

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 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 23, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879
VOLUME V, NO. 38 [WHOLE NO. 134] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1932 PRICE 5 CENTS

New Wage-Cuts Start

Accentuated Attacks on Workers Prelude to 4th Crisis Year

The fourth winter of the crisis is at hand. The fourth winter of hunger and starvation for millions of unemployed workers in the United States. Many of these workers are eager to know just when a revival will bring back prosperity so they can obtain employment. Many of these workers are looking to the Wall Street boom with hope that it is the first sign of the revival.

Regardless of a brief upturn or a prolonged protracted crisis the fact remains that neither condition holds in store any promises for the workers in their present unorganized condition. While the press speaks of an upturn the bosses are giving the workers an introduction to the fourth winter by a new wave of wage cuts in the basic industries. The defensive struggles of the workers have not yet been transformed into offensive struggles. Much preliminary activity will have to be carried on before we can accomplish this, even with a brief upturn. The capitalists are still on the offensive.

The last three years of the crisis have witnessed drastic inroads into the standard of living of the workers. Mass unemployment, wage cuts, speed-up and worse conditions are the general while vicious defensive struggles to retain part of the gains of the past has been the exceptional. Now the fourth winter is to be baptized with a wage cut in the basic industries. This will be followed by wage cuts in all the other industries, with a worsening of the conditions of the workers unless we follow the heroic example of the Illinois miners and fight back.

If one really wants to look for more fundamental conditions paving the way for revival, one must look deeper than the stock market, or the price movement and look to more basic factors. One of these factors is the reorganization of labor power to industry at a much lower wage scale. The American capitalists have been successful in reducing the cost of necessary labor in production. All signs indicate that they are preparing the fourth winter for further reductions of the cost of necessary labor in order to increase the surplus labor to counteract the falling rate of profits and enable the capitalists to retain more production in the form of surplus value.

The soft coal miners were slated for a drastic wage cut primarily in the remaining organized fields. They intended to smash the last stronghold of the U. M. W. A. The officials of the U. M. W. A. have already given their consent but they forgot to take into consideration the workers who rebelled against the bosses and their agents in the ranks of the union. The establishment of a new union and the mobilizing of the workers against the wage cuts have strengthened the workers' struggles. Much will depend upon how the workers in the other basic industries act to the pending wage cuts.

The operators and "union leaders" of the Anthracite region met in New York to discuss a 20 to 25% wage cut. The union committee headed by John L. Lewis, "gave no inkling as to its attitude but it is understood a strong protest would be made against the operators' proposals," says the New York Times. Nothing but betrayal can be expected from Lewis and Company. The only road for the anthracite miners, is to follow the lead of the Illinois miners and join hands with them.

The second meeting of the Operators and the Labor Fakers resulted in a "frank discussion" and was a "constructive meeting," according to the New York Times. The Labor Fakers did not oppose the "wage modification" but instead proposed a CUT IN TAXES FOR THE BOSSES TO AVOID WAGE REDUCTIONS.

In the Railroad section of the American Industries the railroad executives propose a second wage cut. The railroads were so successful in their "United Front" in the last 10 per cent wage cut that they want to increase it by another 20 per cent. The leaders of 21 unions are "amazed" by the idea of another cut. But it is their own sell out in the last negotiations which helps make the present demand possible. The railroads have laid off an increasing number of workers, at least 100,000 since last February, rather than reduce hours and employ more workers as desired by the Unions.

On Monday, September the 5th the Longshoremen and Ship Owners held a conference in New York. The Ship Owners insisted that a big wage cut is necessary if they are to compete with other shipping lines. Joseph T. Ryan, president of the Longshoremen's Association and Tammany boss says the men will be "reasonably". But it is well to remember that Ryan like Lewis is an agent of the bosses and nothing but betrayal can be expected from him.

In New York, Mayor McKee's economy drive has made drastic inroads on the workers' standards. He demands wage reductions all around: the 36,000 teachers, however, have announced they will resist pay cut.

The Stock market had its boom and in a few days ran up a paper profit of over 7 billion dollars but at the same time unemployment has increased, wages are going down, retail trade has fallen off over 30% from a year ago and carloads for the week ending August 13th were down more than 30% from a year ago.

The wage cuts announced in these basic industries are the opening guns of a wage cutting campaign that will sweep the whole nation, down to the lowest paid sections of our class. Twice before in the present crisis such organized wage cutting campaigns have run their course throughout the country. Each time they have been started by talk of a return to prosperity and each time the first guns were fired at the steel, railroad or coal mine workers.

American imperialism is reorganizing industry. They are reorganizing industry at the expense of the workers. If they succeed and thereby become enabled to compete on the international market with other imperialists there will be some "prosperity" for the capitalists. This does not include the workers. The capitalist prosperity will mean a new form of greater exploitation, mass unemployment and misery for the workers.

SIX VOTES AGAINST 2 THOUSAND

Stalino-pacifism Wins in Amsterdam

Six delegates, those of the International Left Opposition, voted to reject the pacifist manifesto of the notorious Amsterdam Barbusse Congress. Not because they reject the struggle against war but because they remain true to the Leninist position against any shoddy compromise with pacifism. Even if these two thousand delegates had not been, for the most part, doctor's widows, sopranos, bureaucratic clerks and the like, the relationship of numbers would have been no reason for a Communist surrender of principle. It is precisely in the question of war that revolutionary Marxism had to base itself upon meager forces. In spite of that, it arrived at victory. In this case, it was a question of two points primarily: to advocate clearly the revolutionary standpoint towards the war question and further, to sound the alarm before this international forum about the fact that the best fighters of the civil war against imperialists are today languishing in exile and imprisonment.

This aim was attained. The sidewalk rally held in Amsterdam, were inscribed with our slogans. Not a step could be taken without encountering slogans like "Bring Trotsky back to the U. S. S. R.!", "Long live Trotsky and Rakovsky!", etc. Our material was in everybody's hands, in spite of every attempt to terrorize our comrades. The speech of our Indo-Chinese comrade, Ra, delivered on Sat. amidst the greatest applause, was, significantly enough, omitted from the Congress bulletins. Our comrade Molinier of France, as representative of the Congress War Victims, was howled down in the Sunday discussion, and another French comrade was manhandled, so that even the President had to apologize, but all of this only with the result that the same evening everybody spoke only about Trotsky and Muenzenberg had to wheel into position his whole artillery of falsehood against Trotsky, the "pacifist".

The Left Opposition was represented by Greek organizations like the Communists' Union, the Iron Workers' Union, the War Victims, etc., and several French organizations. Because of police and material difficulties, our Greek comrades were compelled to transfer their credentials to proxy delegates abroad.

Our declaration to the Anti-War Congress, published in the Militant two weeks ago, was distributed in hundreds of copies to all the delegates, translated into the German, French, English and Russian languages. So also were a mass of other leaflets and pamphlet distributed. At the time of voting, our comrades presented a special declaration, advocating the Leninist struggle against pacifist confusion. On the basis of the Congress, we succeeded in convincing numerous Communist workers that the "Trotskyists" are the best representatives of Lenin's teachings. Two thousand to six-thousand to be proud of in these times of Stalinist degeneration and demoralization!

In coming numbers, we will present a detailed report of the Congress.

VOTE COMMUNIST!

Urgent Appeal

Last week we addressed the question to our readers and supporters: "Will The Militant continue to appear regularly?" We were compelled to address it to you. We had no other choice. We can record a few responses to our appeal; but entirely insufficient. We must say frankly that the continued regular appearance of The Militant is very seriously endangered. Our obligations have increased and with them our expenses. Our opportunities for new gains are enhanced but we have not the means to take advantage of them. We are now printing enlarged editions and shipping bundles to the mine fields. That we must continue. We have a couple of young organizers there building up The Militant circulation and building our organization to help in this vital struggle. We had to get out additional material to fight back the Stalinist pogrom campaign. We are moving

forward on these opportunities available but the creditors are threatening to close down on us. As a matter of cold fact we cannot meet our expenses unless you come to our assistance.

You would not want to see The Militant discontinued or any enforced retrenchments upon its regular appearance. But that is what we face, and that we say to you openly and frankly. Unless our readers and supporters assist, there is no other way out. We know you can do something either in the way of a contribution yourself, or by enlisting some of your friends and comrades to help. But that much we absolutely depend upon you to do. We leave the decision in your hands. If you want to secure the continued appearance of The Militant you will do your utmost. If not we will be compelled to retrench. Your assistance is urgently needed!

Trotsky Barred from Czechoslovakia

After reports that Leon Trotsky would be granted permission to spend a few weeks in Pstyan, Czechoslovakia, purely for the purpose of improving his health, it is now announced that "Czech Nationalist propaganda against Leon Trotsky's proposed visit to the Pstyan Spa apparently has been successful. . . . At a Cabinet council today Minister of the Interior Sziavik, who is an Agrarian, declared he would be unable to take responsibility for M. Trotsky's safety at Pstyan. The Consular Service also states it is unable to grant M. Trotsky a visa as he does not possess a passport" (New York Times, September 15' 1932).

So much for the counterfeit democracy of the Czech republic, vassal state to the country which "embodies" the traditions of democratic revolution, France. Nor was very much else to be expected from the puppet states of imperialism in view of the attitude of their masters. Comrade

Trotsky now has the distinction of having been refused, not merely the right of asylum, but even the opportunity to enter a capitalist country for a short period for his health—a refusal now undersigned by the British Labor government, the French republic, Holland, the Germany of the social democracy and the Catholics, the "republic" of Spain—and the Soviet Union.

Upon the announcement that permission had been granted, the Stalinist press, of course, launched another of its old stink-bombs against the Opposition: "Trotsky has been invited to Czechoslovakia to help lead the imperialist struggle against the Soviet Union." Villification of this sort cannot conceal, try though it may, the crime committed by Stalin in sending comrade Trotsky into the midst of the Russian White Guards concentrated in Constantinople under the rule of Stalin's bosom friend, Kemal Pascha.

An Open Letter to John Watt

Standpoint of the Left Opposition in the Present Miners' Struggle

John J. Watt, Springfield, Ill.
Dear Comrade Watt:

The purpose of this letter is to review the outburst that occurred on Friday, Sept. 8, at the local Socialist party branch at which you were the main speaker, and also to give you my opinion of what I think of the whole affair.

First a brief resume of your speech: 1. You began by saying that you were very glad to hear the message that was delivered on the previous night by the Socialist party candidate for Governor of Indiana (Powers Haggood) and the Socialist party organizer of West Virginia (Most), that the only reason the Socialist party got such a small audience was because the miners of Springfield did not know that such distinguished socialists were in Springfield and if the miners of Springfield really knew that they were in town that the largest hall in Springfield would have been filled.

2. That you were not affiliated to any political group. That there was some good in all groups together. 3. Then you went on to a general expose of the general economic situation in the country and the mining situation in particular. Reading from a mass of documents—the Illinois Miner—United Mine Workers Journal—and the Congressional Record. 4. You answered the mis-statements that are being circulated against you. 5. You criticized the miners for the way they are carrying on the fight against Walker-Lewis coal operators.

(a) That instead of marching to West Frankfort, they should have marched on Lewis' and Walker's homes. (b) Instead of signing up individual coal operators with the Progressive Miners Union, to strike until able to get a district contract. (c) And a number of other points. 6. You brought forth your proposals for winning the strike and building the P. M. U. of A. Such as: 1. Broad United Front 2. Mass Demonstrations 3. 8-hour day, 6-day week. 4. Re-instatement of expelled. 5. Etc.—etc. 7. You ended your speech with the reading of the United States Declaration of Independence.

Angelo's Reply
In my reply to your speech, I tried to stress the following points:

1. That the present miners' struggle is part of the general political struggle against capitalism. That only with the living weapons that Marx, Lenin and Trotsky gave us through their teachings and their actions can we understand correctly the role which the working class as a whole must take part in. 2. The fight of the Left wingers in the new Miners' union must be class struggle, class collaboration. 3. I closed the Socialist party lead.

ership as indirect agents of Lewis-Walker, who are the agents of the coal operators.

(a) The National Committee's (of the Socialist party) decision on the Illinois miners' struggle which is: "Hands off the internal struggle between the miners and union officials."

(b) The part played by Jack Hindmarsh, Richard Glover and Jack Reed, all leading Socialists, in trying to defeat the miners in their fight against the coal operators and their hunkies, the Lewises and Walkers.

(Continued on page 4)

«Pacifism» at Work in Gran Chaco

Some figures which have leaked out of the League of Nations give away the whole capitalist ballyhoo about disarmament. The war which is raging in the Gran Chaco is only the latest form of the struggle between Bolivia and Paraguay, which they began in 1923, and which is a reflection of the greater and profounder struggle of the world-wide imperialisms, British and American. Since 1923 this dispute has been pending before the League Council, of which Britain is a member. In the same year the dispute was submitted for settlement to the Pan-American Commission in which the United States is the dominating member.

Both of these "peace" bodies have made desultory plays at "settling" the dispute. At the same time they have been shipping munitions in increased quantities to both countries. With charming impartiality the United States sold, between the years 1928 and 1930, \$49,000 worth of powder to Bolivia; and \$24,000 in machine guns to Paraguay.

The two countries were a futile market for munitions shipments for Belgium, Chile, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, and the United States. Yet all of these countries did not fail to place themselves on record as opposed to the forceful settlement of disputes and some of them signed by the Kellogg Peace Pact. But business is business and a treaty is only a scrap of paper. Capitalist pacifism and morality are intended for the workers to keep them faithful slaves of the capitalist juggernaut. As for the rest it is a question of cold calculation around profits and the political, diplomatic, and military positions and maneuvers necessary to maintain the manœuvres.

Preparations are now being completed for the launching of the Workers' School of the Communist League of America (Opposition), which will open its classes in approximately one month. Further announcements on the School will be made in an early issue so that all those interested in it may obtain full details.

Unity Is Urgent Need of Illinois Miners

National Class Struggle Union Will Win!

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

A great many of the present leaders of the new Progressive Miners Union expect to solve the present coal problem in Illinois within the limits of capitalism in Illinois, that if the "Reds" keep their feet and hands out, they will be able to settle their differences with the Lewis machine and the coal operators. Then again, efforts are made to push the political struggle into the background, as for instance the attempt by Buck Roberts who was acting as chairman at the Taylorville meeting, to gag comrade Mayer who attempted to speak about the conditions of the miners in the S. U. Buck was prevented because of the militancy of the miners. Then again, the attack against the International Labor Defense at the Gillespie convention because it was a Communist organization. And again, the statement issued by Gillespie headquarters with reference to Foster speaking in Gillespie which declares as follows:

"We, the U. M. W. of A. of Illinois,

are fighting against the illegal contract forced on us by our officials and will not allow any outsiders to interfere with our policy adopted at our la. state-wide conference held in Bend.

The plain brutal truth is that if the miners of Illinois mean to build a new militant miners' union and secure better conditions they must not put up an intense struggle against the coal operators and the Lewis machine; not only be prepared to endure hardships; but the Illinois miners must broaden out on a more comprehensive scale. In other words, the Progressive Miners Union in building and leading the miners of Illinois must find allies, sympathizers and supporters from the working-class. Not only unity with miners in other states, but a united front with all working-class organizations. Further it is necessary to set before the miners the class struggle in sharp and simple terms, so that they may be able to understand the true nature of the capitalist system. Finally they must endeavor to bring about a fighting combination with the railroad and other workers.

Who Is Leading?

This is a brief characterization of the miners who are taking a leading part in directing the affairs of the Progressive Miners Union.

Dan McGill, the leader of the Springfield group. Democrat. While President of the Springfield Central Labor Body (A. F. L.) ran for senator from this district on the Democratic ticket. Was removed by President Green as president of the Central body because he supported Walker-Fishwick and was against Lewis.

Ed. Mable, was one of Lewis' leaders in Springfield until this present struggle. Delegate to the last convention of Lewis' at Indianapolis. Joined Socialist Party in the last two weeks.

Bryon Humphries. Lived in Springfield for many years—never took any part in any struggle against any officials until the rank and file convention that nominated him for Vice-President. Always against all "Reds". As is apparent, an opportunist of the worst type.

Buck Roberts. Formerly a mine boss. 100% American. Springfield.

Wm. Keck, Belleville, Socialist. Secretary of the Rank and File Union and now Secretary of the Progressive Miners Union. Known to be sincere and honest.

Alex Fraser & Andy Steed. The two always go together. Product of the British Minority Movement. Leaders of the Gillespie sub-district in the present struggle. Good timber in any movement.

Joe Goett, Peoria, formerly sub-district president of the Peoria sub-district, and then vice-president of Lewis' provisional officials in Illinois.

Pat Ansbury, formerly a Lewis supporter against Fishwick-Walker fight. Took an active part in the rank and file Union that was organized at Belleville and when the Rank and File Union merged with Walker's clique, Pat was elected Board Member from the Franklin county sub-district. Aggressive fighter and has guts. Got his experience in the British Labor movement. In my opinion, it was Ansbury that started the present struggle against Walker and Lewis when Ansbury organized the Franklin county march on Springfield of 3,000 miners, a few days after the miners found out that Walker had signed the first contract. It was that march which aroused the miners of Illinois. I don't know his present status politically. But in all of his speeches that I have heard he already brought in the class issue and called for a broad united front with all working class organizations. At the Gillespie convention where the Progressive Miners Union was formed, the International Labor Defense offered defense and the services of their lawyers and it was Ansbury that made the attack against the I. L. D. because it was a Communist organization. Of course, much of the bitterness against Communism is due to the past mistakes of the Stalinists and due to its present mistake of creating a condition in which the party drives all its would-be allies, and close supporters and sympathizers away from Communism.

Role of the Socialist Party
True to its historic role as capitalist agents in the ranks of the workers, the Socialist party, in the present struggle in the Illinois coal fields is giving support to Walker and Lewis who are the agents of the coal-operators. The National Committee of the Socialist party has made a decision that the National Executive Committee of the Socialist party will take no sides in the struggle between the miners of Illinois who are fighting coal-operators, and their agents, the Walkers and Lewises, but leaves it open

(Continued on page 4)

The Opposition at Work

Shachtman's Meetings in Chicago

CHICAGO.—A series of successful meetings held here during the brief stay of comrade Max Shachtman resulted in a spurt forward for the Left Opposition in Chicago. The largest meeting held was one in Humboldt Hall where with the intense heat of the evening, more than 100 workers appeared and listened with close interest to the unfolding of the Left Opposition's standpoint on the German events, which was followed by a number of questions from all over the hall on various problems affecting the views of our group. Very few of the many Party and Y. C. L. members and sympathizers present showed that blind hostility which the bureaucrats seek to instill in them, and comrade John Edwards, chairman of the meeting, received a warm reception when he exposed the frame-up launched against the opposition in New York in connection with the death of two workers at the 7th Street meeting. A good collection was taken up for the Militant.

At the end of the same week, a comradely supper party was held at the home of comrade Mashow, which was filled to the very doors with League members and sympathizers, and even Party members and friends. Shachtman spoke on the role of the Left wing in the Communist movement and the historical tasks imposed upon it by the bankruptcy of the Stalinist regime. Here too several questions were asked and answered to clarify the standpoint of our movement. Some twenty-five dollars were taken in as a result of the get-together and all those who attended left in good spirits.

Youth Meetings

Shachtman also met with the members of the Young Spartacus Club which has been formed here around a group of Young Oppositionists who were expelled from the Young Communist League by the desperate bureaucrats, although they were among the most active and advanced comrades in the League. Shachtman gave an outline of the development of the revolutionary youth movement in America and the task to be performed by the young Oppositionists coming into our movement. The youth organization here is advancing rapidly despite all attempts of the Stalinists to dam our progress. Threats made by the latter have not availed to stop the fraternization of the young comrades in both organizations, and increasing sympathy among the Y. C. L. members is being constantly manifested.

The Spartacus Youth Club also held an open meeting which was attended by more than 50 comrades, most of them young comrades, who came to hear Shachtman speak on Anti War Congress masquerade of Stalinism. Until midnight the questions and answers flew thick and fast between the speaker and the Stalinist representatives, one of whom disgraced himself thoroughly, as well as the League of which he is an active functionary. He argued in favor of Communists joining capitalist ministerial cabinets as "a step toward taking power"! Also, he declared, the fact that Tang Ping Shan, as Minister of Agriculture in the Hankow government in 1927, headed an army to suppress the peasant uprisings was to be explained by the fact that "Communists must do anti-militarist work"! So said is the low state to which the militants in the Stalinist movement have been debased, that even the friends of the Stalinist who were present urged him to remain silent and virtually apologized for him on the floor. The Young Spartacus Club comrades, in addition, are beginning to make headway also among the members of the young Socialist organization who have been moving towards Communism but have been repulsed by the antics of the Stalinist bureaucrats. The Opposition places great hope in the development of the youth movement, especially in Chicago, where an excellent group exists. The need for drawing more working youth into the group is keenly felt and measures will be taken to meet the situation.

The following night, Shachtman spoke on "Problems of the Development of the U. S. S. R.," upon the invitation of the Educational Committee of the north side section of the National Students' League. At the last minute the Y. C. L. priest-hood tried to maneuver the meeting in order to prevent Shachtman from speaking. Another speaker was arbitrarily sent to the meeting so as to shut out the Oppositionist, but the trick did not succeed. The audience of 50 students, workers, Party and League members, voted by a majority to hear the scheduled lecture and comrade Shachtman was able to proceed under the chairmanship of comrade Nathan Gould, one of the most active militants of the Young Communist League who was recently expelled. The interest of the audience may be gauged by the fact that the meeting was adjourned at 1:30 in the morning, after hours of discussion and questions.

A day later, Shachtman spoke briefly at the meeting of the Chicago branch of the Opposition on the growth of the movement in Europe, Asia, the American continents and South Africa. The lateness of the hour prevented more than a short discussion. At the same meeting plans were laid for the winter's activities of the Chicago League which are to be facilitated by the acquisition of a regular headquarters, the holding of forums and other meetings, etc.

South Side Meeting

The last Sunday of his stay was occupied by two more meetings for Shachtman. The first took place at the South Side Forum in Washington Park, where Shachtman again spoke on the German

situation, the danger of Fascism to the Soviet Union, the German and international working class, and explained the standpoint of the Opposition. Several hundred workers were in attendance, and although he spoke during the dinner hour, they listened attentively to the very end.

The same evening Shachtman spoke on the role of the Left Opposition at a foundation meeting for the "Friends of the Militant Club" which has been organized by friends and sympathizers of the Militant in Chicago. All those who were present pledged to join the club. The Labor Day week-end prevented a full attendance by many who had signified their intention of becoming members, and it is expected that the Club will grow rapidly and become a rallying center for the radicals in Chicago. Doctor Ruby was selected as secretary and plans are being made for the elaboration of activities for the coming fall and winter period.—X.

Opposition Expands Its Activities

With the rising tide of the class struggle everywhere the Left Opposition is striving to carry out the tasks imposed on it by its historic mission. It is breaking new ground wherever the objective situation and its forces enable it to. The small size of its membership still imposes on it a certain modesty in its efforts. But these are only, we may say, the accents from which will grow the revolutionary oaks of tomorrow.

Most important of our present activities is the work we are doing in the Illinois coal fields. There we have excellent prospects and a tremendous uphill struggle. But the party's false and damaging policies in the past period have estranged the bulk of the miners from Communism with the result that they look on every spokesman for Communism with suspicion. Against this obstacle our comrades in the field, both those who live and work there and those who have gone out as field organizers, are striving to redeem the lost prestige of Communism.

They are trying to organize branches of the L. O. and groups of sympathizers. They are following up the shipments of the hundreds of Militants we are making weekly to establish a base for a wider circulation. And they are trying to establish workers' correspondence direct from the miners themselves.

All reports from the field to date tell a story of the great work being done in the front rank of the struggle. The reports tell, too, an alarming story of the swift rise of the Socialist party and the isolation of the Communist party, held back from its rightful place at the head of the struggle by the incorrect policies of its leadership. What is needed from us is a great effort to put forward the banner of Communism. For this we need organizers, literature and money. We are asking our sympathizers to help immediately with donations. Rush all funds to the MILITANT, 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

Davenport, Iowa

Recently, possibilities for work for the Left Opposition have developed in Davenport, Iowa. Comrade Satir from Chicago has gone to Davenport. He will also do organizational and propaganda work in Muscatine, and Council Bluffs. Reports from that area tell another story of a political group making political and organizational capital of the blunders of the Stalinists. This time it is the Proletarian party which is trying to salvage for its own ends the wreckage left behind by the Stalinists. Watch the Militant for reports of comrade Satir's work.

Two comrades from the Minneapolis branch are working in Des Moines together with comrades in the party. They are distributing Militants and literature and are sowing the ground for future organizational reaping. Watch the Militant for reports of their work.

N. Y. Picnic A Success

The New York picnic was a success. The weather was the best we could ask for, allowing a large turnout of comrades and sympathizers who were well taken care of by the food committee's organization of the banquet and refreshments. The Young Spartacus Club trimmed the League team and won the ball game.

Comrade Shachtman spoke on the Left Opposition, dealing with the German struggle. The Friends of the Soviet Union and the Tremont Workers Clubs held picnics in adjoining plots. Friendly discussions were held by comrades all day, but the climax was reached when over fifty of these workers came over to listen to our speaker. The discussion period was lively, interesting and orderly. Many Stalinist sympathizers left the discussion with a better understanding of the Marxian position of the Left Opposition. The Communist worker of the Centrist faction is showing greater interest in our meetings, our indoor meetings, our street meetings and our picnics. The Militant received \$40.00 from the picnic.

FAIRY TALES AND FAIRY TALES

A returned delegate has said that the most absorbing thing at the Barbusse Amsterdam Congress was the remarkable way Martin Anderson Nexo, Danish writer, had of telling fairy tales. An even more remarkable thing is the manner in which pacifist fairy tales are being told today by the Stalinists in the name of Communism.

The Four Portraits of Chiang Kai-Shek

What Happened to the Ones Sent to Stalin, Rykov and Voroschilov, and the One for . . . Trotsky
EXTRACTS FROM THE ARCHIVES OF STALINIST UNITED FRONT POLICY

On April 5, 1927, Stalin defended his alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek before a select meeting of party officials in the Moscow Hall of the Columns. "Borodin is vigilant!" Through the intermediary of a vigilant agent he hoped to co-ordinate the struggle of the classes and to utilize it. On April 11, 1927, Chiang Kai-Shek after having smashed the proletariat, carried through his coup d'Etat in Shanghai. Shortly before the overthrow, Chiang Kai-Shek still found time to exchange portraits with Stalin, Rykov and Voroschilov, through the medium of Stalin's personal agent in China, Bubnov. It should not be forgotten that in those days the Kuo Min Tang belonged to the Communist International with an advisory vote. The fourth portrait of Chiang Kai-Shek was intended for an exchange with . . . Trotsky. The Secretariat of the E. C. C. I. not only sent along Chiang Kai-Shek's portrait with a note to Trotsky but also categorically demanded that Trotsky promptly send back to the Secretariat his own portrait for transmission to Chiang, with a corresponding dedication. Behind this whole action, it is plain, stood the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The supposition advanced in the Trotsky letter reproduced below, that all this was happening "without the knowledge of the leading persons" is naturally meant ironically. We already know that Stalin did at that time exchange his portrait for that of his Chinese ally. Here is Trotsky's letter:

To the Eastern Secretariat of the E.C.C.I.
Copy: To the Presidium of the E.C.C.I. and the Political Bureau of the Central Committee:
Nr. 45-c

Returned from leave of absence, I found the photograph of Chiang Kai-Shek sent me through the Eastern Department of the E. C. C. I. and the request promptly to send him my autographed picture. Had I received such a request through the Foreign Office then, regardless of my attitude toward this request, I would find the fact itself explainable. But it is absolutely incomprehensible to me why the Eastern Department of the E. C. C. I.—the International organization of the Communist vanguard of the proletariat—occupies itself with such a thoroughly compromising matter as the spreading of portraits of Chiang Kai-Shek, on top of that—as a result of a malicious irony of fate—on the eve of the coup d'Etat carried out by him. I do not doubt that this job, unseemly for the E. C. C. I., was done by some employee of the Eastern Department not empowered to do it, without the knowledge of the leading persons and especially of the Presidium of the E. C. C. I., as a consequence of which I deem it necessary to bring this distasteful affair to your attention. The picture of Chiang Kai-Shek I am herewith returning.

With Communist Greetings
April 18, 1927 L. TROTSKY.

A Reply to Comrade Allard

Dear Comrade Allard:
Your letter of August 31 (published as an answer to the party bureaucrats in last week's Militant) calls for some clarification. First of all let us say that we fully recognize the enormous provocation from the bureaucratic party leaders to which you have been subjected over a period of time. You have acted as a militant on the firing line and in the leadership of a mass movement fighting for correct policies. This is the reason for the provocation. In view of this your reaction is understandable; but your conclusion is faulty.

The Party and Its Errors

Our attitude to the party we must define correctly and precisely. We defend the Communist party at all times, but we defend none of its mistakes. Our defense presupposes a fight against the false views, tactics, methods and policies of its leadership. In this sense we make a distinction between the party and its bureaucratic leadership, and only in that manner can we correctly defend the party.

This is not a new conclusion which we have come to just recently. On the contrary, it has formed a basic principle of the Left Opposition platform since its inception, and all experiences so far have fully substantiated its validity. This conclusion proceeds from our recognition of the great role assigned by history to the Communist party. The proletarian revolution is inconceivable without the leadership of the Communist party. To prepare for the attainment of that goal the every-day working class struggles require the active intervention and direction of the Communist party. In order to illustrate this latter point we need only cite the situation at present existing in the Illinois coal fields.

You have there a powerful movement now marching in a progressive direction. It is made up of workers who have learned many bitter lessons and who have therefore broken with the past. Its leadership is composed of elements of various views and tendencies, ranging from the outright conservative of capitalist ideology to the Communist view. These various tendencies will pull in different directions with the conservative ones applying the brakes upon the progressive development which is so necessary, and driving the movement backward. While a solid rank and file control is essential for the success of the new union it is just as necessary that it have a leadership conscious of its tasks and capable of pursuing a genuine progressive course. Is there any possible way of guaranteeing this without a Communist nucleus functioning actively, constantly exerting its influence and clearly showing its direction. You will readily agree with us that all genuine Left wingers should function in an organized manner within this mass movement to help insure a correct course. But that would also be a hopeless task without the initiative of a Communist nucleus. Needless to add that in general, in the decisive struggles which will face the new union, this responsibility of the Communist forces only multiplies.

Blunders of Stalinism

However, and here we come to an extremely important question, it is precisely in this role and in these duties that the Communist party has failed most glaringly since its leadership fell into the hands of the Stalin regime. We have repeated time and again the examples of the fatally false policies pursued in this regime in the Chinese revolution of 1925-27, in the British general strike of 1926 and now being repeated in the extremely critical situation in Germany today. It is repeated again in workers'

struggles today in America, though on a smaller and less decisive scale. From these false concepts and wrong policies flow the bureaucratic method and practices which not only stifle the party and renders it impotent, unable to develop and grow in objectively favorable situations, but strangles its activities and the movements it influences and controls. This prevents the party from fulfilling its great historic mission, it prevents it from functioning as an active factor giving correct direction to the every-day struggles. It alienates the workers from the party.

Despite all this, or we may say particularly because of this, our duty becomes the more clearly outlined. We recognize that the Communist party can fulfill its historic mission and its tasks of today only through a correct Marxian orientation. We know how essential the Communist party is, and that it is the only workers' political party. This is why we make the distinction between the Communist party and the mistakes of its leadership. This also defines our attitude to the party. We do not assume to function in its place in the sense of taking over the duties of the party. But we must combat the wrong reactions of workers who, because of these mistakes, turn against the ideas of Communism. We must uphold the banner of Communism, and hence, to regenerate the party, to restore it to the basis of Marx and Lenin becomes the fundamental objective. Combining this with our active participation in the class struggle, in the solution of the every-day problems of the working class, we will carry forward the banner of Communism and fight for the realization of its ideas. This is our task to which we must devote ourselves in earnest. It proceeds through the kind of struggles in which you and others of our comrades are now so actively engaged.

Question of United Front

It is in direct accord with the above that we also want to correct the statement in your letter of invitation to "the rank and file of the National Miners Union" (for a united front). Maintaining this attitude would be to imitate the mistakes of the Stalinist bureaucrats, in reversed form. The National Miners Union we consider—as a bona fide workers' organization. Moreover it is a Left wing union. Our attitude to this union as well as to the other unions named by you must be that of a genuine united front. Hence we must approach these unions, and especially the Left union, officially, in our united front policy, as an organization to be invited through its elected leadership, simultaneously urging the rank and file membership that the invitation be accepted.

Hoping this will help to clear up these few points, I remain

Fraternally yours,
ARNE SWABECK.

Watch the coming number of the Militant!

JAPAN

Beginning in the next issue of the Militant, we plan to publish a series of timely articles on the developments of capitalism in Japan and the present situation in that great imperialist power of the Orient. The series of articles is by Louis Weber who has devoted himself to an extensive study of Japanese conditions and developments and especially in view of the recent events in Manchuria, the theme of the series acquires extraordinary importance and interest.

Entered as second class matter November 28, 1923, 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 84 East 10th St., N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern James P. Cannon

Max Shachtman Maurice Spector

Arne Swabek

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1932

Vol. V, No. 38, (Whole No. 134)

Subscription: \$1.00 per year; for single copies, 5 cents per copy.

Bundle rates, 5 cents per copy.

Letters from Militants

Shipstead Exposes His Bankruptcy

MINNEAPOLIS.—Yesterday, Sunday, September 4th, the Minneapolis Central Labor Union held its annual labor picnic at Powderhorn Park with its program of sports, refreshments and speaking. The writer together with other members of the Communist League attended the picnic to listen to the speakers and to place our constructive criticisms on the political bankruptcy of their utterances while mingling with the workers present.

During the entire program, speaker after speaker reminded the workers of their plight of mounting taxation and growing unemployment, of the heavy concentration of wealth in the last twenty years on the one hand and growing poverty with all its attendant miseries on the other. But not one single statement was made by any of them which I heard as to what the workers ought to do about it.

Senator Henrik Shipstead, who has spent ten years in the U. S. Senate as a Farmer-Laborite and during that time has traveled extensively in America and Europe for his own entertainment, was the main speaker of the afternoon. The platform was equipped with amplifiers to convey the words spoken at the microphone to the thousands of workers, unemployed and partly employed, who waited in vain for instructions as to what to do with their economic ills. It was a splendid opportunity for anyone permitted to use that microphone to spread ideas to large numbers of workers eager to listen and learn. The equipment was there, the workers by the thousands were there but those who could and would give them advice were carefully kept from the platform. Instead it was used by labor bureaucrats, public officials and Farmer-Labor politicians who either had no advice to offer the workers or lacked the courage to do so.

Shipstead Exposes His Political Bankruptcy

The Senator spoke at length on the laborer and his labor power which the Creator had given him at his birth and collected at his death. That the creation did not stop on the sixth day as stated in genesis, but that labor continues to create and produce. He spoke of wealth concentration, unsound financing on and off the gold standard and inflation and deflation of money, etc., etc. He also informed the workers of the misery and suffering which flows from prolonged and growing unemployment. This was, no doubt, refreshing news and very instructive to the thousands of Minneapolis workers who have been out of jobs for the last two years and stood in line for soup and charity. After his lamentation on bad conditions and poor statesmanship at Washington he abruptly ended his talk by paying his compliments to Governor Olson, who was absent speaking somewhere else. So after the workers had patiently waited and listened to the flow of words from the amplifiers telling them of their suffering they were all of a sudden left there standing by the Senator without one single suggestion or practical proposal as to what to do about their growing difficulties.

Of course we Communists did not expect anything else from the characters who spoke but, no doubt, many of the workers did. We as Communists and trade unionists went to the Minneapolis labor picnic to get more and concrete evidence of the political bankruptcy of those who spoke and whom the great masses of workers have so far followed and supported for political leadership. This cumulative evidence we as Communists use in a practical way to help and direct the workers, step by step, towards the proper goal through the proper medium, the Communist party, with a Communist program.

The League members distributed a large number of the leaflet issued by the National Committee on the German situation and handbills announcing our open forum meeting next Saturday, at 1530 East Franklin Avenue and our "Hard Time Weiner Roast" at Glenwood Park next Sunday, September 11th. "The Attitude of the Farmer-Labor Party towards the Farmers' Strike" will be the subject for discussion at the open forum meeting, and "The Civil War in Germany Today" will be the subject discussed at the Glenwood Park affair. By attending both of these meetings workers, employed or unemployed, will get information concerning their problems which they were unable to get from those who were privileged to speak at the well attended picnic of the Minneapolis Central Labor Union.

—O. M.

Another «Leader» Against War

LOS ANGELES.—Among the chosen leaders of the "World Congress Against War" appears the name of Upton Sinclair as one of the organizers of the movement, along with H. G. Wells—another smug little bourgeois philistine, as Lenin once contemptuously referred to him.

Sinclair's shifty "revolutionary" record—as a proletarian propagandist of Prohibition, socialism and patriotic pacifism—is pretty well known, even to his friends and comrades on Daily Worker and the New Masses; but the following data may be of interest to your readers—other than the Stalinists (who have to read The Militant on the sly, to keep posted on the revolutionary situation).

In opposition to the official stand taken by the Socialist Party of America—in which he was and is a shining light—Sinclair issued a manifesto or "round robin" letter during the World War, mobilizing the intellectuals in the party to come out openly in support of the Allies. The leading Socialist workers were appealed to, to take sides in the greatest organized slaughter of human beings in the history of the world. Many of the most prominent Socialists in America responded to the call. Spargo, Walling, Stokes, Ghent, A. M. Simons, Charles Edward Russell, Frank Born, Allan Benson (one time Socialist candidate for President)—and other "Marxist" renegades—joined up with the forces of imperialism, and devoted their talents to the service of their capitalist masters—in persuading the workers to destroy one another "to make the world safe for Democracy".

In 1918, during the progress of the war, Upton Sinclair—the great champion of peace (in peace-time)—declared to the writer, in just these words, that "the salvation of society depends on how many Germans we can kill".

As a confirmation that these were the true sentiments of this professed pacifist, I have in my possession a letter, dated Pasadena, California, June 22, 1918, which Upton Sinclair wrote—and sent to me through the U. S. Postoffice, where it was opened by the authorities—condemning my attitude toward the war. In this letter, he said:

"I do not like misunderstandings and I will therefore make my position clear.

"I take this war seriously. I believe that it is the greatest crisis in history, and that the cooperation of every lover of liberty is imperatively required. You do not agree with this. You regard the war with contemptuous indifference, and you declare your intention to remain aloof from it.

"I am a Socialist, and consider it necessary to sacrifice one's personality to the community."

(Signed) "U. SINCLAIR."

This is not a mere hysterical outburst of ill-considered opinion—as might be expected from this quarter. It is the calm and reasoned expression of the author's "sincere" conviction and belief (at the time)—though some of us may be utterly unable to understand or follow his line of reasoning. It recalls the distinguished writer's freak war-time magazine—or private journal of opinion—"Upton Sinclair's", which came to an early end in the heroic effort to give birth to "Wilsonian Socialism".

This is one of the men to be trusted again to tell the workers what to do in case of war!

When the threatened war breaks out between the forces that stand for reaction and those that make for progress—between the forces behind the falling structure of capitalism, on the one side, and those representing the rising power of the dispossessed workers of the world, on the other—we shall know where to look for these peace-loving patriots, who are always ready to "sacrifice" themselves, and their professed principles, for the benefit of their country and their class. They will be found in the camp of the enemy, exhorting the workers to be "faithful to their masters and fight for their 'freedom'—to work and to starve—driving them unwillingly into another ruthless war, "to preserve Humanity", "to stem the tide of Asiatic barbarism", "to save Civilization from Communist chaos and ruin."

In the last war, it was the ferocious "Huns" our young men were taught to fear and forced to fight—because they ate little Belgian children alive when they couldn't get rabbits; and they were on their way to America to take away our wives and daughters. In the next one, the "Yellow Peril" will be the scare and cry raised to stir the masses into war frenzy; the "Bolshevik Beast" will be the bugaboo spread throughout the western world by the yellow capitalist press—with the help of hypocritical howlers for peace, prosperity and human brotherhood—under capitalist control.

The self-sacrificing socialistic patriots and the humanitarian capitalistic pacifists will fall into line when the bugle blows—and "do their bit" in the coming war "to make the world safe" for Democracy.

W. A. NELSON COLLIER.

FULL REPORTS ON AMSTERDAM CONGRESS

Just as the forms for this issue are being locked up, the mail brings us a detailed report of the deliberations of the Barbusse Congress in Amsterdam and the role played in them by the Left Opposition delegates. The brief summary contained in this issue will therefore be extensively supplemented in the next number with the newly-arrived report. All readers are urged to be on the lookout for this extremely important material.

Weisbord's Reply to Trotsky's Letter

Comrade Trotsky:
The Communist League of Struggle has carefully considered your last letter to our organization. In considering this letter we also had before us the report of our representative, comrade Albert Weisbord who has just returned from his visit to you and to the various sections of the Left Opposition.

We are very happy to note that friendly relations have been able to be established and we feel that much misunderstanding has been wiped away and a practical basis laid for the entrance of our organization into the Left Opposition through unification with the Communist League of America.

Your new letter has, first of all, cleared the ground of a good deal of matter that stood in the way of our mutual coming-together and has taken an entirely different approach to us. No longer are our views so misunderstood that we are charged with deriding publishing work or opposing mass action to propaganda. No longer is the charge made that we are connected with Landau in Europe or with Lovestone in America. In this respect we are also happy to note that many of the reasons given by the leaders of the American League against us, have been ignored by you and thus tacitly repudiated. No longer, for example, is the charge made that we want to help Gandhi in India, that we are opportunists on the question of China, that we belong with Puz (who has now, we hear, joined the Socialist Party) etc. Quite the contrary we are glad to learn that though the top leaders of the American League aided people who wrecked our headquarters and stole our library and documents and even now welcome these wreckers at their meetings, and though one of these leaders had declared that only the rope could be the medium between us and that we acted as agents blowing the whistle for the police, you have welcomed our representative and in your letter opened the door for entrance into the Left Opposition. On our part we shall do all we can to join forces with the Left Opposition.

First of all we wish to admit that on the question of the Labor Party we made a serious error in that our group had declared in its general theses: "The Communists at this time especially must not drop the slogan of a Labor Party."

Our error was serious in that in calling for the formation of the Labor Party we were making the same error, in a sense, as the Right wing and the Comintern had made in its various adventures in which it had denied the legitimate role of the Party and had acted as coolies for the reformists.

Our group had taken the following position:

- The Europeanization of American politics must bring about an inevitable and imminent development of a mass party of workers destined to change the political face of the U. S. Historically, such a mass party has taken three forms, namely, a Socialist party, a Communist party, and a Labor party. The question now arises which form is probable as the next step in the political history of the working class in the United States, where there is at present no mass Socialist party or Communist party and where as yet the Labor party does not exist?
- There is no question that the great sharpening of the inner and outer contradictions of American capitalism gives the basis for a tenseness of relationships, a restiveness of the mass which can enable both Communists and Socialists to grow greatly. It is a fact, however, that despite the great and unprecedented severity of the crisis and of its effects, the American working masses have fought shy of both these parties or have not been effectively reached by them. Such a growth of a revolutionary Communist party is certainly not out of the question this depends both on the sharpening of the capitalist contradictions and the policy of the Communists—not the formation of a Labor party inevitable. Nevertheless the existing situation is such that the American workers will be compelled to take independent political action of their own so as to try to counterpose their class interests to those of the bourgeoisie and to strive to ameliorate their conditions. That such political action may very likely take the form of a Labor party can be seen by the great movement for a Labor party which sprung up after the last crisis in the United States in 1921.
- The formation of a Labor party at the present time would mark a great step forward for the American working class. This is true precisely because the present situation shows it would be formed not due primarily to the great growth of Communism in America which the employers fear and wish to forestall, but primarily as a symptom of the beginning leftward drift of the masses who are still illuded by democracy and still misled by reformists and who form a separate Labor party despite the bourgeoisie. Entirely different from a Socialist party, the Labor party in its inception is really not a Party at all but an amorphous mass movement. In fact, the Labor party, in one sense, can be conceived as an integrated series of united fronts by which the masses launch their own independent struggle against the bourgeoisie on every-day concrete questions. The Labor party although serving as a barrier to Communism yet under the present circumstances sets the masses against the will of its reformist leaders, on the road to overcoming those very barriers of reformism. This amorphous political mass movement called the Labor party serves as an arena within which the Communists can wrest the masses from the reformists."

Where we made our error was in concluding from these premises, the general which we still hold to be correct,

Statement of the Communist League of Struggle

.....

that it was necessary for the Communists to help organize that Labor party. What we failed to realize was that the Labor party was an amorphous mass movement that rapidly became a PARTY, that it was more than an integrated series of united fronts but a PARTY, or to put it another way, we failed to realize that in INTEGRATING this series of united fronts we were creating another PARTY, reformist and dual to the Communist. We failed to understand that all united fronts created by us must be specific and definite, while a Labor party is a PERMANENT organization with aims that vary, an organization that to the masses carries an entirely different meaning than ordinary united front. In this respect your recent article on the Labor party question has proved of great value in correcting these errors in the position of the Communist League of Struggle.

It is no more the task of the American Communists to organize a petty-bourgeois Party standing between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in the form of a Labor party, than it would have been for the Chinese Communists to have helped organize the Kuo Min Tang in China. The Kuo Min Tang also symbolized the Europeanization of politics—Chinese politics—and it also historically marked a progressive step forward for the Chinese masses and provided an arena for Communism (as indeed it might be conceived that even the creation of a Socialist party might do in some countries) yet history has decisively shown us what criminality it would be if the formation of such a Kuo Min Tang (or hypothetical Socialist party) were due to the actions and propaganda of the Communist themselves.

A party exists for the seizure of power. Every worker knows that. To ask him to organize a Labor Party is inevitably to give him the conception that the Labor party is the instrument for seizure of power. Such a conception paves the way for all the monstrous crimes committed by Stalinism and the Right wing.

However, we must declare that in your letter to us we believe you have criticized us too severely. You must know that for over two years, up to very recently, the Communist League of America also had the same slogans as we did on the Labor party question, changing its thesis only at its last national conference. Yet all that time, the Labor party question was not considered a decisive one, capable of barring a group from the Left Opposition and it was not, therefore, because of this question that the Communist League of America or the International Secretariat at first rejected collaboration with us. For the first time, then, through your letter to us, we have learned that you considered this question a decisive one.

In respect to this matter of "decisive questions" permit us to add that there are other questions which we consider decisive and which you should put to the American League. To mention only two of these questions: Is it so "decisive" that a League should be run by people who voluntarily turn over the names and addresses of members and sympathizers, subscribers to their paper, to the United States government? Is it not "decisive" that on such a burning question in the United States as the Negro question, the American League now for close to four years has taken no official position, taking the ground it must "study the question" (great consolation to the struggling Negro masses)? Certainly all questions can be "decisive" once they are developed and expanded upon and brought into general relation with the general theoretical program of the organization. But what must be kept in mind in relation to the Labor party question in America is:

- There was no large-scale movement for a Labor party actually being organized and that our error therefore was concerning a contingency rather than an actuality and this made it easier for us to fall into error.
- It was never the position of the Communist League of Struggle to behave even remotely as Stalin in acting as the coolie for the Kuo Min Tang. We have constantly stressed the necessity and historic independent role of the Communist party. It was our intention to utilize the Labor party movement for the building up of a strong Communist party that would soon liquidate and make antiquated the Labor party rather than that we should become subordinate to it. We never had the theory that "hand in hand with the Kuo Min Tang" (or Labor party) we would accomplish the revolution. For us the Labor party was no substitute for a Communist party. Rather have we constantly stressed that only by a relentless fight against the opportunism embodied in a Labor party would the workers be able to cross over the bridge the Labor party offered them, and move to the Proletarian Revolution.
- However, since the Labor party was not actually formed we were not able to show in practice how entirely different our whole conception and action was from that of the Right wing.
- Finally we must declare our confusion on the question of the Labor party was also due to the fact that the Comintern in the time of Lenin had taken a position similar to ours not only in regard to Great Britain but specifically and concretely in regard to America and the American Labor Party. In the light of these specific decisions of the Fourth Congress of the Communist International which we believed correct we felt we could not change our views at least without a long and thorough discussion with

the leading sections of the International Left Opposition, which we have only just now had the opportunity to have. We cannot be condemned for being late in raising our views when you yourself have only recently mentioned it even in your first letter to us.

We cannot leave this important question of the Labor party without calling attention to several errors in the position of the Communist League of America. The American League, in its last thesis, has declared that the question of a Labor party has less of a timely significance than in the past. How can this position be reconciled with your opinion that the question of the Labor party has now become decisive for the American groups adhering to the Left Opposition? Does the American League believe that the Europeanization of American politics which you have stressed as imminent will take only the form of mass Socialist and Communist parties as in Germany? Such an analysis is far from a realistic appreciation of the American situation at the present time and is far from being born out by the facts. The Communist League of Struggle wishes here to reiterate its view that far from being less important, the Labor party question will tend to become even more and more important in the ranks of the working class.

You declare in your statement on the Labor party question that you cannot affirm that the creation of a Labor party would be a progressive step in the United States because you do not know under what circumstances such a party would be created. It is also our position as well as yours that even if it were objectively a progressive step it is not our duty to help organize such a party, or proclaim its progressiveness, but on the contrary, its insufficiency ambiguity and limitedness and its historical role as a hindrance to the proletarian revolution.

Nevertheless the question goes deeper than a tactical one. The question stands in what historical period in American politics are we in America at the present time? You imply that the more probable perspective in America is the huge growth of a Communist party putting such pressure on the employing class that the Labor party would be organized by capitalist elements solely as a weapon against the Communist party.

We believe such an analysis is not correct. Certainly there are great possi-

billities, never utilized by the Stalinists, for the large growth of the Communist party, in the U. S., but certainly also in the light of present day facts and conditions in America we can not agree that the most probable perspective to which we can turn is that the Labor party, like the Zubatov Unions under the Czar, will be organized mainly as a deliberate move against Communism. As we see American conditions today (tomorrow may compel another analysis based on new world events) we can declare that out of the great complex of social forces leading to the formation of a Labor party, the primary leading force will be the movement of the working class to the left on the road of independent political class action against the capitalists and even if such a movement were to have in it capitalist elements who are primarily concerned in utilizing the Labor party, against Communism and even if those conscious anti-Communist elements were dominant, yet the Labor party movement itself would be unleashing those very forces destined to overthrow all anti-Communist plans. To conceive of the Labor party primarily as a movement carefully controlled by capitalists and formed to meet the menace of Communism rather than primarily as a spontaneous movement of the workers against the capitalist elements is to distort the picture. Taking such a view, we believe it was incorrect for the American League to make it merely an "open question" whether, under such circumstances the Communists should participate and work within the Labor party.

Of course, as the Labor party is not organized yet in America, this is music of the future. Yet we wish to call to your attention that the American League has taken an un-Leninist position on the whole question of the united front, even though on the Labor party question the American League did reach a correct conclusion. We have, for example, reported to you how, contrary to your opinion, the American League is against the idea that the Communists in India should enter the Indian National Revolutionary Congress; how, contrary to your opinion, the American League failed to send delegates to general united front meetings called by labor organizations outside the Communist party and how it failed to organize united fronts where possible. If we have erred on the Labor party question, it was also because we zealously wished that the Left Opposition in America actively participate in the life of the American working class and enter into all its concrete battles.

(To be continued)

The Elections in Greece

Left Opposition Holds Aloft Banner of International Communism

The beginning of this year witnessed an intensification of the crisis in Greece, with no prospect of amelioration, since the main revenues of the country: exportation of tobacco and raisins, drafts from the immigrants of America decreased and its main industry, shipping, is crippled by the lack of world trade.

Premier Venizelos, the famous lackey of British and French imperialism, vainly appealed to his masters for a loan in order to meet the payments of amortization and interest on the State's debts. In spite of his dramatic appeals (possibility of a Communist dictatorship in case he falls) his masters did not need his services as they did during the war and after, when he enthusiastically supported the French General Staff with a few Greek divisions in order to help crush our proletarian fatherland; and therefore they totally ignored him.

The Bolshevik-Leninists (Archio-Marxists) of Greece issued a Manifesto last March to the party and the working class outlining the events that took place in May with a correct Marxist prognosis and stressing the necessity of uniting the working class in workers' councils in order to resist effectively the capitalist offensive. The Stalinists refused any kind of co-operation and criminally neglected to undertake any sort of preparation. The Stalinists confined their activities to pointing to the police many militant Oppositionists, and asking the capitalist wardens to remove from the prison collectives every Archio-Marxist, including some invalid comrades. Their sole concern is the creation of artificial barriers between the workers of the party and the Oppositionists.

In the meantime the financial crisis sharpened and Venizelos was forced on April 25th to abandon the gold basis of the drachma and immediately an inflation took place with the obvious result of sending the prices of foodstuffs to the sky without a corresponding increase of wages. The working masses were unable to purchase even bread. Dissatisfaction was brewing among the workers, poor farmers, and state employees and the Opposition again urged the Stalinists to form workers' councils, but to no avail.

On May 25 many spontaneous uprisings took place in the agrarian sections of the country, trains were halted and looted by peasants. The reformists called a general strike which embraced even the State employees. Venizelos was forced to resign and his successor Papanastassiou the leader of the Workers' and Farmers' Party, got the co-operation of the reformists and called off the general strike, as was expected. Squads of the British and French fleet rushed to the Greek waters ready for any emergency. Papanastassiou was removed by the big bourgeoisie as soon as the crisis passed its danger point. Venizelos undertook again the premiership promising to the masses a general election for September 25.

Factory after factory closed its gates and thus tens of thousands of workers were added to the unemployed list. Even the Government's public works, the so-called productive works, aimed to absorb part of the unemployed, were discontinued. This unprecedented crisis embraced the petty-bourgeoisie also and not convinced by the timid and capitulating attitude of the party, it is beginning to orientate itself towards the Monarchists.

The Popular Party of Tsaldaris (monarchist) launched a vigorous campaign and so far is making great inroads in the camp of the agrarian masses also.

The progressives under Kafandaridis and Papanastassiou's Workers' and Farmers' Party are opposing for obvious reasons the Venizelos Party where formerly they themselves belonged. Also a new party has appeared on the political scene, the Agrarian Party, led by reformist elements.

The big bourgeoisie aims with these theatrical combinations to deceive the masses by drawing the attention of the latter from their severe misery and orienting their attention to an election struggle not based upon the class struggle. They exaggerate the possibilities of a monarchist victory and thus attempt to revive the old political passions not upon the class struggle but upon the question of the king and "democracy". The prospects of a Royalist landslide similar to the one of 1920 are not at all likely.

The only revolutionary party on the political arena is the Communist Party of Greece, even though it conceals itself behind the banner of a so-called "Workers' and Peasants' Bloc." In spite of the confused and opportunistic form of its platform and the Marxian criticism of it by the Archio-Marxists, the Left Oppositionists of Greece are conducting a vigorous campaign among the workers and poor farmers of Greece. The Stalinists have resorted for support to every discredited element in the labor movement and some paper unions, but refuse so far to accept the support of the Left Opposition in the election campaign. The Archio-Marxists called mass meetings throughout Greece urging the workers to support the candidates of the Communist party and appealing to the party members to exercise their pressure on the bureaucrats to stop this criminal attitude.

We are sure that the party members in many sections of Greece will follow the revolutionary example of the district of Lesbos and thus succeed in winning the majority of the working class and poor farmers from the clutches of the reformists and other reactionary elements. Last year, the candidate of the Communist party of the island of Lesbos, comrade Achilles Contaros, accepted the support of the Archio-Marxists and succeeded in polling one-third of the total

votes and approached thousands of workers in the heart of the most reactionary section of Greece.

The formation of workers' councils in Greece is imperative and must take place immediately, because the result of the elections will prove that no party will master a parliamentary majority and therefore in the pretense of a Royalist coup d'Etat (the bourgeoisie will resort again to the services of the Military League to put an end to the fragmentary democratic rights that the workers still enjoy). The refusal of the Stalinists to co-operate with the oppositionists in this important work places all the blame squarely upon their shoulders.

—AR. CALDIS.

Unity Urgent Need of Illinois Miners

(Continued from page 1)

to each individual branch of the Socialist party in the Illinois coal fields, to make any decision that the branch may see fit. Such is the "leadership" that the Socialist party gives the workers. Of course, the real purpose of such a decision is to help Walker-Lewis and the coal-operators to put over the wage cut. And the leading members of the Socialist party in the Illinois coal fields understand clearly the purpose and are loyally carrying out the decision of the National Committee of the Socialist party.

John Hindmarsh, leading member of the Socialist party in Illinois and a henchman of the Walker-Lewis machine was thrown out by rank and file miners from his local union because he tried to force the miners to accept the wage cut and go back to work under the Lewis-Walker company union. Richard Glover, member of the Socialist party and Editor of the Illinois Miner, the official mouthpiece of the Walker-Lewis union, is also very active in trying to put over the wage-cut for the Peabody Coal Co. Then there is Jack Reed, member of the Springfield Socialist party and one of the members of the Lewis-Walker scale committee that made up the contract which the miners are now fighting against. Reed voted for the wage-cut and signed the present outrageous contract. He has refused again and again to face the miners of Springfield and explain why he did not carry out the instructions of the miners of Springfield. Then again, there is Adolph Germer, one of the leading Socialists in the state of Illinois and Editor of Rockford, Ill., Labor News. He, too, is very active in trying to defeat the miners in their fight against the combination of the Lewis-Walker and the coal-operators. Such is the role of the leading members of the Socialist party, true agents of the coal-operators in the ranks of the workers.

Communist Party

Due to the incorrect policies pursued by the official Communist party leadership, the party has been unable to unite the miners under the banner of class struggle. Instead of consistently and systematically trying to build united fronts with allies, sympathizers and supporters of the Communists and the Left wing, in order to defeat the main enemy, the American Stalinists, consistently and systematically attack every individual and drive them further away from Communism. The result of their incorrect bureaucratic policy, is isolation from the miners to such a point that the miners will not even listen to their proposals. The Stalinists have only one miner who is really active in the new miners' union and he doesn't dare to come out openly and declare himself a member of the Communist party.

The miners have great forces against them, yet the spirit and militancy of the Illinois miners was never as great as it is today. They have been winning some kind of a victory from the coal-operators almost every day. The struggle has not yet reached its height. It will probably be a long drawn-out struggle. Quite a number of the small independent coal operators have signed up with the Progressive Miners Union, yet the key to the whole Illinois mine situation is Franklin and Williamson counties. If the P. M. U. can break the power of Lewis in these two counties, then Lewis' union is done throughout the country. And I believe there is a good chance to break the hold of Lewis in these two counties—the conditions under which the miners of Franklin and Williamson counties must work will force the miners themselves to fight. The important thing is to keep the mines that are out on strike solid. —JOE ANGELO

Outcome of the Belgian Miners' Strike

The Belgian working-class is at present engaged in one of the greatest and most important struggles it has witnessed for years. The whole mining proletariat is striking! To understand the full importance of this fact, it is sufficient to remember that the coal-mining industry in Belgium is one of the most important of all.

For months, the owners, encouraged and supported by the social trade union leaders' apathy and consent, were applying successive cuts in wages. Most of the miners, moreover, were but working four or five days a week. Notwithstanding all the dangers of their work, the miners and their families were literally driven to poverty and want.

This situation couldn't last and when a new cut was to be applied, the strike broke out in several pits of the Borinage. The trade union leaders did not advocate the extension of the strike, but, passing ahead of their leaders' treacherous advice, the miners of the rank and file, in the local sections of their trade unions, unanimously voted for the strike and its extension to the other districts and industries.

This elementary mass movement was not foreseen by the leaders, and it wasn't conducted by them, it was imposed upon them by the fighting will of the miners themselves. All that was left to the reformists was to follow, and so they did, trying by all means to regain over the miners the control that had slipped out of their hands.

Strike Extends

The strike was extending rapidly. Without any direction at all, the miners, men and women, occupied the streets, marching and cycling from one mining village to another, to cease work. In a few days, all activity was stopped in the whole district of the Borinage, the Center and Charleroi, including the metallurgical works, glass factories, tramwaymen, etc., etc., and the strike was extending towards Liege and Brussels. But this magnificent mass movement of solidarity of all workers towards their brother miners, was to be brutally cut off by the socialist leaders' treason whose tactics it always was to divide the working class in struggle, inducing it to fight separately for its own special claims. Indeed, as the metal workers arrived at a partial agreement with the bosses as to their wages, and as some promises were made to the miners, the trade union leaders ordered the men back to work and all workers, except the miners, obeyed, being faced with the threat of not receiving any strike indemnities.

By now, still more than 100,000 miners are on strike, some of them since more than two months, but their fight is brought to a deadlock and their chance of victory greatly endangered by the socialist's maneuvers.

From the beginning of the strike, the repression of the bourgeois government brutally prevailed. Police forces, gendarmery and troops were massed in the mining districts, preventing manifestations, savagely provoking and even killing several workingmen during street riots. Especially fierce were the searches and arrests directed against all those suspected of Communism. Several members

of the Communist party and the Opposition were arrested.

A Lesson to the Workers

It was a great occasion for the working class to learn and see by itself who its defenders are, especially for the young, who hadn't even yet experienced a great proletarian struggle. They can now see by themselves what the several organizations who pretend to group the young workers with the aim of fighting for their righteous claims, have done.

The "Young Christian Workers' organization in Belgium, dependent on the Catholic party (conservatives), at its recent congress, doesn't even think it necessary to mention the existence of a strike in Belgium!

The Young Socialists tried, it must be said, to conduct an anti-militarist campaign. As in Belgium military service is compulsory, and all young men of twenty have got to enter the army, and were now obliged to patrol with machine-guns in the mining villages, and even to replace the working men like strike-breakers, keeping the mines in repair and loading coal wagons, the young Socialists appealed to the soldiers not to shoot their brother workers.

As to the Young Communists, the Stalinist politics have been so disastrous, that the Communist party is hardly existent in Belgium, and its influence very confined indeed. Many of their leaders being arrested as soon as the strike broke out, they were hardly able to do any revolutionary work at all during the strike, this especially on account of their tactics of "Revolutionary Trade Union Opposition", which had cut them completely off from the centralized organizations.

And so it appears, that it was left to the young Oppositionists, to lead a real revolutionary action during the strike. But our youth group is numerically very feeble, and apart from its anti-militaristic action, couldn't work separately during the movement, but all of our comrades were at their place at the sides of the adults.

The Opposition, in fact, has done splendid work during this movement, greatly increasing its influence, especially in the district of Charleroi, one of the four mining districts, where it is practically leading the whole movement, through the strike committees. And the Opposition having been able to test in the action, its own capacities and the revolutionary capacity of the working class which seemed so low, can feel confident in the future.

—NORA.

NEXT ISSUE

The next issue of the Militant will contain another one of the articles in the series forming the new book on Germany by comrade Leon Trotsky, "The Only Road". The forthcoming chapter is entitled:

The Twenty-One Mistakes of Thaelmann

MINERS! Read
LEON TROTSKY
ON
The Trade Union Question
Communism and Syndicalism

Paper Cover: 64 pages: 15 Cents
0 Cents in bundles of five or more.

Orders from our literature agent in Springfield, Illinois—Joseph Angelo; r from Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Street, St. Louis, Mo.; or direct from

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

The Checking of the Stalin-Thaelmann Policy Against Their Own Experience

From the Series of Articles in the Forthcoming Book 'The Only Road' :- by Leon Trotsky

Tactics can be checked in the critical and most responsible moments. The strength of Bolshevism rests upon this, that its slogans and methods find their supreme confirmation as soon as the course of events demands bold decisions. What value have principles which must be renounced as soon as the situation assumes a serious character?

Realistic policy bases itself upon the natural development of the class struggle. Sectarian policy endeavors to prescribe artificial regulations for the class struggle. The revolutionary situation signifies the highest accentuation of the class struggle. Just because of that, the realistic policy of Marxism, in the revolutionary situation, exercises a powerful force of attraction upon the mass. The sectarian policy, to the contrary, becomes all the weaker the more mighty is the impetus of events. The Blanquists and Proud-honists, taken by surprise by the events of the Paris Commune, did the opposite of what they had constantly preached. During the Russian revolution, the anarchists were forced to recognize the Soviets, that is, the organs of power. And so on without end.

The Comintern supports itself upon masses who were won over in the past by Marxism and fused together by the authority of the October revolution. Only, the policy of the present leading Stalin faction seeks to command the class struggle instead of investing it with political expression. This is the essential feature of *bureaucratism* and in this it coincides with *sectarianism* from which it distinguishes itself sharply in other features. Thanks to the strong apparatus, to the material means of the Soviet state and to the authority of the October revolution, the Stalinist bureaucracy has been able, in comparatively calm periods, to impose for a length of time artificial measures of restraint upon the proletarian vanguard. But to the degree that the class struggle condenses itself into civil war, the bureaucratic prescriptions come into increasing collision with unrelenting reality. Faced by sharp turns in the situation, the arrogant and inflated bureaucracy easily lands in a muddle. If it cannot command, it capitulates. The policy of the Thaelmann Central Committee in recent months will some day be studied as a model of the most pitiable and miserable headlessness.

Since the "Third Period" it was held to be inviolable that there could be no talk about agreements with the social democracy. It was not only inadmissible to assume the initiative in the united front, as the Third and Fourth World Congresses taught—but even proposals for common actions emanating from the social democracy had to be rejected. The reformist leaders are "sufficiently exposed." The experience of the past is sufficient. Instead of pursuing politics, the masses must be told history. To turn to the reformists with proposals means to acknowledge them capable of fighting. That alone would be Social-Fascism, etc. Thus intoned the ear-deafening melody of the ultra-Leftist barrel-organ in the last three-four years. And look: in the Prussian Landtag, the Communist fraction proposed on June 22, unexpected by all and by itself, an agreement with the social democracy and even with the Center. The same thing was repeated in Hessen. In face of the danger that the Presidium of the Landtag might fall into the hands of the Nazis, all the consecrated principles flew to the devil. Isn't this astounding? And isn't it debasing?

To explain these goat-leaps, however, is not so difficult. As is known, many superficial liberals and radicals continue to joke their whole life long about religion and celestial powers, only to call for a priest when they face death or serious illness. So also in politics. The mark of Centrism is opportunism. Under the influence of external circumstances (tradition, mass pressure, political competition), Centrism is at certain times compelled to make a parade of radicalism. For this purpose it must overcome itself, violate its political nature. By spurring itself on with all its strength, it not infrequently lands at the extreme bourne of formal radicalism. But hardly does the hour of serious danger strike than the true nature of Centrism breaks out to the surface. In so delicate a question as the defense of the Soviet Union the Stalinist bureaucracy always built much more upon the bourgeois pacifists, English trade union bureaucrats and French radicals than upon the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Scarcely did an external danger approach than the Stalinists promptly sacrificed not only their ultra-Leftist phrases but also the vital interests of the international revolution—in the name of amity with uncertain and false "friends" from the genus of lawyers, writers and simple drawing room heroes. United front from above? Under no circumstances! At the same time, however, the Top-Commissar for Ambiguous Affairs, Münzenberg by name, fished around after the coat tails of all sorts of liberal jabberers and radical tripe "for the defense of the U. S. S. R."

The Stalinist bureaucracy in Germany, like in every other country—except in the Soviet Union—is extremely dissatisfied with the compromising leadership of Barbusse in the affair of the Anti-War Congress. On this field, Thälmann, Foster and others would prefer to be radical. Yet in their own national affairs, every one of them proceeds according to the same model as the Moscow authorities: at the approach of a serious danger they cast off the inflated, falsified radicalism in order to reveal their true, that is, their opportunistic nature.

Was the initiative of the Communist Landtag fraction, as such, false and inadmissible? We don't think so. The Bolsheviks more than once proposed to the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists in 1917: "Take the power, we will support you against the bourgeoisie if it should resist." Compromises are admissible and, under certain conditions—obligatory. The whole

question lies in what aim the compromise shall subserve; how it looks to the masses; what its limits are. To confine the compromise to the Landtag or the Reichstag, to regard as an independent aim whether the president will be a social democrat or a Catholic democrat instead of a Fascist, means to sink completely into parliamentary cretinism. Completely different is the situation when the party sets itself the task of the systematic and planned struggle for the social democratic workers on the basis of the united front policy. A parliamentary agreement against Fascist predominance in the presidium, etc., would in this case constitute merely one component part of the extra-parliamentary fighting agreement against Fascism. Naturally the Communist party would prefer to resolve the whole question at one blow outside of parliament. But preferences alone are not sufficient where the forces are lacking. The social democratic workers have demonstrated their faith in the magic power of proceed. The former mistakes of the Communist the July 31 vote. It is from this fact that we must party (Prussian referendum; etc.) extraordinarily facilitated the sabotage of the united front practised by the reformist leaders. A technical parliamentary agreement—or even only the proposal for such an agreement—must help free the Communist party from the accusation that it is collaborating with the Fascists against the social democracy. This is no independent action, but solely the clearing of the road to a fighting agreement or at least to the struggle for a fighting agreement of the mass organizations.

The difference between the two lines is entirely obvious. The joint struggle with the social democratic organizations can, and in its unfolding it must, assume a revolutionary character. The possibility for an approach to the social democratic masses can and must be paid for, under certain conditions, even with parliamentary agreements at the top. But for a Bolshevik, this is merely the *admission price*. The Stalinist bureaucracy acts in the opposite manner: it not only rejects fighting agreements, but still worse, it maliciously destroys those agreements which arise from below. At the same time, it proposes to the social democratic deputies a parliamentary accord. This means that at the moment of danger it declares its own ultra-Leftist theory and praxis to be worthless; only it does not replace it with the policy of revolutionary Marxism but with an unprincipled parliamentary combination in the spirit of the "lesser evil".

We will indeed be told, the Prussian and Hessian episodes were a mistake of the deputies and were made good again by the Central Committee. In the first place, a decision so important in principle should not have been taken without the Central Committee: the mistake falls back completely upon the latter as well; in the second place, how explain that the "steel-hard", "consistent", "Bolshevist" policy, after months of blustering and screeching, of polemic, of villification and expulsions, at once gives way at the critical moment to an opportunistic "mistake"?

But the matter is not confined to the Landtag. Thälmann-Remmele have absolutely renounced themselves and their own school in a much more responsible and critical question. On the eve of July 20, the Central Committee of the Communist party adopted the following decision:

"The Communist party, before the proletarian public, addresses to the S. P. D. to the A. D. G. B. and to the Afa-Bund the question if they are prepared to carry out, together with the Communist party, the general strike for the proletarian demands."

This so important and unexpected decision was made public by the Central Committee in its circular letter of July 26 without any commentary. Can a mere annihilating judgment be made of its whole preceding policy? The approach to the reformist summits with the proposal of joint actions was but yesterday declared to be social-Fascist and counter-revolutionary. Because of this question Communists were expelled. On this ground the struggle against "Trotskyism" was conducted. How then was this Central Committee suddenly able, at one stroke, on the eve of July 20, to bow before what it had the day before banished? And to what tragic state has the bureaucracy brought the party when the Central Committee could dare to come before it with its amazing decision without explaining or justifying it!

The policy is tested upon such turns. The Central Committee of the German Communist Party in reality demonstrated to the whole world on the eve of July 20: "Up to this moment our course was good for nothing." An involuntary but completely correct admission. Unfortunately, even the proposal of July 20, which overthrew the preceding policy, could in no case yield a positive result. An appeal to the summits—independently of the present answer of these summits—can be come of revolutionary significance only when it has been previously prepared from below, that is, when it is based upon the whole policy in its totality. But the Stalinist bureaucracy repeated to the social democratic workers, day in and day out: "We Communists reject any connection with the S. P. D. leaders" (see "Antworten von Thälmann"). The unprepared, unexpected, unmotivated proposal of July 20 was suitable only for exposing the Communist leadership by revealing its inconsistency, lack of seriousness, inclination to panic and adventurist leaps.

The policy of the Centrist bureaucracy helps the adversary and enemy at every step. Even when the mighty pressure of events drives a new hundred thousand workers under the Communist banner, it takes place in spite of the Stalin-Thälmann policy. Precisely because of this the coming day of the party is in no way assured.

—L. TROTSKY.

An Open Letter to John J. Watt

(Continued from page 1)
4. I disagreed with your criticism of the West Frankfurt Miners March. I admit that the march was not organized properly, but nevertheless, the miners have accomplished more by the West Frankfurt march than they would if their march on Lewis-Walker was wholly successful.

5. I disagreed with your criticism of the separate local agreements that are being signed by the P. M. U. I also believe in district and national agreements, but, under the present conditions and circumstances the local agreements is the best tactic for the present time.

6. I did not think that it is the proper thing to waste the miners' time with a lot of documents from the United Mine Workers Journal, the Illinois Miner, the Congressional Record and the Declaration of Independence, but that at this time it is necessary to rally the miners on clearly defined class issues in consistent opposition to the power which stands against them as their master and receives its most polished embodiment in the Lewises, Walkers, the Socialist party, etc.

It was after my reply that you went completely wild.

1. You accused me of trying to break up the Socialist party.

2. You defended the Socialist party when you said that "Hindmarsh just slipped in unawares into the Socialist party but that the Communist party had ever worse elements."

3. You accused the Communists as splitters, disrupters.

4. You accused me of trying to prevent you from speaking before the Socialist party local branch.

This whole matter would have a ring of comedy, if it didn't have some political significance. I will sum up the whole matter as follows:

Watt and the Opposition

1. You know yourself that it is not true when you accused me of trying to prevent you from speaking at the Socialist party local. The first time that I heard of your speaking at the Socialist party local was Friday night at the Slavie Hall before the Most-Happgood meeting, when you yourself told me, I told you then that we ought to take this matter up after the meeting and you agreed. At our meeting on Cook St., I proposed that you speak on the mining situation as a member of the Left Opposition and bring out the Left Opposition policy for the miners' fight. You refused to do this saying that it is too late as you had prepared other matter. You said that you would not support the Communist party in the next election because the party had nominated Foster for president.

Now in my opinion I had a right to ask you to speak as a member of the Left Opposition and on the policies of the Left Opposition for the miners' fight. You had time and time considered yourself a supporter of the Left Opposition. The Left Opposition is a Marxian group and the first fundamental test of a Marxist as Lenin put it, is:

"Upon what rests the discipline of a revolutionary party of the proletariat? HOW IS IT TESTED? How is it reinforced, strengthened? Firstly, by the consciousness of the proletarian vanguard and by its devotion to the revolution, by its steadiness, spirit of self-

sacrifice and heroism. "The problem here and everywhere always consists in the ability to apply the general and fundamental principles of Communism to the specific relations between classes and parties, to specific conditions in the objective development toward Communism—conditions that are peculiar to every separate country and which one must be able to study, understand and point out.

Where Is 7th World Congress

(Continued from page 1)

year. Even the Fifth Congress took place less than two years after the Fourth—on June 17, 1924.

Between the Fifth and the Sixth Congress (which was opened on July 17, 1928), four years elapsed, during which the Left Opposition throughout the world was crushed by the bureaucracy and even the leadership elected regularly at the Fifth Congress was illegally wiped out.

But now, more than four years have passed since the last World Congress, four years of tremendous significance, replete with important struggles and problems left unsolved or badly solved. And not the slightest indication is given by the Comintern leadership that a Seventh Congress is even being considered. Yet it is one of the most urgent requirements of the present world situation.

The eighth point of section II of the "Constitution and Rules of the Communist International", adopted by the Congress in 1928, reads as follows:

"The World Congress shall be convened once every two years."

Why has this important point been contemptuously ignored? Why has a period during which at least two World Congresses should have been held—been allowed to pass by without calling even one? Is the Stalinist bureaucracy bent upon destroying even the formal existence of the Communist International, as it has been engaged in overtime work to destroy it politically and organizationally?

Let the Communist workers reflect on this vital question and join us in the demand for the convening of the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern. Not a Congress of automatons and office clerks, bureaucratically called together and ordered about, without any significance to themselves or anyone else—but a Leninist Congress, adequately prepared in advance, with a previously published agenda to be discussed openly and democratically in the ranks of the party, with the free selection of the delegations, and with the active participation of the Left Opposition!

Without these conditions, a World Congress would be an even worse tragedy than the recent "Plenums" of the Comintern which have passed like ships in the night, unnoticed and unremembered.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern must be convened immediately, in the spirit of Lenin and Trotsky. The cowardly, fatal silence and indifference of the bureaucracy must be broken. It can be tolerated only at the cost of a dreadful calamity for world Communism!

"We carry on the class struggle against the labor aristocracy in the name of the working-class in order to gain them on our side. And we do battle against the opportunist and social-democrat leaders to achieve the same object.

"The attitude of a political party towards its errors is one of the most important and surest criterions of the seriousness of the party and how it fulfills in practise its obligations towards its class and towards the laboring masses. To admit a mistake openly, to disclose its reasons, to analyze the surroundings which created it, to study attentively the means for correcting this mistake—these are the signs of a serious party, this means educating and training the class and consequently the masses.

"Our theory is not a dogma, but a manual of action, said Marx and Engels, and the greatest crime of 'patented' Marxists as Karl Kautsky, Otto Bauer, etc., is that they have not understood this, that they were unable to apply it in the most important moments of the proletarian revolution."

—(From Infantile Sickness—LENIN)

These quotations of Lenin's are the very essence for an understanding of what Communism is. And as a member of the Left Opposition, I have tried to apply them in my work among the working class to the best of my ability to organize the Communist movement on the basis of a Marxian policy and to strengthen the working class in its struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, but in order to do this correctly it is necessary to fuse oneself to a Marxian group which is the only organization that can give the correct leadership.

2. Imagine a man who has expressed his sympathy with a Communist group as the files of the Militant will show, coming to speak before a Socialist party local and ending his speech with the reading of the Declaration of Independence. The Declaration of Independence is not a guide of action for the working-class in their fight against the capitalist system. Marxism is that guide.

Which Party?

3. You said before the S. P. meeting that the working class must organize politically into an organization to abolish the capitalist system. But that assertion means nothing, the workers demand a program of action now and WILAT PARTY. Do you believe that the workers should join the Socialist party that accepts such men as Oscar Ameringer, Jack Hindmarsh, Adolph Gerner, Jack Reid, etc., and which is part and parcel of the Second International and that such a party will give correct leadership to the working class? Or do you believe that the Left Opposition, with comrade Trotsky as our leader can give the correct leadership to the working class? A militant leader of the working class always takes a decisive stand on all problems pertaining to the working-class and I am sure that you will do the same.

Finally, I don't want you to think that there is anything personal in this whole affair. I'm not like the Stalinists. We both have gone through many battles as friends and comrades for quite a number of years and I know we will go through many more, and so we can be frank and ask each other just where we stand politically. I am,

Yours for Ours,

JOSEPH ANGELO.

On the Proletarian Revolution in the United States

(Continued from last issue)

The needs of the Negro, Mulatto, Asiatic, Mexican and foreign born workers cannot be solved by first taking steps toward democratic demands, as in Russia, and then proceeding to the socialist demands. Only by direct steps to socialist demands, to socialist reorganization can we solve the problems of the American workers. If the proletarian revolution does not move with speed towards socialist demands we will be lost.

The exclusion of a bourgeois stage, no matter how short, as the first stage of the Proletarian Revolution is made necessary by the dialectics of history. This excludes and condemns the road Stalinism is following in the United States. The party under Centrist leadership advances the following slogans for the United States: "Workers and Farmers Government", "Agrarian revolution in the South", "National liberation of the Negroes in the South", "Self-determination for the Negroes in the South", etc. These Stalinist slogans are driving in the direction, not of a proletarian revolution, they are driving in the direction of a bourgeois first stage of the proletarian revolution. National liberation and self-determination for the colonies, etc., is another question entirely.

In backward countries, Stalinism skips over democratic demands and economic needs and sees no need for such preparation in the class struggle toward revolution. But when Stalinism arrives face to face with the revolution in backward countries it does not intend to establish a Dictatorship of the Proletariat, but instead intends to establish a "Democratic Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry."

In advanced capitalist countries Stalinism swings to the other wrong extreme. It skips back to what economic conditions have already surpassed and presents slogans that can only be classed under bourgeois democratic demands and not socialist demands.

We are discussing programmatic slogans, not tactical slogans. In this case,

what must our slogans drive at? Our tactical slogans must coordinate the special grievances of the class and of sections of the class with our programmatic slogans, our goal. The special forms of exploitation and suppression of the Negro, Asiatic, Mexican and foreign born workers can only be solved by socialist measures in the first stage of the coming revolution—the Proletarian Revolution. The slogans Stalinism presents are not special tactical slogans but programmatic slogans. They lead in the wrong direction.

Once we brush aside the wrong programmatic slogans of Stalinism for the coming American revolution we will be able to proceed to the pressing tactical slogans to coordinate the problems of the Negro race, the other subjected races, as well as other classes who will be our allies.

The Left Opposition must lead the way in formulating the correct tactical and strategic problems for the coming revolution. The first in order is: to correct the wrong programmatic slogans and then follow up with proper tactical slogans leading up to the revolution.

The proletarian revolution in America will establish a dictatorship. What will be the form of the Soviets? It will not be a "Workers and Farmers Government." It will not be the result of a "People's Revolution." In America, the form of the Soviets will right at the beginning be at a higher level than the form of the Soviets established in Russia in 1917. In Russia the overwhelming majority of the people are peasants and in America the overwhelming majority are workers. This reflects the different stages of the two countries in economic development. This lays the basis for different forms of Soviets. The existence of the Soviet Union is another powerful factor favoring the coming revolution in America. Workers' Councils will be established on a higher plane in America and will usher in a higher type of proletarian democracy at the start. Our Soviets will lay a much stronger

foundation for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in America, much stronger than we had in the first stage of the Soviets in Russia after October. The strength of the class dictatorship lays the basis for the higher class democracy. Class democracy and "democracy" under a classless society are two different things, just as capitalist "democracy" and workers' democracy are the different expressions of different systems. In order to win the American workers to Communism it is necessary to explain the differences in the two forms of Soviets. Only in this manner can we really clear up the question of content and give a proper answer to the question of our Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

On the continent it may be possible for one of the lesser countries to overthrow its exploiters before we do. Unless we give them support unequalled in the past the new Soviets will not be able to hold out against the American imperialists. This does not mean that the reactionary, non-revolutionary theory must be advanced—that we must not strike for power in these countries—because we cannot hold out. With proper support from the world proletariat and the Soviet Union they can hold out and extend the revolution. The struggle for power always means the struggle against world capitalism at this stage of the class war.

On the other hand, a successful revolution in the United States will carry with it the continent, extending far down into Latin America. This opens a broad perspective and confirms the theory of the permanent revolution. The revolution in the United States will flow over the continent in revolutionary storms which will wipe out the capitalists and their flunkies. The slogan for the United States—For a "Proletarian Revolution" leads directly to extension of civil war on the continent and to the slogan of the "All-American Soviet Republic."

If the Soviet Union can withstand the coming storms, and the Left Opposition must see to it that our fatherland does in spite of the stranglehold Stalinism has on the world revolutionary movement, we can say the world proletariat has before it not only the realization of the Soviet United States of Europe, not only of the All-American Soviet Republic, but also of the World Soviet.

—HUGO OEHLER.