

WORKERS
OF THE
WORLD.
UNITE

THE MILITANT



Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879
VOLUME VI, NO. 4 [WHOLE NO. 151] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1933 PRICE 5 CENTS

Liberals Protest Chen's Arrest

The continued imprisonment of comrade Chen Du-Hsiu, leader of the Left Opposition in China, has called forth a protest from a number of leading liberal and radical figures in American public life. A cablegram sent by them to Chiang Kai-Shek in Nanking reads as follows: "Leading Americans protest prosecution Professor Chen Du-Hsiu and associates. Urge their release."

Among those who signed their names to the cabled protest were a number of writers who are notably sympathetic to the Communist movement in the United States and include Theodore Dreiser, Sherwood Anderson, H. W. L. Dana, Malcolm Cowley and Waldo Frank. Among the liberals and socialists who signed the protest are to be found Upton Sinclair, John Haynes Holmes of the Community Church in New York, Floyd Dell, Oswald Garrison Villard, editor of the liberal weekly, THE NATION, Arthur Garfield Hays, the lawyer, and Roger N. Baldwin, of the American Civil Liberties Union.

The official Communist party, however, and the International Labor Defense, have not yet raised a single protest against the arrest of comrade Chen and his comrades, whose lives are still endangered. The only comment yet made by the Daily Worker was aimed at preventing any protest from the militant labor movement on the grounds that comrade Chen is a "counter-revolutionary Trotskyist." To the disgrace of the movement, it has remained for liberals and radical intellectuals to speak out where the party preserved that dreadful silence which could not be of greater good to Chiang Kai-Shek and his butchers than if the latter themselves had arranged for it.

The Communist blot must wipe out this shameful work by demanding that the party and the I. L. D. take up the fight for the Left Oppositionists in China and connect their case

with those of the many other brave militants whose lives are at the mercy of the Kuo Min Tang brigands.

HELP!

There is every reason to hope that the Weekly MILITANT will continue. Thus far, our paper has depended almost exclusively upon the membership of the Communist League, out of their limited resources, to maintain the leading English expression of Bolshevism. Now, today, our readers and sympathizers must lend a hand to save the Weekly. The demands upon our numerically small membership have been heavy, especially so in this lengthy period of economic crisis.

We have no doubt that our readers will respond to the plain, frank appeal of the Left Opposition to maintain the Weekly MILITANT.

The requirements of the situation demand more and more the participation and direction of the Left Opposition in the daily class struggles. Through the MILITANT, still our best organizer, the ideas and practices of Leninism, of the Left Opposition, are made known to the Communist movement, to the Left Opposition, to the broad masses of workers coming steadily, if yet slowly, toward class consciousness and Communism.

The MILITANT can and must be maintained. Its existence as a Weekly through these scouring years of the economic crisis, have shown clearly the devotion and sacrifice of the supporters of the Left Opposition to their paper. What has been done before, can be done again—better and even more generously. Sympathizers, readers—help the MILITANT now! Save our and your Weekly!

Send money at once to:
THE MILITANT
126 EAST 16TH STREET,
New York, N. Y.

Left Opposition Demands Broad United Front at N. Y. Unemployment Conference

Presents Revolutionary Program to Stalinist Confab Oriented on Opportunist Half-Turn

L. O. Resolutions

Note: This statement was distributed to the delegates at the Unemployment Conference at Irving Plaza, New York, on Sunday, January 22.

The United Front conference for Unemployment Insurance and relief is a step in the proper direction. Properly developed it can result in a genuine and big movement of the working class against the scourge of unemployment and its source capitalism.

Through such a broad movement the working class can be more closely welded together in common struggle for the immediate and historical interest of the masses. The Communist League of America heartily welcomes this movement and works for its advancement.

The call for the present conference proposes a state-wide conference to lay out a legislative program in defense of the interests of the unemployed and working class. This proposal to put pressure on the capitalist legislature is a necessary part of a fighting movement for the unemployed. The fight on this front, however, can become really effective, even to serve the immediate interests of the unemployed only if it is supplemented by and combined with a program of direct mass pressure through huge united demonstrations of the workers.

This preliminary conference, should aim to put the movement on a firm foundation by recommending a concrete program for the consideration of the State-wide conference. For this program we proposed the following points:

1. Immediate Relief.
2. Unemployment Insurance, to be paid for by the employers and State government.
3. The 6 hour day and 5 day week, without reduction in pay.
4. Long term credits to the Soviet Union, as a means of unemployment relief for American workers and the cementing of fraternal relations between the American and Russian workers. This implies the demand for recognition of the Soviet Government and the establishment of trade relations.

In supporting the movement for legislative action the Communist Left Opposition deems it necessary to point out the inadequacies of a parliamentary campaign to achieve any one of these demands. Such a tactic by itself is insufficient and would be misleading and incapable of obtaining the aims of the Conference. The broad masses of the workers must be drawn into class struggle activity for these demands. Through mass demonstrations and activity among the working class organizations—trade unions, fraternal organizations, etc., the employed and unemployed, the organized and unorganized must be united in the fight for these demands. In short, the widest possible mass pressure of the economic and political organizations of the working class must be exerted upon the ruling class to reinforce the legislative demands.

It is necessary that this Conference shall conduct a sharp campaign of exposure and criticism of the so-called labor representatives and their lobbying methods behind the scenes with the politicians at Albany and elsewhere in order to secure a few cheap and meager concessions for the unemployed. This capitalistic "politics" is only a snare and delusion to the workers and serves to disarm them before the attacks of the capitalists and their agents. These labor fakery must be shown up in their true colors by counterposing a program of class struggle to their political chicanery.

In order to achieve the aims of the Conference in concerted struggle, it is necessary to take a further step forward on the road of a broad united front of all working class organizations—unions and political parties (A. F. of L., Socialist Party, Communist Party, etc.) It is not enough to invite the branches of these organizations. The respective central organizations and the official leaders of these organizations must be put to the test before the eyes of the workers and compelled to show their colors in action. The Communist Party must participate officially in this movement and undertake thereby, to give direct leadership to the struggles of the workers for their immediate needs and final aims—the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a Soviet Government.

Communist League of America
(Opposition) N. Y. Branch
126 East 16th Street
New York City
(Continued on page 4)

The New York conference held under the auspices of the A. F. of L. Committee for Unemployed Insurance on Sunday, January 22, 1933, was of such significance for the struggle against unemployment in general, and the Communist movement in particular, that it deserves a detailed account and treatment. The importance of the Conference did not lie so much in the organizations represented. In this respect, the gathering fell far short of the possibilities as

well as the requirements of the situation. Of the American Federation of Labor locals in the city, only a handful (23 of them). With isolated exceptions, the balance of the organizations present were those in which the Communists have already gained predominance. When it is considered that the ravages of the crisis, plus the treacherous passivity of all the reformist leaders and the exclusive position occupied by the

Communists in leading whatever militant fight for unemployment relief there has been in this country, it will be seen that the representation at Sunday's conference was far below the vast possibilities at hand for the mobilization of a strong fighting movement. The very fact that the meagre response can be said by the Daily Worker to have "exceeded the best expectations of the Committee", is only an indication of the extent to which the sectarian policies of the official party in the past period have isolated it from the bulk of the workers and their organizations.

This phase of the Conference may be summed up in the following observation: To the extent that the representation from non-Communist organizations was small in comparison with what it should and could have been, its size is to be attributed to the "Third Period" antics of the past, the elimination of the united front, the ultimatum policy of the party, as well as to the inadequacy of the turn made in the recent Chicago united front and at the present Conference. To the extent that non-Communist participation "exceeded the best expectations" it is due to the turn made in dropping the idiotic verbiage about "social Fascism" and approaching the standpoint on the Leninist united front which the Left Opposition has sought to drill into the mind of the party for the past few years.

Our Reservations Justified

The fact that the turn was made, and while still defective, was nevertheless made in the right direction, could not fail to bring it the endorsement of the Left Opposition. At the same time, however, all the shortcomings and dangers already perceptible at the first stages of the party's turn—which we pointed out from the very beginning as factors which made it impossible for the Opposition to accord the turn an unreserved endorsement—were obtrusively present at the very first Conference in New York.

The keynote of the Conference was struck by the Committee representative who opened the meeting, Bordman, and by the Committee chairman, Weinstein, who made the general report for the hand-picked credentials committee. The burden of their appeal was the need of presenting to the legislature soon to convene in Albany a program for "unemployment insurance and other labor legislation". The burning problem of connecting with the fight for unemployment insurance, the demands for immediate relief, the six-hour day and five-day week without pay reduction, and long-term credits to the Soviet Union—this was not dealt with at all by either of the two spokesmen before the Conference. Anxious to get as far away as possible from yesterday's "fight for the streets", of the "Third Period", the speakers sedulously avoided any reference to the need of mass pressure from the workers in the attainment of their demands. The whole program of action outlined by them simmered down to the presentation of a petition to the capitalist legislators assembled at the Capitol. With not a single word did these two Communists—who apparently thing that the way to function in the trade union movement is to cease acting and fighting like Communists—emphasize the danger of entertaining any illusions about what could be obtained by "petitioning the legislature", or the limits necessarily set by a parliamentary campaign. They neither drew a clear line of demarcation between their program of action and the pernicious "lobbying system" of the A. F. of L. and the Socialists, nor did they stress the quintessential importance of organized action by the masses to force concessions from the ruling class and its government.

The warning we gave a week ago against the tendency towards parliamentary opportunism already visible in the party's half-turn, proved to be more than well-founded. The straining towards "respectability" was positively painful. In an overwhelming Communist assembly, the party members and apparently been instructed to adhere strictly to the solemn ritual of avoiding the term "comrade" and addressing each other as "brother" and "sister", obviously for the sole purpose of impressing the half-dozen or less "pure and simple" A. F. of L. delegates present with the fact that the sponsors of the Conference were beyond reproach or the suspicion of being connected in any way with the "Reds".

Socialist Workers Absent

The same game of hide-and-seek was played by the party in the selection of the chairman. The call for the conference, while saying nothing about "so-

Com. Cannon's Speech

Comrades and Fellow-workers:

In the limited time allotted for speeches from the floor it is naturally impossible to deal adequately with the whole problem which has brought us into conference here to-day. I will therefore confine myself to some of the most salient points which must be considered in connection with our next steps on the road to a broader movement and a more effective struggle. Permit me to refer you to the mimeographed copies of the statement and resolutions of the Communist Left Opposition which have been distributed to the delegates. In this material you will find a more thorough elaboration of the program and tactics which the Bolshevik-Leninists advocate than I will be able to present orally in my limited time.

The conference here today represents a step forward in the direction of a united struggle of the workers against the unbearable burdens of the crisis. The tendency towards such a union of forces in the fight constitutes, from our point of view, the progressive feature of this conference. For it is only when the workers of various organizations and political trends are welded together in a common front that real blows can be directed against the class enemy on the great class issue of unemployment. When this union of forces is lacking, when the comparatively small groups of the workers' vanguard take the field alone and fight as isolated detachments, the blows fall heaviest on them, the class enemy remains unshaken and the masses of the workers gain no advantages.

To the extent that the present conference signifies a progressive step toward the united front struggles of the workers, we, of the Left Opposition, declare our readiness to give hearty support to the movement and to work loyally for its advancement.

Broader Base Necessary

The invitation which the committee extended to the branches of the Socialist Party, to the trade union locals of the A. F. of L. and similar conservative organizations means in itself and can only mean a recognition of the fact that the unemployed issue is not an issue of any party, tendency or group, but rather an issue of the class. This is the only way to present the question and to lay the groundwork for a real struggle. But this step in itself remains uncompleted. The roll call of the delegation bears eloquent testimony to this fact. Between the aspirations of the committee which called the conference and the workers' organizations actually represented there is an enormous gap. From this there do not conclude that the calculations of the committee were wrong or that the aspirations to draw the reformist and even the reactionary organizations into the joint struggle are without foundation.

No. We only have to conclude that the step taken toward this end must be followed by others. The tactics of the united front as Lenin laid them down, and as they have been verified by experience on an international scale, must be unfolded in their full scope. It is not sufficient to invite the branches of the Socialist party and the local unions of the A. F. of L. to join us in a common fight. To be sure that is something. By such an invitation we recognize the fact that the workers in these organizations also suffer from the plague of unemployment and that it is quite possible for them to join in a fight for a program of immediate demands even while they retain reformist and conservative in their political views, even while they retain membership in organizations representing these political currents. That is the beginning of wisdom on the question of the united front.

But it is by no means the whole of it. The fact remains that these workers in the reformist and reactionary organizations who have good cause and very probably a real will to fight against the scourge of unemployment are not ready to break with their organizations and are not convinced that their leaders who talk against the evils of unemployment,

no less than we do, do not mean what they say. They are not ready to break with their leaders at the present moment and to respond to appeals over the heads of their official leadership and their respective central organizations. This is the situation as it exists in reality, and not in somebody's imagination. The problem is to base ourselves on this reality and find the way to draw these workers into the common struggle with us in spite of that. For this we must have recourse to the political wisdom of Lenin who has taught us how to do it. For this we must have recourse to the genuine tactics of the united front.

The appeal to the Socialist party branches of greater New York brought a response from one single branch which is represented here alone—and even that branch is located outside the metropolitan territory. The appeal to the A. F. of L. locals brought a mere handful of delegates and even these, in almost every case, come from locals already under the influence of the Left wing. Do not shut your eyes to these facts, comrades. Let us not delude ourselves with the idea that we have a united working-class front. For that we must have a large section of the workers who are absent here to-day. If we proceed from the point of view of the committee that the workers generally, regardless of their political views and their affiliations, want to struggle against unemployment—and I think this is the correct point of view—then we ought to ask ourselves why they have not responded to the call.

And if we face the problem clearly, we will have to say that the fault lies not with the workers but rather with the manner in which they were approached. By ignoring the central organizations, by ignoring the official leadership of the reformist and conservative organizations, the committee unfortunately gave these treacherous leaders all the ground they needed to excuse themselves before their own membership for their failure to participate.

Moreover it put the locals and branches of these organizations before the problem of acting over the heads of their official leadership and their official bodies. If you understand something of the mechanics of organization you will recognize that this is an untimely demand. The reformist workers take their organizations seriously, no less perhaps than we do. They do not act over the head of their official in-

(Continued on page 4)

International Workers School

AMERICAN LABOR LEADERS
The Movements and the Men
A Series of 8 Popular Lectures on
American Labor History and Its
Outstanding Personalities

- by
JAMES P. CANNON
- FEB. 12—TERENCE V. POWERLY
The "Grand Master Workman"
of the Knights of Labor.
 - FEB. 19—SAMUEL GOMPERS
The Labor Lieutenant of the
Capitalist Class.
 - FEB. 26—ALBERT PARSONS
The Haymarket Martyrs and
the Eight Hour Movement.
 - MAR. 5—EUGENE V. DEBS
The Socialist Agitator—The
American Railway Union and
After.
 - MAR. 12—DANIEL DE LEON
The Socialist Theoretician.
 - MAR. 19—WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD
Industrial Unionism, the West-
ern Federation of Miners and
the I. W. W.
 - MAR. 26—SIDNEY HILLMAN
"Business Efficiency" in the
Betrayal of the Workers.
 - APR. 2—WILLIAM Z. FOSTER
The Blight of Stalinism.
- Single Lectures—15 Cents
One Dollar for the Course.
SUNDAY 8 P. M.
126 East 16th Street

Nazis, Cops Provoke CPG

Von Schleicher Uses Fascists to Bolster Bonapartist Regime

On Sunday, January 22, tens of thousands of Fascists made a demonstration in Germany. In clashes with workers and Communists one worker was killed and a hundred were wounded. According to the press the occasion was the anniversary of the death of a Fascist killed in an assault upon workers. Touching sentimentality! The Kaiser sent a wreath of flowers to lay upon the grave.

Had the demonstration for this sort of human rubbish been part of the usual Fascist tinsel of bluster and burlesque pomp it could have been set down as another item in the ledger of the working class account with these agents of capitalist reaction, to be settled in full and forever by the proletarian revolution. But there are aspects of the demonstration that mark it as an event of great significance for the German and international working class and its vanguard.

In Berlin the Fascists invaded the heart of the proletarian districts to assemble in front of Communist party headquarters. Alone the Fascists would not have dared the anger of the workers. But the Fascists were "guarded" by the largest police mobilization ever made in Berlin. This was a sinister united front between the Fascist hordes and the Bonapartist police. This fact gave the demonstration a character of the highest political significance. It was not a memorial meeting at all, but an enormous provocation of the workers' vanguard. Under the circumstances the party correctly refused to be drawn. That is to its credit.

In the mind of every worker questions will arise: Why was the party not able to arouse the masses of workers to resist this hostile demonstration in its stronghold? Why could it not call on the social democratic workers to join with it against their common foe? The knowledge of its ability to do so would have made the demonstration in red Berlin impossible.

To ask the questions is to hint at

OPEN FORUM

REPORT OF THE PROGRESSIVE
TRADE UNIONS CONFERENCE
AT GILLESPIE, ILLINOIS

Speaker:
J. P. CANNON
now in Illinois Coal Fields
Friday, February 3, 1933
126 East 16 Street,
ADMISSION: 15c
Auspices:
N. Y. Br. Communist League of America
(Opposition)

their answers. The demonstration succeeded in establishing the weakness of the party. This must be said openly. The reason is to be found in the false theories of the Thaelmann-Stalin leadership which harnessed the party to the yoke of social-Fascism and erected barriers across the line of march to the unity of the working class. That is why the socialist workers today remain under the bloodstained flag of the Noskes and Sheidemanns. And that is why the party had to suffer the humiliating insult of a Fascist demonstration in front of its windows. The demonstration was another warning to the party leadership to redress its line and begin, without delay, the approach to the social democratic workers and trade unions through their organizations, mobilize the whole class for the extra-parliamentary struggle against the Bonapartist, Fascist and social democratic pillars of capitalist reaction.

Having escaped disaster on one reef the party leadership is still unable to steer by the charts of a Leninist course. It has not assimilated the lessons of this "memorial meeting". It is now embarked on a course of counter demonstrations lasting a week. "We have numbers too" seems to be the essence of their reaction to the Fascist insult and provocation. Such demonstrations are significant when they are manned by workers following a correct policy. In the present situation these demonstrations must take place on the basis of the extra-parliamentary united front. Otherwise they are futile protests against the Fascist outrage.

That is one aspect of the events of January 22. The united front between Von Schleicher's police and Hitler's mercenaries is a new and striking development in the German situation. What is the meaning of this co-operation?

In the interregnum of the Bonapartist regime of Von Schleicher the class situation has not stood still. The economic crisis has continued to deepen. Unemployment is rising again. Dissatisfaction with Von Schleicher is growing. He has successfully postponed the convening of the Reichstag for a time but on its next assembling he may find himself and his cabinet forced out, the precarious equilibrium of his Bonapartist regime disrupted by a rising tide of working class struggle.

The united front of Hitler and Von Schleicher was a maneuver directed against the spearhead of the working class. Von Schleicher utilized the Fascist troops to provoke the Communist party to struggle under unfavorable conditions; to drown its defense in blood and make bloody reprisals against the working class; to appease the restlessness in the Fascist ranks with this

(Continued on page 4)

Letters from Militants

Twenty-two P. M. A. Miners Framed

TAYLORVILLE, ILL.—The working class is again on trial in a county called Christian. Twenty-two members of the Progressive Miners of America will stand trial March 13 on a murder charge, growing out of the Kincaid battle of two weeks ago when Emma Cumerlato, an Auxiliary member, and two Peabody strike-breakers were killed and 18 others wounded.

In an atmosphere that smells notoriously Peabody, our fellow workers are being held like convicts of old behind dismal walls that have been constantly in service for the Insull Empire since the beginning of the strike struggle against the scab-herding United Mine Workers of America.

The Christian county grand jury has rendered murder indictments against the backbone of the midland strike movement. Besides the 22 charged with murder, there are 32 others charged with unlawful assembly and inciting to riot. The names of others are being suppressed by the court. The suppression is, no doubt, to be used as a club over an active striker's head.

Bills charging murder were reported against the following persons:

- Albert Mattozo, Kincaid Chief of Police
- Nick Passa
- Fred Bassana
- Vincent Calza
- Emilio Vitali
- Ferdinand Patterozzi
- Walter Lusebrink
- Emil Dupre

Other charges have been placed against the victims. 10 of the 22 indicted on the most serious charges are already held in the Christian county jail without bond. Defense attorneys have been employed by the Progressive Miners of America to defend the miners.

The case developed from the gun fight that took place between striking coal miners and Peabody guards, when the latter attempted to disperse a group of pickets that had formed along the sidewalks of the mining town of Kincaid. The guards approached the miners with guns in their hands and white banners tied around their arms, as an identification mark to prevent their side from shooting at them.

The Peabody guards were the aggressors in this fight as they have been in many other struggles that have taken place in the strike-torn region.

Thugs Terrorize Miners

It developed, however, that in the melee that took place the striking miners properly defended themselves and for once the Peabody guards got the worst of the fray. In retreating the thugs sniped Mrs. Emma Cumerlato as she was opening the door of her home to save her husband from the wild shooting.

Vincent Rodems, formerly a national guard, now employed by Peabody as a guard, died as a result of wounds. The following morning James Guy Hickman, imported from West Virginia, was killed as he shot at the relief station of the Progressive Miners of America in Kincaid.

Immediately following the battle the Peabody gunmen, backed by members of the national guards, began a reign of terror. Relief stations were smashed; women and men were dragged from their homes and beaten; striking miners were kidnapped and strike leaders were hounded for weeks. The blood-lusting gunmen of the Peabody Coal Company started one fight in which the miners did not bow like slaves before their master. W. C. Argust, general superintendent of the Peabody Coal Company, issued a statement that the scabs were unarmed. "They were helpless," he stated to the press. Yet in recent conferences it has been proved that strike-breakers have a checking room in wash houses where they store their guns before going into the pits.

Members of the Progressive Miners of America have been urging the formation of a defense committee to secure national attention on the cases that threaten to execute active members of the Progressive Miners of America. The formation of such a committee is under consideration.

GERRY ALLARD.

Stalinists Collaborate With Clergy, Millionaires

PHILADELPHIA.—Because of our exposure of their shameful collaboration with the Greek clergy at the Greek meeting on Jan. 8th, the *Empros* placed the blame on the shoulders of the comrades of the Unemployed Committee of N. Y. City. In spite of this the *Empros* of Jan. 21st encouraged the Philadelphia Stalinists to undertake a united front with the semi-Fascist organization, *Ahepan*, a priest of St. George Church, and a rival church which is controlled by a group of Greeks headed by the millionaires, Stefanou Brothers. This meeting coincided with the day of our lecture in Philadelphia. Many Greek workers whom I met upon my arrival suggested that we postpone the hour so they could be present.

This we did and went with the comrades to the Church where the meeting was taking place. There we were amazed to see the Stalinists guarding the gates of the church! Against whom were they on guard? Not against the bourgeoisie. They were supporting the meeting and were using again the services of the famous lackey, Stefanou (former editor of *Empros* whom we helped to remove), who still parades as a Communist thanks to the Stalinist regime of the party which covers every

section committee that brought the charges. Of most significance was the vote of the jury. Seventeen voted for expulsion and eleven for probation. While most of the party members and YCLers voted for expulsion most of the members of the party-controlled organizations voted for probation. The audience was divided on this decision, not unlike the members of the jury.

To rid the working class of white chauvinism mass trials must not be made farces. What is needed is Communist education. This Leninist method, which is foreign to the Stalinist bureaucracy, must be revived.

—L. ROBERTS.

League Activities in Youngstown

On Sunday, January 8, the Youngstown Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) held a lecture and discussion on "The Communist Party and the Left Opposition", at Central Auditorium, Youngstown. The meeting began at 2:30 P. M., with comrade Gordon presenting a brief outline of the history of the Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition in the Russian Communist Party. He followed this sketch of the Left Opposition's origin with a summary of the platform of the Opposition today, dealing with the question of the united front against Fascism in Germany, the betrayal of the Chinese Revolution and their problems confronting the Communist movement.

There was an interested audience of workers present—several members of the C. P., S. L. Pites, and a number of workers interested in Trotsky's position. The crowd totally forty, most of whom were very favorably impressed by our platform. A number of them asked very pertinent questions on the united front policy, and we were able to explain Lenin's tactic to workers who will ponder the questions seriously.

After a summary by comrade Gordon, in which he refuted the charges of Trotsky's having broken discipline and explained what Bolshevik discipline is, the meeting, and, consequently, we were able to make clear to all the workers present that despite our bureaucratic expulsion from the C. I., we remain the Left wing of the Communist International. The meeting was a success for the Opposition.

Bureaucrats Checked in I. L. D.

Recently several members of the Left Opposition, after repeated attempts, were finally admitted into the I.L.D. branch in Youngstown. This organization, like all the other Party organizations here, have been terribly run down by the Stalin regime, so that hardly a skeleton remains of its former self. Our comrades joined, declaring their willingness to exert every possible effort in helping to rebuild the workers' defense organization.

They were sympathetically received by the membership at the first meeting they attended and one of their number was even elected to the Section Bureau.

The Party bureaucrats, alarmed by the progress of the Left Opposition, immediately set out to "rectify" this "mistake". To the next meeting they sent down a representative, a certain Lewis, who is not even a member of the organization, to "wipe out" the Trotskyites. Lewis took the floor without anybody's permission, denounced the Left Opposition, and declared that they had no place in the I.L.D. This provocative action of the bureaucrats' representative naturally aroused the resentment of all the members present and after a brief struggle on the floor he was overruled and the meeting proceeded to its order of business.

Another «Mass Trial»!

PHILADELPHIA.—If it is the aim of the official party to besmirch the name of Communism, then the party can look with pride to the burlesque of white chauvinism grafted on Ida Tabachnick, a member of the Communist party.

If the trial, (which took place in Irish Hall, 39th and Lancaster, on Tuesday, January 10, 1932 at 8 P. M.) had been for inactivity one could not help indorsing her expulsion with both hands. However, when the charge of white chauvinism is concocted out of the thin air, in a manner worthy of Don Quixote, then we must protest as did eleven of the jurors. For such actions can only compromise Communism thereby increasing our isolation from the masses.

In this tragical-comedy the Communist party of District 3 and Section 3 made a goat of Ida Tabachnick to hide its lack of education as well as to "prove" that the Communist party stands for full equality, social, economic and political as well as for "Self Determination in the Black Belt."

Only individuals like Davis (the prosecutor) could "prove" that to ask your guests not to make so much noise is white chauvinism, because a colored comrade is amongst those present. Does it matter to the bureaucrats that it was near midnight, and that a party can reach such hilarity that other tenants in the building complain? Did the fact that the accused had colored comrades sleep and dine at her house mean anything? Of course not. "She was a chauvinist in spite of this. And what is more she is a concealed chauvinist which is worse than an open one." She has been brought to trial and therefore must be found guilty.

The next charge was that she had refused to go out on tag days with colored comrades. The defense countered this by showing that she had gone out with negro comrades. Once she had been assigned a certain territory with a new colored comrade but when the people of that neighborhood were hostile to the mixed committee he refused to go any further and she returned to the headquarters. On another occasion she went home to her child who was sick. If Ida Tabachnick was guilty of anything in these two cases it was not white chauvinism but a desire to shirk the responsibility of Communist activity. This was admitted by both jurors and witnesses for the defense.

Although Freed, for the defense, put up a good but hopeless fight the Party bureaucrats had arranged a Roman holiday. The Stalinists made sure of that by placing on the jury members of the

Report of Unemployed Conference

(Continued from page 1)

cial Fascists", did not address itself to the Socialist party or the A. F. of L. Such a turn-about face—demanded by the situation as well as by the elementary Leninist conception of the united front—was too much to expect from the Stalinist bureaucracy which only yesterday opposed any united front at all. The result naturally was that only the most advanced sections of the A. F. of L.—and comparatively few of them—responded to the call and the militants were deprived of the opportunity of pressing the A. F. of L. leaders to the wall on a concrete issue and revealing to the rank and file conservative workers what their leaders are worth. The same held true with regard to the Socialist party. The call was addressed to "locals of the Socialist party", thus making it unnecessary for the S. P. hierarchy to put themselves on record. Concrete results of this "united front from below" of the second edition? One local of the Socialist party responded to the Conference, and not a local from the metropolitan area, but one of the least important groups—Huntington, Long Island. The rank and file of the socialist workers, who by and large feel as much attached to their organization as do the Communist workers to their party, responded just as coldly to the Sunday Conference call to the "locals of the S. P." as, let us say, the individual shop nuclei of the Communist party would respond to a "united front" appeal of the Socialists addressed to the "lower branches" of the Communist party. This simple fact, which does not require a course in the Moscow Lenin School to be comprehended (more accurately: only such a course is capable of rendering the student incapable of comprehension!) has not yet penetrated into the skulls of the Stalinist bureaucracy. If it has, they have thought the better of it in the interests of maintaining themselves in the international apparatus.

To make up for this mortifying failure to bring the socialist workers into the conference, the Conference directors elected as chairman the sole S. P. delegate from Huntington! This decorative trick—worthy of the intellectual level of a stage manager in a small-town theater which is short of appropriate scenery—was the Stalinist substitute for the united front proposed by the Left Opposition which would bring together into a militant movement not only the Communist but also the socialist workers.

In the invention of such two-for-a-cent tactics, the Conference stage-managers were inexhaustible. The call asked for the election of two delegates from every organization; but the call was not meant for the Left Opposition. When the self-appointed credentials committee reported, its secretary proposed the unseating of one of the two delegates from the New York branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition), one of the two from the Young Spartacus Club, from the Unser Kamf Workers Club and from the *Protomagia*, the Greek workers' club sympathetic to the Left Opposition. Furthermore, James Gordon, unanimously elected by the cafeteria department of the Food Workers Industrial Union, was marked for the discard by the credentials committee. Finally, the Lovestoneite youth group was to be unseated altogether, as were also two of the three delegates sent by the parent body.

"Brilliant Tactics"

The motivation for these unseatings was positively brilliant and worthy of the masterful strategist who conceived it. Where the central organizations—like the A. F. of L. or the S. P.—did not have delegates, it was explained, their local organizations were entitled to two apiece. But where the central organizations did send delegates—like the Communist party, the "Communist Oppositions", the Unemployed Councils they would be adequately represented by one delegate! Thus, the TUUL, with its how-many-thousands of members was given one delegate, while a carpenters' local of, let us say, a hundred or more members, was given two delegates. What could be fairer? Thus the Communist delegate, with Hathaway, its one official delegate (together with the dozens of Rubins, Winters, Benjamins, Neesins, and others from party-controlled auxiliaries), was on an "equal footing" with the Left Opposition or the Lovestone group!

Protests against this ruling were voted down. Another ruling was that there shall be one speaker from each "trade" or "political" group. That is only one carpenter could speak at the conference; only one member of an Unemployed Council could speak; only "one" member of the Communist party could speak as a "Communist"; naturally, only one Left Oppositionist could speak; and let us not omit to mention that comrade James Gordon, the Oppositionist whom the bureaucrats just expelled from the

partly, could not speak at all because he was unseated on the grounds that the Executive Board of the Food Workers Industrial Union had sent a delegate, thus voiding the unanimous decision of the Cafeteria department to send its delegates. In this manner, Shachtman of the Left Opposition delegation, Carter of the Spartacus Youth Club, Bonanes from the *Protomagia*, and two Lovestone delegates were required to leave the conference when it went into "executive session". With this ingenious tactical plan the Stalinists won the signal and decisive victory of ridding themselves of a handful of Oppositionists from the Conference, even if their pretensions to "respectability" made it extremely difficult to unseat us altogether. The motion of comrade William Kitt, of the Alternation Painters Union, to seat as fraternal delegates those whom the Stalinists proposed to exclude, was defeated by a show of hands, thus saving the American revolution, the Communist International and the Soviet Union.

This picaresque trick did not keep the Opposition from presenting its stand-point to the conference, just as little as the well-oiled maneuvers at the New York "anti-war" conference prevented us from making known our point of view.

Opposition Speaks

No sooner was the floor thrown open for discussion than comrade Cannon, representing the League, was up to the front of the room and ready to speak for the Opposition. A vigilant Stalinist promptly jumped up to propose a limitation of speaking time to seven minutes, which was adopted and to which comrade Cannon was held with laudable strictness! The Opposition had already issued a leaflet to the conference in which our point of view was set forth. In addition, we had handed out to every delegate a copy of the two resolutions which we presented to the conference for consideration. One dealt with the need of organizing immediately for a second conference on a broader basis to which would be invited not only local but central organizations, like the A. F. of L., the Socialist party, the Communist party and the independent trade unions. The other proposed a concrete and all-embracing program of action on unemployment which would go beyond the mere demand for an unemployment insurance bill and a parliamentary agitation for it. All three documents are printed elsewhere in this issue, as is also the speech delivered by Cannon.

Our representative spoke on the resolution for a broader conference and expounded, for the first time in years before an audience composed overwhelmingly of Communist party members, the A B C of the united front as outlined in the Communist International by Lenin and Trotsky. There was not only the closest attention paid to his remarks, and a complete absence of interruptions, but at the end of it there was a good round of applause. The presentation of our standpoint, in the resolutions and the speech, was a striking advance of the Left Opposition. The turn made by the party was in the direction we had been demanding for a long time and the apparatus men felt uncomfortable about the fact. By the very nature of things, the Opposition set the tone for the conference from the outset of the discussion.

The numerous party members who took the floor after Cannon, spoke generally in an agitational spirit, but none of them ventured to attack or abuse the Left Opposition in that contemptible routine manner which has always been the stock in trade of the Stalinists in their campaign against the Bolshevik-Leninists. Of considerable interest was the speech of one of the two Huntington S. P. delegates who referred to comrade Cannon: "I deny the assertion of the first speaker that the Socialist party is unwilling to fight for unemployment insurance and relief," he said. "It is necessary to use politics. The Labor party in England had unemployment insurance. In Germany and other countries the Socialist party got unemployment insurance for the workers. In Holland, they have good unemployment insurance. (All of which will be gratifying news to the German, British and Dutch workers!) I will conclude with the hope that we will support the Socialist party—but we must not fight amongst ourselves." The Communist delegates carefully refrained from dissipating the illusions of the socialist delegate. Like him, they were anxious "not to fight amongst ourselves"—which they understand to mean the concealment of the Communist point of view.

Stalinist Confusion

The Negro delegate from the Carpenters' Union, comrade Moore, opposed the Opposition's resolution and offered a sorry example of Stalinist mis-education. "Don't waste time on the leaders of these organizations," he urged, referring to the S. P. and the A. F. of L. "The

rank and file are with us". The only trouble with his assertions was that they were, unfortunately, not true. It was and is precisely because the rank and file are not yet "with us" that the revolutionists must "waste time on the leaders" and organizations whom the masses still follow.

Among the delegates who did support our viewpoint was comrade Dreyer, of the Pharmacists Union, who called our resolution the only united front proposal made along the line of Lenin's teachings. His speech is not even mentioned by the *Daily Worker*. It does, however, mention the "fact" that the Left Opposition "did not have a single worker representative of organizations outside of themselves". Not only were we supported by the Spartacus Youth Club, the Unser Kamf Workers Club and the *Protomagia*, but also by such delegates as Dreyer of the Pharmacists, Bill Kitt of the Alternation Painters Union, William Hermann of the Carpenters Local 2090, Henry Stone of the Technical Men's Union, and a couple of delegates from the International Labor Defense. Out of a total of 90 delegates, Cannon received 18 votes as candidate for the resolutions committee, with the highest vote cast for a candidate standing at 61.

The Lovestoneite delegate, Lifschitz, spoke in favor of the united front, and Weisbord, representing his group, announced his support of Cannon's argument for a new conference and a broad united front, adding that it did not "go far enough" because it did not propose to aim at a... general strike. All during this discussion, the representatives of the official party were silent, apparently not greatly concerned with our intervention on the grounds that "we have the votes anyway; let them talk". But at the end of the discussion, the floor was taken by the "sole" representative of the party, Hathaway. He took his place in the division of labor arranged for by the steering committee which he directed. The Communist workers and militants who did not directly represent the party, were allotted the task of speaking like trade unionists—not as Communist trade unionists but as "respectable" trade unionists! The "pure Communist" standpoint was to be presented solely by the official party spokesman. Thus, while the bulk of the speeches made by the Communist militants could have been made without much difficulty by a somewhat advanced representative of the A. F. of L. School, "comrade" (not brother, or sister) Hathaway took care to maintain appearances by telling the audience not to "think that the legislature will give anything it is not forced to give". "We have to reject," he added, "the proposal of Cannon as a proposal to delay." What Hathaway meant was that the movement had to orient itself—not on the mobilization of the widest section of the working class, but on the legislative calendar at Albany. In this single sentence, Hathaway revealed that aside from a few formally radical phrases about "not relying" on the legislatures, his viewpoint differed in no serious degree from the vulgar parliamentary opportunism with which the speeches of the other party-instructed delegates was drenched.

Genuine United Front Rejected

The proposal to "invite the leaders", as he put it, was also rejected by Hathaway because, you see, they are sabotaging the fight; Hathaway only neglected to point out that the workers still following these leaders by the millions, are not yet aware of the sabotage, unless Hathaway believes either that nobody of importance is following them or that they are being followed because they sabotage the interests of their followers.

In any case, it is interesting to note that Hathaway refrained from the customary slanders about our "counter-revolutionism". The resolutions committee report proposed that all the delegates present constitute themselves as the provisional committee for the Albany state-wide conference. As to the resolutions we submitted, the committee found itself obliged to borrow virtually all our concrete demands. Instead of confining the movement to social insurance, the program now included the demand for immediate relief, and for the shorter work day, without, however, specifying the six-hour day and five-day week. The only one of our proposals not incorporated by the committee was the one dealing with credits to the Soviet Union. Our resolution for a broader conference was rejected without a single political argument being presented against it. The cornered Stalinists merely argued that there were only six weeks left until the legislature convened, and they were so anxious to be on time to meet it that they would not be able to find time in which to call a wide united front conference to precede it!

Yet, so demoralized were the Stalinists, caught in the contradictions inherent in the half-heartedness of the turn, of its inadequacy and one-sidedness, that upon Weisbord's motion that the central bodies—the A. F. of L., the S. P., the

(Continued on page 4)

LEON TROTSKY

History of the Russian Revolution

PUBLISHERS PRICE Vol. One Vol. Two Vol. Three \$4.00 \$3.50 \$3.50 Send All Orders Immediately To	OUR PRICE \$3 per Volume \$9 the Boxed Set PIONEER PUBLISHERS 84 East 10th Street, New York
---	--

POSTAGE 20c PER VOLUME Extra

Confusion Marks Stalinist Policy on Fight Against War

Student Conference Compromises Communism in Chicago Edition of Amsterdam; Yield Principled Positions

The Student Congress held in Mandel Hall, University of Chicago, on December 26th and 27th, gave further testimony to the political revision invoked upon the Communist movement by Stalinism. The congress signified that the struggle against imperialist war and militarism was the task not of the Communists and revolutionary workers, but of the students. The progenitor of this gathering was the Amsterdam Congress held in Brussels in the summer of 1932. For that occasion, the International Left Opposition presented an extremely sharp criticism of the present regime in the Communist International, because it turned the struggle against war over to an arbitrarily appointed group of pacifists, liberals, poets, musicians, artists, actors and what not, removing this decisive activity from the hands of the Communist International, and its sections.

Over the question of the war the working class movements during the war-years split. The culmination of years of political and theoretical struggle in the 2nd International came at the outbreak of the war when the leading party in the 2nd International, the German Social Democratic Party, voted for war credits. That action was a signal for the other Socialist Parties to follow suit. With each section of the Socialist International supporting its own fatherland, the doom of Social Democracy as the leader of the revolutionary proletariat was sealed. Out of the background of this collapse, rose the international Left wing which was later to form the Communist International. The attitude toward the war in particular, and militarism in general, was the burning question in those trying days, and upon which the attitude, the political fate of the movement depended.

Upon the experiences of the world war, the Communist International in its early years set for itself the task of clarifying the great confusion of that and made clear to the revolutionary movement that the struggle against war is one of the chief tasks of the Communists. It must at all times carry out a systematic agitation and propaganda against war. The ranks of the army must be penetrated by the Communists. In the event of war the aim of the Communists must be set upon transforming the imperialist war into a civil war. Upon concrete issues the Communists must initiate united front movements of the working class and its organizations against war and militarism. But above all do not entrust the struggle against war, to pacifists, to liberals, to the socialists, the petty-bourgeoisie or other such groupings. Unless the Communists direct the struggle against war, that struggle will in the end result in betrayal. Wasn't that the lesson of experience? Certainly! International pacifism, international social-democracy, international liberalism, betrayed the masses and came to the support of the imperialist conflicts. That is why it is all-important that in organizing united front movements against war, political policy must be absolutely correct. It is impossible to unite on the basis of an "agreement" on program with other political groupings. The basis for united front action is the concrete situation—but the Communists at no time surrender their political aims, modify them or alter them in the interests of forming united front action. That is why the Fourth Congress of the Young Communist International found it necessary to declare:

"The Young Communist International and the Young Communist Leagues, in close connection with the Party and paralleled with the struggle against bourgeois militarism and the danger of new imperialist wars must carry on a SPECIAL AGITATION, PROPAGANDA AND EDUCATION FOR THE INEVITABILITY OF THE CIVIL WAR, THE NECESSITY FOR MILITARY PREPARATION AND THE ARMING OF THE PROLETARIAT AND THE RIGHT TO DEFEND THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION BY FORCE OF ARMS, THAT IS TO SAY THE CREATION OF THE ARMED PROLETARIAN POWER, THE RED ARMY."

Not any artificially created organizations have the task of carrying on the general struggle against war, not the pacifists, or the liberals, but the Communists. Isn't that clear? The Communists do not conceive of war as an abstract issue but understand it as a product of the economic order of capitalism. The elimination of war and militarism will come about with the abolition of capitalism. Thus the struggle against war as an integral part of capitalism must be unified with the general social system and its replacement with Communism.

The Amsterdam Congress marked a departure from Communist principles. The Communist International, instead of organizing and leading the struggle against war, turned this task over to Barbusse, Rolland, Patel and others. Officially the Communist International was represented at the Congress. But the actual organization, of the Congress, its political program, its direction, was in the hands of an arbitrarily selected group who in reality represented nobody. Is it any wonder that the ripples created by Amsterdam have now settled to a dead calm? Confusion marked the program of that Congress. Genuine issues making necessary the existence of such a congress were not fully blossomed. The Congress in Amsterdam only succeeded in creating confusion on the question of the struggle against war. The Communists hid behind the veil of the congress.

How does the further confusion of

Amsterdam take place? It took place in the form of the organization of the American Committee against War, another arbitrarily selected committee of elements akin to those who organized the Amsterdam Congress. And just as the Amsterdam Congress not only formally but actually replaces the C. I. and YCL, so the organization to lead the struggle against war and militarism, so the American Committee against War, accomplishes the same end nationally. It was also, on the basis of a cable from the Amsterdam Congress, that the National Students League initiated the movement for the Student Congress Against War. Building upon the experience of Amsterdam and the American Committee Against War, the NSL arbitrarily organized a National Committee for the Student Congress Against War composed of a variety of elements representing numerous political views ranging from pacifism to Communism, but actually representing no organizations or members. It was this committee that organized and directed the congress. But behind this committee, as behind Amsterdam and the American Committee, stood the Communist party and the Young Communist League. Official Communism hid once more behind the cloak of a "National Committee". And so we witnessed again the spectacle of the Communists turning over the struggle against war to semi-Communists, pacifists, liberals, and anti-Communists. But what is outstanding in relation to this affair, is that for the first time since the organization of the C. I. and YCL, we are made to understand that the struggle against war and militarism is to be carried out this by the students, divorced from the working class and the class struggle.

Paying lip-service to the contrary, means nothing. The fact is that the first organized attempt to build an anti-war movement was turned over to the students. It is necessary to analyze this further. But before that, one other observation is necessary. Stalinism, which rejects the united front tactic as originated at the third and fourth congresses of the Comintern, and so much insisted upon by the Left Opposition, on the basis that they could not "unite with leaders", "but only from below", betrays itself on the question of war. Here of all places, the "united front from below" is completely forgotten and what does take place is a united front purely from the top, with individual and isolated leaders of various movements, without contact or control by the workers. It is but another instant of Stalinist zig-zags.

The advanced student in capitalist countries represents socially and ideologically the ruling class. The percentage of proletarian students is extremely small. Students do not play an independent role in the class struggle and for the most part they support capitalism and become its intellectual leaders. As a mass the students are reactionary. Only small sections of the students can be won to Communism or to the support of the proletariat. But under no circumstances can the students independently engage in struggle let alone lead any struggle against capitalism. That is the view that dominated the Young Communist International, at its inception. (At a future date the writer will present for discussion an article on the role of the student and National Student League). It is the task of the Communists to win support of the small minority of proletarian students and draw them into the struggle. That activity belongs to the Young Communist League. But what happened is that the student movement initiated the anti-war movement, gave it its leadership and only succeeded in realizing what Amsterdam has: confusion.

If our analysis of the student is correct (that analysis coincides with the resolution of the Young Communist International adopted at its 2nd congress) then it was utterly false to transfer the anti-war work into the hands of the students. Actually in relation to the youth, this task is one of the chief activities of the Young Communist League, which embodies in itself the glorious traditions of the world youth movement during the war days. But here again, following the logic of Amsterdam, the YCL, which should have initiated the movement was nowhere to be seen. It was not even represented at the congress. It was afraid to taint the congress with Communism. "Keep it pure" was the slogan, because the aim is to win the pacifists and liberals! That is how the pre-congress period looked. The stu-

AN APOLOGY
The burning importance of the New York United Conference on Unemployment made it necessary for us to carry over to next week the material we had planned to run in this issue on Lenin, Liebknecht and Luxemburg.

THE MILITANT
Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879.
Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th St., N. Y.
EDITORIAL BOARD
Martin Abern James P. Cannon
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
Arne Swabeck
SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1933
Vol. 6, No. 4 Whole No. 1

dents were organizing the movement against war and militarism!

Let us examine briefly the pre-congress period. First of all, a burning concrete issue was absent. Therefore the congress took on the character of a united front (among students!) for the drawing up of a program in the struggle against war. When it is understood that the whole affair was initiated by the Communists, the criminal nature of the understanding becomes clear. The working youth was not invited to the congress thereby cutting off all relations between the students and the workers. That was criminal act number two. In an effort to win the pacifists and liberals the call for the congress was addressed in the vaguest terms. What is more the congress call was false. It raised the cry for a struggle against war without specifying what kind of war. In popularizing the congress, the Soviet Union and its defense was not even mentioned. So close a sympathizer to the Communist movement as Carl Haessler, in speaking for the congress at one of the colleges in Chicago, did not mention the Soviet Union and its defense. When confronted with objections by members of the Spartacus Youth Club, he replied that if he were to do that it would drive the non-Communists away from the congress. Such and more marked all the activities of the NSL. The Young Communist League remained ignominiously silent during this whole period.

It was on of the above mentioned situation that the Spartacus Youth Club in Chicago issued two statements, one addressed to the National Students League and the other to the YCL, outlining our criticisms of the congress preparative and proposing the necessary changes. These statements were well received by the rank and file. The leadership, however, attempted to edge out from under the criticism with charges of "Leftism" and "sectarianism". The proposal to invite working class youth organizations to the congress, made by a member of the Spartacus Youth Club at a meeting of the high school division of the NSL, was defeated by the vote of members of the YCL. It was to be a

Daily Worker Decries Promoter of the Amsterdam Congress

Out of the clear blue sky, we read the following comment under the "International Notes" written by "Robert Hamilton" in the *Daily Worker* of January 21, 1933: "H. G. Wells, noted British novelist, has been engaged in a war of words with the *London Morning Post*, in which he endeavors to play the honest pacifist. . . . Strange words, indeed, for the author of the *Outline of History*! We recall this to warn workers of the two-faced pacifists such as H. G. Wells, who ten years after the World War shrieks his anti-war attitudes to the four winds, but keeps his mouth shut about the bombing of Iraq tribesmen and Hindu revolutionists, and who will whoop it up for murder again when the next imperialist conflict breaks out."

It would not be imagined from the violent tone of the *Daily Worker* that this is the first time that Wells has been endeavoring "to play the honest pacifist". Were "Robert Hamilton" to give the full story, it would prove to be an inconvenient revelation of the fact that only a few months ago, the whole international Stalinist press was not only engaged in a big publicity campaign for H. G. Wells and his kidney, presenting him to the militant workers as "honest pacifists" but also in helping the "two-faced pacifists" such as H. G. Wells to "shriek his anti-war attitudes to the four winds" through every megaphone the Comintern could put to his lips.

For Wells is one of the original signers of the Barbusse-Rolland-Stalin call for the notorious Amsterdam Congress which addressed itself to "all men and women of good will". While the Bolshevik-Leninists of the Left Opposition were virtually driven from the tribunes of the international and national "anti-war" conferences, the Wellises of every country were hailed by the Comintern apparatus and press as "honest pacifists", "sincere fighters against war", "reliable friends of the Soviet Union!"

The Comintern abused the Opposition for demanding that an open call be addressed to the social democratic and reformist trade union organizations for a united front against the war danger. "We will not unite with the treacherous leaders." But the "honest pacifist fighters"—with them they not only united in pathetic harmony, but they deluded—and continue to delude—the class conscious workers with the idea that the miserable masquerade of Amsterdam was a powerful weapon of struggle against imperialist war. We of the Left Opposition, even under the hail of calumny, warned that the petty bourgeois literateurs, doctors, dentists, pacifists and generals without armies—represented nobody in particular and would add to the movement only deception and confusion. Wells is the first concrete example that the Stalinists themselves have been compelled to recognize—long after the fact and without any explanation. As a matter of fact, they "wisely" refrain from referring to Wells' co-initiation of the Amsterdam Congress. It would be a little . . . embarrassing.

If Wells is the first, there is no reason to think that he will be the last. The pamphlet recently issued on the Congress by the "American Committee", announces that among the delegates "two were French socialist members of the Chamber of Deputies, Hamon and

pure student gathering and the organizers made sure in advance that it would be tainted by delegates representing workers organizations.

The nature of the congress becomes clear. Its composition was woeful. There gathered some five or six hundred students. A majority represented the NSL, some socialists and pacifists, and a great number individual students. The agenda of the Congress was an un-serious one. For a Congress that was to take up the question of how the students should struggle against war, to work up a program and resolutions, one day was allotted to speeches by Communists, pacifists, and socialists. The various speeches did not help to clarify those gathered. At best confusion became more confounded. On the evening of the first day, study classes were held on various questions relating to war and militarism, directed by Communists, pacifists and socialists. And mind you, this was a congress. On the second day the practical questions of how to struggle against war, the resolutions, the election of the executive was to take place. Quite understandably, the proceedings the second day were rushed through with such speed that it was impossible for the delegates to actually assimilate its deliberations.

On the opening day of the congress the Spartacus Youth Club distributed a statement expressing the views of the Opposition youth on the congress and making concrete proposals to it. In addition to this statement the declaration of the International Left Opposition to the Amsterdam Congress was distributed. The Opposition pointed out in the statement the false nature of the congress, its failure to unite with the working youth, confusion in program, the need to adopt a revolutionary position in the struggle against war, the error in attempting to organize a permanent anti-war organizations and called upon the Young Communist League to issue an invitation for a broad united front conference of working class organizations to struggle on concrete issues against war.

(To be continued)
—ALBERT GLOTZER.

Poupy: another was Nicole, editor of *Travail*, a Swiss socialist paper. These socialists as a group passed a resolution in which they stated: "We decided to work zealously within our respective organizations to win them over for a united front against war, and for the defense of the Russian revolution. . . . Hamon and Poupy are still deputies; Poupy is even a member of the Permanent International Committee. As every two-year old child knows, France is the principal backer of Japan in its Manchurian adventure, and that in the most direct sense. What have Messrs. Hamon and Poupy said in the Chamber of Deputies—to say nothing about what they have done among the masses outside the Chamber—concerning the piratical war Japan is conducting in Manchuria, and the role of French imperialism in it? To our knowledge—nothing!"

And the Amsterdam Committee itself, what is it doing about the erupting volcano in Manchuria which threatens to engulf the East in a new world war? It is doing the maximum it is capable of doing: nothing! The movement which was conceived as a joint substitute for the Communist struggle against imperialist war and the united front of all the workers for action against the war danger—proves to be impotent and passive when confronted by the first situation that calls for action. The Amsterdam Committee does not act—it cannot. It does not even speak. And what could it say about so acute and unambiguous a situation as the Manchurian conflict, what proposals could it make that would harmonize with the views of the Communists on the one hand, and the H. G. Wellises, Henri Barbusse, General von Schoenaichs and Ala Nazimovas on the other?

What the Opposition once said about the Anglo-Russian Committee, holds good for the Amsterdam Committee: at the moment of real crisis (when deeds are required and not merely words), as the danger of war and attack upon the Soviet Union becomes more acute, this Committee will reveal either its silent impotence or—its treachery of the illusions it aroused, or more accurately, of the illusions which the Stalinists aroused in its name. Before the Communists are presented with new shocks in the form of the sudden discovery of new "Jingo H. G. Wells" (as the *Daily Worker* now calls him), this whole monstrosity of Amsterdam must be removed from the scene. Before the road can be clear, the obstacles must be cast aside. The Amsterdam masquerade is such an obstacle. The Communists must start from the beginning again. At the very outset, the party must renounce the opportunistic idea of forming a permanent organization with non-Communist elements for the "leadership" in the movement to educate the workers about the struggle against its oppressors. That is the function of the party alone. But the party must take the initiative in the formation of a united front of all workers' organizations, the socialist parties and the trade unions included, for a joint struggle based upon a minimum program of action, concrete and clearly defined, and not going (i. e., attempting to go) beyond the strict limits within which such a united front is inevitably circumscribed.

JAPAN

Its Rise from Feudalism to Capitalist Imperialism and the Development of the Proletariat

By Jack Weber

Can there be any greater irony than that the Comintern, founded by Lenin and Trotsky, should urge the Japanese Communists to gain "legality" at any price, including the yielding of its own platform and program? What better object lesson is required of the extreme importance of maintaining unity of action through clarity of policy and unity of point of view—that is, through restriction of the membership of the Party to those advanced workers only, who accept Marxism and the Leninist concept of discipline—than the rich history of the Russian Bolshevik Party? And under what striking similarity of conditions! Yet history presented that irony in Japan as elsewhere. Fortunately the adventure proved in vain.

It is the function of the Party to utilize every vital activity of the proletariat to lead and direct the class along the road to power. In the light of its ultimate "illegal" revolutionary goal—the dictatorship of the proletariat—the Party demands democracy not for its own sake but for the political education of the masses, for their disillusioning with all reformist methods and objectives. The Party demands the "right" to propagate its own revolutionary platform and if this right jeopardizes democracy, so much the worse for democracy. The workers must fight for democracy, for legality of the Party, for reforms,—but this struggle must never leave the masses in doubt as to the position of the Communists who, taking the objective conditions of the moment and their future trend into account, advance the interests of the working-class as a whole so as to strengthen the class for further struggle along the road to power. Even those Communist parties that have achieved legality never forget for a single instant that they may, under changing circumstances, be forced underground.

Universal suffrage was granted to the Japanese workers under the strong pressure of the masses. But it bore also a different character. It was used as a pawn by the bourgeois capitalists in an attempt to win over the workers and the petty bourgeoisie for a struggle against the militarists. The capitalists would prefer, if possible, peaceful penetration to outright conquest in China. But the struggle proved abortive, the capitalists were tied hand and foot to the war machine. Furthermore the internal crisis resolved the problem for the capitalist imperialists by its urgent demand for the most desperate remedies. Not in vain are the changes in the mode of production and in the productive forces the "shock factors" of historic development!

The moment universal suffrage was promised, in 1925, the militarists prepared carefully for any untoward eventualities. Baron Tanaka—the author of the Tanaka document—immediately resigned from the army and became president of the Seijukai Party. In the eyes of the military clique the situation called

ed for a "strong" man, a Bonaparte. And Tanaka was groomed for the task at precisely the same moment and in precisely the same fashion as Marshal von Hindenburg (as President) in Germany. Tanaka became premier in the first elections held under universal suffrage, elections so tainted by fraud and corruption, so strongly controlled by acts of autocracy that to stifle the angry criticism of the masses a thousand workers and intellectuals were arrested under the frame-up of a nation-wide Communist plot. The Tanaka regime ended in scandals strikingly like those of the Harding administration in America.

The wily Japanese capitalists have made every effort to establish the two-party system in Japanese politics. The Seijukai may be compared with the English Tory party the Minseitō with the Whigs. Both parties are under complete boss control. The party platforms mean nothing, are much alike, in fact do not vary from election to election. The government connection with big business, plain enough in America, is far more open in Japan. The party leaders become directors of the South Manchuria Railroad, of steamship companies, etc. These leaders cannot reward their followers with government jobs as these are reserved for the bureaucracy under the military clique. Hence, the parties resort to a more open cash system. The cost of elections is far greater, owing to greater corruption, than in other countries, and elections are more frequent. Before the War it took more than 20,000 yen to elect a man to the Diet. Now it costs more. Each candidate pays one-half the requisite sum—the party the rest. Since four hundred are elected each time, party expenses are enormous, control falling naturally into the hands of the rich (as elsewhere). The pay in the Diet is small but bribery for concessions and purchases provide rich plums.

The workers have no illusions concerning the bourgeois parties whose history has been all too short to permit the use of those refined niceties of technique of the Western countries. The masses pin little faith in types like the first great "commoner", premier, Hara, who came to power after the Rice-Riots. This lawyer in the pay of the copper king, Furukawa, this liberal whose doctrines were expressed in his remark: "My platform is a blank sheet of paper. I can write upon it what I will", was the willing tool of the military in the Siberian adventure. It was Hara and his minister for Home Affairs, Tokonamu (one of the worst suppressors of free speech and the press), who organized one of the largest of the thirty reactionary societies ready at all times to attack the workers. Despite his personal bodyguard, despite his great services in the interests of the ruling class, Hara was assassinated for the slight difference that existed between the interests of finance capital and those of the military clique the situation called

Our Club Plan

MILITANT BUILDERS

THE THREE-IN-ONE REVOLVING FUND
Our campaign is not in full swing yet. Many are the comrades who failed to take advantage of the club plan and the Paid Sub Cards. What can be achieved by taking advantage of the club plan is shown by the New York comrades by whom fifty-two subs out of a total of sixty-one have been turned in since the beginning of this drive. There are a number of sympathizers who invested a couple of dollars in Paid Sub Cards and after selling them re-invest the money in additional sub cards. This creates revolving fund of \$2 per comrade-investor, helps the *Militant* financially and extends its circulation. This is the best way of keeping money in circulation, at the same time increasing the circulation of the *Militant*.

THE RECORD BY CITIES
New York 31
Chicago 66
Minneapolis 22
Pittsburgh 16
Philadelphia 15
Montreal 15
Toronto 10
Boston 10
New Castle, Pa. 8
Lynn, Mass. 5
South Bend, Ind. 5
St. Louis 4
Des Moines 4
Youngstown 4
That up-and-coming sub-getter from

the local environs has done it. He has crashed through to first place. Is he going to stay there? What do you say, comrade Vomvas? And you, comrade Nash? And what has the Chicago Friends of the Militant Club to say? And all our other comrades? If he's going to stay there make him do some lively stepping to keep his place.

H. Capells	14
Chicago Friends of the Militant Club	12
P. Vomvas	12
H. Nash	12
B. Morgenstern	8
V. R. Dunne	8
J. Weber	7
W. Krehm	6
A. Joel	6
A. Ross	6
L. Basky	5
C. Ingram	5
H. A.	4
M. Hudson	4
F. Rayburn	4
M. Gottlieb	4
J. Hamilton	4
W. Konikow	4
O. Coover	4
S. Lessin	4
J. Sifakis	4
E. McMillen	4
A. Miller	4
G. Drucker	4
J. Ritz	4
M. Koehler	4
J. Ruby	4

BOUND VOLUMES

of the MILITANT

OLD FORMAT from Vol. 1, No. 1 to Vol. 4, No. 12 Nov. 15, 1928—June 15, 1931 71 Issues \$10

NEW FORMAT from Vol. 4, No. 13 to Vol. 5, No. 51 July 4, 1931—Dec. 31, 1932 70 Issues \$5

Order from THE MILITANT 126 East 16th Street, New York City

Conference Report

(Continued from page 2)

Workmen's Circle and so forth—be invited to the Albany conference, the resolutions committee stated that this is what they had intended to do in any case, and when it was put to a vote, it was carried by a majority! Thus, on paper at least, the "united front from below" was rejected. It is most likely that the adopted motion will remain on paper. It involves too much of a blow at the party bureaucracy and its ever-changing policies to have much chance of being carried out seriously in practice.

From the whole course of the conference, it is clear that the party is in the midst of a serious turn-about-face, forced upon it by the increasing misery of the masses, the bankruptcy of its previous line of policy, and the incessant hammer-blows of Left Opposition criticism. Nor can there be any doubt that the turn is also the result of pressure from the party ranks which have been disturbed and disoriented with the policy of sectarianism and ultimatism which proved so sterile for the movement. That the turn is inadequate, that it is rendered far less effective than it should be, was also demonstrated clearly by the New York conference. The retention of yesterday's ultra-Leftism with regard to "no united front with the leaders or the organizations" continues to be a heavy anchor preventing the movement from advancing with the necessary power and speed. The combination with this feature of the turn of the opportunistic, parliamentary twist that has been incorporated into it, contains a grave danger for tomorrow. The Centrist bureaucracy, which swings between ultra-Leftism and a Right wing policy, is quite capable of dragging the promising movement into a stinking parliamentary swamp. In this respect, it has not changed fundamentally from the days when it worked in unbreakable harmony with Purcell and Chiang Kai-Shek. And that is what must be guarded against with the utmost vigilance.

Not only was the confused nature of the party's leadership of the present movement strikingly shown at the conference (opposition to "united front with leaders", but adoption of Weisbord's last motion, to give one example) but it was clear that the Stalinists have not thought out what their next step will be. To neglect this factor in any movement, is fatal. The function of a revolutionary leadership is to make a thorough analysis of the situation at hand in the light of past experiences; and on the basis of it to forecast the line of development for the next period; to think out problems and programs to the end; and to drive consciously and clearly headedly along the right course. This the party leadership has done at no stage of the struggle. It is incapable of doing it. It is the task of the Opposition to stand unbendingly by its

policy, which is verified over and over again by the events of every day, and to fight for its victory in the ranks of the Communist vanguard. The New York conference showed again that the Opposition is fulfilling its task.

—MAX SHACHTMAN.

Resolutions Presented to the N. Y. Conference

(Continued from page 1)

(Introduced at the Unemployment Conference by the delegation of the Communist League of America (Left Opposition).)

This Conference for the Unemployed recognizes that although a base has been laid for a broad workers' movement, the representation at this Conference is insufficient for a really effective campaign for our demands. It is necessary that a united front movement on the broadest basis for the unemployed be developed. Such a United Front movement must include representatives from all working class organizations—trade unions, fraternal bodies, political parties and groups.

Therefore, this Conference goes on record to issue a call for a second Conference within two weeks time. To this conference all working class bodies—central bodies as well as, local and branch organizations—shall be invited to participate in a movement on the basis of a minimum program of concrete demands. The respective central organizations of the Communist party, the A. F. of L., the Socialist party and independent trade unions shall be directly invited to participate. At this conference all representatives shall as a matter of course have the right to maintain their own particular views, but shall be under the obligation to engage in a common struggle for the adopted program.

In accord with the foregoing, a standing committee shall be elected with the following instructions:

1. To issue a call immediately for the Second Conference inviting all working class organizations to participate.
2. To organize the sending of speakers to the various organizations to urge the acceptance of the invitation and explain the aims of the movement.
3. To issue a minimum of 50,000 leaflets to popularize the conference and its projected program.
4. To call upon each organization represented to hold a public meeting in support of the conference under its own auspices.
5. To organize a joint mass meeting of all organizations participating in the conference with representative speakers from each tendency.

RESOLUTION ON PROGRAM AND TACTICS

(Introduced at the Unemployment Conference by the delegation of the Communist League of America (Left Opposition).)

We must aim to develop this conference into a broad movement of the working class against the menace of unemployment and against its breeder, capitalist society. In such a movement the working class can be united more closely and militantly in common struggle.

The call for the present conference proposes a statewide conference to map out a legislative program in defense of the interests of the unemployed and working class. This proposal is acceptable but in order to obtain the objects of this Conference, in part or while, the program must be widened.

Therefore, this Conference shall go on record as favoring the following program of immediate demands:

1. Immediate Relief.
 2. Unemployment Insurance, to be paid for by the Employers and the State Government.
 3. For the 6 hour day and 5 day week with no reduction in pay.
 4. For trade relations with, and the extension of credits to the Soviet Union, as a means of unemployment relief for American workers and for drawing the American and Russian workers into a closer fraternal bond.
 5. Recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States Government.
- This Conference recognizes also the need to develop the struggle for its program beyond a merely legislative and parliamentary program. It is incumbent

STRIKE WHILE THE IRON IS HOT!

Because the Militant goes to press before correspondence from the middle and far west, on the basis of the previous issue, has time to reach us, we are unable, at this writing, to gauge the response to our appeal for funds to print comrade Trotsky's speech, "The Defense of the October Revolution", as a pamphlet.

Of one thing we are sure. That is, that if the speech meets with the same reception outside of New York—as it did here—as it is sure to do—it will be hailed as a political weapon of tremendous importance for our movement. Once more we want to emphasize the absolutely burning importance of bringing it out as a pamphlet in the shortest possible time. Fully half a hundred comrades and friends here have been struck with the same idea independently of one another.

There must be hundreds more. While their enthusiasm is at white heat, while the greatness and beauty of the speech are still upon them—let us strike! Devoted comrades and sincere sympathizers need no exhortations to lubricate the revolutionary movement with funds. They will know how to act in the present situation. But out on the periphery of the movement there are people who must be moved by some unusual event or writing. This speech is such an exceptional event. The impulse to acquaint friends and fellow-workers with

therefore to build a broad united front movement of all working class and political organizations for mass struggles for the conference's aims through demonstrations and activity in all workers' organization for the unity of the employed, the organized and unorganized. The utmost mass pressure must be exerted upon the capitalist class and its agents to obtain our demands.

The Conference resolves further to work for the mobilization of all working class organizations for the attainment of its program in the swiftest possible time.

Cannon's Speech

(Continued from page 1)

stitutions and leadership until they are ready, or nearly ready to break with the central organization. Do we act otherwise? And cannot we find our way to the reformist workers more effectively if we attribute to them something of the same sense of organizational loyalty that we ourselves manifest?

In the resolutions of the Communist Left Opposition which I have introduced here, there is a proposal to call a second conference within two weeks and to invite to this conference not only the locals and branches of the A. F. of L., the Socialist party, the Workmen's Circles and similar organizations but also their respective central bodies. I will be answered to the effect that the leaders of these organizations obstruct and sabotage the movement and do not want to engage in any real struggle with the employers and the state. We are quite convinced that this is true. But the A. F. of L. and Socialist party workers are by no means convinced and will not be convinced merely by our denunciations.

The way to convince them is to put their leaders to the test in action. That is the meaning of our proposal to invite also the leaders to join in the common struggle. It puts the conscientious workers in these organizations—those who really want to fight—in a position to demand of their leaders that they translate their words into deeds without in any way, at the beginning, involving a break with their organization. It puts them in a position to bring pressure on their leaders by normal organization means, to force some of them, if only for a short time, to participate in the united movement and to convince themselves by this test, by this experience that their leaders have been deceiving them with phrases.

Only in this way, in this process can we separate the masses of the conscientious workers in the reformist organizations from their treacherous leaders and draw them into a common struggle without those leaders and against them. This is not a new revelation of the Left Opposition. This, comrades and fellow-workers, is the A B C of the united front tactic of Lenin.

This is the way we must move. This is the way the movement is tending under the enormous pressure of conditions on the one side, and the bankruptcy of all other tactics on the other. The united front tactic as we have laid it down in our resolution is a means for the mobilization of a genuine workers' mass movement for the struggle against the class enemy. It is, at the same time, a means for the separation of the reformist workers from the influence of their treacherous, phrase-mongering leaders.

The tactic that has been employed up till now, despite all the good intention, has served opposite ends. Here in the fourth year of the crisis the capitalists remain secure and arrogant. The reformist and reactionary labor bureaucracy in the political as well as in the trade union field remains unshaken in its position. The vanguard workers' movement remains comparatively weak, isolated and ineffective. All the objective conditions point to a difference state of affairs. The fearful mass misery, the appalling hunger, destitution and discontent of the millions is a powerful force to change the whole situation in a comparatively short time. It is to aid this process that the Left Opposition has come to this conference and submitted its resolutions for your consideration.

Japan

(Continued from page 3)

Japanese history embodies a great lore of bloody deeds of vengeance. When feudal society was dissolved by decree, there remained a class of "masterless men", the former samurai whose only occupation had been the wielding of the sword in the services of some lord. These ronin form the hirelings of the reactionaries in politics to convey and carry out threats against political opponents. Assassinations by these feudal mercenaries are of frequent occurrence.

In the split that followed the debacle of the all-embracing farmer-labor mass party, three parties gradually crystallized out, each one supported by a split-off section of the trade unions. The writer has been unable to obtain sufficient data as to the precise activities of the Communists in the various splits so that he can merely enumerate the parties and their strength. The Japanese General Federation of Labor supports the Shikai Minshuto (Right wing social democratic party) which obtained 165,000 votes and 4 seats in the 1928 elections. The Nihon Ronoto—Japanese Labor-Farmer Party was organized by the centrists of the General Federation of Japanese Labor and Farmers. It captured 2 seats with 96,000 votes in 1928. The Left wing organized the Rodo Nomu which obtained no seats despite its 85,000 votes. The centrists and Left wing parties were both dissolved by the government as being dangerous. However, the party reorganized, the Lefts forming the Shin Ronoto (Labor Farmer Party) in 1929. The centrists formed the Nihon Taishuto or Japan Mass Party. In the 1930 elections the combined vote of the parties was over half a million.

From the attacks made by Japanese Communists at the present time on the "social fascists" of the other worker parties, it is clear that the Japanese Communists have followed blindly the Stalinist zig-zag tactics, tactics that have resulted at this crucial moment in the history of the working class of the world, in causing loss of confidence in the vanguard by the Japanese masses. Although we cannot accept without question the opinion of so confirmed an enemy of the Communists as Matsuoka of the Japanese General Federation of Labor, yet there is a sufficient element of truth in his remark, made in 1929: "The Communist movement is getting more and more idealized and formalized. In other words the movement has become one of students or young men and women; it is diverging increasingly from the practical fighting line, so that it is coming more and more under the surveillance of the Minister of Education than that of the Home Minister. Their sphere of action is passing from the factories, mines and agrarian villages to the schools and colleges."

Nazis Provoke CPG

(Continued from page 1)

"dress rehearsal" by this means to bolster his regime; this was the game of Von Schleicher and Hitler.

To accomplish this, Hitler moved up to the firing line. The time is not ripe for his special services of unrestrained murder and pillage of the working class organizations. But it may be soon in the calculations of the world bourgeoisie. The working class throughout the world must be on guard, alert.

Some shifts are taking place in the world situation but the key is still in Germany. Some shifts have taken place in the German situation but the slower tempo has not altered the basic issue. It is still: Communism or Fascism. The workers must tell Von Schleicher and the bourgeoisie that the alternative to Bonapartism is not Fascism but that the solution to the problem is the proletarian revolution. Everywhere the workers, and particularly the Communist vanguard must raise their voices with the Left Opposition to demand that the C. I. and the German party throw overboard the ruinous theory of social-Fascism and adopt the Leninist united front to unite the German working class around the banner of Communism for the proletarian revolution. —T. STAMM.

Unemployed & Barter Exchange

Petty Bourgeois «Solution» Reflects Pressure of the Crisis

The capitalist press has now picked up the "Self-Help" and "Barter Exchange" movements as remedies to solve the problem of the breakdown of capitalist production. Every new theory and new movement which claims to alleviate the desperate situation within the confines of capitalism is grasped by the press with the eagerness of a drowning man clutching a straw. This is the case with the widespread national movement of barter exchange.

Large sections of the middle class are participating in the movement. Exchange organizations have been set up by business interests in order to put their frozen assets into circulation. Otherwise these small business enterprises will fall into bankruptcy and thence the hands of the local bankers. The small business interests, taking the initiative in this field, hope to keep up a semblance of profit and prevent big business from taking its toll on the wave of the crisis. These movements first obtained a foothold in the West. Now they have been extended, in one form or another, to all parts of the country, drawing in large sections of the urban middle class, farmers and unemployed workers.

Whole layers of the working class have been drawn into the barter exchange movement. These unemployed workers, pressed between unemployment and starvation on the one hand and inadequate and, often, no relief on the other, have turned to the barter and self-help movements in an attempt to cheat hunger and starvation—until better times.

The barter exchange movement finds a working basis for the exchange of manufactured and farm products for the idle labor power of the workers. These movements take on varied forms, depending upon the initiative of local industries and organizations. The organizations vary from the business men's "cooperatives" to the cooperatives of the workers, with hybrids and temporary class collaboration plans in between. The business men's associations which have drawn in the workers as an auxiliary have by far been the most successful.

A Note On Max Eastman

To the Editorial Board of the Militant:

Dear Comrades:

Recently I have repeatedly had opportunity to convince myself of the fact that Max Eastman is carrying on a systematic fight against materialist dialectics, the philosophical foundation of Marxism and scientific Communism. In its content and its theoretical tendency this fight does not differ in any way from the other varieties of petty bourgeois revisionism, beginning with Bernsteinism (in its philosophical-theoretical parts). If Eastman while so doing keeps his warm sympathy for the October revolution and even for the Left Opposition this crying illogicality is subjectively honorable for him but does not raise by one iota the value of his criticism of Marxism.

I could have left the Croton variety of revisionism silently to its proper destiny, if I had not been bound for a long time to Eastman himself by personal and literary ties. Eastman recently translated three volumes of my History of the Revolution into the English language. As is generally acknowledged, he has carried out this great work in an excellent manner. I have expressed to him my sincere thankfulness for this, and am prepared to repeat it here. But as soon as Eastman attempts to translate Marxian dialectics into the language of vulgar empiricism, his work provokes in me a feeling which is the direct opposite of thankfulness. For the purpose of avoiding all doubts and misunderstandings I consider it my duty to bring this to the knowledge of everybody.

With Communist greetings,
L. TROTSKY.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS

How many have you sold? Have you made yourself into a literature agent to dispose of this pamphlet in record time? It is easy, incredibly easy. Five cent pamphlets are just the thing. Everyone can afford them.

In the last few years, especially, a vast literature has been written about unemployment. Most of it is a "Niagara of trash pouring into oblivion." Very little of it is Marxist. Even that which bears the stamp of the official party is not free from serious errors. But here is a simply written, short piece which is Marxist.

It opens up new propaganda fields for us. Who is not interested in the question? And what worker is not looking for a clear Marxist statement on it? We must strive to put copies into the hands of thousands of workers. The carefully and painfully built-up prestige of the Left Opposition will not be the least advantage to us in presenting our position on unemployment to the class. The weapon is forged. Let us wield it.

A REMINDER

Just a short note to remind our comrades and readers that we still have the following on hand and get in more from time to time: **Revolutionary Lessons by Lenin; Whither England by Trotsky; Value, Price and Profit; Wage-Labor and Capital; the Communist Manifesto; and other Marxist classics.** If you want any of these speak up.

Under the guiding hand of the business men's barter exchange associations, labor power takes on a form of charity.

The exploitation of labor power is still further disguised behind the "brotherhood of men", "self-help" and "charity". It becomes a substitute for social and unemployment insurance paid by the capitalists and their state. It "replaces" the class struggle; or, rather, becomes an inverted expression of the class struggle. This kind of charity is only given for a certain amount of labor power. The workers exchange their labor power at a discount for food and supplies. If this can be extended the local charity drive and the agitation for social insurance can be held in reserve—until the class pressure forces action.

These barter exchange organizations usually function on the basis of negotiable credit certificates or script. The smaller associations function on a pure barter base. The whole barter exchange movement, regardless of which way it leans—in the direction of the workers or the capitalists—is the result of the breakdown of commodity production and distribution under capitalism. It is a return to more elementary forms of exchange. This in no sense denotes a step forward. Socialism, not barter exchange, is the solution for the breakdown of capitalism. Barter exchange in a crisis, under the domination of the business interests, is not a step toward socialism. It is a class collaboration move to prevent the free play of the class struggle development of the working class. The barter exchange movement is an attempt to bridge through the crisis until normal exchange, which rests upon the capitalist mode of production, is re-established.

The barter exchange and self-help movement has more than one side for the workers too. Dominated by the business interests, the movement becomes a powerful lever of class collaboration. Where the self-help movement becomes a workers cooperative movement, subordinated to the interest and aims of the class and the party, it can be useful to the workers as an auxiliary movement. It cannot substitute for the class struggle. It cannot replace the struggle of the employed and unemployed for demands against the capitalists and their government, such as immediate relief, social and unemployment insurance, the six hour day and five day week with no reduction in pay; in short, it cannot replace the class struggle.

The workers who raise the slogan of "workers' control" in relation to the barter exchange and self-help movement are suffering from the worst kind of ultra-Left sickness. Opportunist class collaboration ideas and ultra-Left slogans go hand in hand. The slogans of workers' control are slogans for a period of the class struggle that we have not yet reached in America. When the class struggle and the relation of class forces reaches this stage, to delay issuing these slogans will be suicidal. In the dual power stage, when the working class and its organizations become the kernel and the capitalist class and its governmental and industrial administration becomes the shell, then the time is ripe. In the meantime, a revolutionary, international program with proper tactics in the day-to-day struggles of the workers is the order of the day.

—HUGO OEHLER.

Resolution on Weisbord

The following resolution was adopted by the N. Y. Branch:

The N. Y. branch of the Communist League of America endorses the position taken by the NEC in its negotiations with the C. L. of Struggle. We view as entirely correct the present suspension of the negotiations on the following grounds:

1. Every opportunity was afforded to comrade Weisbord, as spokesman for the C. L. of Struggle to clarify his position in relation to the Left Opposition. The NEC posed correctly, after the initial blunders of comrade Weisbord, the minimal, principle requirements set by the League for the fusion of the two organizations. The columns of the Militant were open for the free expression of comrade Weisbord's views on these requirements. Comrade Weisbord failed to meet the requirements.

2. The NEC in all its negotiations with comrade Weisbord showed clearly its desire to leave the road open for the entrance of the Communist League of Struggle into our organization. Comrade Weisbord, on the contrary, has yet to show that he seriously wishes to fuse with the League. Even aside from basic principle difference which remain unliquidated, notably those involving the relations within the Communist movements, of its three groupings—the question of centrism—the entire approach of comrade Weisbord was based on a false policy of maneuvering, on attacks on the NEC rather than a serious approach to the International Left Opposition, on the holding of public meetings for the specific purpose of appealing to the membership (united front from below) over the heads of our leadership.

3. We emphatically state that comrade Weisbord has placed obstacles in the way of fusion with our organization. If comrade Weisbord and his group still desire to make it possible for them to become an organic part of the C. L. of A. and the I. L. O. they must be guided genuinely by the proposals made them by the NEC.

Pioneer Publishing Fund

It must be well-nigh irresistible. For this purpose everyone will be willing to donate something. It cannot be otherwise.

Not very much is needed. Only ninety dollars. Here in New York we have al-

ready raised six and a half, four and a half through the efforts of comrade Finkel, one dollar from comrade Vomvas in Pittsburgh and one from a party member in New York. That is only a small beginning. Let us go to work!

Unemployment and the American Working Class by Arne Swabeck

A popular Marxian analysis for workers of the unemployment situation and the basis for a revolutionary workingclass program of action!

24 Pages 5 Cents

Minimum Order 5 Copies

Postage 1c extra per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10 th Street, New York, N. Y.