of the plan, to the accuracy with which the National Committee estimated the resources and responsive spirit of the membership and its own ability to fulfill the obligations.

As matters stand now our planned method of work stands vindicated, but the program remains uncompleted. The thing now is to finish the job. This will signify another step forward for our movement. Not the least of the positive results of a triumphant completion of the whole program will be its influence in convincing ourselves and others that we mean what we say and accomplish what we undertake. There has been more than enough of bluff and bluster in the Communist movement of America. A practical demonstration of a different method will have a wholesome effect all the way around.

The central task of the moment, upon which the appeal of the National Committee is primarily based, is the stabilization of the *Weekly Militant*. The launching of this enterprise in the face of the traditional "Summer slump" was a bold step, but it was necessary and therefore correct. This is the tenth issue of the resurrected *Weekly*. It was undertaken without adequate reserves, and all Summer the financial resources of the organization have been strained almost to the breaking point. We confidently believe that the worst is behind us in this respect.

However, it must be said frankly that a new push is needed all along the line to secure the *Weekly*. If all the supporters of the *Militant* see the situation

as it is, there can be no doubt that they will pull the belt a little tighter and make the necessary sacrifices to guarantee the uninterrupted weekly publication of our beloved paper. Their past performance speaks in favor of this assumption, and the confident appeal of the National Committee is predicated upon it.

Although the problem presents itself at the moment as a practical question of finances the campaign will derive its scope and power, and its certainty of success, from the broader aspects of the issue. It was a great day for the Communist vanguard of America when our *Militant* recovered from its first defeat and raised its head again as a weekly publication. And not only for America; the embattled sections of the unconquerable Opposition throughout the world, who are united with us in a single fighting fraternity, have drawn a new strength and inspiration from the triumphant resurgence of our militant paper. It is these considerations which will animate our whole organization as one man when we say that the re-establishment of the *Weekly Militant* was no trifling experiment, but a deliberate action. We meant to carry it through at all cost and we will do so.

—J. P. C.

FIRST RESULTS

Following an appeal to the last meeting of the New York branch by comrade Arne Swabeck, national secretary, close to ninety dollars was contributed or pledged for immediate contribution by the comrades assembled. This action should serve to give a new impetus to the completion of the Expansion Program Fund, not only in New York, but throughout the country. The following comrades contributed: J. P. Cannon, \$5.00; Sylvia Bleeker, \$5.00; Marty Abern, \$5.00; M. Levit, \$10.00; Al Glotzer, \$2.00. Pledges in addition were made as follows: J. P. Cannon, \$5.00; M. Levit, \$5.00; Al Glotzer, \$5.00; Harry Milton, \$5.00; Max Engel, \$10.00; George Clarke, \$5.00 E. Field, \$10.00; Louis Basky, \$5.00; Jerry Marsh, \$1.00; H. Capelis, \$10.00. Grand total, \$88.00. What do the comrades in the other cities say?

Gordon Arrested at Boston Meeting

BOSTON.—

Sam Gordon, organizer for the Communist League of America (Opposition) was arrested at a street meeting in Malden here for "speaking without a permit". The meeting, one of a series at which Gordon had been speaking to ever-increasing groups of workers, was held in connection with the anti-deportation campaign, and had attracted a large number of Malden workers. After having spoken for about half an hour, a police patrol arrived in an auto and comrade Gordon was asked by the police sergeant to stop speaking. Gordon refused. A bit nonplussed the police stood around for another ten minutes and then, at a signal from the sergeant, when Gordon once more refused to leave the platform, he was pulled down by a couple of burly cops and into the police auto. There were loud and noisy protests from the crowd which had by that time swelled to more than three hundred workers. While in the auto, flanked by the gentlemen of Law and Order, the order was given to the cops to "stay and break it up". At the police station, Gordon's tie and belt were removed so that, according to the sneering remark of the sergeant, he would not "hang himself" (!). The International Labor Defense, upon

being informed, sent a representative down to court next morning who requested that the I. L. D. be given charge of the case, a gratifying change of course on its part as compared with the sabotaging action it pursued in the demands for defense made upon it in the Philadelphia Morgenstern-Goodman case. Bail was set at \$200.00 which upon being furnished, enabled the release of comrade Gordon. Trial was set for September 11 on the charge of speaking without a permit, although—as is the Massachusetts custom—it is possible that the prosecution may change the charge when it sees how weak its case is.

Representatives of the Left Opposition have conversed with Harry Cantor, head of the I. L. D. locally, and arrangements are being made for the defense, although comrade Cantor emphasized that in such cases it is not the I. L. D. policy to present to provide attorneys or pay fines. However, it appears that there is a good likelihood that satisfactory arrangements can be made with the I. L. D. of cooperation in the case. Mr. David K. Niles, of the Civil Liberties Union, has informed the Left Opposition comrades in Boston that he wants to make a test case out of the arrest and is willing to cooperate with the I. L. D.

Credits for Soviet Union

Stalinists Change their Stand but Evade Most Essential Points

The Communist party has finally incorporated into its unemployment program a part of the demand put forward by the Left Opposition for a campaign in favor of large, long-term credits to the Soviet Union. In the new unemployment program published in the *Daily Worker* of August 29, 1931, we find that the last point which the party "declares that the masses must demand" reads as follows:

"10. Development of trade relations with the Soviet Union (including the demand for recognition of the Soviet Union not only as a fundamental requirement of international working class solidarity, but also as a vital immediate economic need of the starving masses) in order that the idle factories may work, fill the constantly growing demands of the successful construction of the workers' government and its five year plan."

Following upon the insertion of a similar point in the demands of the Unemployed Councils of New York, upon which we commented last week, it is

clear that, on this question, the Stalinists have made a turn about face in the direction of the Opposition—not their customary hysterical turns of 180 degrees, nor even a complete turn to the correct position, but at any rate, a turn in the right direction. The cool and off-hand manner in which the change is made cannot conceal the fact that for more than a year now the Stalinist hierarchy in the party—and throughout the Comintern—has systematically and bitterly sabotaged the promulgation of this vitally necessary slogan of economic collaboration with the Soviet Union.

What We Demanded

As far back as April 5, 1930, the *Militant* wrote: "We regard it necessary for the Communists to conduct a campaign for and to make demands upon the Hoover government for the establishment of broad and long-time credits to the Soviet Union by the United States. This should, in fact, be a central slogan of the Communists in all countries. It is possible to demonstrate to the American

(Continued on page 3)

I. Y. D. All Out!

Amidst the fires and flames of World War, at a time when international socialism had collapsed, the national socialist parties had (with few brilliant exceptions) turned social-imperialist, the socialist youth assembled at Berne, Switzerland, unfurled the banner of proletarian internationalism. It was there, in April 1915, that the first Sunday of every September was set aside for the mobilization of the working youth against capitalist militarism and war.

The kindled sparks served as torches to light up the path towards proletarian revolution. The socialist youth, actively aided by the Bolsheviks, inspired by Lenin, Liebknecht, and Luxemburg, courageously led the struggle against opportunism and social patriotism. Hand in hand with the revolutionary socialists of the social democratic parties it forged ahead, organized Left wings, held demonstrations, defended the principles of revolutionary Marxism.

The victorious October gave unprecedented impetus to this development. In November 1919, in Berlin, a few months after the Comintern had been formed, amidst tumult and uncertainty, victories and defeats, the Young Communist International was born. Continuing the best traditions of the Socialist Youth International, it made International Youth Day a living expression of its anti-militarist work. The traditions of I. Y. D. were enriched, made more glorious, enshrined in the heart of every young revolutionist. Growing thousands of youth rallied to the call of the Y. C. I. against militarism, armaments, war. The fight against militarism was intimately connected with the struggle against wage slavery, with the winning of the youth for Communism. The Y. C. I. was becoming the acknowledged leader of the international proletarian youth.

Today more than ever since the last war, the need for systematic anti-militarist work exists. The present worldwide economic crisis compels the imperialist powers to intensify their search for new markets. The increased armaments, the numerous peace conferences, the wide spread militarization of the youth, the offensive of the capitalist governments against the Communists, the divers campaign against the Soviet Union are a few of the outstanding signs of the day.

Are the Leagues prepared to play the same role that the socialist youth did in the last war? Can they mobilize the youth for the defense of the Soviet Union? Will they be able to carry on a revolutionary struggle against their own capitalist class?

The absence of systematic and effective anti-militarist activity, and the virtual sterility of the Leagues caused by the revisionist theories, false strategy and tactics and bureaucratic regime predominating in the International Communist movement, spell a serious danger. Just as in 1915, the revolutionary socialist youth, who were in the forefront in the struggle against militarism, led the fight against opportunism in the revolutionary ranks, so today the Communist youth should rally around the Left Opposition in its struggle for revolutionary Marxism, against opportunism, for the regeneration of the Communist movement.

We should greet the seventeenth International Youth Day—resolved to emulate the young comrades who came before us; to carry on their work until final victory.

Young Communists! Struggle for the unity of the Communist youth movement! For the unity of the world Communist movement!

Against opportunism! For revolutionary Marxism!

Young Communists, young workers, young students! Demonstrate on September 8th against capitalist militarism and war!

—JOS. C.

Our Spanish Fund

We are anxious to sum up our campaign for the support of the Spanish Left Opposition press in ship-shape style. The aim we have set ourselves, and it is a modest one, is to raise the sum of two hundred dollars to help our militant Spanish comrades in their efforts to issue a popular weekly organ. Our assistance will not end there, but for this campaign, at least, we want to get the money raised as quickly as possible.

Since our last list, we have received the following contributions: Chicago branch, \$8.00; Toronto branch, \$1.00; D. Dreyer, N. Y. C., \$1.00; M. Morris, Loch Sheldrake, N. Y., \$1.00; Previous total: \$155.81. Grand total to date: \$166.81.

Not much more is required to fill the sum completely. Let us do it generously and speedily!

Mooney Appeals!

All Efforts Now for a Broad and Genuine United Front Move

A Call from Prison

California State Prison,
San Quentin, California,
August 20, 1931.

To All Militant and Revolutionary
Labor Organizations and Groups

Dear Comrades and Fellow Unionists:

The time for action has come. Too long have we been deceived with slick promises—away with them! From the cell where I have been buried alive for fifteen long years I appeal to every working class organization with a spark of militancy or revolutionary purpose—I appeal for united action.

The most flagrant "frame-up" this country has ever seen is dragging into its sixteenth year, and not even a glimpse of freedom is in sight. In fact, I am more securely imprisoned today than when first arrested. The dictatorship of capital knows the economic conditions are so ominous that to issue a pardon at this time would be as though a lighted match were thrown into a powder keg. We must prove that neither will my continued imprisonment serve their purposes. Let this appeal be the spark which will start an unparalleled conflagration—agitation that will arouse the masses to demand my unconditional pardon and the release of all class war prisoners.

I ask for a genuine united front. Every working class organization should elect delegates and be represented on Pardon Mooney Committee that will direct the activities of the workers in this fight. The task of such committees will be to call mass meetings, distribute literature, carry on monster public demonstrations, and engage in an energetic campaign that will make the ground tremble under the feet of the arrogant rulers of California.

One of the immediate tasks of these committees will be to force through the pressure of an awakened public opinion, the publication of the Wickersham Commission of the suppressed report on the Mooney case, prepared by its experts. This Report, I am given to understand, is a factual record and, when published, will definitely prove that the California authorities combined to organize the frame-up.

Too many working class groups divide and weaken their forces. The effect they quite naturally should have in combined numbers is lost when they quarrel among themselves. This case ought to serve as a common rallying ground for all revolutionary and militant groups which should unite for effective work in the face of a common enemy.

I call upon the following groups, listed alphabetically, and other similar groups I may overlook or forget in my haste to unite and organize Pardon Mooney Committees in every city and state in this nation for immediate action:

All the militant units and individuals within the A. F. of L.
The Amalgamated Clothing Workers.
The Communist Party, and all of its subdivisions including the Trade Union Unity League, the International Labor Defense, and other similar organizations.
All of the groups who have split away from the Communist Party, such as the Majority Group, the Communist League Opposition, the Communist League of Struggle.

The Conference for Progressive Labor Action.
The Farmer Labor Party.
The Industrial Workers of the World
The Proletarian Party.
The Socialist Labor Party.
The Socialist Labor Party, etc.

I know it will not be easy for some of these groups to cooperate, one with the other. But this is a basic issue, and every sincere man and woman willing to join in a united effort should and shall, be welcome.

I have spent fifteen of the best years of my life in a California dungeon for the ideals and purposes all these groups represent and my fate is in their hands. When they fight for my freedom, they fight for their cause—the cause of labor. My continued imprisonment is the very best evidence of the futility and weakness of their divided efforts. Only by their combined strength can they defeat the common foe.

I hail each and every one of my fellow workers and comrades in this struggle. Let us all work in common for the Social Revolution that will bring to an end this barbarous dog-eat-dog, profit-mad, capitalist system.

To each and every one of you I send fraternal revolutionary greetings.

TOM MOONEY
31,921

In an adjoining column, we print Tom Mooney's clarion call to all revolutionary and militant labor organizations and groups.

We agree with Tom Mooney that the "time for action has come", and unreservedly indorse the call. To the Communist movement, to all revolutionary and militant workers it becomes a golden opportunity and an imperative duty to close the ranks and act unswervingly and unitedly in a struggle which will reverberate from coast to coast, for the unconditional pardon of Tom Mooney and the release of all class war prisoners. The Communist League of America (Opposition) adds its voice to that of Tom Mooney's from his prison cell, where he has been buried for fifteen long years. We say: Yes, this issue can serve as a common rallying ground for all revolutionary and militant groups!

The Need for Action

With the capitalist offensive forging its way ruthlessly, with its dungeons filled with miners from Harlan, Kentucky, and from the Pennsylvania fields, with Negro workers from Chicago and Scottsborough, with the Centralia prisoners still languishing in jail and the continued increase of class war victims, this issue of freedom for Tom Mooney and release of all class war prisoners has become an ever more potent one, action upon which brooks no delay. With the deepening of the crisis and more acute working class misery, it is to be expected that the rulers of Wall Street, in order to extricate themselves from their economic difficulties, will attempt to feed the greedy maws of class oppression with many more victims—sterling champions of the proletariat. But it is not yet too late for the working class to rally and to build a gigantic movement which will prevent it.

From his prison cell Tom Mooney says: "I ask for a genuine united front." This is entirely correct and will meet with the approval of every red-blooded worker. Only a genuine united front can produce a movement sufficiently strong in numbers, sufficiently strong in purpose and in conviction to batter open the prison doors and to advance the American working class toward the social revolution. Only an international solidarity, steered by a revolutionary

purpose, can liberate the working class from capitalist oppression and forever destroy the capitalist dungeons.

Tom Mooney names specific organizations upon which he calls to build a genuine united front, to create Pardon Mooney Committees throughout the country. He does not call upon the imperialist agents within labor's ranks, the reactionary trade union bureaucrats, nor upon these who have deceived with slick promises. Their role as deceivers and betrayers he has already unmasked by his burning denunciations. A genuine united front must mean an effort to include all of these organizations and others willing to participate. In this there need be no fear of the deceivers and betrayers within some of these organizations. The Hillquits, the Hillmans and the other little Mustes hate more than anything else to work in common with us in any genuine struggle, or even for the release of all class war prisoners. They prefer the ranks of reaction to the camp of revolution and they prove it daily at every serious test. But it is our task to make them stand up in front of the workers on every concrete question and affirm this by their refusal to participate in a real struggle. Such leader types will oppose the united front with the Communists because they aim to maintain capitalism. But without the Communists, there can be no united front and the workers will thus, by one more experience, learn that to heed the clarion call of Tom Mooney they will have to fight all such leaders standing in the way.

The Communist Duty

Upon the Communists devolves, therefore, the duty to bring this genuine united front into life. Their guiding line can only be the one of the dearest interests of the working class and of following the glowing spirit of Tom Mooney and the other class war prisoners. To weld together various workers organizations, with varying programs, into one solid fighting front around this one common purpose will bring about a mighty echo of approval from every militant worker.

It is therefore pertinent to ask, in view of the statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party published in the *Daily Worker* of August 28 (Continued on page 2)

Offer Aid in Party Election Fight

In view of the coming municipal elections in New York, the local branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) in an effort to do all in its power to cooperate in the furtherance of the Communist campaign, has addressed the following letter to the official party:

New York District Executive Com.
Communist Party of the U. S. A.
50 E. 13th St.,
New York, N. Y.
Comrades:

The New York Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) offers its services in the coming election campaign. We are ready to supply speakers, press space, literature, and aid in any other manner assigned to us.

In order to have as successful a campaign as possible, it is essential that a prompt and energetic effort be made for the collection of signatures for the placing of Communist candidates on the ballot.

We are prepared to participate in this collection campaign.

We await an early response.

Comradely

H. SPONE,

Secretary.

No reply has yet been received from the party, but the New York branch of the League is laying plans for the maximum participation in the campaign in spite of the obvious desire of the Stalinist officials to prevent our cooperation.

The Anarchists in Spain

The «Turn» of the Syndicalists and Macia's Nationalism

In recent days, the Catalan question has occupied the foreground of Spain's political life. The Catalan Statute is to be discussed by the Cortes at Madrid: will it be adopted? The jubilation in the Catalan nationalist circles was great this week, but it has swiftly abated. From the latest information, Macia himself went to Madrid to defend the Statute. The telegrams add that, following a conversation between Macia and Zamora, Barcelona is sure that the Statute will be adopted by the Cortes without great difficulties. What lies behind all this agitation around the Catalan Statute?

The Catalan nationalist movement is led entirely by the Catalan petty bourgeoisie. It is in this movement that the great popular mass of Catalonia has put all its economic and social hopes aroused by the April revolution. The Communist party being too weak in Catalonia and the Catalan Federation, led by the confusionist Maurin, having favored the policy of Macia by its false "separatist" policy, has enabled Macia to canalize into the zone of his influence, by an "evangelical-social" agitation of the most vulgar demagoguery, the sympathies of the great majority of the popular masses of Catalonia, primarily those of

the petty bourgeoisie of the cities and the country. This fact gives the Catalan movement a conciliatory and opportunistic character. Macia, Companys and the other leaders of this movement have adopted the only policy adapted to the spirit and the social nature of the petty bourgeoisie, that is, the policy of those "seated between two chairs". It is only eight days ago that complaints were made against Macia in the Spanish press and even from the tribune of the Cortes for having conspired with the National Confederation of Labor against the central power of Madrid and for having supported the strike movement of the N. C. of L. against the bourgeoisie. Companys delivered a flamboyant speech in the Cortes in favor of the anarcho-syndicalist N. C. of L. In reality, Macia assured himself, on the eve of the plebiscite for the Catalan Statute, of the aid of the "a-political" anarcho-syndicalist N. C. of L. Macia cannot rule tranquilly without the aid or at least the benevolent neutrality of the organized Catalan workers. The syndicalist leaders of the N. C. of L. who undividedly rule the Catalan working class have lent this necessary accord to Macia, in the hope of having "social peace".

(Continued on page 2)

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

U. S. S. R.

FROM MOSCOW & DEPORTATION

From Moscow:

After a fairly long interruption, I have succeeded in passing some time in Moscow. The provisioning is extremely badly assured; it should not be forgotten that in Moscow it is, in any case, much better than in the provinces. The winter was very harsh, the past year was not any better, but the suffering has never before been as it is now. The successes of construction have brought the workers nothing and enthusiasm is demanded of them... on an empty stomach. The workers complain about the frightful mess and the bureaucratic regime in the factory, in the trade union, everywhere. The absences have become "permanent". The shock brigades (the workers say, "they are always shocking each other") have no effect. There is no doubt that behind the veil of the official shouting about the uninterrupted successes we are proceeding towards an accelerated accumulation of contradictions. Many are those who see it. The "floaters" (workers who shift from one plant to another) still exist. And this in spite of the rule according to which the worker, by changing the factory, has not the right to a higher wage than the one he got in the factory he left (the size of his wage must be noted in his booklet)... The worker gets his provisions in the factory cooperative. Besides these cooperatives, divided into three categories—the first category: industrial proletariat; the second: non-industrial workers; the third: employees—there are cooperatives close to the living places. There still exists a number of camouflaged provisioners: for the diplomats (without restrictions), for the foreign specialists, for the big bureaucrats etc. All this is differentiated according to the grades and the posts occupied.

Apart from this, they have created, as you know, cooperatives where everything is sold at market prices. Here, everything is from five to ten times dearer: the prices are absolutely unapproachable. The Moselpromtorg, one of the enterprises where one can buy everything, but at fantastic prices, is nicknamed the Ramzin (or the Stalin) Museum. "Museum", because the products to be found there are to look at and not to buy—they are too dear.

I have spoken to some of the militants who at one time criticized many things. Today it is still more difficult than it was last year to speak "with an open heart" with anybody. Most of these comrades were very sympathetic to our criticism during the period of "exaggeration" and "dizziness". They all agree in recognizing that the thought of the party is stifled, that there is no life in the party. This is not an object of discussion. One of these comrades—a very important director of economy—told me approximately this: there is nothing to do, we must suffer the Stalinist regime. One cannot lead among us except with an iron hand. It is only in this way that the five year plan can be achieved—today that is the most important thing. There is nothing to look for from the C. I. It is weak and lives only by grace of subsidies. There are no leaders; there are not even any parties, with the exception of the German C. P. We know that perfectly well. The C. I. will not lead us far; that is why we must develop what is, that is, the Soviet Union. That is a real task. Such a national socialist position is not exceptional and I believe it comes from higher-ups [That is right; it is just what Stalin said to Lomdazze in speaking of the Comintern.—Ed.] It is interesting to note that most of them accept the persecutions against Kizianov with the same passivity: there is nothing to do about it. To be sure, my interlocutors reflect only a thin layer of the party, but for this layer the sentiments it expresses it seems to me are symptomatic.

A voice from deportation:

Since the Spring I have been living in a new place. During the Winter and the Spring, all the deportees were "shaken up" so that those who, like myself, for example, were not sent into solitary, were transferred to a more "pernicious" locality. As before, things are very bad from the standpoint of provisions and postal service: a message from friends is an extremely rare affair. In spite of this we read not so long ago with great pleasure the booklet "What is the Permanent Revolution?". Christian G. Rakovsky has elaborated theses on "The Laws of the Socialist Dictatorship", which we have received. If you have not the latest works of Rakovsky, I can tell you that they coincide entirely with the works of the Old Man [Trotsky.—Ed.]

From everywhere, we receive news of a new wave of repression. In May, a number of "recidivists" (former Oppositionists who have come back to the Opposition) were arrested in Moscow. Some of them were sent to Solovki, others were condemned to ten years in concentration camps. Two comrades have proclaimed a hunger strike; their condition is very grave. We do not know, unfortunately, what has happened

ed with them.

In the Spring of this year, the term of deportation of many of us should have expired (three years) but the majority were given a "repeater", often even the solitary. Some were arrested all over again a month or even less after the expiration of the deportation term. The aim pursued remains the same: our extermination.

The comrades who were not arrested again received certain "reductions"; in reality, this means a transfer to a new place of deportation.

A great interest exists among us for the Spanish revolution and its perspectives. It would be interesting to know the opinion of the Old Man. None of his works on the Spanish revolution has reached us.

Mooney Appeal

(Continued from page 1)

alongside of Mooney's call: Do the party leaders intend to emulate the Hillquits, the Hillmans and their helpers in a refusal to organize a genuine united front? Is this statement to be a justification for evasion of duty? While it indorses Mooney's call in general, it falls entirely to indicate one single measure, one single step toward the organization of a united front. While it does call upon the workers, upon the unemployed councils, etc., for support to the call, it falls in the most crucial demand—the demand for the organization of a united front movement. The statement attempts to cover this failure by the usual base slander against the Left Opposition as a means of diverting the issue away from the party leadership's responsibility.

Why do the party centrist bureaucrats fear a genuine united front? Not a "so-called 'united front' arranged from the top with 'leaders'... an alliance of a few so-called 'leaders'." This is not what Tom Mooney asks for. In a genuine united front the Communists can have nothing to fear from such "leaders". Why, then, do they shrink this responsibility? This is what every party member should ask of the leadership!

Through the International Labor Defense there must be initiated the organization of a genuine united front, the setting up of Committees to fight for the freedom of Tom Mooney and release of all class war prisoners. The party leadership must give up its miserable evasion and cease begging the issue. It should grasp this as an excellent opportunity for Communists to mobilize a powerful movement. That much every militant worker will demand from it. Our modest forces will stand unreservedly at the disposal of such a movement.

"Tom Mooney" is an historical symbol of the American workers—of their weakness and failures of yesterday and today and their potential dynamic power which alone will bring victory tomorrow." To bring this potential dynamic power into motion is now the task. Throughout the period of the present crisis, the insoluble contradictions of capitalism are intensifying. Throughout the country, the signs of sharpened struggles are multiplying. We are facing the beginnings of an upward working class curve. It harbors enormous possibilities. In this situation, the ringing call for Tom Mooney's liberation and the release of all class war prisoners must echo and re-echo throughout the length and breadth of the country. It must resound in a movement of powerful proportions. The Communists must become its spearhead.

—ARNE SWABECK.

IN SPAIN

The Events of a Fortnight

THE INCIDENTS AT SEVILLE

The bourgeois press, formerly monarchist and today republican, has passed over in silence and distorted the truth about what happened during the last general strike in Seville. It confined itself to declaring that the origin of the strike was the assassination (it did not use the expression "assassination") of a striking brewery worker, an assassination carried out by the police. As a protest, the Seville working class called a general strike. During the burial of the assassinated worker, a violent clash took place between the police and the workers caused by the prolongation of the arrest and also by violent fights between the public forces and the workers.

Four workers were killed and many wounded in the fighting. But the bourgeois press passed over in silence the principal object. In the battles, the workers defended themselves with brilliant heroism and the police received only what it deserved. Many guardsmen were killed, among them an officer of the Security Guard. When general Sanjurjo (monarchist up to the day the republic was proclaimed), sent by the republic government to suppress the movement, arrived in Seville and ordered the killing of the workers, the police—surprised by the heroic defense of its life conducted by the working class—refused to fire, even though it only lasted a few hours. But the Guardia Civil, a police body hated by all Spaniards, launched the fight which came to the point of the bombardment and the destruction of many homes, rendered uninhabitable, in which some elements friendly to the workers had been living up to the time of their imprisonment. Censorship of the press was imposed in order to conceal the truth. The "republican" government has already committed infamies and crimes which Primo de Rivera did not dare commit. One of the workers detained during the incidents was wounded and imprisoned in a boat converted

into a jail. A few days after the incidents, when all was already peaceful, he was found assassinated in the floating prison. The government called it a suicide.

The Constituent Cortes sent to Seville a Parliamentary Commission to investigate what happened there. Some of these parliamentarians saw the horrible truth, threatened to tell it and to demand judgment upon those responsible. But the government has compelled the press to conceal the authenticity of these manifestations. It is needless to say that the injustices and the crimes tolerated by the republican government will go unpunished.

THE LABOR ORGANIZATIONS DURING THE RECENT DISTURBANCES

The leadership of the official C. P. has declared pompously and pedantically after the Seville disturbances that it took all the responsibility for the past incidents. But unfortunately, we have observed that during the last strike disturbances, the C. P. remained completely in the shade. Not even a single word from the Stalinist bureaucracy, nor the smallest gesture made during the struggle. As for the leaders of the N. C. of L., they were afraid of the recent incidents. The working masses, more impetuous and militant than the leaders, exceeded the limits of the plans projected by the anarcho-reformist leaders and also left in the background the C. P., which should have been in the vanguard of the working class. The leaders of the N. C. of L. of Spain gave the order for the general strike in Seville, announced and threatened a general strike throughout Spain, but when they see the amplitude and the character that the Seville movement assumed, the anarcho-sindicalist leaders—not knowing what to do with the strike, lacking in a program, and not knowing what orientation to pursue—let the Seville workers in the lurch. The official C. P. was neither

A Letter from Berlin at Election

It is insistently claimed that there were great differences on the plebiscite in the Central Committee of the Communist party. Thaelmann was against, Neumann for: there were extremely violent discussions among them. On July 21, the *Rote Fahne* being prohibited, the local Communist press issued the slogan: "Against the White plebiscite!" On the 22nd, the *Rote Fahne* reappeared with the slogan: "For the Red plebiscite!" It should be noted that Pravda has not published a single article on the question.

A few facts. A rank and file Communist, whom we asked the meaning of the party's activity and its perspectives, answered us: "There is nothing to be disturbed about, they'll never get there." The action was taken without thinking about it.

On the 5th, there was a big party meeting in the largest hall in Berlin. It is hard to estimate the number attending (7000 to 10,000), but the hall which is usually absolutely packed during party meetings, was hardly full in the downstairs seats, and about half empty on the three balconies. The meeting began very late. A large police force on the outside, in the lobby and, according to the law, even two police officers, one in uniform, in the hall besides the tribune. Beaugrand, of the French party, who spoke partly in French and partly in

German aroused considerably sympathy... After his speech, a dozen Schupos (Defense police) broke into the hall and picked up a young newsboy of the *Rote Front*, which is prohibited. This provoked only cries, but no clash. The meeting continued after this incident...

Sunday, Berlin presents the usual picture. In the workers' quarters (Wedding), large numbers of police, in autos, mounted, afoot. But the streets are calm, no assembling; in the afternoon much fewer police are seen. The *Rote Fahne* has given the order to hang red flags from the windows. All told, there are few, except on Koeslinstrasse, which is really red. The tenants of this street are all Communist; that is where the May First shootings took place in 1929...

We visited many voting places; it goes on here in saloons. To our questions, the party placard bearers answered that things were not going well. There were hopes for the better in the afternoon, which brought about no change. Before the results, it was clear that the plebiscite had flopped in Berlin. A Communist placard bearer at the entrance to a voting place, after having heard our opinion replied:

"It's no good with the plebiscite; and just as bad without it."

As to the fighting of the evening and the night, I will write next time...

Solidaridad Obrero, wrote: "In spite of everything", we have said on many occasions that we want nothing against the republic. In an official declaration of the N. C. of L. its leaders declare in the name of the thousands of revolutionary workers whom they are deceiving that "nobody can boast of being able to do better than the Spanish republic" and that consequently, they will do it no harm. While these articles and declarations were made, the workers, abandoned to themselves, were massacred and the trade union organizations sacked.

Only the Spanish Communists, in spite of the absence of a party and a clear-sighted leadership, supported the heroic fighters of Seville by revolutionary class instinct. The Spanish working class will remember these two differing attitudes of two political currents in the revolutionary proletariat of Spain. The treason of the anarcho-sindicalists and the courageous conduct of the Communists in the Seville events should serve Spanish Communism to enlighten the masses organized in the N. C. of L. on the shameful and ignoble role of the Pestagnas, Urales and the other leaders of anarcho-sindicalism. With a correct policy in the trade union field, as in all the other fields of proletarian life, the Spanish Communists today could deliver a mortal blow to the anarcho-sindicalist movement. That is what the friends of the Spanish syndicalists in France not without anguish, are beginning to understand. The *Cri du Peuple* of Monatte and Chambeaud which only two months ago expressed the hope that the Spanish an-

able nor did it dare to put itself at the head of the movement which had already taken on a genuinely insurrectionary and revolutionary character. The working masses had outstripped their leaders and the latter were surprised and demoralized. They lack the basis for the insurrection; the proletariat lacked a guide. Why was the order issued for a general strike? Those who issued it are unable to reply. The workers of Seville, disillusioned were beaten. Their defeat is full of lessons for the future. It is necessary to profit by these lessons and to study them profoundly. The Seville strike had the advantage of showing the great necessity which the Spanish proletariat has of the organization of a revolutionary vanguard and of the very foundation of the revolution—the revolutionary Juntas of the workers and peasants.

If this is the way we see the problem, as every Marxist-Leninist must see it, then the struggle of the Seville proletariat was not a route but on the contrary, produced a great arsenal of lessons. Let us know how to profit by them in the coming struggles!

THE SOCIALIST MINISTERS

The bourgeois press has begun the open struggle against two of the three socialist ministers who belong to the present government of the republic: against Indalecio Prieto, minister of finance, and Largo Caballero, minister of labor; and it is precisely because these two gentlemen cause a serious danger to the government, being two ministers who, together with Maura have lost all prestige and are dishonored. Prieto has carried out a catastrophic job at the head of Spanish finances. The peseta has suffered an enormous depreciation, which has produced an aggravation in the already difficult Spanish economic situation and has extended the labor crisis. Caballero has distinguished himself by his anti-labor policy and has brought the hatred of the workers upon him. The workers arise against those who, usurping a representation which nobody has conferred upon them, work against the interests of the class. The bourgeois press, taking into account the importance of the matter, proposes the idea of replacing the two socialist ministers by others who will be better able to fulfill the ministerial functions. In reality, Prieto and Caballero have shown an absolute incompetence at the heads of their respective ministries. The bourgeoisie which gave them their posts in order to have them confine the impetuosity of the workers from these vantage points, sees that that they have done has been to heighten the courage of the workers by their myopic actions and means to remove them. They will succeed. Prieto especially is swamped in his ministry.

THE REPRESSION CONTINUES

Upon going out of a meeting of the International Red Aid in Madrid, the workers were pounced upon by the police who killed one and wounded many. Later, many workers were arrested. Labor meetings are suspended and workers papers are seized, correspondence is violated, house raids are conducted, arrested workers without defense have judicial law applied to them, workers are imprisoned and brutalized more and better than during the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, just as in the heyday of Martinez Anido. The republic government has assassinated more workers than did Primo de Rivera in the seven years of his government. Misery, hunger and despair increase incessantly among the workers. The coming Winter threatens to be prodigious in desperate struggles between the workers who will ask for bread and the police who will mow them down. The present government promises to be bloody and brutal to a degree exceeding the dictators of the monarchy.

Will the Spanish working class know how to organize itself and to react? Madrid, August 8 1931.

—HENRI LACROIX.

GERMANY

THE PLEBISCITE'S REAL RESULTS

The press service of the German Communist Party, commenting on the results of the referendum to dissolve the Prussian Landtag, seeks to swindle the party followers with empty boasts about the alleged victory of the Stalinists in their disastrous combination with the Hitlerites: "Yesterday's referendum was a truly Red referendum... The Red referendum furnished the proof that it is possible, by a principled Bolshevik policy, not only to drive back Fascism, but to beat it decisively." The *Daily Worker* in this country, which paid very little attention to the Prussian referendum at all—it is more interested in "Communism in one country"—chanted the same song. Pitiful as these claims are, they are properly revealed in all their falsehood and deceit by the final returns which have just reached us.

The Figures Speak

We publish the comparative figures of the votes given in the 20 "verwaltungsbezirke" (roughly equivalent to our wards) of Berlin, first in the referendum of a few years ago on the expropriation of the German princes, a campaign led by the Communist party which won the support of the socialist workers, and second, the votes given in the same districts during the recent Prussian referendum which was really led by the Fascists:

Ward	"Princes" Referen.	"Pruss." Referen.
Center	127,561	67,329
Tiergarten	111,215	66,469
Wedding	191,579	89,986
Prenzlauer Berg	150,162	72,890
Friedrichshain	175,084	70,094
Kreuzberg	179,742	88,352
Charlottenburg	120,178	79,440
Spandau	48,652	29,003
Wilmersdorf	46,767	47,266
Zehlendorf	8,733	16,932
Schoeneberg	76,261	60,699
Steglitz	42,166	58,863
Tempelhof	26,969	23,941
Neukölln	153,905	71,500
Treptow	48,112	21,860
Koepenick	32,156	17,511
Lichtenberg	96,067	53,652
Weissensee	25,683	18,741
Pankow	40,809	31,636
Reinickendorf	48,756	30,536

Thus in such decisively proletarian wards as Center, Wedding, Friedrichshain and Neukölln, the "Red" referendum to dissolve the Prussian Landtag, gave only half or less than half the votes cast for the Communist referendum a few years ago to expropriate the princes. In such bourgeois wards as Zehlendorf and Steglitz, the "Red" referendum received more (in one almost double) than it received last time. Red referendum indeed! The fact is that the Fascists brought out almost their maximum forces (very few Fascists failed to vote on account of the Communist party's participation) for the referendum, while the revolutionary workers stayed at home, indifferent or resentful towards the Stalinist capitulation to the nationalist demagoguery of the Hitlerites.

Further "Victory" Proof

In proletarian Berlin-Center, 67,329 "For" votes were cast in the "Prussian" referendum. At the last Reichstag elections, the Right wing parties received 61,000 votes and the C. P. 58,872.

In overwhelmingly proletarian Wedding, out of the 279,000 eligible voters, 89,986 "For" votes were cast. In the last elections, the Right parties received 51,936, while the C. P. got 99,273. The "Red" referendum did not even receive the total C. P. vote of last September 14. In workers' Friedrichshain, 70,094 "For" votes, while the C. P. got 80,000 and the Right parties 74,000 votes last September.

But how do we know whether the "For" votes in these districts came from the C. P. or the Right? The answer is found in the unmistakable indications furnished by the bourgeois wards:

In overwhelmingly bourgeois Zehlendorf: last September the C. P. got 2,598 votes, the Right parties 20,424 votes. In the present referendum there were 16,932 "For" votes! The C. P. won over... the bourgeoisie!

Take Steglitz, a bourgeois ward. 14,165 C. P. votes and 69,299 Right votes in September. "For" the "Prussian" referendum: 58,863.

Outside of Berlin, the same picture. In Cologne, which gave 132,557 Right votes and 67,786 C. P. votes, there were 74,358 "For" votes in the referendum, with 540,000 eligible voters. In Aachen, with 113,593 eligible voters, 15,859 voted "For". In September, the C. P. received 14,564 votes, the Right parties got 25,780.

As a final straw to show which may the wind blow—from the workers or from the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie—to the Communists or to the Fascists—we take the characteristic example of the rural, backward, petty bourgeois district of Hesse-Nassau, a "natural" stamping ground for Hitler's cohorts: Eligible to vote: 1,720,210 September C. P. vote: 137,148. September Right vote: 614,393. "For" the referendum: 554,537.

A political party—particularly the revolutionary Communist party—cannot stand many more such "victories" without collapsing under the deadly weight of its own folly...

—M. MILL.

Paris, August 15, 1931

The Anarchists in Spain

(Continued from page 1)

But the Catalan big bourgeoisie has viewed matters differently. It exercised a pressure upon the government of the Generalidad by another means: it addressed itself directly to the central power of Madrid in order to guarantee its divine right to property. We read in the August letter of the special correspondent of the *Paris Temps*:

"On July 20, the members of the 'Fomento del Trabajo Nacional' (which embraces the representatives of all the big Barcelona Industries) met in order to examine the imminent peril presented to them by the attitude of the laboring masses, and, considering that the co-operation of the government of the Generalidad with the Sindicato Unico had disastrous consequences, they decided to address themselves directly to the central government of Madrid in order to request it to defend them. At the same time, there was held a meeting of seven hundred proprietors of Barcelona, Girona, Tarragona, Lerida, etc., whose tenants demand a 40% reduction in rent. They also decided to request aid from Madrid."

Loyal to his petty bourgeois nature, Macia has yielded to the "powerful boss". For, Macia is more the "Barcelonan agent of the Madrid imperialists" (Trotsky) than the sincere friend of the

anarcho-sindicalists of the N. C. of L. The arrangement with Zamora and Macia's trip to Madrid will definitely consecrate the treason of Macia's party. The hopes of the Catalan working masses in the national independence and social enfranchisement, demagogically promised by Macia will be cruelly disappointed. The duty of the Catalan Communists is to unmask this double-dealing of Macia and to tear off his apostolic mask. Unfortunately, Catalan Communism, at the present time led by the Maurins and Arlandises, is not in a position to accomplish this task, for, instead of severely criticizing all the treacherous acts of the Catalanist movement, Maurin practises a policy of benevolence and amity towards Macia's party.

The Anarcho-Sindicalists

The conduct of the anarcho-sindicalists also requires a pitiless criticism by the Spanish Communists. Never has the treason of the syndicalist leaders of the N. C. of L. been more cynical, more avowed. The workers of Seville who battled courageously against the armed forces of the provisional government looked in vain to the support and the solidarity of the strongest trade union organization in the country, the N. C. of L. The police of Maura-Caballero were still raging through the streets of Seville when the central organ of the N. C. L.,

DISCUSSION ARTICLES

Some Shortcomings of the Thesis

The present pre-conference discussion will have to thoroughly evaluate the work of the period since our last convention, our accomplishments, shortcomings and mistakes, our past and present perspectives and tactics. In this way, the second national conference of our League will be able to see clearly our possibilities and tasks.

This article will confine itself primarily to the thesis proposed by the National Committee for the present discussion.

The thesis marks a decided step forward from the platform accepted at our first conference (May 1920). At that time, the first cadres of the Opposition had been expelled from the party and League. Our leading comrades had not yet succeeded in separating themselves from former associations, views, tactics and perspectives which they had held as a group in the party (Cannon group). Our platform was therefore permeated, and understandably so, with these "vestigials". It was formulated with references to the former policies of "our group" (Cannon group), the "proletarian character" of the Foster group, etc.

On the important question of the perspective of a long and inevitable period of social reformism and the organization of a national labor party, the thesis states:

"The Left Opposition, at its formative stage, leaned in the direction of this reformist perspective which constituted to a certain extent an uncritical carry-over of the preceding group struggle in the party, prior to the time when the Left wing took shape and was established as a political grouping distinct from all the others in the movement." (My emphasis—J. C.) "Leaned in the direction of?" Is there any doubt as to our previous position? The importance of the question requires a more categorical statement of change.

Change on Labor Party

It will be recalled that, during the first pre-conference discussion and at the conference itself, the leading comrades not only stressed the correctness of the slogan for a labor party, but offered as their strongest argument its so-called "inevitability". Our platform stated: "The propaganda slogan (of a labor party) must be really revived and as soon as it has found roots in the masses and their experiences in the struggle it must become an agitational and finally an action slogan". Why is this slogan necessary? "It is not reasonable to expect that the masses of the American workers, who are still tied ideologically and politically to the bourgeois parties, will come over to the Communist Party politically at one step (1) in a period not immediately revolutionary" the platform replied. Wherein does this position of the inevitability of the labor party, and the need for Communist leadership of the movement in this direction, differ from the present Lovestone position? Not in a hair's breadth!

The change on the question of "radicalism" is likewise a step forward.

Further, the present theses no longer speaks of "our group" position previous to the actual organization of the Left Opposition. That is, we are no longer the "Cannon group" (in the historical sense). In fact, the abandonment of the above position on the future of reformism in the United States marks an important departure from that group's position.

The thesis states: "The unevenness of social development rendered particularly acute and jerky in the present epoch of imperialism, may easily advance the United States toward the head of the list." The thesis in attempting to take sharp issue with the general conception of the American Communist movement that the revolution in the United States is a thing of the distant future, exaggerates the state of affairs. The essential truth of the statement lies in the fact that revolutionary upheavals in Europe which characterize post-war imperialism considerably hasten the forces making for revolution in this country. However, the probability of the situation, and that is precisely what we should base our perspectives on, is that the proletarian revolution will first come in Europe; a Soviet United States of Europe will be formed which will find itself in irreconcilable conflict with reactionary capitalist United States. This perspective outlined with such lucidity by comrade Trotsky in "Europe and America" (1926) still holds good today.

A few brief comments on some of the smaller shortcomings of the thesis.

The first section mentions in disconnected form the position of France in Europe today. Instead of showing the importance of this position (the last important capitalist country to enter the crisis, its immense stock of gold) the thesis rests satisfied with the mere statement of it. It should be clearly stated that France is becoming ever more an outstanding creditor nation; that on the European continent it is more and more replacing England as a creditor; that this promises future serious conflict between France and the United States.

The section of the thesis which polemizes against the Stalinist conception of a narrowing of the "base for social reformism" should be strengthened along the following lines: The party leadership confuses the ground or base for the growth of social reformism with the "social basis" for it. The latter which rests on the ability of American capitalism to bribe sections of the working class is undoubtedly becoming even more limited. But the basis for the growth of social reformism is more than that. (We are speaking of its growth among the working class only). It feeds on the first signs of the awakening of class con-

sciousness of the workers as well as the blunders and mistakes of the Communists. The mechanical "economic determinist" interpretation of the Stalinists, of course, leads to serious tactical mistakes. The thesis, while essentially correct should include the above thought.

The Economic Crisis

On the present economic crisis, the thesis states: "The present crisis is distinguished from many which preceded it in the history of capitalist production by its virtually planetary character" Is this correct? No. This is not sufficient. The thesis should state clearly and with emphasis that the present economic crisis develops on the basis of the post-war crisis of imperialism. One can, of course, find the essential features of the latter mentioned in various sections of the thesis. But this is insufficient. They should be enumerated as part of a whole. At this time, I will not attempt to discuss the prospects of the American crisis.

Comrade Field in his article on "The Meaning of the American Crisis" (which we intend returning to at some other time) tells us that there is a contradiction in the thesis when it states: (1) that America will get itself out of the crisis, and (2) "the prospect of struggles ahead that will increase in breadth and depth and militancy". Although there is absolutely no contradiction between the two statements, the thesis is undoubtedly incomplete on this important question.

The thesis correctly states that the American workers, because of the absence of struggles—and therefore defeats—in the previous period will have vitality for militant struggle. But—and this is unfortunately overlooked—these struggles are primarily defensive. Can we expect the present defensive struggles of the workers to be converted into the counter-offensive against the capitalists during the present crisis? It is hardly likely. Comrade Field implies that a liquidation of the crisis means a perspective of decreasing battles. On the contrary, the re-entrance of workers into industry—that is, the beginnings of economic revival—when they are materially more secure, morally stronger, a decreased unemployment, will mark the beginning of the counter-offensive of the workers. The thesis should contain this important thought.

—JOSEPH CARTER.

To Improve our Will

In the discussion on the first two main divisions of the national committee thesis in our branch, the question was asked: "How can American capitalism issue out of this crisis? As a whole, the thesis correctly describes the methods capitalism will use to endeavor to extricate itself from the crisis and analyzes the contradictions it will meet in each process. Yet it gives no direct answer to this question since it can only be answered from life, in the course of the class struggle. However, two comrades endeavored to answer this question giving possible means by which it could be done—"which 'accidentally' could be upset by war".

I think that the formulation in the thesis to the effect that "the present crisis of American capitalism is not its final revolutionary crisis", is erroneous as it stands, and is not in harmony with the rest of the thesis. It leads to an underestimation of revolutionary possibilities the war danger, organization, op-

portunism defeatism, etc. Just as the formulation to the contrary would be just as erroneous, leading to Leftist adventures or indolent fatalism. The revolutionary Marxian party has a role, a historical duty, to bend every effort to make each crisis of capitalism its last. Aside from a breakdown of economy and capitalist rule, there must be a conscious organized proletariat with a will for power, before capitalism can be destroyed. The party must work consciously for this at all time, we must not allow one situation to be missed if it is in our power to advance to victory. Without losing any of its ability for recognizing reality, the Left Opposition must give itself and the party a determined tenacity to work for the revolution. True, we are faced with tremendous difficulties we are a far way off

from our goal, but that does not mean necessarily that it is a long time to it. The character of this crisis, as to its finality, should be put problematically, a question of struggle. The Bolshevik-Leninist in 1905 and 1917, fought to make the crisis of capitalism its last, and won. Besides the art, we must have the will. It is to improve our will that I propose this change. Capitalism can issue out of this crisis and have another only after a defeat of the proletariat. Do we already see defeat? No, our thesis time and again must call our League our party, our class to work and to fight for victory. This does not mean that at the same time we should not point out, expose and mercilessly fight against all dangers and obstacles in our path that threaten the victory for our class.

—CLEM FORSEN.

The Thesis and the Crisis

The thesis deals at some length with the crisis and presents many facts, but leaves unanswered a couple of important points which I desire to raise for discussion. One place, the thesis says, "The present crisis is distinguished from many which preceded it in the history of capitalist production by its virtually planetary character." The universal character of the crisis is not new nor the distinguishing character. Marx and Engels of the last century pointed them out more than once. The universal character is an effect and not a cause. The above sentence explaining its scope, nevertheless explains none of the basic difference in relation to past crises.

In another part, the thesis says, "The present crisis comes after the existence of an acute disruption of the 'equilibrium' between agriculture and industry, and only serves to aggravate the agrarian situation; it appears coincidentally with a contracting domestic market which gives no appearance of noteworthy extension in the immediate future; and, finally, it occurs in the period of declining world imperialism and is part of a planetary crisis which, precisely because American imperialism's sources of power are spread all over the world, invest the disruption of American economy with highly perilous character."

Of the three points, the last is of vital importance, the basic but the first two are of no value. In other parts of the thesis more sentences are presented to show this difference but it does not negate the above question; however, such a vital point should not be scattered through the thesis. Speaking of agriculture and industry, the "acute disruption" is not new; American agriculture is a subordinated part of machine development and industry and the process of disintegration and centralization has been the logical outflow of the general process of capitalist production in America, in relation to agriculture.

To say, "coincidentally with a contracting market" is to put the problem upside down and approach from the side of consumption rather than the point of production. This factor should be presented as an ABSOLUTE decrease in the number of workers in production, a fact Marx predicted in the last century.

Further, the most vital point, not only in regard to the world crisis, but particularly in regard to American imperialism—an excess of capital a new form of overproduction in the period of financial capitalism, is not even considered or presented in its proper light in relation to the crisis.

As to prospects, the thesis says, in a criticism of the *Annalist* perspective, that "A more objective estimation of the

prospects for a decisive upward swing of the conjuncture would put the period for a commencement of recovery at an even later date." Saying such without explaining what kind of a revival it can be is to leave hanging in the air the main point of the perspective. We may add that the date of recovery is not as important as the kind of recovery.

No blueprint can be given, nor asked for, but a Marxian group must at least present possible variants as well as what is not possible. The thesis takes up what is not possible but does not deal with what is possible.

It is possible for the crisis to develop into a war. Such a one would be not a mere economic crisis, but a new problem of higher dimensions. With it would proceed a negative revival of industry and production only to end in greater difficulties. At least there would be a flow before the next ebb, considering capitalist economy. It is most probable (as presented by the thesis) that American imperialism at the expense of the other imperialisms, will come out on top. But on top of what, is as important as to specify: on top. Such a revival will not be the prosperity of the immediate past; however, this does not mean decline.

The Leninist analysis that we are in a period of decay capitalism means that capitalism as a whole is in decay and from this approach, American imperialism, from the absolute standpoint, is also in the decline. However, from the relative standpoint the problem is different. From the relative standpoint, American imperialism still has ebbs and flows because it holds the upper hand and all indications are that, in the downward curve American imperialism will be able to hold its upper position (at the expense of the others). The problem can only be considered correctly from its twofold relation of the absolute and relative.

To show that there will be a diminishing rate of profit and draw conclusions that this holds decay and decline for American production, is false. A diminishing rate of profit in the past has accompanied an increase in production and logically so. Profit is only a part of surplus value and such an approach will not settle the basic problem of capitalist production and its crisis.

We must have more discussion on these two points: difference of this crisis in relation to the past and the variations possible for the future in order to round out the thesis on this point.

—HUGO OEHLER.

TORONTO

The Canadian Red Raids

When the first attack was made against the Communist party in Toronto two years ago the reformist leaders were able to delude many workers by explaining that the rights of free speech were being taken away from the Communists only, and not from the workers.

In less than a year the right of free speech had been banned even for the "pinkest of the pink."

Today the Communist party is again attacked, not locally but nationally. The Attorney-General of Ontario has openly stated that the purpose of this attack is to drive the Communist party into illegality.

History has already taught us that political tendencies of the day are determined by the basic economic conditions and in order to understand why the political rights are being taken away from the Communists it is necessary to go beneath the surface.

In Canada, agriculture still plays a dominant role in the economic and political life of the country. The present depression coupled with the big drop in the price of agricultural products below the cost of production; the record-breaking accumulation of tremendous stocks of raw materials; the falling off of the internal and external trade—have left in their wake mass starvation and destitution. Thousands upon thousands of small and middle-class farmers are ruined and bankrupt, while mass unemployment leaves its bitter trail from one end of the country to the other.

Again, in Canada, workers have demonstrated behind the Red Flag. Troops being called out to cow down the workers has become a common occurrence. Militant demonstrations of the unemployed, while yet still limited to the West are growing. The hungry workers in the cities want bread. The ruined farmers want the bankers' noose taken off their necks.

This present crisis is quite different structurally from that of previous crisis and will not be overcome in a hurry. Even the capitalist bankers themselves openly say that much. This winter, the bourgeoisie openly state, is going to be the hardest winter yet experienced by all classes. Mr. Meighan, former Prime Minister of Canada, in a speech at Toronto stated "that Canada is facing its greatest trial in history." "Unless something is done to meet the growing competition from Russia, the existence of thousands of producers will be ruined." He calls for a war against Russia to save capitalism but that is another question which we will discuss in future. The fact, though, is, the growing competition Canadian capitalism is meeting on the world market is coming not only from Russia but from Australia, Argentina, etc., added to which is the reduction of the demand itself, and there lies the crux of the matter.

Canadian capital is preparing to fight for a greater share of the markets of the world by the lowering of the standards of living for the workers and farmers. The question before capital is not only this winter as many bourgeois politicians wish us to believe, but the Winters and the Summers of the future.

What are the principal factors behind the present assault of capital against the workers and farmers? The power of the bourgeoisie in Canada has been built up on a strongly organized and centralized industrial and banking system. The small and middle-class farm-

ers, in the vain hope of achieving security and independence, organized themselves in a "Wheat Pool", financed by the banks with the purpose in view of keeping up prices. But this worked to the contrary. Today they are worse off than ever before, and their land and possessions are mortgaged to the banks who are also extracting their pound of flesh for the huge accumulated stocks in the "Wheat Pool".

The workers—except for a small minority of the higher skilled labor—are completely unorganized and at the mercy of the bosses. The majority of industries are concentrated in Ontario and Quebec. In the latter Province the workers are almost completely under the influence of the Roman Catholic Church and the company and Catholic Unions. In Ontario, it is the Orangemen and conservative trade unions. Only in the West have the workers demonstrated with the spirit of militancy.

The leader of the workers and poor farmers is a weak Communist party. The false policies and perspectives the Stalinist Comintern has foisted on the Canadian party in the last few years, is one of the principle factors responsible for the failure of the party to penetrate the masses. The isolation of the party finds its reflection in the fact that in the West where the workers are more militant, the party is organizationally weaker than in the East, where the workers are more conservative. The adventurous 3rd period policies were forced on the party during the peak of the capitalist prosperity. When the slogan should have been for partial demands, the party was "fighting for the streets". What saved the party from committing complete suicide in those days, was the fact that the membership of the party is made up of foreign language federations, whose activity is mostly cultural and social.

The growing terror against the Communists raises to the forefront more sharply than ever before the necessity of the rehabilitation of the party. In the present crisis, the party is faced with problems that raise again the following demands, if the party is to measure up to its tasks.

1. Unification and reinstatement of all expelled Oppositionists.

2. Inner-party democracy and ideological clarity; that is absolutely essential if the membership is to develop as the real leaders of the working classes.

3. Policies based not "on the building of socialism in a single country", which cannot become a reality surrounded by a bourgeois globe, but on international revolution.

We warn all Left wing workers, whatever may be the differences that they may have with the Communist party leadership, that this must not be made the cover for the failure to take a definite position in the defence of the party. The workers of Canada if they allow the bourgeoisie to smash the party, will find that tomorrow they too will be disarmed. We warn the workers and farmers of Canada, that the capitalists are preparing a general attack against your living standards. The successful suppression of the party will follow in the suppression of all militant labor organizations and progressive bodies.

In the fight for legality, the Left Opposition calls upon all workers to actively support the party.—Q.

CREDITS FOR THE SOVIET UNION

(Continued from page 1)

workers the simple material needs that link them closely with the needs of the Soviet masses."

More than two months later, on June 21, 1930 (that is, still more than a year ago), the *Militant*, under the heading of "Towards a Concrete Program of Action", had the following to say: "The demand for credits for the Soviet Union at once reveals the inner link between the interests of the American working class and the workers of the Soviet Union. Millions are idle in the United States. But the socialist plans of the Soviet Union cry out for machinery and other industrial equipment. Employment here and collaboration with the Five Year Plan in the U. S. S. R. would be the consequence of large scale credits. Thousands of American workers would receive practical lessons in the implications of internationalism in the fundamental struggle between capitalism and socialism and the meaning of Communism. Thousands could be mobilized for the U. S. S. R. and against the capitalist government of the U. S."

In this manner, we advanced the slogan for trade and credits with the Soviet Union on a revolutionary basis, coinciding in this with the demand raised by the International Left Opposition and first initiated by comrade Leon Trotsky from his Turkish exile in an article written on March 14, 1930.

Stalinist Objection

What did all the Stalinists of the world reply to this imply and irrefutably correct proposal? They rejected it decisively. The Czechoslovak party organ wrote that according to the "Trotskyist plan", the contradiction in principle between the Soviet state and the capitalist world is to be replaced by their mutual collaboration. . . . It is a pity that the Messrs. Trotskyists did not tell us on what principles the general Czechoslovak-Soviet plan for the solution of the crisis should be constructed:

on capitalist principles—but by that, aid would be given to the victory of capitalism within Russia; or on socialist principles—this would mean that the Trotskyists believe in the readiness of the capitalists themselves to introduce socialism . . . the responsibility for unemployment is to be thrown upon the Soviet Union which does not give us sufficient orders . . . instead of compromising the worthless capitalist system, the industrial crisis is to serve to compromise the Soviet Union." (*Kude Pravo*, June 24, 1930.)

In one form or another, these same unbelievably stupid objections were repeated by the Stalinists in every other country. In the American party, such a job naturally fell to the lot of Earl Browder, who could not find words violent or contemptuous enough with which to exorcise the "counter-revolutionists" and their "counter-revolutionary" plan.

Our answer to the infantile clownings of the Stalinists was contained in the words with which comrade Trotsky concluded his proposal: "But is there any hope that with their present leadership the Communist parties are capable of a serious revolutionary mobilization of the masses? We will not decide this question beforehand. The policy which we defend has such profound roots in the objective situation and in the historical interests of the proletariat, that it will finally make its way through all the obstacles. It is entirely a question of time. But that is a very important question. The duty of the Left Communist Opposition, therefore, is to exert all its strength to shorten the period."

So powerful is a correct revolutionary idea that in the span of more than a year it has broken through the opposition of the bureaucratic apparatus and has finally made its way into the program of the Stalinists, giving new justification—if it were needed—for the insistent advocacy of the idea by the opposition. What value has the contempti-

ble reference, in the same "unemployment program", to the Left Opposition's program being identical with that of the A. F. of L. when the new turn of Mr. Browder and Co. so glaringly reveals their own doleful bankruptcy and incompetency in this question, which they have overcome shamefacedly after a harmful delay of a year and a half—a period in which the immense unemployment crisis in the United States offered the richest possible soil for rooting the idea in the minds of the workers?

The Need of Credits

Yet, even now it is not completely overcome. The formulation of the demand in the party program is a half-way measure. The Opposition's proposal must be adopted in its entirety. The party demands recognition of Russia and the "development of trade relations" for the entirely correct purpose of putting idle American factories to work and of filling Russia's growing demands. But what is one of the—if not the—outstanding obstacles to trade relations? Not merely non-diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, but the virtual credits boycott against it by the U. S. It is no secret that the Soviet trading agency in New York is compelled to pay interest rates running as high as twenty-five and thirty percent—a particularly outrageous sum in the face of "easy money"—in order to swing even the smallest purchase of American products. All the babble about "trade relations remains babble unless one raises the demand for large, long-term credits to make these relations possible for the Soviet Union on the most advantageous basis.

The demand for long-term credits to the Soviet Union is particularly facilitated at the present time when the United States is expending hundreds of millions of dollars in credits to bolster up the collapsing structures of reaction in England, Germany and elsewhere. What pointed lessons in the class struggle the

Communists can teach the American workers in this connection! The present party proposal leaves the whole issue without its spear-head.

Further: Aside from the proposal being buried at the end of nine other points—instead of being up at the head of the list as a central, urgent demand—there is nothing said about organization a nation-wide campaign among the workers and throughout the organized labor movement to press for its adoption. This demand gives the Communists a splendid opportunity to organize a broad united front movement of workers of all industrial or political standpoints by approaching the non-Communist labor organizations with the proposal for joint action on this issue. Their replies to this proposal will show the workers following the reformist leaders where the latter really stand on questions of importance to labor.

Still further: the party speaks in a permanently hysterical monotone about the defense of the Soviet Union, as though it were a purely military question. Behind military power stands the factory—industrial power, and for Russia especially, it means the power (and consequently the consolidation) of the proletarian dictatorship. But for this it requires that which it has not, at least what it has not in adequate or properly developed quantities: machinery. To get this highly essential machinery, it must trade with the bourgeois nations. To trade on a scale commensurate with its "growing demands", requires not so much diplomatic recognition—which we favor unreservedly—as it does credit facilities which Russia hasn't got and which Hoover seeks to prevent it from getting. In short, regardless of what angle of the question is approached, the formulation in the party program reveals its inadequacy and half-heartedness in exactly the same degree as the rounded and incontestably correct standpoint of the Left Opposition is confirmed.

Finally, one phase of the party's demand requires comment. It says that the "development of trade relations . . . fill the constantly growing demands of

the successful construction of the workers' government and its five year plan". The essence of what is said here is a repetition of what we have always contended and a slashing refutation of the reactionary theory of "socialism in one country". According to the latter, Russia can be made a self-sufficient socialist island, not dependent upon any of the rest of the world, because it has all the economic resources and pre-requisites for the construction of a socialist classless society. If this is so, and if we have—as the Stalinist bureaucracy declares—"entered the period of socialism in the Soviet Union", trade relations with capitalist countries would not need "development" but "diminution". The party tells us, now, however, that precisely because of the "constantly growing demands of the successful construction" there must be a "development of trade relations". It is this simple and ordinarily indisputable idea that we have defended against the vulgar national socialists for years. The Opposition declared a thousand times, against the furious denials of the Stalinists, that Russia's connection with, its need of and even its subordination to the world market would become more acute precisely in the period of its economic construction and reconstruction. We pointed out that the contradictions which each passing year multiplied for a capitalist encircled workers' state would bring increasingly conclusive refutation of the theory of "socialism in one country".

Time and its events are great teachers, even if their teachings mean so little to the mentally ossified Stalinist official. The Browders not only refuse to learn, but try to prevent others from learning. The former have at their disposal an enormous, usurped apparatus. Our weapons are chiefly correct ideas. The machine has a temporary strength. But in the end, ideas last longer and prove invincible. The ideas of the Left Opposition are even now making a way for themselves to the minds of the militant workers. The only boast of the Centrist official is that he can succeed for a time in delaying their progress.—S.

EDITORIAL NOTES

WHERE IS THE BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY?

The catastrophic collapse of the British Labor government is an example of reformist bankruptcy that rings around the entire world. Since the world war there has been no more striking illustration of the truth that social democracy is the shield behind which capitalism marches in its assaults upon the working class. In the dramatic events of the past week the whole game stands revealed. MacDonald and Company led the British masses up to the edge of the precipice and then pushed them over it. A reduction in the miserable unemployment dole and a cut in wages for the civil employees, the signal for a furious attack on wage standards in industry; these are the concrete results of the workers' experiment with a reformist Labor government. What will the laboring masses of Great Britain learn from this terrible experience and how will they prevent a repetition of it on a still greater scale? These are the most important questions arising out of the present situation.

And here it must be acknowledged that, as far as can be seen now, there is nothing to warrant optimistic expectations on this score in the immediate future. It is true that the masses learn only in the course of their own experience. But even this is not an automatic process. It is the historic function of the Communist party to assist the masses to assimilate the experience and raise their struggle to higher ground. And it is precisely this indispensable factor that is lacking, thanks to the devastating regime which ravages and disrupts the Communist movement from within. The heavy blow which reformism has dealt to the workers ought to be transformed into a still heavier if not a mortal blow against itself and its future usefulness to the masters. But the arm which could deal the blow—the party of the vanguard—is palsied.

The stabilization of British capitalism rested in the first place on the reformist labor bureaucracy, and particularly on its "Left wing". The policy of Stalin in the general strike covered its advance and disarmed the revolutionary workers. Only this enabled the labor bureaucracy to escape unpunished for the betrayal of the general strike and to prepare the way for the new debacle. The pseudo-Left wingers are now organizing another division of labor to head off the furious resentment of the masses and divert it again into the same channel of reformism. And again their maneuver is facilitated by the helpless regime in the Comintern.

The Stalinists content themselves with routine denunciations of the strategy of the Left reformists, in all of which can be read a fatalistic acceptance of their victory. The question of what could be done to defeat this strategy and open the way for the Communist party to bound forward at the head of the insurgent masses has not yet occurred to them.

They will not press the counterfeit Left wingers to the wall, split their ranks and take the workers away from them with a fighting policy of the united front on concrete issues of the day. God forbid! Only a few years ago they could make a bloc with these same people—social imperialists to the core—"against imperialist war"! They could sit at the same table with the betrayers of the general strike at the moment of their betrayal and even after it! But they have become very radical since then. Having burned their fingers on the "united front" with the strike-breakers—after expelling the Left Opposition for opposing it—they will not think of a united front with reformists any more under any circumstances. And with this pseudo-radicalism, the British Communist Party—already enfeebled, disrupted and beaten down by the international leadership—is still further handicapped and prevented from taking a single step forward in the face of this tremendous opportunity.

With an air of wisdom, pathetic in its emptiness and impotence, the *Daily Worker* "exposes" the aims of the "Left" laborites. In the issue of August 27 they say the Labor "Opposition" to MacDonald is "trying to prevent the workers from turning to the Communists". This is the last sentence in the leading editorial. It represents their conclusion on the subject of the Laborite "opposition", the only conclusion they have offered up to date. But the matter does not end with this inference, which is a fairly obvious one. That is rather the premise from which we should begin. What is the Communist party going to do about it?—that is the question. On this crucial point the *Daily Worker* has not yet reported any program of the British Communist Party. Neither has it offered one of its own as it is in duty bound to do. Internationalism means anything to them. Let the America Stalinists ruminate over this question and tell us what they think about it. And while they are at it, perhaps they can give some information on another question of primary importance to every internationalist: Where is the British Communist Party? Did it expire completely in the embraces of Purcell and Stalin? Up to the present writing, we have heard nothing of its activities or its proposals in these events which are so fateful for the proletariat of the entire world. Could there be a more devastating commentary on the present regime in the Comintern than the recital of this single fact?

THE RETURN OF GERRY ALLARD

The return of comrade Gerry Allard to the ranks of the Left Opposition is of itself a matter of interest to those who are fighting under the flag of Marxism. In a time of reaction against the basic principles of International Communism, when those who remain faithful to the banner are numbered by tens, and not by hundreds or thousands, every man is important. And when one of the most outstanding militants of the younger generation of revolutionary miners—as comrade Allard is without a doubt—finds his way for a second time to the platform of the Opposition, after a long period of study and conflict, it can be regarded only as a victory for our cause and a significant sign of hidden developments taking place deep within the ranks of the conscientious and uncorrupted Communist workers.

Comrade Allard, who supported the Opposition at the time of its expulsion from the party three years ago and then a few months later capitulated to the Stalinists, accompanied his application for readmission into the Communist League with a manly and straightforward acknowledgment of his mistake and a declaration of solidarity on all the important principle questions. The National Committee readmitted him to membership with a six months probationary period. This action is to be regarded as an extraordinary one which is not designed to set a precedent. The reference, of course, is not to the question of probation—that goes without saying—but to the readmission of a capitulator. Only an exceptional set of circumstances could justify such a decision. As a general rule it cannot even be thought of.

There were a number of extenuating circumstances in this particular case. Comrade Allard came to us in the first wave of protest in the party against the outrageous violations of party democracy committed by the combined forces of Lovestone and Foster against the Opposition. He did not remain with us long enough to assimilate the more profound principle conclusions at the bottom of the dispute—another illustration of the truth that party democracy alone is not and cannot be the basis of the faction.

Comrade Allard was caught by the argument, which was Foster's contribution to the education of the miners, that "mass work" in the mine fields, unobstructed by disputes with the party leadership, was the most important and decisive question—proof again that the ballyhoo about "mass work", without regard to the principle basis upon which it is conducted, is a capitulatory tendency. Lacking at the time of the great questions in their world-wide scope, comrade Gerry allowed himself to be swayed by personal attachments and the immediate issue of agitation among the miners—a further confirmation of the necessity of a principled and an international orientation.

A closer examination of the fundamental issues of the struggle, during the course of which he also had the opportunity of testing the practical policy of the Opposition as against that of the Centrists in concrete action, enabled comrade Allard to clarify his views and take his stand. In view of all these conditions the National Committee, having confidence in his seriousness and good faith, could not do otherwise than welcome him back into the ranks of the Communist League. We believe that we will justify that confidence and that the organization as a whole will approve the action taken.

—J. P. C.

Books

by Leon Trotsky

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION

86 pages, two-colored paper cover 25c
Introduction by Max Shachtman

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION

30 pages, paper cover 10c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION

208 page book—cloth bound 1.00
paper bound .50

THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA

Introduction by Max Eastman
364 page book formerly \$2 now 1.00

MY LIFE—600 pages

5.00

COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM

The Trade Union Question
Introduction by James P. Cannon

64 pages, paper cover 15c

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER

64 pages paper cover 15c

PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.

48 pages, paper cover 15c

Special Rates in Bundles of 5 or more

Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street
New York City

The Anonymous Factional Struggle in the Party

A new factional struggle, a new type of factional struggle, is brewing in the party. It is a new type because it corresponds so perfectly with the bureaucratic, artificial "monolithism" of the "third period" in the Comintern.

In the early years of the Comintern, groups and factions took shape on the basis of clearly defined standpoints in principle, and the discussion between contending groups took place openly on questions of principle. That is how the doctrine of Marx and Lenin was clarified and strengthened in the Communist International. After Lenin's death factional struggles began to degenerate into unprincipled combinations, mechanically concocted to serve the momentary interests of similar combinations in the Political Bureau of the Russian party—Zinoviev's, Bucharin's or Stalin's. With the final triumph of the Stalin faction, with the organizational crushing of all opposition in the parties, "factionalism" was eliminated. The destruction of a virile internal ideological life in the parties—falsely labeled "monolithism" or "anti-factionalism"—was made possible by the canonization of the system under which leaders exist only thanks to an unquestioning obedience to the infallible Stalin faction. Nobody in the leadership of any Comintern section dares to develop a "different" point of view without knowing what Stalin (or Kuusinen, or Manuisky) has to say about the issue. And once either of the latter has spoken, then there is surely nobody in the national leadership who dares to develop this "different" viewpoint. This is the way factional struggles are "eliminated" in the "third period" of the Comintern.

Unfortunately for this consummately bureaucratic "solution", political struggle has a logic which is more powerful. The effects of it are being partly disclosed in the present struggle of the cliques in the American party.

An Anonymous Struggle

For the reasons already mentioned, the struggle has two additional characteristics to justify its designation as a "new type". First it is carried on anonymously. Policies are mentioned, viewpoints are referred to, but the outer world is not informed as to who represents them. Second, the ranks of the party are kept in abysmal ignorance of what is going on or what is involved. For, to submit the dispute to the membership of the party is to submit the bureaucracy as a whole to the decision of the ranks—which would be the beginning of the end for the Browners of all stripes. But in spite of all the disguises and camouflage and anonymity, the principal actors in the tragic-comedy can already be discerned. The first hint as to who is who and what is what was given to us by the present leader of the party, Earl Browder, in his speech to the sixth convention of the Y. C. L.:

"It is necessary that our comrades, especially the youth should have more definite understanding of the terms 'defensive', 'offensive' and 'counter-offensive'." (*Daily Worker*, July 14, 1931.)

A commendable idea. How does Browder illuminate the problem?

"The capitalist class is conducting a vicious economic and political offensive against the working class. Within the working class there is wide-spread radicalization and upsurge of activity and beginning of struggle. The main body of the working class is, however, as yet

only beginning to overcome the hindrances and to resist wage cuts, speed-up, the starvation of unemployment. The beginning of the mass actions has primarily a defensive character. Wherever this defensive movement begins to involve broad masses and sharpen the struggle, it simultaneously begins to develop the elements of a counter-offensive against the offensive of the capitalists. The general character of the mass strikes that sprang up during the past period all over the country is, in the main, that of the defensive. In the miners' strike we already see this defensive in the process of passing over into a counter-offensive." (*Ibid.*)

A truckload of mud could scarcely be clearer. But what—that is who—is Browder really aiming at? Let us read further:

"It is therefore clear that it is absolutely wrong to speak of the 'offensive' of the working class and the counter-offensive of the capitalists'. An example of this wrong use of these terms, which can create an entirely erroneous political atmosphere around our struggles, may be found in a recent issue of the *Daily Worker*, which says: 'Increased mass picketing at Piney Fork and other mines Saturday morning checked the counter-offensive of the coal operators'." (*Ibid.*)

Browder vs. Dunne and Foster

As we see, the comrade who "is absolutely wrong" remains anonymous. But he has a name which is far from unknown. We look through our files of the *Daily Worker*, and find that the quotation made by Browder refers to a dispatch to the *Worker* from Bridgeport, Ohio, signed by William F. Dunne, a colleague of Browder's on the omnipotent Political Bureau. Having revealed the man who has created "an entirely erroneous political atmosphere around our struggles" we find that the unrelenting Browder resumes the thread of his struggle a month later, more sharply and more anonymously. In the August issue of the *Communist*, Browder writes:

"At the miners' convention, there occurred unprecedentedly bureaucratic distortions of the correct revolutionary line. This was typified by the method used in making a change in the name of the Union. The miners were all for the old name, National Miners Union; the Party had never made any decisions instructing its members to try to change the name. And yet, one comrade holding a strategic position proceeded upon his personal whim and by use of personal prestige to propose and to have adopted without discussion the change of name to Mine, Oil and Smelter Workers Union (without even a discussion with the Communist fraction!) . . . It was an extreme example of bureaucraticism [hear! hear! This from Browder], of going over the heads of the workers—and even of the party. Further demoralization was thrown into the work of the Union at this convention by another irresponsible action, the postponement of the election of the official leadership and the installing of a 'provisional' committee instead. This again was an individual action . . ."

Once more, our anonymous, high-handed, bureaucratic, irresponsible, etc., etc., criminal proves to be Dunne, who represented the T. U. U. L. at the N. M. U. convention, making the main report and—as Browder so delicately informs us—running affairs in general. But Dunne appears to be not the only

one for whose throat the rapacious Browder is itching. In the same article, we read a condemnation of

" . . . the idea that, because we have a splendid fighting spirit among the masses therefore we are already developing an offensive of the working class. Sometimes this is theorized . . . In its least harmful form, this is no better than phrase-mongering. It is a substitution of the wish for the deed."

Again, who is the phrase-monger in question? He appears to be no less a one than Foster himself! In the very same issue of the *Communist*, he writes, using the same "anonymous language" as Browder, about the mine strike:

"It would be to completely misunderstand this strike to consider it merely a defensive struggle . . . While this began as a defensive fight against a local wage cut at the Avella mines, the strike is taking on a counter-offensive character," etc., etc.

Thus, according to Browder: Dunne is absolutely wrong and what is more, is irresponsible and bureaucratic.

According to Foster: Browder completely misunderstands the mine strike.

According to Browder again: Foster,

in his least harmful form, is a phrase-monger.

To those who know the three men involved, as well as the Bittelmans, Weinstones, Johnstones, Stachels and other shadows who lurk even more dimly in the vicinity of the factional stage, what has been quoted above is enough to indicate the "line-up". For that matter, to have imagined that Foster or the others, who have about as much respect for Browder as he has for them, would stand by silently under Browder's managership would mean to display a callow ignorance of the party situation. If there are no issues, they will be found. Right now, they all juggle with "defensive" and "offensive" and "counter-offensive" as if the terms were so many colored balls without meaning or importance. But underneath all this word-play the cliques are busy undermining each other—anonously, for the rank and file must not find out about it "prematurely" and the fighters must take no chances in burning their fingers in open combat. Thus it is that they serve themselves well who serve Stalin best!

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

Maurin and the Anarcho-Syndicalists

We must pitilessly criticize Maurin without succumb; the events will completely confirm our criticism. In a short time Maurin will only be a comical figure with his provincial reflections, his corroded doctrines and his primitive slogans. Everything lies in knowing who will succeed him. The Left Opposition will be unable to become a leading force in Spain without being one in Catalonia.

The second urgent question is that of the anarcho-syndicalists. It is indispensable to publish a pamphlet against anarcho-syndicalism and to distribute it widely not only in Spain, but also in other countries. Have you read the articles by Monatte (leading French syndicalist—Ed.) in which he expresses his hope to see the Spanish anarcho-syndicalists oppose to the Bolshevik state a genuinely "anarchist" state? The whole fate of world anarchism, or rather of the fragments saved from the Russian revolution, is intimately bound up today with the fate of Spanish anarcho-syndicalism. And since anarcho-syndicalism in Spain is moving inevitably to the most pitiful and ridiculous bankruptcy, there is no doubt that the Spanish revolution will be the tombstone of anarchism. But attention must be paid so that the tombstone of anarcho-syndicalism does not at the same time become the one of the revolution. If Maurin is the temporary cover for the Stalinists, anarcho-syndicalism is a temporary cover for the socialists and the republicans, that is, for the bourgeoisie. Just as Maurin can turn over the advanced Catalan workers into the hands of the Centrist bureaucracy, so the anarcho-syndicalists can turn over the whole revolution into the hands of the bourgeoisie. The theoretical and practical struggle against anarcho-syndicalism now stands on the order of the day. It is manifest that this struggle must be conducted on the basis of the policy of the united front, of the unity of the trade union organization, etc. But we must unmask the leaders of anarcho-syndicalism and, above all, ex-

pose that pitiful lay priest of a Pestagna who will undoubtedly play the most infamous and cowardly role in the coming developments of the revolution . . .

The samples of Maurin's speeches produce a painful impression. Contrary to us, he considers, you see, the Five Year Plan as an acquisition of the revolution! Can it be that he has read nothing?

By the way, the Renter Press Agency and other agencies with it, are spreading false telegrams concerning alleged articles and interviews with me on the Five Year Plan (complete failure, falsehood, etc. . .). It is extremely important to unmask and to deny these infamies. In the present case, the bourgeoisie uses against the Stalinists the latter's own falsehoods and calumnies. . . Kadikoy, June 29, 1931

—L. TROTSKY.

The Real Situation in Russia

By LEON TROTSKY

Introduction by Max Eastman

364 pages. Sold formerly at \$2. Through

special arrangements with the publishers can be had from us now at \$1

PART I—The Fear of Our Platform

PART II—The Real Situation in Russia and the Tasks of the Communist Party

PART III—Stalin Falsifies History
Only a limited number of these books at this special price. Order now

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th St.,

New York City

Lovestone 10 Years Ago

It is not customary or seemly to write anniversary articles about the living but we feel that under the circumstances our readers will understand; and to understand, says de Stael, is to forgive. It is September 1931 and in these lines we shall engage to commemorate the tenth anniversary of Jay Lovestone's conversion from counter-revolutionary Trotskyism to Stalinism. The fact that Lovestone, ten years ago, was a "Trotskyist"—we hasten to explain to the wondering reader—is adequate justification for a memorial notice today.

The last few issues of Lovestone's paper, the *Revolutionary Age*, have been publishing a series of articles on "The Soviet Union and Its Bourgeois Critics: Building Socialism in U. S. S. R.", in which Lovestone makes a moving attempt to appear as the defender of Stalin . . . against Walter Duranty. The occasion for this ardent and touching defense was a series of articles by Duranty in the *New York Times*, in which he argued that Leninism had been replaced in the Soviet Union by Stalinism, which has subordinated or cast aside the perspective of international revolution in favor of the "practical reality" of national socialism. The Lovestone defense consists of an argument that Stalinism does not exist; if it does it is merely a legitimate repetition and continuation of Leninism itself. It is not Stalin, you are given to understand, who invented the theory and practise of "socialism in one country", but Lenin himself. The only opponent of this theory is Trotsky.

"The Russian workers have seized political power," Lovestone announces. "What shall they do with their power within the Soviet Union? This is no abstract question. To play with the state power is to play with fire. The question of constructing socialism in the Soviet Union should never be treated abstractly. What shall the Soviet proletariat do in the Soviet Union except build socialism?"

[Is this not a positively annihilating question? They might build a system of barbarism. And they might build up a feudal society. But they do neither. In spite of the Trotskyists, the Russian workers have decided to build socialism!] "For what other purpose shall they use their state power in the Soviet Union except for constructing socialism there? Let the critics of the Soviet Union—bourgeois and otherwise ['otherwise' means . . . Trotskyists]—tell us what should the Soviet workers build in the Soviet Union except socialism." (*Rev. Age*, 8-22-1931.)

We assume this means that the Opposition is in favor of the Russian workers building capitalism, or feudalism, or nothing at all. If such unrefined idiocy were so, Lovestone has already won the first victory. But let us pass this by out of kindness, and read further:

"It was at the Fifteenth Party Congress in December 1927, that Bucharin speaking for the Congress, administered the most crushing ideological defeat to Trotskyism on this viewpoint. If the C. P. S. U. were not correct in concluding that the Soviet proletariat was capable of overcoming fully all bourgeois elements within its country, that is, of building a socialist society, then, it would really have no reason for maintaining power." (*Ibid.*)

The line of division is clear: "Leninism" (a la Lovestone) declares that the Russian proletariat, by itself, is capable of the successful construction of a national socialist society. "Trotskyism" declares that this can be done only with the "state aid" of the revolutionary proletariat of a number of other countries. If this is the line of division, we are now in a position to look back at *The Communist*, official organ of the Communist Party of America (the underground C. P. of a decade ago) Vol. 1, No. 3, for September 1921, where we read an article by Roger B. Nelson, en-

titled "Russia's Hour of Need":

"Our speakers and agitators should utilize the movement for the relief of Soviet Russia for specific purposes. But at no time must we compromise the class character of our campaign for immediate results. Any other policy would in the end do more harm than good to the starving workers of Russia . . . We must bring to light the fact that no successful revolution can be accomplished in ANY ONE COUNTRY without the assistance of the international proletariat."

Who is this counter-revolutionary Trotskyist who smuggled his anti-Leninist views into the official organ of the Communist Party of America under the guise of a famine relief article? As we have said, it was Roger B. Nelson. And who is Roger B. Nelson? He is, or was—it is not much of a secret today—Jay Lovestone, yes, the same Jay Lovestone whom we quoted above. And if the revolution could not be accomplished successfully in "any one country" by the forces of the proletariat of that country alone, why did not Lovestone, in September 1921, tell the Russian workers—in line with his arguments of September 1931—that they "have no reason for maintaining power"?

But is it not possible that this was a momentary "Trotskyist" aberration of one individual? Let us look further in the same issue of *The Communist*, and on page five we find an article "The Third Congress" written by "James A. Marshall, Delegate Communist Party of America" who, after speaking of "Lenin, Trotsky and other irreproachable leaders" (he changed his mind about that later), writes:

"Soviet Russia cannot exist as an isolated state within a capitalist world." [Name of a name! Trotsky was expelled for saying no more than that!] "This is the problem. Two solutions are possible. One puts the burden of the action upon the revolutionary working class outside of Russia. The other must be carried out by the workers of Russia. The first is the overthrow of capitalism in the countries of Europe or America, and the establishment of a proletarian dictatorship there. The other is a method to break the deadly economic isolation of Russia. It waited until it could wait no longer." [Why did it have to

wait if Lenin "in 1915" said that they need fear no isolation because they could build socialism with their own forces?] "It now proposes to break the unbearable economic isolation. The concessions policy is one of the methods of doing it." And who is this Trotskyist No. 2? Is he Cannon or Swabeck? No. At the risk of producing the rupture of a blood vessel, we must point out that James A. Marshall was and is Lovestone's bosom friend of yesterday—Max Bedacht, member of the Political Bureau of the party today and professional Trotsky killer.

But perhaps we have before us only two individual aberrations? Not at all. In *The Communist*, official organ of the United Communist Party of America (both Lovestone and Bedacht were members of its Central Committee), No. 5, for August 15 1920, we read the following official pronouncement, presumably representing the standpoint of the whole party, unless Lovestone's and Bedacht's protests were concealed by the other "Trotskyists":

"The Soviets will realize that the theoretical deduction from the facts of the struggle between capitalism and communism, that a proletarian state cannot exist in a capitalist world, must be followed in practise and that Soviet Russia can only preserve itself by developing the Russian revolution into the world revolution. Soviet Russia will stand or fall as the revolution in that country becomes, or does not become the world revolution."

Cannot even exist! Can only preserve itself! But what about building up a complete national socialist society with their own forces, without "developing the Russian revolution into the world revolution"? Where was Stalin to put the quietus on such arrant Trotskyism? Where was Bucharin? Where was Bedacht? And Lovestone? The horrible truth is that they were all, all, "Trotskyists" in those days. . . .

There is no exact record of when Lovestone was converted. He may tell us some day what caused him to see the light and when. But we doubt it. He appears to be too busy dividing his tongue between Stalin's boots in Moscow and Muste's in the United States.

—MARSH.

THE MILITANT

Vol. IV, No. 22, September 5, 1931

Published weekly by the Communist League of America [Opposition] at 84 East 10th St., N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy