

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Vol. III, No. 8,

Telephone: DRYdock 1656

NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, February 22, 1930

PRICE 5 CENTS

Unite in Struggle for the Jobless!

THE PARTY "ANSWERS" ON BLUMKIN

But It Fails to Make a Straightforward Reply to the Questions We Have Raised

The Daily Worker has finally been compelled to "answer" our pointed questions on the assassination of comrade Blumkin. But how contemptibly, how like miserable philistines who bask in the shadow of the distant power that pays so well for literary funkeys, how like the irresponsible bureaucrats who disdain to give an accounting of themselves and their actions.

We asked Foster, Browder, Bedacht, Minor and Co.: Has Blumkin been assassinated and why was this hideous deed committed. They have not answered.

We asked these loyal servitors of the Stalin domain: Do you take upon yourselves joint responsibility with your employer for this unheard of crime? They have not had the courage to do this either.

On the contrary, in the official editorial published in the Daily Worker on February 15, 1930, the whole issue is cravenly avoided. If Blumkin has not been murdered, a simple official denial would suffice and our retraction would follow. If Blumkin has been shot secretly by the G. P. U. on the personal orders of Stalin, then he "must have been" a dangerous enemy of the revolution. In that case, his death should not only be confirmed by the party press, but the action

should be openly defended and the reasons for it made clear to the class conscious workers.

But the handmaidens of the Stalinist bureaucracy dare not take either course: They cannot make a denial because they know Blumkin has been killed. They dare not defend it publicly and boldly, because every honest worker will recoil from them in horror.

We continue to demand of them to explain, not by gratuitous slander and cowardly subterfuge, but in simple straightforward language:

In 1918, when the revolution was surrounded by the wolves of imperialism and torn by bourgeois reaction at home, comrade Blumkin was one of the leaders of the armed anti-Soviet insurrection organized by the Left Social Revolutionaries. He was arrested, tried, and released. He joined the Bolshevik party, became one of the most devoted militants, was a hero in the civil war, and carried on work of the most responsible and rigorous nature for the party and the government up until the time of his death. He was a supporter of the Opposition from the first and never con-

Continued on Page 7

Naval Conference at a Standstill

The fall of the Tardieu government in France, which will delay the "progress" of the London naval conference for at least a week will only result in the postponement of what has now become as plain as day: Despite all the protestations of the imperialist statesmen, the London Farce has not and will not accomplish anything at all in the direction of "insuring peace" by the deceptive route of so-called naval reductions or agreements. The only favorable point on the balance sheet of the conference is the further discrediting of all pacifist nonsense and the naive belief that capitalism can disarm or take any other step towards peace.

N. Y. Times is Cynical

The hypocritical character of the whole affair has become so obvious that not even capitalist observers are doing much drum-beating for it. The well-informed correspondent of the New York Times, Edwin L. James, cables his paper from the conference (2-16-30): "Its (the conference's) highest hopes were three: First, reduction second, abolition of submarines and third, elimination of battleships. They all have been disposed of. As the conference approaches its second month, it has been settled that battleships are not going to be done away with. It is settled that submarines will still submerge when the meeting is over, and reduction has got so far into the limbo that the statesmen have now realized that the chief results of the London conference will be some of the finest naval construction programs the world has yet seen."

The cynical comment of a capitalist reporter is indicative of how much stock the imperialist spokesmen themselves put in all

their pious assurances and claims. This refers as much to Tardieu as to Mussolini, and as much to Ramsay MacDonald as to Herbert Hoover. The conference performance of the alleged "labor" premier of England, the prince of pacifism, the darling of the liberal Nation and the less liberal New Leader, is far more disgraceful than that of any of his co-conferrees. The others at least make no particular pretence to speak in the name of labor and a new social order. They know what they want, and they go after it without more than a fromal sprinkling of piety. But MacDonald, who is a "spokesman" for labor and a new day, is working with no less zeal for the maintenance of the glorious old Empire, for the retention of its present and future markets, for its domination and violent suppression of hundreds of millions of colonial slaves, than his predecessors of the Tory and Liberal stripe. This austere statesman of "the new order" is anxious to show king and country that the labor party can protect the blood-sated empire as energetically as Baldwin or Lloyd George.

Thomas Apologizes for MacDonald

His American colleague, Norman Thomas, writes apologetically in the New Leader (2-15-30) that "in the handling of this naval conference Ramsay MacDonald can say with truth that he is doing the best he can as the head of a minority government and in face of the traditional British love of the navy." If Mr. Thomas means that MacDonald is doing the best he can to safeguard the piratical interests of British imperialism, he is absolutely right; in fact, he is understating the case. MacDonald and his party are the best props that the declining empire possesses.

Unite Forces on March 6th Demonstrations!

The army of American unemployed workers has risen until it runs into millions of men marching the street in a vain search for a job. The most acute suffering has been felt by the workers in every part of the country. Hundreds of thousands who, during the years of "prosperity", had been lulled into a false feeling of security, are now experiencing the bitterest difficulties. Even among the better-paid workers, the savings put away are being rapidly consumed, the homes purchased with mortgages are being put on the block. The prospect for any immediate improvement in industry that would absorb any substantial amount of the unemployed is extremely dim.

U. S. Capitalism Offers No Relief

The millions of unemployed are monumental testimony to the anarchy of the capitalist system. In the United States, where the greatest riches of the world are contained, where industry and agriculture have been developed to a high point, where efficiency schemes have become the rule—the most elementary requirements of human existence cannot be satisfied by capitalism. In the United States, where the records show the greatest number of multi-millionaires, where the payments of dividends and other profits mount into fabulous sums—there is "not enough" to keep five or more million workers and their families at the lowest subsistence levels.

The workers have worked too hard. They have strained their muscles and brain to the last degree. They have produced more than can be absorbed. Then they are thrown out on the streets. The workers starve because there is too much food. They freeze because too much clothing has been produced. They have no work because they have worked too hard.

The capitalist class fears the unemployed mass. It knows that the worker thrown out of a job begins to think, and that ideas become powerful when they penetrate millions. The bosses therefore try to prevent the workers from thinking and acting by dishing out a cup of coffee, and a crummy doughnut, and an occasional flop to the unemployed most severely hit. All the contemptible societies of charity work overtime to give the unemployed five cents worth of grubby "food" to keep them from five minutes of thought.

The workers want no charity, which degrades and shames them and puts them at the mercy of upper-class sob-sisters and sky pilots. The workers want work or maintenance by the state and industry which have used them as long as they were profitable and then thrown them on the heap. The workers have a right to the job, and to the machines and industries and products for which they alone are responsible. But what the unemployed need immediately to relieve their intensely difficult conditions, is work, work at union wages, work without the speed-up system, work without overtime. If the capitalist system cannot provide work, then it must be made to provide maintenance for the unemployed and their families.

To obtain this, the unemployed must fight. The working class never won anything by begging, crawling on its knees, or waiting passively. That holds true today more than ever. United action by the millions of workless, combined with the support of the workers who have jobs, will compel the capitalist class and its government to act. The latter cannot abolish unemployment, which is a natural outcome of the system but it can be made to relieve

some of the suffering if the workers will act militantly and in unison.

Councils of Unemployed

Every city must form its unemployment council, consisting of representatives of the jobless and of every possible labor organization, unions, etc., that is ready to fight in the common battle. A well laid organizational foundation for the movement will insure its strength. The workers must demonstrate their power and make their demands in masses in every city. Isolated disconnected demonstrations, or those organized on ten minutes notice without preparations, or those organized on a narrow basis which makes it impossible to reach the masses, are worse than worthless because they dissipate energy and discredit the movement.

The Communist International has set the date of March 6th for an international day for demonstrations against unemployment. There is much to criticize in the manner in which these demonstrations are being planned and organized by the Stalinists. The date has been set arbitrarily, at brief notice, without preliminary preparations that would insure its effectiveness. It has not taken into consideration the differing pace of development in the various countries. It has not taken into consideration the varying character of the labor movement in the different countries. The American unemployed worker is in a different economic position than the unemployed worker in England or Germany. In the United States, the development of the

Continued on page 2

Illinois Jobs Declined

CHICAGO—Though Pres. Hoover and the other loudspeakers have been shouting prosperity and industrial recovery the past two months, Illinois statistics are just as dead against these false federal claims as are those of New York state. The official Labor Bulletin says:

"The decrease in industrial activity which has been apparent throughout all sections of the state since last September was rendered still more pronounced by a 2.6% decline in employment in December. The manufacturing industries during the last three months have reduced their forces 6.1%, thereby losing all the advances made earlier in the year and bringing the index of employment down to 99.3, or about the same as the figure for December, 1928."

"The payroll totals for factory work declined 4.9% from November to December and for the first time during the year the payroll index went below that for the corresponding month of 1928."

The state department of labor reports the average wage for male factory workers as \$20.66 a week and for females \$17.30 a week. Not counting Chicago, the average was \$27.10 a week for males and \$13.23 a week for females.

Φ

BUILDING TRADES HIT IN D. C.

WASHINGTON—Harry Wardma, biggest building trades employer in the District of Columbia, announces that he is now paying only \$3,000 a week on construction payroll, as compared with \$20,000 a week one year ago. He says he will build no more apartments for a year, and that other contractors are in like situation. Local building trades union officers agree that unemployment has been severe for the past four months.

The Anti-Soviet Crusaders

The whole world of plous opium peddlers is agog with indignation over the latest decree on religious associations issued by the Soviet government. His Most Devout and Respected Holiness, Pope Pius XI, who holds communion with the son of god himself, has declared that "the horrible iniquities which have been committed grow worse every day". His Inspired Excellency, the Archbishop of Canterbury, seconded by his brother in Christ, the Archbishop of York, has bewailed the fact that "no one can question the truth of the long and shocking tale of imprisonment, exile and deliberate putting to death of prelates and parish priests, of monks and nuns and of the humblest folk". His Terrifying Eminence, Bishop William T. Manning, has urged that "the ministers of all faiths all over our land will speak in support of the protests which have been made and in condemnation of these wicked, cruel and inhuman deeds".

The Crime of the Soviets

What is this unspeakable, this new crime of which the Soviet Republic is guilty? The priests and parsons and rabbis of world capitalism are outraged at the "autocratic and brutal delimitation of religious liberties", this "trodding under foot of all moral values". What they are really concerned about is the fact that the Soviets are drastically cutting into the heritage of special privileges enjoyed by the religious parasites in Russia, privileges exercised at the price of the physical and mental welfare of 150,000,000 people that the Soviets are making it more and more difficult for the forces of capitalist restoration to utilize the churches and the priesthood for a basis against the Workers' Republic. So far as freedom of religious belief is concerned, there is no prohibition of that in the Soviet Republic, something which few if any other countries can maintain. Groups of one faith are permitted to associate together, under strict political limita-

tions which are calculated to prevent them from becoming instruments of reaction. What is prohibited is the ownership of special church property except that required for the exercise of their religious rites and worship; the transformation of religious institutions into financial or industrial establishments which would give the priesthood an economic stranglehold on its flocks"; the enrollment of anyone under the age of 18, which would permit the "men of god" to poison the minds of the youth with superstitious and religious venom; functioning without registration at the local Soviet organ; etc., etc.

That atheist and materialist societies and groups conduct, in the meantime, an energetic campaign among the population ary duty as well. Those who go among the ary duty as well. Those who go among the people and help dispel the fog of darkness, reaction, ignorance and bigotry on which the various religious sects are founded are giving a mighty shove to the wheel of progress. That the Soviets not only tolerate, but encourage these materialist activities, is to their everlasting credit. What the priesthood fears more than anything else is an open discussion of religion and the church vs. maerialism, for it knows that in such a contest the proletariat, armed with all modern science, must necessarily issue forth the victor. The fact that the Soviets and the Communist Party are the patrons of this campaign of enlightenment and progress raises them to a greater height than that attained by any progressive or revolutionary regime or party that history has known.

But let us assume for a moment—something which is far from the truth—that some of the black-robed leeches of religion have been damaged a little in the Soviet campaign to break the hold of superstition on the masses. Who are the ones that have a right or reason to condemn the Bolsheviks? Are they the prelates of the Catholic

Church, the institution that is built on the human skulls of millions, the masters of the Spanish Inquisition, the heroes of St. Bartholomew's eve massacre in France, the Church of corruption and speculation for centuries, the master prop of reaction at all times? Are they the shepherds of the innumerable protestant churches, the traducers of colonial peoples in the interest of imperialist piracy, the gentry that argued for the sacred foundations of Negro slavery in the United States, the pastors whose ancestors burned "witches" at the stake? Are they the representatives of Greek Catholicism, the right arm of czarism, the oppressor of Russia's "dark millions" for centuries, the haven of shamelessness and ignorance, of the "holy" Rasputin? Are they the priests of Jewry, the staunchest defenders of tolerance when they are the underdog and the most ruthless emissaries of a bloodthirsty Jehovah when they hold the whiphand?

Where were all these cardinals, bishops, rabbis, metropolitans, pastors, preachers, priests and beadles with a condemnation of the "wicked, cruel and inhuman deeds" of imperialism in cutting down a whole generation in its prime on the battlefields of France and Belgium? They were behind the lines, inciting their countrymen to slaughter each other in the name of Christ and Jahweh. Where were they all when czarism sucked the bloods of Ruussia's millions, when workers were massacred on the streets and their leaders sent to a living

death in Siberia? They were sanctifying the "little father". Where were they when the wolves of reaction encircled young Red Russia and sought to rend it to bits? They were euologizing the "princes of peace": Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau. Where are they in every bitter struggle of the workers, in every strike, in every critical situation where the masses seek to liberate themselves from the murdeou yoke of capitalism? They are on the side of the bosses, the capitalists, trying their best to disarm and weaken the militant proletariat by directing its eyes to a non-existent paradise that awaits them...when they are dead.

Let Bishop Manning, and the Archbishop of York, and the Pope of Rome, and Rabbi Glazer, and the rest of the gentlemen of god, turn their attention to the millions of unemployed who are on the verge of starvation, to the horrors of capitalist marauding, and all the other monstrosities of the present social system. They will not and cannot do it, because they are an inseparable part of the system of rapine and class rule. Their task is not to help the workers free themselves, but to tie tighter the chains of wage slavery. That is why the Soviet Republic, which has struck the chains of slavery from the body of the Russian workingclass, will be considered by religion the principal blasphemy of the century, the unforgivable sin besides which adultery, patricide, hatred of one's neighbor, and any other violation of the commandments are easily and lightly condoned.

Unemployed Must Demand Work or Wages

Continued from Page 1

movement will necessarily be at a slower pace—unless it is to become a sectarian adventure. Up to now, no serious effort has been made to develop a united front movement. No effort has been made to mobilize the support of the organized and employed workers, who have a most direct interest in the position of the unemployed, in preventing them from becoming strike-breaking instruments, etc. In the U. S. particularly, the official Communist party has narrowed down the "preliminary demonstrations" to a handful of party members and a few jobless workers. Such a course dooms the movement to defeat in advance.

The movement must be organized and developed on the broadest basis that will make it capable of setting large masses in motion against the capitalist system and its institutions. Up to now, the "demonstrations" of the party have been bombastically heralded, held for a couple of hours and forgotten the next day. No serious movement has been created. Unless the helm is turned, there will be a repetition of this futility in the movement of the unemployed.

All Out on March 6th

Every worker, employed or unemployed, should join the demonstrations on March 6. An impressive display of working class determination must be presented everywhere on that day. The demands for "Work or Maintenance" must be put in the forefront. The banner of struggle against the infamous speed-up system must be raised. The demands of the unemployed must be few, direct, simple and capable of drawing the workers to the movement. The party, as usual, has drowned the important issues in a mass of subsidiary ones and issued a list of demands long enough to satisfy Moscow and cool the interest of the average worker.

The demonstrations can be made suc-

If the number on your wrapper is



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

cessful; they can become the point of departure for a serious and powerful movement. Every worker and labor organization must join the movement and prevent it from becoming a passing sensation or spectacle by helping to steer it on the right course.

The curse and misery of unemployment can be fought only by the active, unified power of the working class!

Detroit Prosperity

DETROIT—A report just issued by the Union Trust Co. of Detroit should make excellent reading for Sec. of Labor Davis and others who share his "prosperity" psychosis.

The report, pointing out that automobile production in 1929 exceeded that of all previous years, draws attention to the fact that this increase of 19.8% was accomplished with "an increase of only 3% in employment". "While this a result to which automobile manufacturers may very well point with pride" it is "one which is accompanied by an increasingly serious consequence—unemployment". They emphasize the latter with the announcement that "two of the largest automobile companies have recently given notice that casual laborers will not be employed".

Unemployment paralyzes a large section of the workers and low wages ravage the rest, but "retail food prices in Detroit were 4% higher Dec. 15, 1929 than a year previous. Cost of living...increased 2% in the period of Dec. 15, 1928 to Dec. 15, 1928."

The extensive unemployment among building trades workers is shown by the decrease of \$29,000,000 in volume of the building during 1929. "The value of building permits decreased 21.5% as compared with 1928". A chart published with the report shows a decline of nearly 50% in the value of building permits from "normal".

The report concludes with the not too hopeful statement that "optimism over 1930 operations in the industry is tinged with conservatism, and leaders are watching the buying trend closely...In spite of the substantial reductions being made in various groups of commodities the volume of business is not large."

Help Us to Sustain The Militant

A labor paper, particularly a revolutionary organ, does not receive the big advertisements and subsidies, without which a capitalist paper is unthinkable. The Militant is no exception to this rule. It must depend entirely upon readers and supporters for its existence and growth.

The Militant was founded because it fills a special and urgent need in the labor and revolutionary movements. It has been maintained by a group of devoted workers, who understand the value of adherence to the fundamental teachings of the great leaders of our movement, Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky. These teachings are not strong if they are limited to small groups; they become a powerful weapon for labors liberation when they are made known to the whole working class—honestly and truthfully. This is the task set itself by the Militant.

This great work can be carried out effectively only if the existence of the Militant is secured. For this purpose, it is necessary to establish and strengthen a systematic SUSTAINING FUND. Such a fund will not only enable us to print a whole series of most valuable books and pamphlets. The Militant has on hand a number of manuscripts by L. D. Trotsky. They include: "What is the Permanent Revolution?" "The Struggle for the Chinese Revolution", "Europe and America", "The Great Organizers of Defeat: a Record of Five Years of the Comintern", and many others. If the SUSTAINING FUND of the Militant is assured, we can proceed to the immediate publication of these Bolshevik classics.

The sooner donations accumulate for the FUND, the more rapidly can we proceed with this important job. Every dollar counts doubly now. We are depending upon all our readers and friends to act with speed. The blank below is for your use. Fill it out now!

THE MILITANT
2525 Third Avenue
New York, N. Y.

I am enclosing a donation of \$..... for the Militant SUSTAINING FUND to help maintain the paper and publish the workes of L. D. Trotsky.

Name

Address

City State

* DANCE *

For the Benefit of the Weekly Militant
on THIS SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1930 at 8 p. m.

at the

HUNGARIAN HALL, 323 East 79th Street

Excellent Musical Program—Dancing—Entertainment

Admission: 50 cents in advance or 60 cents at door

AUSPICES: Communist League of New York (Opposition)

English and Hungarian Chances

Passaic Strike Anniversary

Some Lessons in Militant Labor Leadership for the Future

By James P. Cannon

Experience is the capital of the labor movement no less than of other human enterprises. The generalization by which we steer toward Communism are not drawn out of thin air but are the concentrated experience of the international working class. Marxism established its place as the only valid theory of the proletariat because it alone stood this test. Experience is the laboratory of the science of revolution. Those who discovered and invent tactics without the aid of this laboratory and in defiance of it substitute guesswork for science and thereby confuse and weaken the workers' movement.

This is the present day practice. It accounts for the orgy of experimentation in all fields of activity which is running through the Party like a virulent influenza. The results of this guessing-game are very harmful for our experience, though limited is fresh and rich and much can be learned from it to the advantage of the workers' movement. Moreover there is no better nor easier way to teach the workers than by examples near at hand. American experience has a tenfold value for the education of the American workers, including the Communists. What we have we should treasure—and study.

The anniversary of the great Passaic strike which has just passed by the Party unnoticed is a case in point. That was the first large-scale experience of the Party in the direct organization of the workers for economic struggle; it was the biggest job was carried through in the most workmanlike and responsible manner. Would not the manifold experience of this strike be an excellent source of study for the industrial work of the Party today especially in regard to the organization of the unorganized.

Our leaders evidently do not think so. The Passaic strike occurred before the "Third Period". Therefore it doesn't count. Therefore, forget it; or, if it is mentioned at all, refer to it, as Browder did in an article some time ago, as a "shameful page in our history". Such a remark serves only to establish the measure of Browder. It does not in any way effect the validity of the methods employed in the Passaic strike. They stand out with conspicuous import and merit against the dubious tinkering which is being passed off by the Browders as trade union tactics.

The management of the Passaic strike was a brilliant illustration of the effectiveness of united front tactics which were, and will be the heart and core of the Communist struggle for the masses. The united front, the guiding line in all phases of the direction of the Passaic strike was vindicated in all of them on a scale which looms colossal in contrast to the sad results which have followed its rejection.

A few of the outstanding features can be mentioned:

The strike was a genuine movement of the workers. The great majority of the workers employed in the mills were drawn into the struggle and held solidly together for months. It was a strike which paralyzed the mills and never had the character of a putch or flare-up. The masses were in it and behind it. The Communists held the unquestioned leadership although there was but a handful of Communists in the mills when the strike began. By their services and skill the Communists led the workers with a moral authority that needed no mechanical manipulation; moral authority which, in the final analysis, is the rock on which real leadership is based. Under such conditions every step, every turn in tactics required by changes in the situation, could be and were executed with the knowledge and consent of the masses of the strikers. Compare this demonstration of real leadership with some of the recent exploits and "forced marches" of the Party under the "new line", such as, for example, the disgraceful exhibition in the Illinois coal field. Cannot something be learned from this comparison?

The reactionaries were isolated and non-party forces effectively utilized in the Passaic strike. The reactionaries were busy with efforts to disrupt the Passaic strike no less than in others. But here the Communists by their tactic, cut the ground from under their feet and robbed them of all influence. The most important weapon in

this fight was the slogan of unity. This slogan has more power to move the masses than any other and in Passaic the Communists kept it always in their hands; and with it kept the leadership, despite all the machinations of the reactionaries. The Communists appeared before the strikers, as they were in fact, the champion of a united struggle, and thereby held their allegiance.

Side by side with this isolation of sabotaging representatives of the A. F. of L. there was a skillful and successful utilization of non-party elements in the leading bodies, both from the ranks of the strikers and from the outside. Notable among the latter was Elizabeth Gurley Flynn. This practice contributed not a little to the broadening of the base of the leadership and the strengthening of its support from below. It is a prerequisite for success in mass organizations at the present stage of development in America. The problem presents itself in every struggle that breaks out of the narrow circle of immediate Party influence. The present leadership do not understand this. They cannot even find room for dissenting factions of the Communist movement in the unions they control. They knew no way to deal with the independent opinions of such an honest and influential militant as John Watt except to frame him up and throw him out. They do not know how to disarm and isolate reactionary disrupters with the slogan of unity. These are some of the reasons why they stage putches instead of real mass struggles like the Passaic strike.

The Passaic strike mobilized non-party mass support on a national scale. This was before the three million organized workers of America were given up as "social-fascists". The conservative trade unions were deeply penetrated with the issue of Passaic. The Left wing gained access to more unions on this occasion than on any other in its history with the exception of the Sacco Vanzetti campaign. Conferences on a scale for which the present day caricatures offer no standard of measurement were organized throughout the country. In many cases even the most conservative officials were forced into line by the sweeping appeal of the issue. Funds to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars for the support of the strike, which came through these conferences, were an indication of their mass support. All this work was most effectively stimulated by a vast propaganda conceived in terms of a mass movement. A weekly bulletin scattered broadcast, an illustrated pamphlet—even motion pictures—were employed to dramatize the struggle before the workers.

All this work and its results did much to popularize the Communists as serious workers in the labor movement. The Passaic strike, which was made known to everybody was a crushing answer in itself to the accusation that the "reds" are impractical theorists, who are incapable of constructive organization work. Communist ideas found a readier acceptance from workers who saw the Communists competently promoting and organizing such a big movement.

It will be worth while for the Communist and Left wing workers to compare this mobilization with the almost total lack of it in recent struggles led by the Party and to ask the reason for the difference. The answer lies primarily in the difference in the methods and conceptions. The results of the new tactics cannot bear comparison with the results of Passaic. But are not results the best criterion by which to measure tactics?

The Passaic strike movement was conducted without any advice from the Executive Committee of the Communist International. This is mentioned not as a virtue, but as a state of affairs which the crusade against "Trotskyism" had brought about in the leading organ of the World Party. This was the biggest task our inexperienced Party had ever undertaken in the domain of mass work, and for this there was no international advice. The Comintern building was swarming with functionaries who had nothing else in the world to do but give advice and instructions, but in this case they had none. The Party had to go on its own resources. The E. C. I. about that time was burning up the cables with ambiguous decisions on such questions as the removal of Party headquarters from

Chicago to New York, but the Passaic strike was overlooked. Of course the Party was not entirely without help. It had the basic Lenin teaching on the united front which was not yet prohibited and this was sufficient. Lately the E. C. I. has remedied the neglect of Passaic and has been giving the Party much instruction on the trade union struggle. Unfortunately, it has all been bad.

Was the affiliation of the Passaic Union to the United Textile Workers a mistake in principle? This opinion is the contribution of Losovsky—after the event—and all the Party leaders, who were hot-foot for the action at the time, are wearing it like a second-hand halo. It is a not unimportant question, and one which, in the mutations of the struggle, may rise again. Therefore an answer is in order; and, for our part, in spite of Losovsky, or Zack, or even Browder, we say, no, it was not a mistake in principle. It was not even a mistake in tactics although, in the desire to keep alive the struggle which was at the point of exhaustion unnecessary concessions were made. To say that the affiliation amounted to a "betrayal" of the workers is childish nonsense that ignores all the facts. The strike was virtually at an end at the time. It had been prolonged for eight or ten months and the workers were simply worn out. If the affiliation to the U. T. W. had any effect at all it was to keep the remnants of the strike together during the negotiations until some of the mills made a sort of settlement with the organization.

The continuous proposals of the strike committee to affiliate with the U. T. W. were the weapon which isolated Hillfers (the A. F. of L. agent of disruption), enabled the strike appeal to wedge its way into the conservative unions and even compelled Green to withdraw his denunciation. Without a doubt it had a strong influence in holding the strikers' ranks solid month after month and in securing the funds to sustain them.

The withdrawal of Weisbord, the strike organizer, as a condition of affiliation, was a big concession, and a dangerous precedent to establish; but in the circumstances it had little effect. The Passaic union retained its local autonomy, the local leadership remained and the influence of the Party on the subsequent decisions was the same as before. The greatest error was the opportunistic manner in which the affiliation was carried out. This was particularly noticeable in the publicity of the strike committee which began to be tainted with defeatist apologies to the labor fakers. We had occasion to make several motions in the Political Committee to correct this line but these motions were all defeated with the help of those who now, characteristically enough, bawl loudest about "betrayal" of the strike. But the errors were incidental. It will be a disaster for the Left wing if it condemns the affiliation of a Left wing union to the A. F. of L. as a mistake in principle. Lenin's teaching and international experience refute such a contention.

* * *

The Foster leaders, appeal to the Communist workers to bury themselves in "mass work" and let controversy alone. Not a few comrades, eager for activity in the class struggle, have been caught on the hook of this false formula and their effectiveness as militants is thereby negated. Mass work is not simply an exercise to be gone through, like acrobatics, for its own sake. Bolshevik mass work is an art. Communists must study its underlying principles and make these principles their own.

There can be no better preparation for effective mass work than the evaluation and study of Party experiences in the light of Lenin's basic teachings. The high light of our experience in the industrial struggle was the Passaic strike. The Party will again enormously by a study of it and by a popularization of its lessons. The most important of these is the necessity of a return to the tactics of the united front as Lenin taught them. A serious investigation of the question will convince the American Communist workers of this. Then their mass work, their sacrifices and their courage will begin to bear fruit for Communism.

Φ

\$200,000,000 Profits and—Unemployment

YOUNGSTOWN, O.—Since last October the mills in Youngstown have run two to three days a week and some are now closed down. Now we are told that the bosses of the U. S. Steel Corporation are not satisfied with the two hundred million dollars (\$200,000,000) from the workers for 1929, and expect to make more by throwing workers into the streets.

The «Right to Think»

The monstrous hypocrisy and duplicity of the Lovestone Right wingers seems to have no bounds. Its latest manifestation is expressed in an article by Will Herberg entitled "Have Communists the Right to Think?" (Revolutionary Age, Feb. 1, 1930). Herberg is very much pained because "the present intolerable regime in the Communist International... meets every sign of initiative or ideological self-reliance with immediate threats of suppression or expulsion." He is also very much worried because the bourgeois intellectual world takes advantage of this unfortunate situation to attack Communism.

It's really too bad. But, my dear Herberg, who helped to erect this "intolerable regime"? Who laid the foundation for it in the American party? How long ago is it that you were participating in this "intolerable regime" and expelling comrades for "ideological self-reliance"?

Perhaps it would not be inopportune to quote a few of your directives which you wrote in an "Outline for Speakers on Trotskyism" in March 1929. Listen to this: "Trotskyism is incompatible with membership in a Communist Party". How differently you write today! "Moreover, though membership in a Communist Party implies agreement with certain broad fundamentals it does not follow that a comrade must agree with every implication or proposition of the Marxian world-view—or out he goes!" New times, new principles!

"Why we break up Trotskyist meetings—they are demonstrations against the Soviet Union of the same type as Monarchist, socialist demonstrations." Who knows? Perhaps here we have discovered the seed of the theory of social-fascism!

No Discussion, Say Lovestone-Foster

"The struggle against Trotskyism must be a struggle against all the 'immediate issues' that the Trotskyites raise: 'no discussion', 'freedom of discussion, of opinion', 'democracy' etc. We must completely expose all these artifices." Was it for this purpose, Herberg, that you wrote your article on whether Communists have a right to think? There must be no fraternization with the Trotskyites who must be treated as counter-revolutionaries." How heavy the past weighs down on us!

Hypocrisy, always an integral element of Lovestoneism, finds its highest expression in you, my dear Herberg. How much consideration for the right of Communists to think did you have when you executed that infamous dual maneuver—the N. E. C. acceptance of the Y. C. I. letter and the Polcom's statement against it? (Innocent Herberg—he was completely ignorant of the intrigues of Zam, chameleon Kaplan and Pepper.) How much regard for the right of Communists to think did you have when you concocted all the hocus-pocus about the Y. C. I. being a section of the Comintern like any other section, and therefore there was the right of one section (the American Party) to appeal against another section (the Y. C. I.)?

What contempt for the ability of Communists to think is contained in this abominable trickery to deceive the membership of the League. Yes, my dear Herberg, your duplicity was really ingenious—in accordance with the needs of the situation. Today you pursue this same line of duplicity. Only the situation has changed; therefore your line of duplicity has changed. The Communists will detect the false notes in your new crooning songs.

We have always advocated a free and open discussion of the points of view of the three tendencies in the Communist International, the Right (Bucharin-Lovestone-Brandler); the Center (Stalin-Foster, et al); and the Left (Trotsky, etc.). We proposed that this discussion be conducted within the Party in accordance with the procedure of inner-party democracy and in the spirit and practice of Lenin. You and Foster, disciples of Bucharin and Stalin, said no, and expelled us. Now the discussion of the views of the three political groups is nevertheless being conducted—but outside the bounds of the Party. This is not the best way. But the class struggle will not wait or stop at bureaucratic boundary lines, no matter who draws them. The discussion is here! Worker-Communists are exercising the right to think. With confidence, therefore, the Communist League, the Leninist-Bolsheviks, greet and prepare the future.

GEORGE RAY

Can Monopoly Capitalism Be Organized?

Herbert C. Hoover, the "engineer in politics" has again assured the "public" that economic conditions are "essentially sound". He sees a new upward trend. Undoubtedly this is not very assuring to the growing numbers of the millions already tramping the streets in vain search for a job.

There could perhaps be no better proof that the selection of the president of the United States is made entirely in accord with the interests and policies of the dominant imperialists. Prior to Nov. 1928, the coming lean period could be foreseen. A mediocre Coolidge would not do to carry the scepter. An engineer was required who could step forward and boldly carry out these policies, which, as the coming period will witness, have intimate relation with world shaking events.

Immediately the "Hoover prosperity" was made proverbial. At the beginning of this present crisis he set out on his first task—to restore "public faith". His economic conferences were heralded as the unflinching stabilizer. Did he set out to materialize the program of the Committee on Recent Economic Changes, headed by himself, which summarized the problems of American capitalism as follows?

"To maintain the dynamic equilibrium of recent years is indeed a problem of leadership which more and more demands deliberate public attention and control. Research and study, the orderly classification of knowledge, joined to increasing skill, well may make complete control of the economic system a possibility."

If so, the answer can already be given categorically: Not until the capitalist system of production with all its cancers and conflicts is abolished will complete control of the economic system be a possibility. And then no more in the interest of the capitalist exploiters, but in the interest of the proletarian producers.

Opposition Platform Forecasts Present Crisis

The phenomenal rapid expansion of American imperialism during the last decade; the extreme rationalization of its industry; the gigantic development of productive forces, outstripping the expansion of the market; the immensely increased exploitation by speedup of the workers bringing in its wake an immense standing unemployed army; the reduction of skill and sharpened economic contradictions;—these have brought the first inevitable result in this present cyclic crisis.

We described this in our Communist (Opposition) platform, of April 1929, as a "growing disproportion between the rate of expansion of productive capacity and the rate of growth of production and consumption". We cited the index figures of production in big industry as having risen from 146 in 1919 to 171 in 1927 (1914 equals 100). The index figures for workers employed in big industry fell from 129 in 1919 to 114 in 1927 (1914 equals 100) although population growth for the same years was from 106 to 120 respectively (this includes the period of so-called prosperity). In addition there has been an influx into the ranks of the unemployed of declassed farmers. It has also been estimated by most economic authorities that during the last decade the improvement of machinery has increased the productivity of labor by 45%.

Hoover's Program

Hoover in stepping forward with his program for maintaining "economic balance" did not call upon Congress; but openly proclaimed where the real power lies by calling upon financiers and executives of the big corporations and banks. Compare for one moment this present arrogant dominance of American imperialism with the United States of pre-war days. President Roosevelt, also the "choice" of the Republican party, became the best possible public front to express and simultaneously to allay the large middle class suspicion and antagonism toward trust combination. Only under the shield of his "trust busting" program could the basis be laid well for the further rapid capitalist monopoly developments. The Sherman anti-trust law proved no real obstacle whatever.

Gigantic mergers have been on the order of the day ever since, yet representing only a fraction of such developments to come. The Interstate Commerce Commission proposal for merger of the existing railroads into 19 systems is but a begin-

By Arne Swaback

ning. Monopoly capitalism has had its development par excellence in the United States. The great resources have been sufficient to keep the biggest enterprises solidly in the hands of private owners, without much need of the government taking over such functions, save such examples as the U. S. Shipping Board. The government could serve capitalism better by appearing to stand separate and to maintain the illusion of "democratic regulator of relations of production". Now the first actual tendencies are indicated toward the higher stage of development—toward state capitalism. Not, of course, in the same forms, ramifications and methods of developing state capitalism of the fascist state in Italy, nor even the forms of the actual tendencies toward state capitalism in Germany; but rather as one capitalist economic writer "hopefully" puts it in the *Forbes Magazine*: "An experiment of social control of business... as a substitute for the utter anarchy which in the past characterized the government of industry... with a new code of rationalized co-ordination and stabilization in the interest of the larger economic group".

Capitalism Can Only Intensify Anarchic Production

The first steps in the direction of this "experiment", the most important aspect of the Hoover economic conferences, gives to the building program the role mainly of the public front. The projected economic council, now being formed, is to become the experimental instrument. It can be expected to have far reaching powers; but the mere shouting of "fascist council" without full understanding of the process becomes empty chatter, despite the fact that fascist methods will be employed against the workers in an increas-

ing degree.

What are the prospects of this experiment, this attempt to institute "social control for the utter anarchy in the government of industry"? The present crisis and its consequences are the answer to developments to date. Moreover, the whole history of development of productive forces under capitalism points to the inevitable conclusion that precisely this which is aimed for "social control of business", based as it is upon further expansion of productive capacity, instead of becoming a substitute for, becomes the lever to further increase anarchy in production as a whole. Instead of decreasing or doing away with present contradictions, "social control of business", which in the capitalist system could only mean strengthening of the control of one class—the capitalist class—will increase and sharpen the contradictions both within the country and in the international sphere. The question, however, just how this "experiment" will appear in the United States and the possible manifestations of its effects, both in general and upon further working class developments are of particular interest to Communists. Lenin and Trotsky combat Bucharin's and Stalin's Economic Theories

Between the Center and the Right (the Stalinists and the Bucharin, Brandler-Thalheimer, Lovestone, etc. group) of the Communist movement a battle of quotations is now taking place on this problem of effects of capitalist developments in the post war period—monopoly capitalism with its tendencies toward state capitalism. Both sides quote Marx and Lenin profusely for their own ends. The Center quite easily proves the similarity of the reformist position of the Right wing to that of the socialist imperialists of the Second International. The basic proof

An Opposition Group in Mexico Formed

The International Communist Opposition lives and grows! All the lies, slander, concealment and terror of the Stalinist bureaucracy cannot prevent its extension. A little while ago, we announced the formation of the first Opposition group in Latin America, organized by members of the Argentine Communist Party. Today we are able to announce the second: the Opposition group in Mexico, directed by comrade Rosalio Negrete of Mexico City, member of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League who has recently been expelled for his Opposition viewpoint. Comrade Negrete was in New York City some time ago on Party work, and came to speak with the comrades of the Communist League (Opposition) here. Plans were laid for the carrying on of work for the principles of the International Opposition in Mexico. At the first sign of this activity, the hopelessly Menshevik leadership of the Mexican party, the subservient ally of the Calles regime for years, expelled Negrete and other leading and active comrades. The Mexican party has been virtually wiped out, betrayed by its leaders (Galvan, etc.) and unable to mobilize support to fight the governmental repression. The Opposition is attempting to mobilize the dispersed Communist elements and help strengthen a proletarian revolutionary movement in Mexico, instead of the confused "workers and peasants" party that has been masquerading as Communist in Mexico for years.

The fury of the Stalinist bureaucrats in the U. S. and Mexico has exceeded all bounds at this new development. The *Daily Worker* has been surpassing itself in falsehood by trying to identify the Communist Opposition with the Right wing which has organized the "governmental (!) Communist Party" (Bach, Monzon and other Mexican friends of Lovestone and Company.) A recent statement in the *Worker* by Hernan Laborde, secretary of the Mexican party repeats the calumnious lie that comrade Negrete collected money to be sent to Lovestone here! Needless to say, our Mexican comrades have no connection with Lovestone or any other Right wing group.

It is interesting to note that comrade Diego Rivera, one of the most notable leaders of the Communist movement in Latin America for years, has issued a statement supporting the International Left Opposition led by comrade Trotsky, denoun-

ing and maintaining his complete disassociation from the latter. The tiny group of traitors from the latter. The tiny group of Stalinist leaders are of course still trying the farcical game—learned from Earl Browder—of insisting that Bach, Negrete, Monzon and Rivera are in one and the same camp. Naturally, there is neither an ounce of truth or sense in this declaration. The comrades of the Mexican Opposition are moving forward to Communism—not to social democracy and class collaboration. Bach, Monzon and Co. are in the camp of Calles-Gil-Rubio. Our comrades are in the ranks of the International Revolution.

GASTONIA STOOLPIGEON GOT HIS

CHARLOTTE, N. C.—Claim has been filed with the state industrial commission for compensation for the death of Marvin Johnson, detective, employed by Gaston county to act as stoolpigeon on Loray mill strikers held in jail following the Aderholt shooting.

Jailers who threw tear gas bombs into the strikers' cells to stop them from singing, forgot Johnson was among them. He contracted a pulmonary disease, it is claimed, from which he died.

AMERICAN PLAN MEANS 55 CENTS FOR MACHINISTS

DETROIT—American plan, so-called, blooms to perfection in the Smiley Machine Co. plant in Detroit. Skilled machinists are getting 55c an hour and working 51 1-2 hours a week. One mechanic, a belt repair man and millwright, has worked with the firm nine years, but still gets 55 cents. The foreman employed there for 15 years, gets 85 cents.

MINERS WOULD LIKE TO SEE PART OF STEEL TRUST GOLD THEY PRODUCED

HIBBING, Minn.—Net profits of almost \$200,000,000 taken last year by U. S. Steel are not reflected in the mining industry on the Messaba range where most of the steel trust's ore is mined. Wages in the mines are only \$4.20 a day.

NEW YORK—French navy men were thrown on the Ile de France, crack French liner, when seamen struck in the port of seamanship the French line decided to Le Havre. After a taste of the navy men's grant concessions to the strikers.

we have ever done in this field; and it advanced by Bucharin in his book, "Economic Theories of the Transition Period", published in 1920. This whole opportunist theory of Bucharin, which did not then in the least prevent his leadership of the Leftists supported by Pepper who also then posed as a Left, was criticized by Lenin at the time. Trotsky has never been sparing in his criticism of Bucharin's opportunism; but from the Stalin regime nothing was heard. Nay, more, this opportunist theory was the basically accepted theory of the Right-Center bloc, one of its expressions being "socialism in one country" with the kulaks gradually developing into socialism, already nine-tenths attained! The Leninist opposition to this theory was expelled and exiled. The international character of the revolution was forgotten. Its international development and organization became subjected to opportunist combinations on top with the betrayers of the British general strike, the Purcells and Hicks in the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee; with the hangmen of the Chinese proletariat, the Chiang Kai-Sheks in the "four class government".

The position of social democracy on the development of monopoly capitalism and tendencies toward state capitalism, given its classical expression by Hilferding, can be summarized into: A new era of transition from competitive capitalism into organized capitalism overcomes the anarchy inherent in the former; then the further transformation into an economy directed by the democratic state. From organized capitalism to socialism (!) The Socialist Party in the United States, although it can still afford to pose in some respects as a Left wing within the Second International, being yet far away from governmental responsibilities, takes essentially the same position in greeting the Hoover economic conferences as something the socialists have always advocated. Lovestone and Bucharin Approach Social Democracy's Views

The sharp gravitation of the Bucharin-Lovestone Right wing toward the Hilferding position is, of course, clear. It is swinging from the view of recognizing external contradictions on a world scale by development of monopoly capitalism, but eliminating internal contradictions, to the view of overcoming anarchy in production by organized capitalism.

Says Lovestone in *Revolutionary Age* (No. 2).

"The plethora, the superabundance of capital in the country—the basic cause of the panic (stock crash)—brought on a condition of the most serious dislocation between the security stock and the fundamental conditions of the capitalist productive economy..." (!)

A mere dislocation from the "sound" economy—and further:

"The panic in Wall Street did not come as a result of the decline of American capitalist economy. It came as a result of the very strength of American capitalist economy (!) magnifying and sharpening the contradictions of world capitalism" (emphasis in original).

Bucharin says in his book "Economics of the Transition Period", published in 1920:

"Finance capital has destroyed the anarchy of production within the countries of large scale capitalism. Monopolistic associations of enterprises, the combined enterprises and the penetration of finance capital into industry created a new type of production relations, turning the unorganized capitalist system into a financial-capitalist organization."

The Centrist Phrases and the Results

Yet today the Centrists, all their declarations notwithstanding, continue to repeat parrot-like supposedly revolutionary phrases devoid of the content which will secure a mass basis. They proceed with their false concept of "revolutionary unions" rejecting possible labor party developments isolating the Communists from the basic section of the working class; they thus negate the correct analysis of growing gigantic contradictions with its opportunities for growing mass contact and for laying the foundation for a class movement of the American workers. The "Left" policy of the leadership still represents the strategic conjectures from which sprang the opportunist tactics of yesterday.

The growing capitalist contradictions of the imperialist stage will be taken up in another article in the next issue of the *Militant*.

Throughout the World of Labor

The Stalinization of the Mexican Party

The Communist Party of Mexico is no exception to the general crisis in the Comintern. For many years it was but a very small organization with little ideological foundation and an extremely weak organization. Due to the general development of the petty bourgeois and agrarian revolution, the party from the time of its foundation was permeated with more of a peasant's than worker's ideology, and its press always had a greater circulation among the peasantry than in the industrial centers. It was common in those times to hear members of the party Central Committee state that the Mexican Revolution and the Russian Revolution were almost the same thing. The party comrades were always the first to applaud the liberal petty bourgeois measures of the "Leftists" in the government, giving to these elements an almost unconditional support. Almost all of the party's work among the masses was done under some disguise or another, and party candidates never took part in elections although numerous party members occupied government posts as "agrarians", "laborites", "anti-clericals", etc.

At the time of the Sixth World Congress, the third period was discovered, and immediately the party right-about turned and loped off at the double quick. All of the reforms instituted by the government of the petty-bourgeoisie, which had until then been considered revolutionary gains, were now denounced as counter-revolutionary. The sell-out of the government to American Imperialism, meant that the bourgeoisie had "betrayed" the revolution, and it became a crime over-night for any party member to even sustain personal relations with anyone at all in the government, with which the party had so recently collaborated. It became then the chief earthly desire of every member, to see how often he could be arrested. Even the Mexican section of the I. L. D. converted itself into a simple instrument for attacking the government, driving itself into illegality before the party.

The party press, taking advantage of the objective revolutionary situation created by the bourgeoisie's capitulation to imperialism and the struggle between the government and reaction, announced that the proletarian revolution was at hand. The masses were called upon to seize the factories and the land; all power was demanded for the soviets (there were no soviets, and the party did not give instructions as to their organization—but these are only "details"). Many of us, intoxicated by the excitement of the moment, impressed by the unrest among the peasantry, and over-estimating the strength of the party, did not take into account the fact that there was not a single local of the party or Y.C.L. that was not in disorganization at the time. Fortunately for the Mexican workers and peasants, the C. C. talked and shouted until what was considered the moment for action had passed by. The government of the bourgeoisie, aided by Wall Street, managed to hold its seat and since then has dedicated its attention to the consolidation of its power.

The Communist Party, which due to its romanticism had already slackened up its fundamental work among the masses in order to dream of insurrections, now found itself deserted by the masses that formerly had looked to it for leadership.

Then the expulsions began. First came the agrarian leaders of the National Peasants League who are mostly elements that never should have been admitted into a Communist Party, because of the petty-bourgeois class interests that they represent. Shortly after, with the arrival of two "Third Period experts" in the form of the C. I. and Y. C. I. representatives, the true Stalinization of the organization began. Tendencies and deviations were discovered in the most unlooked for places, and where they were not discovered they were invented. Two ex-Right wingers that came as reps had to make themselves shine in Moscow. The political guillotine commenced to function with extraordinary regularity and precision cutting both to the right and to the left. Almost a dozen C. C. members of the party and several ex-C. C. members of the party and several have been expelled since last Sep-

tember. The last victim was Jose Gallardo, General Secretary of the Y. C. L. who was sacrificed last week because his report given in Moscow, where he attended the plenum of the E. C. Y. C. I., concerning the organizational strength of the Mexican party did not agree with the report rendered by the C. I. representative in Mexico.

Together with the "cleaning of the ranks" on the part of the C. C. has come an intensified repression on the part of the government. At a moment when the party's influence among the industrial workers is zero, and its influence over the peasantry has dropped more than sixty percent, the Y. C. I. representative together with S., the party C.C. Representative in the C.C.Y.C.L. "discovered" that anti-militarist work was not being carried on in Mexico. Half a dozen circulars were sent out demanding an eight hour day for the soldiers and calling on them to form regimental committees, and to send their officers to Hell. This was done in an abstract manner and without any relationship to movements among the proletarian masses. The concrete result was a general repression on the part of the government against the Y.C.L. organizations of the eight largest centers, including the imprisonment of most of the C. E. C. of the Y. C. L.; disorganization of all national youth work and also all youth work in the capital. Ten foreign comrades were expelled from the country and five natives have been interned in the penal colony of the Islas Marias. During these recent repressions, the "bolshhevized" party has not been able to carry out a single real mass protest. It is also of interest to note that the valiant M., the Y. C. I. Representative, found that this was the best time to leave the country, which he did without even notifying the C.E.C.s of the Party or the League. For six weeks now the Mexican Y. C. L., which a short while ago was stronger than the party, has been unable to budge. Even its funds have been confiscated by the C. E. C. of the party. Money is scarce and the bureaucrats must eat.

This is, briefly, the situation existing today in the Mexican Communist movement. Since the beginning of the "third period", with the "radicalization of the masses," the Mexican party has lost eighty percent of its membership, most of its mass influence and contacts, and its weekly organ "El Machete". It is now almost completely "bolshhevized". With a few score more members that get disgusted or are thrown out, it will be completely so.

The task of the Communist Opposition, of recent formation and still in its infancy organizationally and politically, consists in saving what is left of the party and Y. C. L. organization, regenerating the movement along true Bolshevik-Leninist lines. The saner elements of the party and youth realize this, and by one means or another we shall manage to build up in Mexico a real Communist Party, capable of leading the proletariat in its struggles.

Mexico City, February 8, 1930

ROSALIO NEGRETE

Mondism and Unemployment Grow in England

While MacDonald pursues his "world policy of disarmament and peace", like a great spectacle and with loud accompaniment, the trade union leaders are more discreetly pursuing their policy of class collaboration, the effects of which will be unfortunately more tangible and lasting: they are plunging more and more deeply into "Mondism".

Lord Melchett (formerly Sir Alfred Mond) is of course no negligible power by himself: he runs the imperial trust of chemical products whose domain increases without end. Still, his influence covers one industry. The big employers' organizations, which embrace most of the other industries invited by him to participate in the negotiations, begun upon his initiative, with the trade union leaders, have replied negatively. Not that they have not understood their interest in assuring conditions of a permanent social peace by the treason of the trade union leaders. They want to deal directly with them and disdain the good offices of Sir Alfred Mond. And that is what they are just about to do.

Preparatory meetings have been held in which there participated delegates of the national confederation of the employers' or-

ganizations, the Federation of British Industries, and delegates from the General Council of the Trade Unions. Towards the end of last December, a plan of consultation and cooperation was unanimously adopted, which established permanent and cordial relations between the representatives of the employers and the workers. "This in itself is something new", observed the Times. And it saw a striking proof of the change of mind that has taken place on the side of the workers in the fact that the resolution was proposed and defended by A. J. Cook himself, seconded by a representative of the confederation and a representative of the employers' Federation.

The organ of The City is entirely correct. But this new state of mind prevails primarily in the upper circles. The workers offer no resistance. They have not yet been able to overcome the demoralization engendered by the great defeats of 1926 and there is nobody and no organization to help them recover, for the Communist Party has been unable to gain their confidence; it has been unable to gain their confidence; it has not even been able to keep the thousands of workers who have flowed into its ranks.

In the meantime, the conditions of life of the workers remain difficult; they have not been improved under the Labour government; they have grown worse. Various corporations have imposed reductions in wages and unemployment has continued to grow. Here are the figures, from 1924 to 1929, on the date of December 16, for each of the years:

19241,158,000
19251,102,400
19261,309,700
19271,100,000
19281,271,000
19291,303,600

The bourgeoisie has no recognition for the men who betray their class in order to serve it. With the bankruptcy of the Labour government in this field before it, it overwhelmed with sarcasm the man who, in the ministry, is in charge of unemployment, J.H. Thomas forgetting the services that he has rendered it in the past. It is known that Thomas at first undertook an unsuccessful voyage to Canada to dispose there of the unemployed and coal at the same time. Today, he looks for the remedy in England itself. In the speech he has just made at Manchester, he denounced the chaos that still prevails in the principal British industries and declared that the rationalization of these industries must be undertaken methodically. He promised the industrialists the financial aid of the City. Towards this end, the Bank of England has created a private company called "Industrial Securities Management, Ltd.", the province of which is the establishment and examination of projects for rationalization and the contribution of financial aid to realize them.

This may yield results, for in the realm of rationalization, England is still very backward, even though fusions of concerns are frequently announced. It is hoped that in this way England will be in a position to fight under better conditions on the market and will be able to regain its lost outlets. That is possible. But on the other hand, rationalization has everywhere the effect of appreciably reducing the workers employed so that in the final analysis, there is no sign that these measures, assuming that they are seriously applied, can produce the remedy sought for unemployment.

On the other hand, the "financial aid of the City" signifies that the reorganization of industry will take place under the direction of the Bank of England, outside of all "meddling" from the State. It actually means full power ceded to the Bank in a field of capital importance. Thomas has spoken of a "new epoch", in which order is being substituted for chaos. But in the New Leader, Brailford observes that "the most singular feature of this 'new epoch' lies in the fact that it is a Labour ministry—which it opponents call socialist—that is opening it." He remarks that the initiative did not proceed from Thomas himself, but from the financial powers whose instrument he is, and he recalls that the Liberal project for reorganizing industry did not abdicate quite so completely to the Bank, for it confided the direction of this substantial enterprise to a "council of national development" and thus approached the project elaborated by the Labour party before the formation of a Labour cabinet. London, January 28 1930 —S. D.

After the French Socialist Congress

The socialist party in being disturbed a bit about the problem of participation (in a bourgeois cabinet—Ed.). Formally, it is a question of knowing if the socialist party can participate from now on in a cartel ministry. In other words: can the socialist party exercise capitalist power under such conditions that it will not even be able to realize its minimum program?

This problem is not peculiar to the French section of the Socialist International alone; it is raised for the whole international social democracy. Furthermore, the reply given to this question has already been given in the attitude of the principal parties of the Second International which are exercising capitalist power. The German social democracy is ruling for the German bourgeoisie. English Labourism rules for the king and the English bourgeoisie. Both display all their duplicity in order to enable capitalism to pass through a difficult stage, and by trying to blind the working class to bourgeois interests, to show the workers that their interests lie in class collaboration and the "re-establishment" of capitalism. It is certain that the French socialists are destined to play the same role. But their relative weakness, their insufficient roots in the working masses, have prevented them up to now from playing this role in the government, as they already play it in all countries, in economic conflicts, in municipalities, in the Chambers, etc. The problem of participation has already been partially resolved in practice.

The real fear of workers' discontent and of the Communist Party also exists for many, in the attempt at a legal "opposition" that the socialist Left is making in the North and Center.

At the Sunday Congress, the socialists discussed it in a very academic manner which reflected their numerous internal and external contradictions. The Right wing, led by Boncour and Renaudel, wanted the party to admit immediately the necessity and direct possibility of sharing power with the other parties of the "democracy", that is, with the Radical party. The "Centrists", like Leon Blum and Auriol, as well as the "Left" of Paul Faure and Zyromski, acknowledge the same possibility. But they want to choose the moment when to translate it into facts, and for that the present legislature does not seem to them so favorable. In 1932 we will see. The latter carried by a strong majority. But the contradiction will not continue to exist any the less between the quite radical petty bourgeois wing of the party and the workers' sections which the "Left" still retains.

This Left thinks that at the next elections, the socialist party will show such progress that it alone will be able to direct the "democracy" and that it will be able to assume power with an authority that it has not yet today. The Temps is of the same opinion. It calls this congress ironically: a revolutionary congress. That is to indicate that if it really wants to become a governing party, even in coalition, the socialist party must extend its clientele and also lose its "revolutionary" character, that is, quite simply to abandon its "Marxist" label which no longer corresponds to anything and can only embarrass it.

The victory of the socialist Left at the Congress in the Jean-Jaures Gymnase shows that the majority of the party still believes in its labels and its program of social revolution, and that it hopes to follow the open road of the Austrian social democracy: increase its members and its influence up to the time when it will represent the majority of the nation.

The crisis in the Communist Party, the decline of the confidence that the workers put in it, does not permit one to reckon that this situation will be exploited to the full in favor of the proletariat. However, a situation favorable to the gathering of the working masses on a revolutionary basis may assume form. At the present moment, the Communist movement needs sincere, courageous and devoted cadres without which a new favorable situation will escape Paris, January 31, 1930.

—JA VERITE

The «Third Period» of the Comintern's Mistakes

«No Agreements with the Reformists»

By L. D. Trotsky

But there is another important tactical deduction from the "Third Period", which Molotov expresses in these words: "Now more than at any other time the tactic of coalition between the revolutionary organizations and the organizations of the reformists is inadmissible and harmful", (*Pravda* No. 177, August 4, 1929).

Agreements with the reformists are inadmissible now "more than at any other time". Does it mean that they were inadmissible before too? How then shall we explain the whole policy of the years 1926-1928? And precisely why have agreements with the reformists, inadmissible in general, become particularly inadmissible now? Because, they explain to us, we have entered a period of revolutionary ascent. Yet we cannot but recollect that the conclusion of a bloc with the General Council of the British trade unions was motivated at the time precisely by the fact that England had entered a period of revolutionary ascent, and that the radicalization of the British working masses pushed the reformists to the Left. By what incident is yesterday's tactical super-wisdom of Stalinism stood on its head? We would look in vain for a solution to the riddle. It is quite simple: the empiricists of Centrism burned their hands on the experiment of the Anglo-Russian Committee and with a strong oath they want to guard against scandals in the future. But an oath will not help, for our strategists have not yet understood the lessons of the Anglo-Russian Committee.

The mistake was not in making the episodic agreement with the General Council, which was actually going "Left" in that period (1926) under the pressure of the masses. The first mistake was in the fact that the bloc was concluded not on concrete practical tasks clear to the working class but on general pacifist phrases and falsely diplomatic formulas. The chief mistake, however which grew into a gigantic historical crime, lay in the fact that our strategists could not immediately and openly break with the General Council when it turned its weapons against the general strike, that is, when it turned from an unreliable semi-ally into an open enemy.

The influence of the radicalization of the masses on the reformists is quite similar to the influence that the development of a bourgeois revolution has on the liberals. In the first stages of the movement of the masses the reformists move Leftward, hoping in this way to retain the leadership in their hands. But when the movement overflows the limits of reform and demands from the leaders an outright break with the bourgeoisie, the majority of the reformists sharply change their tone. From cowardly fellow-travellers of the masses, they turn into strike-breakers, enemies, open betrayers. At the same time, however, part of them, consisting not entirely of their better elements, jump over into the camp of the revolution. An episodic agreement with the reformists, at the moment when under the influence of conditions, they happen to be compelled to make a step or a half-step forward, may be unavoidable. But it must be understood, beforehand that the Communists are ready to break mercilessly with the reformists the moment they take a jump backward. The reformists are betrayers not because they carry out, at every given moment and in every one of their acts, the direct instructions of the bourgeoisie. If that is how the matter stood, the reformists would have no influence on the workers, and consequently would not be needed by the bourgeoisie. Precisely in order to have the necessary authority for the betrayal of the workers at the decisive moment, the opportunists are compelled at the preparatory period to assume the leadership of the workers' struggle, particularly at the beginning of the process of the radicalization of the masses. From here follows the necessity of the united front tactic, in connection with which we are compelled for the sake of a broader unification of the masses to enter into practical agreements with their reformist leaders.

It is necessary to understand the historic function of the social-democracy as a whole in order to force them step by step out of all their positions. The present leadership has not even a trace of such an understanding. It knows only two methods: either, in the spirit of the Brandlerites, to drag at the tail of the social democracy

(1926-1928), or by identifying social-democracy with Fascism, to substitute helpless abuse for revolutionary policy. As a result of the zig-zags of the past six years, we have the strengthening of the social democracy and the weakening of Communism. The mechanical directives of the Tenth Plenum can only serve to worsen the already sufficiently damaged situation.

Only a hopeless ignoramus can imagine that due to the miraculous power of the "Third Period", the working class as a whole will turn away from the social democracy driving the whole reformist bureaucracy into the camp of Fascism. No, the process will develop by more complicated and contradictory roads. A growing dissatisfaction with the Social Democratic government in Germany, with the Laborites in England, the transformation of partial and isolated strikes into mass movements, etc., (when all these developments actually do take place,) will have as their unavoidable consequence—we propose to all the Molotovs to carve it on their noses!—a **Leftward turn** of very wide circles of the reformist camp, just as the inner process in the U. S. S. R. necessitated the Leftward swing of the Centrist camp—to which Molotov himself belongs.

The social democrats and those of the Amsterdam International with the exception of the more conscious Right wing elements (types like Thomas, Herman Mueller, Renaudel, etc) will be compelled, under corresponding conditions, to assume the leadership of the advance of the masses—it is understood, only in order to confine these advances within narrow limits, or in order to attack the workers from the rear when they will overstep these limits. Although we know that in advance, and openly warn the vanguard about it, nevertheless, in the future there will still be tens, hundreds and thousands of cases when the Communists will not only be unable to refuse practical agreements with the reformists, but will have to take the initiative in such agreements in order, without letting the leadership out of their hands, to break with the reformists the moment they turn away from shaky allies into open betrayers. This policy will be unavoidable primarily in regard to the Left Social Democracy, which during an actual radicalization of the masses, will be compelled to oppose the Right wing more decisively, even to the point of a split. This perspective in no way contradicts the fact that the head of the Left Social Democracy most often consists of the most degraded and dangerous allies of the bourgeoisie.

How is it possible to refuse practical agreements with the reformists in those cases where, for instance, they are leading strikes? If there are very few of such cases now, it is because the strike movement itself is very weak as yet and the reformists can ignore and sabotage it. But with the drawing into the struggle of great masses, agreements will become unavoidable for both sides. It is just as impossible to block the way for practical agreements with the reformists—not only with the Social Democratic mass, but in many instances also with their leaders or what is more likely with part of the leaders—in the struggle against Fascism. This perspective may turn out to be not very far off, not only in Austria but also in Germany. The directives of the Tenth Plenum are simply a result of the psychology of opportunists scared to death.

The Stalins, Molotovs, and the other allies of yesterday of Chiang Kai Shek, Wang Chin Wei, Purcell, Cock, Fimmen, LaFollette and Raditch, will undoubtedly raise the cry that the Left Opposition stands for a bloc with the Second International. These cries, as soon as the real Leftward swing of the working class takes the bureaucrats unawares, will not prevent the pronouncement of a fourth period, or a second stage of the third, and all the Molotovs will enter at least with "both feet" into an epoch of opportunist experiments like the Anglo-Russian Committee and the workers and peasants Kuo Min Tang.

Do Not Forget Your Own Yesterday

Let the present leaders of the French Communist Party, just as, by the way, all the other Parties in the International recall their own still fresh history. All of them, with the exception of the Youth, came from the ranks of the reformists un-

der the influence of the Leftward swing of the workers. That did not prevent us Bolsheviks from entering into agreements with the Leftward moving reformists, putting very precise conditions to them. One of these innumerable agreements was, for instance, Zimmerwald. Whence, this self-satisfied confidence of the social-patriots of yesterday, that the masses, when they actually approach the "advanced positions of the revolutionary rise," will not bring forward a new shift of Cachins, Monmousseaus, Thaelmanns, and others, (the second edition, let us hope, will be better than the first)—and that we shall not be men by the ears into revolutionary position, once more to pull these gentlemen, entering with them into episodic agreements, putting before them, in later stages, 21 and perhaps 42 conditions, or on the contrary, throwing them overboard with their heads into the mud of opportunism, when they start to draw back?

The official theoreticians quite falsely explain the present strengthening of the Right wing in Communism by the fact, that the "inner" reformists got scared of the radicalization of the masses. Here is a complete misunderstanding of political psychology! Opportunism presupposes a very great elasticity and ability for adaptation. If a mass pressure were felt, the Brandlers, Jileks and Lovetones would have moved to the Left and not to the Right, particularly such worn-out careerists as Sellier, Garchery, and others who are concerned primarily with the retention of their legislative mandates. It is true, the capacity of opportunists for moving Leftward is not unlimited. When the Rubicon—the decision, the uprising—is reached, the majority of them jumps back to the Right wing. This was proved by the experience of even so tempered a Party as the Bolshevik (Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Kalinin, Tomsky, Lunacharsky and others). After the victory, the opportunists once more moved "Left", or more correctly to the side of power (Léonovsky, Martinov, Kussinen and others, and following them, such heroes as Pepper, Cachin and Frossard). But in France matters are far from having reached a decision. And if the French opportunists do not go Leftward at present, but jump to the Right, then this in itself is a true sign that the revolutionary pressure of the masses is not felt, that the Party is growing weak, and the municipal and other careerists hope to retain their mandates by coming out against Communism.* The desertions of such rotted elements is in itself a gain for the party. But the misfortune lies in the fact that the at one and the same time false, irresponsible, adventurist self-praising and cowardly policy of the official leadership creates a very favorable cover, for the deserters and pushes towards them proletarian elements whose place should be in the Communist ranks.

Once More on War Danger

In order to worsen this tangle the recognition of an immediate revolutionary situation is multiplied by the announcement of just as immediate a war danger. In defense of this thesis, Molotov unexpectedly directed the full power of his knowledge against Varga, the well-known theoretician courtier, the Shakespearean Poniolius who is inclined to say something agreeable to every "prince," Right or Left, depending upon the state of weather. This time however, Poniolius did not hit the mark. His very acquaintance with the foreign press, with facts and figures, prevented his timely replacement of the meridian of the Comintern at the place where Molotov stepped with his left leg. Varga brought into the resolution the following political correction:

"The sharpening of imperialist contradictions which not one of the major imperialist countries considers at present sensible to decide by way of war, compels them to attempt temporary conciliation of these contradictions in the sphere of the reparations question."

It would seem that this ultra-careful phrase is absolutely irrefutable. But as it nevertheless, demanded some additional strain of thought, Molotov was completely exasperated. How can one think,—he yelled—that not one of the main imperialist powers does not consider it sensible at present to decide the imperialist contradictions by way of war? "It is known to everyone (!)"

listen, listen: Molotov is talking!—"It is known to everyone that the danger of a new imperialist war is growing every day." Nevertheless, Varga "sees the contrary". Isn't it monstrous?—How does Varga dare "deny that precisely as a result of the execution of the Young reparations plan, the sharpening of contradictions are unavoidable". . .

All this is so absurd, so primitively stupid, that it even disarms irony. "It is known to everybody, that the danger of new imperialist war grows daily." What power of thought! Known to everybody? Unfortunately, this is known only to a small percent of humanity, just as the newly-appeared leader of the Comintern does not know at all how the growth of the war danger proceeds in reality. It is absurd that it increases "daily" just as it is absurd that the masses go further to the Left daily. We have before us a dialectical process with temporary weakening of imperialist friction and their new growth. Molotov may have heard that even the development of the productive forces of capitalism, the most basic of all its processes, does not quite take place "daily" but through crises and rises, through periods of the drop of the productive forces, and even their mass destruction (during war). Along these lines develop also the political processes, but with still sharper convulsions.

In 1923 the reparation problem led to the occupation of the Ruhr. This was an outright staging of war on a small scale. But this scale appeared sufficient to create a revolutionary situation in Germany. The Comintern, directed by Zinoviev and Stalin, and the German Communist Party, led by Brandler, wrecked this exceptional opportunity. The year 1924, which brought the Dawes Plan, was a year of weakening of the revolutionary struggle in Germany and started the softening of contradictions between France and Germany. This is how the political prerequisites for economic stabilization were created. When we stated this aloud, or more correctly, when we predicted this development at the end of 1923, Molotov and the other wise ones, accusing us of liquidationism, immediately entered confidently into a period of revolutionary ascent.

The years of stabilization brought forth new contradictions and sharpens a series of old ones. The question of the revision of the Dawes plan rose in all its sharpness. Had France or Germany refuse to accept the Young Plan, Europe would have been confronted today with a repetition of the Ruhr occupation, but on a far wider scale, with the consequences following from it. But precisely this is lacking. All the participants in the game considered it wiser at the present moment to come to an agreement, and instead of a second Ruhr occupation, we see a cleaning up of the Ruhr district. Ignorance is characterized by the mixing up of things, knowledge though begins with their differentiation. Marxism has never indulged in ignorance.

But must there not, exclaims our strategist, "as a result of the execution of the Young reparation plan," necessarily come a further sharpening of contradictions? Necessarily come! But—as a result. It is necessary to understand the succession of events and the dialectics of their alternation. As a result of high capitalist conjuncture there inevitably comes a depression and sometimes a crisis. But from this it does not follow that a high conjuncture is as strong as a low one, and that a crisis "grows daily". "As a result" of his life a human being follows his ancestors, but from this it does not flow that a man does not go through the periods of infancy, growth, illness, maturity and old age, before he reaches the gates of death. Ignorance is characterized by the mixing up of things. The apple of wisdom teaches to distinguish them. But Molotov never had a bite of that fruit.

The sorry schematism of the present leaders is not altogether innocent; on the contrary, it practically strikes the revolution at every step. The Soviet-Chinese conflict created an urgent necessity for the mobilization of the masses against the war danger and for the defense of the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that on this road the Communist parties, even under the present conditions, could have attained considerable successes. For this it was necessary that in the propaganda the tremendous fact should speak for itself. But as if out of

Continued on Page 8

LETTER FROM
MOSCOW

: How Stalin Murdered Blumkin :

RADEK'S JUDAS
ROLE

Beyond doubt it is known that comrade Blumkin has been shot and that this was done at the personal instigation of Stalin. This vile act of vengeance is already arousing large sections in the Party. But this goes on in secret. One of the sources of these rumors is Radek. His nervous prattling is well known. Now he is completely demoralized, a characteristic of all capitulators. With I. N. Smirnov this takes the form of utter dejection; Radek, on the other hand, seeks to avoid this by spreading rumors and gossip, whose purpose is to prove the profound sincerity of his "repentance". Yaroslavsky beyond doubt, makes use of this trait of Radek to set into circulation any necessary stories. It is of value to point out all this in order to make clear the following.

This version, attributed to Radek, is being circulated: When Blumkin arrived in Moscow, his first act was to hunt up Radek, with whom he had more contact during the past few years than with the other comrades, and whom he looked upon as a leader of the Opposition. Blumkin wished to be informed and to see clearly and in particular to understand the reasons for Radek's capitulation. He could not yet bring himself to the realization that in Radek the Opposition already had an implacable foe, who, having lost the last vestige of moral balance, did not stop at any abomination. One must take into consideration, on the one hand, as a characteristic trait of Blumkin the tendency of moral idealization of individuals, and on the other hand, the intimate nature of his former relations with Radek.

Blumkin told Radek of the thoughts and plans of L. D. (Trotsky) concerning the necessity for a secret struggle for their ideas. In reply, Radek, according to his own words, demanded of Blumkin that he immediately appear before the G. P. U. and tell everything. Several comrades say that Radek threatened Blumkin with immediate denunciation if he did not do this. This is quite likely, considering the actual statements of this hysterical mass of putty.

We do not doubt that this actually occurred. Following this, according to the official version, Blumkin "repented", presented himself to the G. P. U. and turned over the letter of comrade Trotsky which he had upon his person. Not only that, he even demanded his own shooting (literally). Following this, Stalin had to take his demand into consideration and ordered Menzinsky and Iagoda to shoot Blumkin. Evidently Stalin had previously had this decision confirmed by the Political Bureau in order that the Right capitulators be linked up with the affair. It is needless to say that the latter were completely in accord with Stalin.

How is this official version to be taken? Its lying character strikes one. We are not in possession of authentic information since Blumkin, as far as we know at present had not time to inform those outside (the prison) as to the actual state of affairs. But the actual course of events unfolds with sufficient clarity throughout this situation—at least in its general aspects. After his conversation with Radek, Blumkin found himself betrayed. Nothing was left for him except to present himself to the G. P. U., especially since the letter of L. D., from the nature of its contents could not but be an absolute refutation of all the slanders which are being propagated in order to justify the expulsion. Were there any addresses of individuals in the letter?

*The letter contained no addresses and could harm no one. Its text was but a short review of the situation in the foreign Opposition and an expression of solidarity with the Russian comrades who were demanding a complete break with Urbahns. The letter at the same time stressed the necessity for energetic measures for the widespread distribution of the Bulletin of the Opposition in Russia. Under the circumstances described by our correspondent, this letter, in the hands of Blumkin, could not but prove that it contained no element of "military conspiracy." This fact explains clearly Blumkin's decision to turn over the letter—after he found it unavoidable anyhow, because of Radek—to the G. P. U. (Note of the Bulletin.)

**According to positive information which we possess no comrade to whom Blumkin should have turned over the letter has been annoyed (Note of the Bulletin).

We believe not, since no comrades whom Blumkin could have made use of in establishing contacts have been "annoyed".*

Did Blumkin capitulate? If he had indeed capitulated, that is, adopted Radek's stand, he could not but have divulged the names of the comrades for whom Trotsky's letter had been destined. I myself would not have been spared.** And yet I repeat: no one was arrested. Besides, if comrade Blumkin had capitulated, the G. P. U. would not have been forced to satisfy his "demand" that he be shot, but would have used him for other purposes, this being indeed an exceptional opportunity. Beyond doubt the G. P. U. actually attempted this, but ran into the stone wall of Blumkin's obdurance. Then Stalin ordered him to be shot. And when alarming mutterings began to reverberate in the Party, Yaroslavsky, through Radek, set into motion the version which we have reproduced above. It is in this light that we picture this affair to ourselves.

Stalin could not fail to understand that the murder of Blumkin would not pass unnoticed within the Party, and that this would definitely result in great injury to "the brutal and disloyal" (Lenin's characterization of Stalin—Ed.) usurper. But his thirst for vengeance carried him away. On this point, a story has long been in circulation in the Party that in 1923, on a

summer evening, at Zoubalova (in the suburbs of Moscow), Stalin confided to Dzerzhinsky and Kameneff: "To choose a sacrifice to carefully prepare the blow to pitilessly avenge one's self—and then to go to bed, what could be sweeter in life?" Bucharin has referred to this conversation (the Stalinist philosophy on sweet vengeance) in his discourse concerning the struggle with the Stalinists, this having appeared last year. The books of L. D. (Trotsky) his articles, his autobiography are appearing abroad. This must be avenged. Stalin arrested, without cause, the daughter of L. D., but since she was seriously ill (having need of a pneumothorax), the Political Bureau did not dare, (despite Stalin's insistence, it is said) to keep her in prison, especially since Trotsky's second daughter died of tuberculosis a year and a half ago under similar circumstances. He confined himself to exiling Trotsky's son-in-law, Platon Volkov, two months ago. M. Nevelson, the husband of Trotsky's dead daughter, has long been in prison. But this vengeance is too ordinary and consequently inadequate. The need for pitiless vengeance—aided by Radek—fell upon Blumkin. Stalin ordered him to be shot and after... he went to bed.

Yours,
N.

Moscow, December 25, 1929

The Russian Opposition Knows Its Path!

NOTE BY THE EDITORIAL BOARD OF
THE BULLETIN OF THE
RUSSIAN OPPOSITION

Although the above letter from Moscow does not yet give a complete picture of the arrest and murder of Blumkin, it nevertheless sufficiently clarifies the most important point of this tragedy. The immediate cause for the loss of this revolutionary, so unusual in his devotion and his courage, evidently lies in two facts: in his own idealistic confidence towards men and in the complete decline of the man to whom he turned. It is also possible that Radek himself has not sufficiently appreciated the consequences of his own actions because in his turn he idealized... Stalin.

The personal fate of Radek reveals with a final clearness the pitiful fate of the capitulators. Their first stage: "Centrism is not quite so bad as we thought." The second stage: "We must come closer to the Centrists so as to help them in their struggle against the Right wing." The third stage: "The Centrists must be paid to struggle against the Right by recognizing the correctness of Centrism". And finally the last stages: The capitulators turn the Oppositionist Bolshevik over into the hands of the G. P. U. dooming him to extermination.

And I. N. Smirnov? And Preobrazhensky? Their personal role in the tragedy of Blumkin is not known to us. But is it possible that Radek did not confer with them on the attitude to take in this delicate affair? In the final analysis, it is not important. Before the party and the international proletariat, they have assumed responsibility for all the ignominies of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Consequently, they cannot disavow them in this case.

NO. 7

THE BULLETIN
of the Russian Opposition

The new issue contains articles by L. D. Trotsky on the Twelfth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, Communism and Syndicalism, Syndicalism's Mistakes in Principle, the Austrian Crisis, China, etc., etc. Articles by Christian Rakovsky on Government Policy and the Party Regime, the Capitulators. Letters from Russian Oppositionists in Exile. An unpublished document of the Petersburg Party Committee on the eve of the uprising, concealed by Stalin. And many other important articles and documents.

ALL ARTICLES IN RUSSIAN

25c each

18c in bundles

Order From

THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue,

New York, N. Y.

"Rather less, but better." From a tiny group we have already twice in the past (1905 and 1917) became the decisive historical force. We are not tired. We know our path. Forward!

—The Bulletin of the Russian Opposition

Daily Worker and
Blumkin

Continued from page 1

cealed the fact. He has been shot by Stalin now—in the dark of the moon and far from the eyes of the working class—simply for belonging to the Opposition. Under Lenin an honest revolutionary foe, taken with arms in hands in an insurrection against the Soviet power, was released. Under Stalin, a devoted Bolshevik who opposed him is secretly assassinated for retaining his views.

Messrs. Foster and Co., answer: Why has Stalin done this?

The Daily Worker has not yet replied. It has sought to drown our demand in a flood of vituperation and calumny. It has declared we are in one counter-revolutionary camp with the pope, with Norman Thomas, with the French reaction, with Ortiz Rubio and the rest. It says that we have raised the old war-cry of the reaction against the Soviets. "The only change it has undergone since the days of 1917," writes the Daily Worker, "is that Lenin the murderer" has now been changed to "Stalin the murderer."

Not at all, gentlemen. Lenin took a few hundred depraved and corrupted aristocrats and bourgeois who had lived on the flesh and blood of the Russian workers and peasants and were seeking to drown the revolution in a sanguinary sea, and stood them against the wall to be shot. The proletarian revolution is not a plaything. But Stalin has taken a revolutionist, a Bolshevik, a man whose loyalty and devotion Stalin will never see reflected in his mirror, and murdered him in the darkness. Lenin was the instrument of the proletarian revolution against the class enemy. Stalin is the instrument of the Thermidorian elements against the proletarian vanguard. That is the difference.

The Daily Worker speaks of the "defense of the Soviet Union". But it is Stalin and his paid press that weaken the defense of the Soviet Republic by assassinating its most faithful guardians. The corpse of Blumkin is a hostage offered by Stalin to the pope, to Briand, to Rubio, to reaction.

Therefore again we demand of Foster and the other leaders of the American Communist Party: Do you assume responsibility for the reactionary blow that Stalin has dealt the party? Why?

The Communist workers still await a reply and they have a right to know.

D

Ludlow Killer Rewarded

DENVER—Sixteen years after he had charge of the burning to death of 12 little children and two mothers at the Ludlow Massacre, the notorious "Pat" Hamrock has just been sent to the state penitentiary. Not, however, to await the trip to the gallows as one would naturally expect after such a ghastly orgy of killing, but to have complete charge of the "inside" of the prison as "military dictator".

Colorado had the worst prison mutiny in American history on Oct. 3, when eight guards and five convicts were killed. Since that time there has been an almost continuous series of petty mutinies, one getting so serious that a prison building was set on fire. In a panic the Board of Corrections in charge of the prison, turned to Colorado's most expert killer to set up a dictatorship. Hamrock has called his old lieutenant, Lewis N. Scerf, who was in charge on the two killings in the 1927 coal strike by his chief aid.

Colorado organized labor lodged a strong objection with the governor, demanding that he immediately file charges against the Board of Corrections before the Civil Service Commission.

Hamrock answered the labor recital of his record with the statement that he would repeat the Ludlow massacre "if it were necessary". He has never shown any remorse or regret for the burnings and his whole record would lead one to believe his statement that he would gladly repeat the holocaust

The revolutionary detachment of the Bolshevik-Leninists has no needs of false friends, and still less of traitors. There are still many difficulties and tests before us.

Billions Made by Big Industrialists

Thirty-eight leading industrial corporations each paid out in 1929 over \$10,000,000 in cash dividends on common stock. Reports of many other large corporations are yet to be published, but profits already announced are flaunted in the face of unemployed workers and of other workers whose wages have recently been cut.

General Motors Heads Lists

General Motors Corp. in 1929, as usual in recent years, heads the list of cash dividend payers. Over \$155,000,000 was distributed during the year to holders of its common stock. Second on the list comes American Telephone and Telegraph Co. paying to common shareholder approximately \$116,000,000, an increase of \$13,000,000 over the previous year. U. S. Steel Corp. stands third, paying over \$63,000,000, an increase of more than 26% as compared with 1928.

DuPont, the fourth company on the list paying more than \$50,000,000, distributed over \$60,100,000 in common dividends. Thus the leading four include the largest automobile company, the largest public utility, the largest steel corporation, and the largest chemical and explosives manufacturer. Oil is not one of the leading four only because the Standard Oil interests are broken into separate units. But together the biggest four Standard Oil companies paid close to \$150,000,000 in common dividends.

F. W. Woolworth Co., paying its workers from \$10 to \$15 a week, paid its common stockholders \$23,400,000 in cash.

Enormous Profits Continue

Common stock cash dividends of the 19 industrial companies whose payments in 1929 exceeded \$20,000,000 were as follows:

General Motors	\$155,000,000	\$163,300,002
Amer. Telephone	116,000,000	103,821,440
U. S. Steel	63,096,801	49,813,645
Du Pont	60,163,216	49,655,669
Standard Oil, N.J.	46,738,063	36,583,117
Kennecott Copper	43,936,353	32,909,565
Gen'l Elec.	43,268,504	42,265,656
Anaconda Copper	42,753,253	14,419,034
Standard Oil, Ind.	40,040,133	32,416,528
Consolidated Gas	34,867,361	23,978,135
Standard Oil, Cal.	32,500,000	37,728,294
Standard Oil, N.Y.	28,600,000	27,580,290
Tex. Corp.	28,500,000	24,306,712
Eastman Kodak	26,000,000	16,452,300
Reynolds Tobacco	25,500,000	26,000,000
Woolworth	23,400,000	19,500,000
Amer. Tobacco	21,091,512	15,623,172
U. Gas Imp'v'm't.	21,000,000	19,788,907
Union Carbide	20,606,859	16,235,208

The other 19 companies paying a paltry \$10,000,000 to \$20,000,000 in common dividends include Sears Roebuck, Sheel Union Oil, Morgan's new Standard Brands, three other motor companies, Bethlehem Steel, United Fruit, and Westinghouse Electric.

Dividends on common stock are not the whole story of returns to investors. Most of these corporations have also made large payments to bondholders and to owners of preferred stock. Part of their net profits they keep in the treasury to increase the corporation's undivided surplus.

THE SITUATION IN THE MINING INDUSTRY

The next issue of the Militant will contain a statement by the National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) on the situation in the mining industry. It will deal particularly with the recent call for an anti-Lewis international convention issued by Harry Fishwick, Alexander Howat, John Brophy, John Walker and others; the recent strike of the National Miners Union in Illinois; the coming convention of the N. M. U. in Pittsburgh, and the tasks of the Left wing in the industry.

TYPOS DEFEAT SALARY BOOST

INDIANAPOLIS—Again the membership of the Intl. Typographical Union has decided by referendum that \$5,000 a year is plenty for its chief officials. Convention action to raise the ante 50% was vetoed by 26,794 against the increase of 22,882 votes in favor.

GAIN 40-HOUR NIGHT WEEK

MT. MORRIS, Ill.—(FP)—Union printers of Mt. Morris, where hundreds of magazines are printed by Kable Bros., have gained the 40-hour week for the night shift. Wage increases include 11 cents an hour nights and 7 cents an hour days.

"The Greatest Disciple of Lenin"

"Comrade Stalin never deviated a hair, comrade Stalin fought side by side with Lenin in October" *Daily Worker*, 1-18-30). When Stalin made a united front with the Chinese militarists against the Chinese workers, he never deviated a hair. When Stalin was in favor of continuing relations with the traitors of the British general strike, he never deviated a hair. When comrade Stalin was in favor of a coalition with the Mensheviks in 1917, he never deviated a hair. When Stalin supported the Right wing in the Comintern and when he split every Communist party into three groups, he never deviated a hair.

"It is true," says John Reed in *Ten Days that Shook the World* (pages 123-124) "that the Petrograd Soviet had not ordered a demonstration but the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party was considering the question of insurrection. All night long, the 23rd they met. There were present all the Party intellectuals (the leaders) and delegates of the Petrograd workers and the garrison. Alone of the intellectuals, Lenin and Trotsky stood for insurrection. Even the military men opposed it. A vote was taken; insurrection was defeated. Then arose a rough workman, his face convulsed with rage, 'I speak for the Petrograd proletariat,' he said harshly. 'We are in favor of insurrection. Have it your own way, but I tell you now that if you allow the Soviets to be destroyed, we're through with you.' Some soldiers joined him—and after that voted again—insurrection won." (Stalin side by side with Lenin in October.)

"The Congress was to meet at one o'clock and long since the great meeting hall had filled, but by seven there was yet no sign of the Praesidium. The Bolshevik and Left Social Revolutionary factions were in session in their own rooms. All the life-long afternoon Lenin and Trotsky had

fought against compromise. A considerable part of the Bolsheviks were in favor of giving way so far as to create a joint All-Socialist government. 'We can't hold on,' they cried, 'too much is against us; we haven't the men; we will be isolated, and the whole thing will fall.' (Thus Kamenev, Rykov and others.) But Lenin, with Trotsky beside him, stood firm as a rock. 'Let the compromisers accept our program and they can come in. We won't give way an inch. If there are comrades here who haven't the courage and the will to dare what we dare, let them leave with the rest of the cowards and conciliators. Backed by the workers and soldiers, we shall go on'." (So, Stalin, side by side with Lenin in October?)

What my eyes hear and what my ears see; laugh, world, laugh with Stalin's bureaucracy.

DENIS PLARINOS

St. Louis Fakers Try Militant Painter

ST. LOUIS—Efforts are being made by the labor fakers in the St. Louis Painters Union to expel Elmer McMillen, leading militant and Left wing worker in this town, from the Painter's organization. He is about to stand trial on trumped-up charges preferred by the officials. These do not like the contrast of their do-nothing attitude with McMillen's activity in organizing the unorganized workers, leading the recent unemployed demonstration in a demand for work or compensation, and his steady efforts on behalf of the rank and file. The members are strongly sympathetic to McMillen. The outcome of the trial has not yet been made known.

TULSA, Okla.—(FP)—There are more than 4,000 unemployed in both Oklahoma City and Tulsa.

The «Third Period» of the Comintern's Mistakes - - by L. D. Trotsky

Continued from Page 6

spite, the far-Eastern conflict broke out in the very heat of the preparations for the First of August. The official agitators and journalists yelled about war in general and danger in general so furiously and continuously, that the real international conflict was drowned in the cries finding only a weak approach to the consciousness of the masses. Just so in the present policy of the Comintern do the lean kine of bureaucratic schemas swallow the fat kine of live reality.

In connection with the question of the struggle against the war danger, it is again necessary to observe the strategy of the "second period": as one of the main reasons in favor of the bloc with the General Council was put forth the necessity of a common struggle against the war danger. At the July Plenum of the Central Committee in 1927 Stalin swore that a bloc with the General Council was fully justified by the fact that the English trade unions were helping us conduct a struggle against British imperialism, and therefore a demand to break with the strike-breakers could come only from those people who haven't the defense of the Soviet Union at heart. Thus not only the Leftward swing of the English workers but also the war danger during 1926-27 served as the main arguments in favor of a bloc with the reformists. Now it appears that both the radicalization of the masses and the approaching war danger demand a decisive refusal of any kind of agreements with them. All the questions are put so as to confuse the advanced workers as much as possible.

There is no doubt, that in case of war or even an actual and clear approach of one, the reformists will be completely with the bourgeoisie. An agreement with them for a struggle against war is just as impossible as a bloc to carry out the proletarian revolution. Precisely for this reason, to imagine the Anglo-Russian Committee as a weapon of struggle against imperialism, as Stalin did, meant to deceive the workers criminally. But matters are such that history knows not only wars and revolutions but also periods between wars and revolutions, that is, periods when the bourgeoisie makes preparations for war, and the proletariat—for revolution. We live at present in precisely such a period. We must win away the masses from the reformists, who gained strength in recent years and did not weaken. By their strengthening, however, they put themselves into a greater dependence upon the evolution of their proletarian base. It

is upon this dependence that the tactic of the united front is fully based. Only it is necessary to carry it out, not according to Zinoviev and not according to Brandler, not according to Stalin and not according to Bucharin. It is necessary in this question to return to Lenin.

Groupings in Communism

The Left Opposition, which has not joined in with the catechism of the "Third Period", will once more be accused of a Right deviation by skirmishers like Monmousseau. After the experience of the last six years, we can look calmly at this accusation. Already at the Third Congress of the Comintern, many of the gentlemen who later went over to the social-democracy or remained temporarily at the Brandler stage, accused us together with Lenin of a Right deviation. It is sufficient to recall that at the period of the Fifth Congress, Louis Sellier was one of the main accusers of "Trotskyism".

There is no doubt, however, that the Right elements will actually attempt to make use of some elements of our criticism. This is absolutely unavoidable. It is not necessary to think that all the accusations of the Rights are wrong. Quite often the Rights have a basis for their criticism of the goat-leaps of Left opportunism. Within these limits they are quite inclined to use a Marxist criticism, so as to counterpose under its cover opportunism to adventurism.

It must be added, however, that in the ranks of that Opposition, which quite justly considers itself the Left, were until recently the remnants of such elements as joined us in 1924, not because we defended an international revolutionary position, but because we fought against Zinovievist adventurism. Many potential opportunists, at that period in France adopted the protective coloring of the Russian Opposition. Some of them paraded even until very recently with the fact that they agreed with us without any reservations ("Sans reserves"). But when the real question of the struggle for the views of the Opposition came to the forefront, it was revealed that between these parlor Oppositionists and us there is an abyss. They deny the presence of a revolutionary situation all the more since they do not feel the slightest need for it.

Many good souls were sincerely worried by the fact that we unceasingly drove a wedge between the Left Opposition and the Right. Our classification of the three

MACHINIST UNEMPLOYMENT WORST SINCE 1921

WASHINGTON—Reports made by locals in 55 American cities to the Washington headquarters of the International Association of Machinists, each week, show that the present crisis in unemployment in this skilled metal trade is the worst since 1921.

Most of these reports show 20 to 100 union members unemployed, and trade "bad" or "poor" or "very dull". The depression began last August and has grown steadily more serious. Many veteran workers still in the prime of life, who have kept at work through all the previous periods of unemployment, have now been without work for six months.

60,000 Unemployed in K. C.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—The unemployment situation in Kansas City is very serious. There are at least 60,000 out of work. Less than 35% of the union men are working. About two weeks ago the city hired some men to shovel snow, with the weather 10 to 15 below zero. Many of the men were so weak that they could not work until they were fed.

RAIL WORKERS DISCUSS MERGERS

MINNEAPOLIS—Railroad workers when they gather in the yards and other railroad hangouts, find proposed consolidation of the roads an absorbing topic of conversation. Some railroad leaders, with ears to the ground, have taken up the 6-hour day movement. Others will be surprised when they find their members forming Left wing groups.

OUR YOUTH SECTION

For lack of space, we are omitting from this issue the "Young Vanguard", our regular section devoted to the working youth. It will appear in the forthcoming number and contain articles by George Ray, Albert Glotzer, Joseph Friedman, and Charles Curtiss.

basic currents in present-day Communism was called arbitrary and they affirmed that for France such a classification is not real because of the absence of a Right wing. The facts of the last months however gave life and blood to the international "schema" also in France. The "Syndicalist League" decisively raised the banner of struggle against Communism finding in this a common ground with the trade union opposition of the second order. Simultaneously the more reformist elements split away from the Party. They utilized the struggle against bureaucratic adventurism, and under the guise of a new party are attempting to preserve their mandates. Immediately, by the power of political relationship, the Right trade union opposition appeared connected with the new parliamentary-municipal "party". Thus gradually everything finds its place. And in this we think the service of La Verite was very considerable.

A straight line is determined by two points. For the determination of a curve it is necessary to have not less than three. The lines of politics are very complicated and curved. In order to evaluate correctly the different groupings, it is necessary to take their behavior for several stages: at the moments of revolutionary rise and at the moment of ebb. To draw a correct revolutionary orbit of the Left Communist opposition is possible only if we put down on paper a series of critical periods: the relationship to the German events of 1923; the question of stabilization in 1924; the relation to industrialization and the Kulak in the U. S. S. R. in 1923-1928; the question of the Kuomintang and the Anglo-Russian Committee; the relation to the Canton uprising, the evaluation of the theory and practice of the "Third Period", etc. Each of these questions by itself includes a whole group of tactical tasks. Out of the complicated system of ideas and slogans the apparatus marauders tear single phrases and construct on them the idea of an agreement between the Left and Right. Marxists take the problem as a whole, carrying the unity of strategic thought throughout different circumstances. This method does not give instantaneous results but it is the only reliable method. Let the spoilers despoil. We will prepare tomorrow's day. Prinkipo, January 8, 1930.

"By the way, in creating a "workers and peasants" instead of a proletarian party Louis Sellier and company have given life in the West to the gifted formula of Stalin intended for the East.