WORKERS OF THE WORLD. UNITE

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879

VOLUME VI, NO. 26 (WHOLE NO. 173 — NEW YORK, SATURDAY MAY 13, 1933 — PRICE 5 CENTS

In the Illinois Minefields

Prospects of Development of the Progressive Miners

The Progressive Miners of America, which took shape in mass struggles against the Operators, their state and the Lewis machine, and which attained a certain stabilization of the union, is now running into a new period of class storms that will determine its life or death, or its crystallization either as a union of class struggle or a union of class collaboration.

The operators, the Peabody Company, the state and the Lewis machine have planned a new drive against the Progressive Miners. The first blows in this new campaign have already been struck. The union was not prepared to meet them and, therefore, they have weakened the union's position. This does not mean that the position of the Progressive Miners Union is helpless. On the contrary, a systematic campaign and correct left wing policy, the same policy of struggle that was so successful in the birth stage of the union can bring it by the Fall of the year, the period when production will start again on the winter basis, in a powerful position to fight the Operators.

Tendencies in P. M. A.

The Peabody Coal Company, the Operators, the State Forces (State, County and City) and Lewis machine, represent the combined force attempting to crush the Progressive Miners of America. The Progressive Miners of America, like all unions of the working class, is composed of different tendencies, groups and factions with different policies. The struggle against the bosses and their agents cannot be separated from the struggle within the union, for a correct program. Within the union we have as definite groups: the Right wing element; the Musteites; the Socialists, Right and Left wing; the Stalinists; the Left Opposition. The Right wing is by no means a homogeneous group. A section would like to go back into the fold of the Lewis machine and another section would like to remain progressives, but "progressives" practising class collaboration with the small operators against the Peabody Coal Company.

In most of the struggles that have taken place within the union up to the present, to determine its character and role, these seven tendencies in the main divided into two camps, the Right wing element uniting organizationally, but the left wing element remaining unorganized.

The line-up in the main was as follows: The Right wing consist of a section desiring to make amends to Lewis, of the confused class collaboration "progresives," and the Right wing socialists who work within the Progressive Miner's. The Left wing in the main are: the militant, class-conscious progressives, the Left wing Socialists, and the Stalinist and Left Opposition wings of the Communist Party. The Musteites usually straddle the fence between these two camps, always landing in the camp of the Right wing in the final analysis. It is necessary to prove the above statement.

The main thing necessary at this stage is to point out the road ahead and the necessary plans for the summer period; to unite the different political forces within the Left wing minimum program.

P. M. A. and Unemployment

The first attack of the Peabody forces in the recent period was the bitter suppression and reign of terror against the State Hunger March. The backbone and bulk of the Hunger March were the coal miners and to smash the Hunger March meant to deal a heavy blow against the coal miners. The coal miners receive, at the most 75 cents a head for families, while the workers in Chicago and other cities receive far more. With a majority of Progressive Miners facing the summer

(Continued on Page 4)

SMASH the Circle of DEBT!

The financial situation is a little better but still serious. The circle of debt which was closing in on us so tightly as to almost choke us has been widened sufficiently to enable us to get out this issue in full size. That is due to the money sent in by some of the branches and a number of comrades.

Whatis required now is to widen the circle so far that we will break through it altogether. The next issue, at this writing, is hanging fire. The difficulties that stand in the way have been detailed many times before. The point now is not to complete a list of them but to sweep them away.

For that funds are needed. They are needed badly and they are needed at once. To delay may mean the loss of another issue or the appearance of the next issue in half size.

We are confient that with the continuation of the response to our previous two appeals we will surmount the crisis in decisive fashion and be able to appear regularly in full size.

This perspective must be turned into reality. We appeal to all our friends and sympathizers to make another effort, another sacrafice — to SMASH THE CIRCLE OF DEBT.

Air Mail! Wire funds! to the MILITANT at 126 East 16th Street, New York, N. Y.

CHICAGO UNITED FRONT SYMPOSIUM

Following right on the heels of the first great practical demonstration of working class united front policy in recent years—the National Free Mooney Congress—comes the news of a public demonstration on the subject of the united front which in itself marks a great step forward in the revolutionary movement.

The united front of workers organizations, systematically sabotaged by the socialist fakers and criminally distorted by the Stalinist bureauaracy, had within recent years become almost a utopian dream or many workers. The Mooney congress showed that it was a realistic possibility. It aroused the workers in the camps of all parties from their apathy and inspired in them a new interest in this central problem of working class action, a problem more acute than ever at the present time, when the onslaughts of world reaction and national capitalist reorganization are beginning to be felt in all their fury.

It is to this new-born spirit that the arrangement of a **symposium** on the **united front** in **Chicago** must be attributed. It is a symposium in which the Left Opposition will for the first time be able to put forward its policy publicly, side by side with the official party, the Lovestoneite Right wing and the socialist party. The fact that representatives of the Stalinist faction and the S. P. have finally, after ever so many unanswered challenges, consented to bring their views face to face with those of the Left

(Continued on Page 3)

National Mooney Meet Lays Basis for Broad Fight

First Genuine National United Front Gathering of American Workers in Recent Times Marks Progress

Three Tendencies in Communist Movement Clearly Revealed in Clash on Policy and Resolutions; Left Opposition Defends Marxist Position

Chicago, Ill.—

One thousand and fortyeight delegates, representative of all sections of the labor and working class political movements, met in response to the call issued by the Tom Mooney Molders Defense Committe, at the Free Tom Mooney Congress in Masonic Auditorium in Chirago on April 30, May 1 and 2. The congress marked the first attempt, belated though it was, to organize a nation-wide united front movement in behalf of Tom Mooney. As the first working class gathering of such a charcter it was accomplished with some success. But more than this is the fact that it indicated the potentialities for mobilizng the masses of workers n struggle, through the wide, bold and constant utilization of the united front tactic.

The efforts to oragnize the congress met with resistance on the part of the leaderships of the American Federation of Laobr, the socialist party and the independent unions under the influence of the Socialists. In spite of the sabotage of the reformists the congress nevertheless did make considerable progress in comparison with the past period. The incomplete report of the credentials Committee revealed the following representation:

Representation at the Congress

	Organizations	Delegates
Local and Central Bodies of the A. F. of L.	114	147
Independent Unions	28	53
T. U. U. L.	75	117
Communist Party	29	43
I. W. W	2	2
Proletarian Party	3	3
Socialist Party	4	5
C. P. L. A.	1	1
Communist League of America (Left Opp.)	4	8
Communist Pary (Opp.)	3	6
Labor Party	1	2
Local and National Defense Org. (I. L. D. G. D. C., etc.)	173	198
Fraternal Organizations	104	153
Unemployed Organizations	83	132
Women's Organizations (YCL, YPSL, SYC's)	37	47
Veterans Organizations	6	10
Farmers Organizations	3	4
Negro Oragnizations	1	7
Shop Commitees	2	2
Miscellaneous	11	13

It is to be observed that this is the first time in the history of the American labor movement that a united front gathering on a national scale has ever been held. This fact was generally recognized and accepted in the congress. And it is in consideration of the fact that the congress marked the beignning and not the culmination of the movement that considerable hope must be expresed for the future of this movement, if the tactic applied (in spite of serious errors committed) is extended on even a broader scale.

The congress was opened at three o'clock on the afternoon of April 30th, by John Werlick, chairman of the Chicago Committee. He introduced Louis Scott, the personal representative of Tom Mooney and organizer of the Congress, to make the first report on the pre-congress preparations. Scott reviewed the unsuccessful efforts made to enlist the services of the socialist party and the American Federation of Labor to take part in the movement; the early support received from the ACW, ILGWU, and the W.C., and their later withdrawal because of the participation of the Communists.

He was followed by A. J. Muste, representing the Conference of Progressive Labor Action, who reported on behalf of the Arrangements Committee. Muste proposed the election of a presiding committee to be in charge of the congress work. Among those proposed and elected to the Committee were: J. B. Mathews of the socialist party; Roger Baldwin fo the Civil Liberties Union; John Werlick, B. Ellisberg, Alex Frazer of the P. M. A.; Wm. Leader of the Hosiery Union of Philadelphia; Chas. Bloom of the Molders Union of St. Louis; Selina Burrell, Women's Auxiliary of the P. M. A.; J. Farley, George Smirkin of the YPSL; Moore, NAACP; Ralph Chaplin, I.W.W.; Al Renner of the Proletarian Party; Louis Scott, Wm. Patterson, Secretary of the ILD, A. J. Muste; Jack Johnstone, C. A. Hathaway, Robert Minor, I. Amter and R. M. Lovett. Chas. Bloom, H. Newton and George Smirkin were elected secretaries of the Congress

The chairman of the first session was Alex Frazer. Benjamin Ellisberg reported for the California delegates on the work of the Mooney committee in that section of the country. He was then followed by Robert Minor who made a report on the Mooney case, its history and present status. The report, as a review of the whole case, was done well. It lacked, however, a concrete characterization of the present stage of the struggle and a report of what should be done. The discussion that followed the report also assumed a more or less agitational character without correctness.

Cannon Takes the Floor

It was only when comrade Cannon got the floor, that a different note was sounded. In the short period of five minutes allotted to the discussion, he stressed above all the question of policy and program of activity. Presenting the position of

(Continued on Page 4)

The Scottsb'ro March

«New Deal» President Ignores Protests of Marchers

The Scottsboro boys must be freed!

The Scottsboro boys shall be freed!

With these demands echoed forth in unison by five thousand throats, the Scottsboro delegation, composed in the main of Negro workers, marched through the streets of Washington in militant protest against this particular brand of lynch justice meted out in the South to Negro workers.

The march which was arranged by the National Scottsboro Action Committee got under way Saturday, May 6, after some delay. The delay was caused by the Bus Company's backing down on its original contract to transfer the delegation to Washington. It was later learned that the state department had had a hand in the Bus Company's action.

All in all about 600 delegates, largely Negro workers from Harlem and South Brooklyn, comprised the delegation. By bus, truck and auto, other delegations came mainly from Eastern cities such as Buffalo, Boston, Newark, Schenectady, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk and Richmond. The largest delegation came from Baltimore—composed almost entirely of Negro members.

As the caravan proceeded on its way it was greeted in city after city by Negroes who lined the streets and showed their solidarity by applauding, cheering and with clenched and upraised fists. Particularly was this so when the caravan passed through the poverty stricken sections of Wilmington, Baltimore and Washington. What with the miserable weather and the previous attempts of the state department to terrorize the laboring populace of these sections, it was truly an imposing spectacle of class and race solidarity.

Most heartening of all was the way the Negro delegation, got up mostly from various churches and lodges, took to the word COMRADE. By the time the delegation was ready to leave Washington, the revolutionary appellation **"Comrade"** had replaced the bourgeois Mister which had been the social designation before the march began.

The march was undertaken primarily to present a bill known as the "Bill of Civil Rights for the Negro People," to the President and to Congress. But the "new deal" president gave a deal to the black and white workers that they will not so soon forget. He refused to see the delegation. "He was too busy," so his secretary said, "convening with foreign diplomats."

(Continued on Page 2)

Congress Sidelights

Political Notes on Incidents at the Chicago Sessions

The Mooney Congress was a big step forward for the Commuist Party and had many positive qualities, which we must acknowledge at the start, even though Communists do not stop to pat themselves on the back. It was, at the same time, top heavy with a whole series of the most elementary and fundamental mistakes and blunders that can always be expected from Salinism. At least one can say, without fear of contradiction, it was a big step in the correct direction, even though only a start.

The success and step forward is due primarily to the rejection of the "united front from below" by the Communist Party and the acceptance of the united front between **organizations.** In a few months this policy has been able to obtain greater results than the Stalinists, with the united front from below, could obtain in the whole past period. In fact, the last few months has demonstrated that the united front of organizations has done more to expose the Socialist and A. F. of L. misleaders than all the slander of the Stalinists and their theory of social-Fascism, which is the motivation for the united front from below.

When the Stalinists opened the door for "all" workers' organizations in their turn on the united front they hoped to find a way to keep the Left Opposition out, contrary to their expectations, they find themselves in the awkward position of being forced to take the defensive under the hammer of the Communist League of America. In other words, as we have pointed out so often before, to close the door to the Left Opposition is to close the door to contact with the American workers. And likewise to open the door, not for us, but for the American workers., is to open the door for us. Ask Hathaway, Minor and the steering committee of their caucus in the Mooney Conference, or, consider the conference and judge for yourselves.

Progressive Miners of America

The heaviest weight outside of the organizations under the ideological influence of the Communist Party was the delegation from the Progressive Miners of America. One of the "lightest" forces in the conference was the C. P. L. A., represented by Muste. However, it was Muste this and Muste that. They thought they were using Muste but facts will prove Muste was using them.

(Continued on Page 2)

Rockefeller Vandals Threaten Rivera Frescoes

As we go to press, word arrives of the ousting of Diego Rivera, the great revolutionary artist, from his job in Radio City, and of the intentions of the Rockefeller interests, owners of the enterprise, to destroy the revolutionary paintings he has already completed there. Immediately as soon as the events got abroad, a crowd of revolutionary workers, many Left Oppositionists and sympathizers among them, gathered in protest before the Rockefeller building, carrying banners and shouting slogans such as "Save Rivera's Murals," "Down with capitalist vandalism," etc.

Company thugs in uniform were lined up provocatively in front of the entrances. Before long a detail of mounted police and cops on foot charged into the crowd and encircled the pickets, breaking up the demonstration.

Diego Rivera is one of the foremost artistic geniuses of the present generation and has been linked in his work from the first with the revolutionary workers' movement, in his native Mexico and internationally. The high character of his ability, which is of world renown, has made his services desirable also for the capitalistic class which is accustomed to judging art, like everything else,, according to its market price. Rivera, who is by no means financially independent, has from time to time accepted assignments for work from various bourgeois enterprises. But he has invariably done so with an eye to the socialist future, filling his frescoes with a revolutionary content which will live long after they have ceased to be private property, with the establishment of the workers' rule.

The murals Rivera was doing at Radio City were of the same character. The special panel which the Rockefellers and their agent particularly objected to depicted Lenin clasping with his hands, the hands of a soldier, a white and a Negro worker, with a background showing an unemployed demonstration carrying bright red banners and placards saying "We Want Work, Not Charity," "Free Tom Mooney" and "Workers, Unite."

The Radio City authorities demanded the removal of Lenin's likeness and other changes. The artist categorically refused. Thereupon the Rockefeller interests proceeded with his immediate dismissal, screening whatever work Rivera had already completed and preparing its destruction — an act of vandalism which, characteristically enough, comes at a time when the world's attention is occupied with that other outrage of capitalist barbarism—the aute de fe of Hitler in the public squares of Germany.

Immediately after the New York organization of the Left Opposition got wind of this, it mobilized a prompt and spontaneous protest action in front of the Radio City buildings. The deminstration was broken up by the boss police with that self same brutality and beastliness which has characterized their interventions always in strike picketings and with which militant workers are well acquanted. Both against workers' revolutionary art, the decadent bourgeoisie has only one recourse—the clubs of the police.

Diego Rivera is to speak on his Radio City paintings at Town Hall this coming Saturday night, May 13. It is no more than fitting that militant revolutionary workers and sympathizers should show their solidarity with the great artist who has identified himself and his art with their cause by attending in big numbers this Saturday night.

The Evening of Entertainment arranged by the International Workers School, should be turned into a powerful demonstration of the workers' defense of revolutionary art.

Capacity Crowd Hails Russian Movie; Second Showing Saturday, May 27

Surpassing all expectations, a most extraordinary film on the Russian Revolution was exhibited last Saturday evening before a packed audience at the Labor Temple, New York City. Before the intensely interested and enthusiastic audience, which burst into applause and song on many occasions, there were unreeled for the first time, the actual and authentic pictures of every important event and action before and after the Bolshevik October Revolution.

We had here the best portrayal of the causes and events that culminated in the Russian Revolution under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky; and moreover every inch of the film is a first hand picture taken by over one hundred camera men on the spot. It includes events taken by John Reed, the American Bolshevik. It is necessary to see this grand picture to realize what a magnificent history of and propoganda for the ideals of Bolshevism is revealed in the ten reels shown last Saturday. No falsified film versions of the Russian Revolution —as given by the bourgeosie film men and by Stalin's hirelings in the Soviet film world—but real, truthful, first-hand versions are given in this extraordinary film. For the remarkable editing of this film, fulsome praise must be given to Max Eastman for his brilliant job. A. Axelbank is his collaborator.

The audience was gripped to the deep when it saw Yudenitch's White Guards execute hundreds of Red soldiers in groups of threes. Here was the Civil War brought out in all its bitter meaning. All is shown: a record of events from the first decade in the 20th century, from early Russia in Czarist days; the events leading up to the July uprising; the July uprising; the Kornilov counter - revolutionary movement; Kerensky, Miliukov, Chernov, Rodzianko and numberless other too numerous to mention here—they and their roles; the rise of the Bolsheviks—Kamenev, Zinoviev. Chitcherin, Rakovsky—and the many-sided duties and roles of Lenin and Trotsky. And even Stalin—emerging publicly for the first time at Lenin's funeral, which is here exhibited grandiosely and poignantly; the Soviets; Bolshevism's rise to power; the Civil War on the various fronts, with map illustrations on the scope and progress of the civil wars; grand scenes of all the Russias; the various Congresses of the Comintern in progress with revolutionary leaders from all over the world at hand; the most astonishing and interesting pictures of Lenin at the height of his powers, his expressive countenance while speaking, indicating the power and force of this extraordinary leader. Pictures of Trptsky and other Bolsheviks in action on the numerous war fronts and in other fields of work. Toward the end there is seen also Trotsky and his family at work in Prinkipo, Turkey where they have been exiled by the false leader of Bolshevism, Stalin.

We would not whet the readers' appetite if it were not for the fact that the film is to be shown again. Hundreds who wished to, could not obtain their Subscription tickets because the entire Labor Temple was disposed of days before the exhibition. The Committee takes the occasion here to apologize to the half dozen persons who did have Subscription tickets and yet did not obtain admittance. These comrades can get a refund or exchange tickets for the second performance

SECOND SHOWING

The second showing of the Great Movie of the Russian Revolution take place on Saturday night, May 27, at the Labor Temple on 14th Street.

Subscriptions can be had at the Film Club of the New York Branch, C. L. A. (O), 126 East 16th Street. The subscription ticket is 35c.

30 Hour Bill Legalizes Stagger System and Furthers Plan for New Wage Cuts

On April 6th the Senate passed a bill introduced by Senator Black of Alabama forbidding, for two years, the shipment of interstate and foreign commerce of commodities made in industries which do not adopt the six-hour day and five-day week. The restricted scope of the measure, formally, is made necessary for the capitalist parliamentary cretins by the limited powers accorded the federal government by the "founding fathers." Its negative formulation is imposed by the necessity of circumventing these limitations by legal language which does not violate the Constitution.

The provisions of the bill did not apply equally to all industries. The canning and printing industry were exempted as were several others. Nor were the thirty hours a week entirely binding. The bill provided for an extension of hours where business was seasonal.

As it stood the bill was a national legalization of the stagger system of Hoover and Teagle. Its ostensible motivation was to put men back to work. The bill, in this sense, represents an attempt on the part of the more far sighted section of the capitalist class to anticipate the coming struggles of the working class for a shorter workday and, if possible, as they think, to take the wind out of the sails of this struggle.

The bill had another aspest. Old boy moneybags understands that any reduction in hours through congressional legislation without explicit provisions to the contrary means a corresponding wage cut. The administration tried to sugar-coat this aspect of the bill by introducing an amendment through Secretary of Labor, Perkins, providing for a minimum wage.

Opposition to Bill

Opposition to the bill as a whole and in part developed from all sides. The New York **Times** of May 2 reports that: "Spokesmen of the sugar, anthracite coal, cannery and building materials industries appeared before the House Labor Committee (where hearings are being held on the bill following its passage by the Senate) and opposed the thirty hour week measure as being too inflexible."

(Continued on Page 4)

★ GALA BENEFIT PROGRAM ★

Maria Theresa
of the original Isadora Duncan group, in a series of dance interpretations

Maria Winetskaja
star of the operatic and concert stage, in a program of folk songs

Albert Meiff
violin virtuoso, formerly of the faculty of the Curtis Institute of Music

And -- For the First Time in America!

Diego Rivera
in a **chalk-talk,** on his widely-discussed frescoes in **Radio City**

Saturday Evening, May 13, at 8.15 p.m.
TOWN HALL, 43rd St. and 6th Ave.

Tickets: 35 cents, 50 cents, 75 cents and $1.00; Boxes $2.00.
Now on sale at International Workers School, 126 East 16th St., and at Town Hall box office

Auspices: International Workers School

The Foltis Fisher Strike

Lessons of Stalinist Blunder Policy in the F.W.I. U.

Jay Rubins article, "Striking a Cafeteria Chain," in the April issue of **"Labor Unity"** contains a number of misstatements and misleading impressions which might hamper the effectiveness of the Food Workers Industrial Union.

I. He says, "The membership and some of the leadership had little faith in the possibilities of the Foltis-Fisher workers. This lack of faith expressed itself clearly by the membership not participating actively in this work."

The fact is that it was not the membership, but the leadership, which failed for a long time to see the possibilities of the Foltis-Fisher workers. The Foltis-Fisher organizational drive was started early in 1932 on the initiatve of a group of comrades in the Cafeteria Department of the F. W. I. U., and was carried out in accordance with a plan proposed by them. For a period of months these comrades had the greatest difficulty in convincing the leaders of the necessity of this work

At the beginning, the office committee mechanically appointed two of the comrades who had proposed this plan to carry it out, without discussion or consultation with the membership. Then they put in charge of this work Comrade Obermeyer, who had already applied for a passport to the Soviet Union, and was, to the knowledge of the TUUC preparing to go to the Soviet Union in a short time.

Naturally, under these conditions, the work was carried on half-heartedly. An additional excuse was found in the fact that summer was coming on and that many of the members would go to work in summer camps. As a result, three months more were allowed to go by without results. The work was completely dropped until the Fall, by which time Comrade Obermeyer had left for the Soviet Union, without leaving any responsible comrade in charge or any preparations for further work, or any explanation or justification of this negligence. Naturally it would not be correct to blame this comrade for this action without placing the responsibility on the TUUC and the leadership of the union, where it belongs.

II. Comrade Rubin fails to point out that the tactical line followed in the handling of the strike was vacillating and opportunistic. He says, "The union exposed this move (making the workers buy shares—J.G.) on the part of Foltis as a means of breaking up the organization built by the workers, as well as a way of indirectly cutting the wages of the workers.

The Foltis-Fisher workers were very indignant at this move of Foltis, but the union utterly failed to utilize this indignation in an organizational manner, and particularly to point out to the workers that this was an indirect wage cut, and thus to help prepare the strike.

When the strike was called, the Central Strike Committee decided that it must be spread to all the stores in the chain, in a week's time. This meant a large distribution of leaflets, mass picket lines, demonstrations, and in general dramatizing the strike so as to bring it to the attention of the unorganized food workers.

Falling into a Trap

Instead of this, the leadership fell into the trap laid by the bosses, of fake negotiations for a settlement, in order to stall for time, and further demoralize the strikers. The only Foltis-Fisher stores which were struck were those where the FWIU groups had already been organized, meaning 8 shops out of 20, with about 100 workers, of whom not more than 50 percent participated in the strike activities from the beginning.

In spite of the decision of last year's Food Workers Conference to "turn the face of the union toward the shops," not a single general membership meeting of the FWIU has been called to mobilize support for the Foltis-Fisher organizational drive. Outside of a dozen or 14 members of the Cafeteria Department, there has been no support of this drive, as a result of the "separatism" which prevails today throughout the union. The heavy financial burden of taxation for this work has all fallen on the Cafeteria Department, contrary to the policy of the TUUL.

In the face of these facts, how can Rubin talk about "the mass pressure developed by the union" which was supposed to have resulted in Judge Bondy's refusing the injunction?

He says, "The union, through the TUUC and the ILD, called a conference of the TUUL unions, together with the Civil Liberties Union, obtained a legal staff, and mobilized sentiment against such an order."

The writer had proposed a real united front conference with AF of L unions, and mass political and fraternal oragnizations, This was rejected on the ground that "it was too soon for such a step."

Instead, this "office" conference was held, with the "social Fascists" of yesterday and the liberals of today—but without the mases.

III. The strategy which grew out of this conference was purely legalistic and in fact opportunistic. They proposed to "fight" against the injunction by behaving like very good boys, and conducting their strike no differently than the AF of L, depending on legal arguments in the court-room, not mass pressure in the streets. They were violently opposed to action proposed by comrades for the purpose of bringing direct pressure on the company as a whole.

When Rubin says that the "bugaboo of the contempt of court order was waved in the faces of the strikers," he forgets to mention that the leadership of the union was the first to weaken and capitulate before this bugaboo.

IV. Why does Rubin cover up the real facts about the so-called "mass activity" and indulge in demagogic boasting about the effect of mass pressure on the injunction order? Only in order to contrast this "mass pressure," which did not exist, with the correct line developed by a number of comrades in the organization. These comrades took as their starting point the real nature of the cafeteria organization, the small number of workers per shop, and the small number of workers who were actually being drawn into the strike activities. Instead of a lot of wind about mass pressure, they proposed to exercise more concentrated pressure on the part of the limited number of strikers; particularly after their efforts to organize a real mass basis through a broad united front had been defeated by the sectarian line of the "office" conference.

Yet this same Rubin says, two sentences later, "The union is faced with certain peculiarities, as for instance, Foltis and its 19 stores employ 650 workers, spread from one corner of the city to another, and this requires very large forces to permit mass picket lines in front of the different stores. Though the need for mass action is very great, the distance between the stores make it **impossible** (my emphasis—J.G.) both financially and physically to carry on mass picket lines."

But what conclusion does he draw from these admitted facts? That the comrades just mentioned were right? No—that they were "renegade Trotsyites!" What a shameful contradiction!

Doesn't Rubin realize the difference between the textile industry and the food industry, especially its cafeteria branch, from the standpoint of mass participation? Has he nothing more concrete to propose than "to rally sufficient forces behind the Foltis-Fisher Workers?" Any child realizes that. What we want is to draw the specific lessons from the whole history of the strike, so as to avoid similar mistakes in the future.

1. We must drop the kind of so-called "Bolshevik self-criticism" which consists in covering up the mistakes of the leadership and blaming everything on the membership. On the contrary, criticism of the leadership will be needed and will prove healthy in the future. An open admission of the weaknesses and mistakes of the leadership will go far to regain the confidence of the membership.

2. By doing this, the leadership must once for all, learn that when it begins an organizational drive it must be carried through consistently and at all costs. The method of changing the leadership by decrees" has had much to do with the loss of confidence of which Rubin complains.

3. Opportunistic tactics must not be covered up by phrases about mass action, but must be exposed and eliminated.

4. A genuine united front conference must not be rejected in favor of fake "office" conference.

5. We must adopt the policy of dramatizing our strikes, as opposed to the AF of L method of conducting a strike.

6. The line of certain comrades in the union who have been accused of "favoring individual acts" was proven to be correct, when the bourgeois press was compelled to break its complete silence on the strike and thus bring the question home to all food workers, and especially the Foltis-Fisher cafeteria workers. This was a little late so far as this particular strike was concerned, but it shows the right road for the future.

7. In conclusion, we must expose and eliminate certain right-wing capitulatory policies of the FWIU and particularly the Cafeteria Department, in the last six months. They have completely abandoned the principles and rules of the union by accepting wage cuts as high as 40 to 50 percent without explanation to the members, and under the slogan of "save the shops" have compromised the principles of the union, in the following way. When the boss does not like a worker because he is a good union man, the worker is sacrificed, thrown out of his job, and so actually eliminated from the union. This has happened in so many cases that it is a genuine threat to the future of the union and to the confidence of the members in the union.

If these lessons are fully learned and properly applied, the union has before it a great future in the revolutionary trade union movement, but it cannot go on as it has done in the past without paying the heaviest penalties in loss of growth and influence. —J. G.

"Under the Leadership of General O'Ryan"

The logical consequence of the policy which led to the catastrophe in Germany by the rejection of the united front of workers organizations "under the leadership of Comrade Stalin" was poignantly depicted the other day. The official Communist party marched in the united front with Rabbi Wise and Judge Hofstaedter at the Jewish anti-Hitler protest—"under the leadership of General O'Ryan," so to speak . . .

The Designs Behind the Four Power Pact

Nazi-Fascist Diplomacy and the U.S.S.R.

About a year ago, comrade Trotsky wrote an article for the New York magazine, **The Forum,** under the heading "Hitler's Victory Means War Against the U. S. S. R." (The magazine itself entitled the article "I See War With Germany". It was reprinted in the **Militant** of July 16.—Ed.). This perspective has since been confirmed with surprising rapidity. To be sure, Hitler and Goering have declared that their struggle is directed against the enemy within their own country, and not against Russian Communism. But such declarations are very cheap. It is only necessary to recall that all the powers who participated in the World War assured each other up to the very last mmoent of their reciprocal friendship.

In reality, the world bourgeoisie is rather surprised by the facility and the lack of danger with which Hitler has succeeded in his task, that of clubbing down the working class for the bourgeoisie. And it is drawing the consequences therefrom. Up to the present, the world powers have been against German armaments, since they did not have any confidence in the "authoritarian governments" which did not possess any authority. They had no way of knowing whether the conquerors of Bonapartism would be the proletariat or not and whether the armaments granted to Germany would not be directed against the world bourgeoisie itself. On the other hand, they did not stake too much on Hitler, since the eventual outcome of the Fascist crusade against the working class and likewise uncertain. At present, however, the question has been decided. The counter-revolution has been victorious. It is possible to do business with it, without taking too much of a risk. The stocks of the armament industry are climbing to the skies. MacDonald visits Mussolini. The latter pulls a ready-made "peace pact" out of his pocket. In Germany, the first armored cruisers—approved at the time by the late S. P. G.—are leaving their docks. Only the Soviet politicians remain blind to all these coincidences. Thus Voroshilov declares in salutary address to the Red Army on its 15th anniversary: in the West the Soviet Union is guarded by the non-aggression pacts, dangers threatens only from the East. Thus also, **Pravda** recently declared itself satisfied with Hitler's hypocritical declaration with regard to his foreign policy.

What position does the Soviet Union take in general on the victory of the Fascist counter-revolution? We quote from the **Pravda:**

"What is to follow? All the problems, which in the course of the last few months were posed so ominously before German capitalism, stand with the same force before the government of the Fascist dictatorship as well. Never in the post-war years has Germany been in such a weakened external political situation. In contradistinction to Italian Fascism, German Fascism came into power under the conditions of the conclusion of relative stabilization and the entrance of capitalism into its second chapter of revolutions and wars. A number of countries are taking measures for the weakening of the external political and economic position of Germany and for the limitation of German exports. The German mark is hanging on by a hair. The policy of the government is driving the country toward inflation. Prices for commodities of mass demand are mounting. Unemployment is not decreasing. The struggle between the National Socialists and the Nationalists is developing. The whole humdrum about the 'national revolution' is calculated to veil the impotence of the government when it comes to solving the 'cursed problems' of German capitalism. The Fascist government does not even indicate a trace of a positive program. It is impossible to deceive classes. Lies and demagogy cannot be converted into bread for the hungry. The clique of the capitalist magnates is again turning toward the social democracy which is to help Fascism in continuing the deception of the masses. The social democratic leaders are preparing to supplement the Fascist terror with the deception of the masses. But neither the Fascist terror, nor the treacherous maneuvers of the social democratic leaders are capable of restraining the rising wave of revolution in Germany.

"The tremendous success of the Communist Party of Germany in its Bolshevik tactic lies in this: that it understood, in face of the terror, the provocations and the base betrayal of the social democratic leaders, how to lead its forces out of the firing line, how to retain its cadres and how to continue the struggle under new conditions.

"The ruling classes have gone mad. Their doings are turning everything in Germany on its head. They are completely denuding themselves, they are exposing before the broad masses the whole mechanism of Fascist domination. Thereby they are conducting millions of new fighters into the camp of revolution."

The theory of socialism in one country has built, in the minds of the Stalinist theoreticians, a fence around every nation, which it cannot trespass. It does not occur to these people at all that the Fascists cannot possibly wait until they are smothered within their own national framework, but will have to resort to the means of war, and war against the U. S. S. R. at that. It is hard to believe that the Stalinists are really so blind; in all probability they do not even **want** to see where they have landed with their theory. They are sitting at the wheel of an auto which is racing down a precipice at top speed, but they close their eyes and tell themselves that the road leads to the main thoroughfare.

Hitler, however, and all the other imperialist powers are forced to conduct war. The rise in the conjuncture has not arrived. The internal contradictions and the contradictions between the powers themselves are becoming sharper with every new day. These contradictions must be brought out into the open. There is only one opponent which tightly interwoven international finance capitalism can come to an agreement to destroy—that is the Soviet Union. There are already in circulation, in the boudoirs of the diplomats, the secret maps which pass from hand to hand, and upon which are inscribed the new boundaries in the East. It is a matter of dividing a sixth of the earth and the their appetite is tremendous.

First of all, article 5 of the treaty draft (of Mussolini) provides that the four powers—to which Poland, the Little Entente, Japan in the East and America, as protector of the whole project may join—attempt to follow a common line outside of Europe and in colonial affairs. Against whom? Such a European alliance can very well be directed also against the U. S. A. But all these states are dependent upon America, and Roosevelt, who feels the point of this alliance pressing up against himself, will attempt with all the greater energy to turn the whole alliance against the U. S. S. R. Europe will obey, that is indisputable. Furthermore, the American bankers are naturally counting upon culling great riches from such a war, since the American armament industry will be in a position to fill the orders of the whole world.

The powers, England, France, Germany and Italy are guaranteeing European peace. But who is it that threatens this peace? The Soviet Union does not even begin to think of starting a war All the worse for her. The German Communists, too, did not think of beginning the civil war, that is why the blow caught them unprepared. It is not our business to worry about who will next "put fire to some Reichstag". We can leave this to the Fascists. It will, indeed, be all the worse for the unsuspecting Soviet politicians when blow after blow rains down upon them unexpectedly. In the Far East, Japan is only waiting for a chance to grab for itself Vladivostok and Chinese Eastern Railway. At Japan's back there is, to be sure, a China. But this China is sick from the effects of the criminal Stalinist policies of the last seven years and is for the moment not to be reckoned with as a point of support for the Soviet Union. And in the West, Hitler is marching as the super-Wrangel and at his side, Mussolini, Pilsudski, Horthy and all the bigger butchers of dying capitalism. Capitalism is once more drawing up to its full height in order to smite the young world of socialism—which does, to be sure, bear within its body the English sickness of Stalinism—and in order to rejuvenate itself in the blood of this young world. Here, too, the Stalinists have squandered all their reserves. The Communist parties of Western Europe have been laid in ruins by ten years of Stalinist policy in the Comintern.

The perspective is rather unfavorable, especially when we take into account the crisis in the Soviet Union as the most significant factor accelerating counter-revolution.

And yet, in such a war are latent tremendous, incalculable possibilities for the world revolution. On August 4, 1914 the Second International collapsed and on October 26, 1917 the Third began to unfold its power over one-sixth of the earth. The coming war will bring in its trail a complete dissolution of the state households of all the participating countries, will call forth a famine against which the misery of the last war will appear pale. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat will be able to lead the masses out of this misery.

Today it is necessary to call attention to the acute war danger and to mobilize the forces of the proletariat against the war. That can only be done by leading the proletariat in every one of the participating countries in the class struggle against its own bourgeoisie. —H. E.

(From **Unser Wort,** organ of the German Left Opposition).

SCOTSB'RO

(Continued from page 1)

When the news that the president had refused to see the delegation reached the ears of the workers assembled outside the White House, a concerted boo echoed and reechoed throughout the entire Capital grounds. The bill was then presented to Speaker of the House, Rainey, to Vice-President Garner and to the Negro congressman from Illinois, De Priest. These gentry of the Negro and White ruling class demagogically and cynically promised to give the bill its "due" attention. As the marchers were awaiting the answer of the president the police initiated a novel method of provocation by scurrying up and down the line on their motorcycles creating a raucous din and emitting volley after volley of carbon monoxide. But the provocation proved futile.

The marchers then assembled at a near-by park where they were addressed by William Patterson, of the L. I. D.; James W. Ford, Negro candidate for vice-president on the Communist party's ticket; Mother Wright, Ruby Bates, former star witness for the prosecution and now chief witness for the defense; and Clarence Hathaway who spoke in the name of the Communist Party. Patterson stressed the new keynote of the campaign to free the Scottsboro boys when he reiterated what the **Militant** had all along demanded, namely: "that no attorney or amount of attorneys will set these boys free—only mass struggle can accomplish that."

It was unfortunate that the United Front was not as broad as it should have been. But here the blame rests squarely with the leaders of the socialist party who have consistently sabotaged every attempt at a United Front offered them. The only two political organiations represented on the march outside of the Communist party, was the CPLA (Muste group) and the Opposition. The CPLA just thrived in the reflected glory of participating in an action with Communists.

As for the political aspects of the demonstration, they will be dealt with in a future issue.

GLEE-ROSS

Young Workers Revolt Against "New Deal"

Working Class youth which entered the forestry conservation corps, deceived by the Roosevelt "new deal" propoganda, is in revolt.

Already 371 of the Camp Dix contingent of 1,407 have quit. Forty-five of these are charged with inciting a revolt and 141 refused to take the special oath for forestry service. The rest left because of illness and discontent.

There is increasing reluctance among workingclass youth to further enlist in these thinly disguised concentration camps. In Nassau County only 213 of the alloted 805 jobs have been taken.

SUB DRIVE

Because of the lack of space in last week's two-pager we were unable to report the progress on the sub drive that has been made. Several comrades have got off to a flying start. Here is the standing so far:

V. Dunne	4
H. Oehler	3
K. Czapko	3
D. Marcus	2
M. Morris	1
H. Newby	1
J. Angelo	1
A. Konikow	1

A heartening sign is the appearance of a number of new names. We hope it will continue . The heavy hitting is coming from Minneapolis and the coal fields: Dunne and Oehler. Comrade Czapko's work is done in and around the steel regions of Bethelhem.

To remind everyone about the drive we repeat: the drive runs to June 1; the unit of scoring is a sub irrespective of its length; to the comrade who stands first in the list goes a complete set of the three volumes of comrade Trotsky's History of the Russian Revolutiin; to the comrade who stands second, a bound volume of the **Militant,** either format, that is, the first issues up to the summer of 1931 (old format), or the issues from the summer of 1931 to the end of 1932 (new format.)

"COUNTER REVOLUTIONARY"!

The following is a letter we have received from the Canadian government, Customs and Excise Division of the National Revenue Department:

Port of Toronto,
March 20th, 1933.

Mr. J. Stewart,
37 Orange Ave.,
Toronto, Canada.
Sir:

Relative to your importation of pamphlets entitled, "In Defense of the Russian Revolution", entered in the Customs Postal Branch of this Port under manifest Nos. 190213 and 192161.

The Commissoner of Customs, Ottawa, has refused permission for these publications to enter Canada, but advises that same may be returned to sender upon payment of return postage charges amounting to $0.34 by you.

Should you fail to arrange for the return of the parcels within ten days from the date of this letter the importation will be seized in accordance with the regulations of the Canadian Customs Tariff.

J. H. BERTRAM,
COLLECTOR OF NATIONAL REVENUE

Comment on this letter is superfluous. This is the fourth or fifth pamphlet of the Left Opposition banned from Canada by the authorities. We recommend to the Stalinists to give this incident a little thought and to figure out just how their designation of us as counter-revolutionists and renegades jibes with these actions of the Canadian government. It appears to us that

Congress Sidelights

Political Notes on Incidents at the Chicago Sessions

(Continued from Page 1)

Muste was the Stalinists' "best bet" for a front because the club he held, for bargaining was none too big. Sad to say for the Stalinists, every time the delegates from the Progressive Miners were put on committees, they were able to exert such great pressure, due to the masses they represented, that they more than once upset the well laid plans of Stalinism and were a great factor in helping keep the Mooney Conference on the path of workers' democracy on the path of the correct united front, in general, helped keep the Stalinists within "civilized" bounds and helped round out a policy in order to build a powerful movement on this start. More power to the Left wing of the Progressive Miners of America.

Until the afternoon of the third day the conference was, in the main, just one long mass meeting. In fact, the Stalinists intended to call off the third-day session to enable them to carry on two days of mass meeings, to wind up with the big May Day Stadium mass meeting and end up the conference by passing a manifesto bursting with propoganda but void of a concrete program of action. At the end of the first day the mass protest of the delegates promoted the change in plans, caused the Stalinists to retreat, continue with a three-day session. On the second day, they forced the election of a Resolutions Committee, a committee the party "forgot about" while they kept everybody entertained with propoganda speeches but nothing substantial on policy and program. Instead of reporting at the beginning of the conference on policy and program, the delegates of the conference had to fight the Stalinists up to the afternoon of the last session before a report on resolutions and policy was given, and then the half day that was left was to be used by the more than fifteen hundred delegates to discuss the program.

The United Front

A big sign in the hall said: "Only a united front of the workers will free Tom Mooney." One could excuse such a slogan from a party that practiced a united front for years but one cannot excuse such a slogan issued by Stalinism. Within it, can be concealed the united front from below. There can be no united front between workers. There can be a united front only of **workers'** organizations.

Scott and Goldman

Scott, representative of the Molders Defense Committee said he wanted to safeguard the conference from communist control. This went over big with the anti communist elemet. This position has nothing in common with the anti-Stalinist position of the Left Opposition.

Goldman, a delegate from Chicago, pointed out that the conference was a good start but too narrow, saying that over 75 percent was Left wing workers. Scott, who repied to Goldman's criticism on this and many other points made a poor job of it. He said on this point that Goldman objects to having a conference with 75 percent Left wingers. Goldman had pointed out that 75 percent of the conference was Left wing in order to show that we have been able to bring the Left wing element together in a united front but that we must now build up and around this Left wing a broad layer of other American workers.

Some members of the committee and most Stalinists cannot distinguish positive from destructive criticism.

The fact, that after four years of the crisis the American workers organized the largest, most representative united front—not on unemployment; not on social insurance; not on the six hour day and no reduction in pay struggle; not on a fight against wage cuts; but on a question of freeing a framed-up class-war prisoner, the most elementary working class demand possible, proves that the failure to build the movement cannot be attributed to objective conditions, which are in our favor. It proves that there is something rotten in our own ranks.

We expect nothing but betrayals from the reformists and reactionary labor leaders. The key to the situation, therefore, is in the hands of the Communist Party. But the party is in the hands of Stalinism and this revisionism of the program on basic international questions and tactics that flow from this is the determining factor in this glaring contradiction between favorable conditions and the Communist Party's present position in the American class struggle.

Political Forces

Without a doubt, the two main political forces of the conference were the Stalinists and the Left Opposition. The Stalinists who have been exercising on us for the last several years up to a few months ago by kicking us out of conferences were forced to recognize us officially. The presiding committee was forced to nominate us for the Resolutions Committee. We were elected to the Permanent National Committee. We compelled the adoption of some important points of our policy.

This was not due to any change of heart by the Stalinists. It was due to the fact that the Left Opposition had a mass pressure great enough, in relation to the pressure of the Stalinist forces, to demand recognition. The Left Opposition had delegates from bona fide trade unions, unemployment organizations, defense committees, etc., that could not be ignored without ignoring a decisive section of the conference itself. For example, to ignore the large delegation from the Progressive Miners of America would have to ignore the most important mass organization in the conference.

The Lovestone right wingers had a hard fight to obtain the right to the floor for even five minutes. Their floor tactics were terrible and their right wing policy was even worse. A clear line of difference on policy could be seen between them and the Left Opposition. The right wing had no pressure of importance relative to the pressure of the organized Stalinist caucus, while the Left Opposition had a pressure and policy that was able to make drastic inroads into the Stalinist original plans. On the other hand, with our pressure we were able to throw our force with the Stalinists on specific issues where they were in the main correct and thereby keep intact the unity of the conference as well as weaken the anti-communist tendencies of the conference that the Stalinist blunders helped free. This is the correct function in a united front.

The Resolution

In the past the Stalinists had to be criticised from the right, because their united front from below was an ultra-left deviation. In this conference, where the united front of organizations replaced the old formula, we had to fight them from the left, because they deviated to the right of the Leninist concept. In the main resolution, they had a sentence stating that there would be no attacks on organizations participating in the united front. This is a non-aggression pact, no matter how one tries to explain it away. One must not confuse two different kinds of atacks, slander and criticism of policy. We presented a minority report on the main resolution stating the following: "Each organization entering the united front obligates itself to discipline in action but retains its complete independence and its right of cri-

(Continued on Page 4)

NOW OFF THE PRESS!

The ONLY ROAD

By LEON TROTSKY

The Only Road follows out the line of thought advanced by Trotsky in What Next and applies it, in a brilliant Marxist analysis, to the situation in Germany as it developed up to the period immediately preceding Hitler's accession to power.

The Only Roard is an indispensable document for an understanding of the social forces at work in Europe. It throws the light of Marxist illumination on the roles of bourgeois democracy, Bonapartism and Fascism in the service of the capitalist repression of the working class.

It makes a damning indictment of the treacherous passivity of the social democracy which held back millions of workers from struggle against the advancing menace of Fascism. And it harshly condemns the criminal and capitulationist policies of the bureaucratic centrists in the Stalinist apparatus of the C. I. and the C. P. G.

Against these policies which, in their totality, betrayed the German working class to the butchery of Fascism is advanced the concrete analysis of the Left Opposition which, now, must assimilated be in order to lay the ground for the resurgence of the revolutionary movement.

100 Pages **25 Cents**

Postage: Six Cents Extra Per Copy

Pioneer Publishers

84 EAST 10th STREET **NEW YORK, N. Y.**

Collapse of C.P.G. and Our Tasks

(Continued From Last Issue)

But how can we build a new party in Germany without breaking with the Comintern, rejoin the ones who, despite all, would like to force the contradictions of the historic process into the framework of the constitution. We must say that this side of the question seems to us least important. Why, even at the time when we were excluded from the Comintern and declared ourselves a faction thereof, the matter of the constitution was not of highest standing. For us it is a question of a political course, and not of the bookkeeping. If any section of the Comintern will yet succeed in rebuilding itself on a healthy basis, we will, of course, lean on this position to hasten the rebuilding of the whole Comintern; then our relations with the constitution also will become much improved. If, however, the Stalinist bureaucracy will bring the USSR to ruin, then no one will recall the constitution—it will be necessary to build a Fourth International.

Let us however return to Germany. In the first days of March the German Communist Party still meant a centralized apparatus, tens of newspapers, thousands of units, tens of thousands of members, millions of votes. We declared ourselves a part of this party and by that took a responsibility for the party as a whole before the outside world; of course, not for the sake of the Stalinist apparatus but for the sake of the lower units connected with it. With their aid we hoped in time, that is, prior to a catastrophe, to renew the leadership of the party. Now, when the official apparatus, armored by ultimatism and illegality, must transform itself completely into a Stalinist agency, there can be no thought of influencing it through the lower strata from which it is completely cut off.

True, the Stalinist press of all the world talks of the "regeneration" of the German Communist Party underground (the illegal **Rote Fahne,** leaflets, etc., etc.) That the local organizations would start to stir after a temporary daze, was clear in advance. That the apparatus of such a large party, disposing of a numerous personnel and money, can issue illegally and semi-legally a considerable quantity of literature—there is nothing surprising in that. But we must repeat again: the German Communist Party has no illegal apparatus connected with the masses. What it has are the remains of the old organization which by the will of Hitler found themselves in an illegal state. This is not one and the same thing. If the German Communist Party is active today it is due to the fact that Hitler has just started his executioner's job and that the reaction has not penetrated deeply enough into the party. Both these processes however are on the order of the day. They will go parallel to each other, nourishing and accelerating each other.

For an illegal Communist party a special selection of people is necesary who understand the extent of the catastrophe and have a clear perspective and confidence in their banner. Such a selection can be made in no other way than on the basis of an irreconcilable criticism of the past. The collapse of the organization of the Stalinists, inevitable in itself, will release elements and clear the soil for the creation of an illegal revolutionary party.

But, one of the German comrades objects: **politically** the party is, of course, a corpse; **organizationally** it is alive." This formula reveals best of all the erroneousness of the position of my opponent. A party which is dead politically cannot have a "live" organization, since an organization is only a tool of policy. If however, the party is dead we must **make the diagnosis openly,** before the face of the workers, with all the necessary conclusions. What part of the old heritage will be transformed to the new party, what will be the forms of the transfer, what will be the stages in the development of the new party, what the relations between the builders and the remains of the old organization—all these are very important questions, which will have to be answered depending upon the development of the whole situation. But in order that the answer shall not be false, not illusory, we must start from what is irrevocably established by history: politically the Stalinist party is dead. Ambiguities and subterfuges are impermissible: they would only throw us off our own path.

"The Party Dead—The Organization Alive?"

The same comrade writes: "The slogan of **reform** is meaningless, as we do not know now what and how to reform; but we are also against the slogan of a **new party** since we do not consider that the fate of the old party is finally decided." One contradiction is piled on top of another, despite the fact that the writer is an observant and keen comrade. If the party is "politically dead," that means that its fate is decided. The apparatus will not resuscitate it: as testified by experience, an apparatus can kill the living but not resuscitate the dead. If the slogan of reform of the old party is "meaningless," then nothing remains but the slogan of a new party.

The opponents are mainly frightened by the relation of forces: we, Bolshevik-Leninists, declare as liquidated a big organization which is still capable today of issuing ten times as much literature and spend a thousand times more money than we, and yet, we "proclaim" a new party in the name of the small Left

New Party is Only Marxian Policy

Opposition. To pose the question in this manner is to be steeped through and through in apparatus fetishism. Today, as yesterday, our main task is to form cadres. But this is not merely an organizational problem, it is a political problem: cadres are formed on the basis of a definite perspective. To warm up again the slogan of party reform means to set knowingly a utopian aim and by that to push our own cadres toward new and ever sharper disappointments. With such a course the Left Opposition would only become the hanger-on of a decomposing party and wuld disappear from the scene together with it.

Agreeing with the fact that the old party is liquidated and even admitting in essence the inevitability of creating a new party, one of the opponents strives for delay, for a moratorium of a kind. His arguments are of the following nature: only 10 perlent of the party members, true, the most valuable ones, are critically incined and listen to us; the remaining 90 percent and mainly the new recruits, have not at all understood yet the mistakes of the party. From this, it follows, that we must explain to these 90 percent, step by step, what occurred and only after that, start to build a new party. This is an abstractly-propogandist, and not a political—or speaking philosophically: a rationalistic and not a dialectic—approach to the problem.

It would of course be splendid if we could place 90 percent of the young Communists into a big school and give them a full course of study. But alas, these 90 percent fell into the school of Hitler. Today already they are not only half-torn from the party but from politics in general. A part will go to Fascism, a more considerable part will become indifferent. These processes will develop within the next few weeks and months :counter-revolution, just as revolution, works fast. Under the influence of the decomposition of the party, the ebbing away of the masses, the political sterility of the apparatus—all the best elements of the old party will keep on asking themselves and others: what to do? In this situation, to provide them with the slogan of "reform" would simply mean to mock at them. In moments of greatest crisis we must proceed not from the quickly changing moods of the party mass, but from objective changes in the political situation. Many of those Communists who today are still afraid to break with their bureaucracy, will blame us tomorrow for deluding them, for keeping up the fiction of the old party; pushing off from us, they will go to the Brandlerites or to the anarchists. The Brandlerites, as is reported, are already calling for a new party: this shows that, although opportunists, they are politicians. If we, with our revolutionary platform, should prove ourselves doctrinaires, then opportunistic politicians will always succeed in pushing us aside.

What **practically speaking** will be our relations with the Stalinist organization in Germany in the next period? This question, naturally, interests the comrades most. Must we, ask our opponents, break with local organizations of the old party? No, that would be absurd. We must recruit the revolutionaries in all workers' organizations, and primarily in the units of the old party, insofar as they exist. When the Third International proclaimed the complete break with the Second this did not prevent the Communists from working for a considerable perid of time within the social democratic parties and even of conquering the majority of the French party together with **l'Humanite.** All the more so, our course towards a new party cannot and must not prevent our working in the units of the old party.

But, we hear the objection, the very slogan of a new party will antagonize against us the rank and file on this basis are possible: but we had also conflicts in the past despite the slogan of "reform." We need not doubt, however, that in the life of the active units of the old party much more space will be given to the relations with their own Central Committee than to the question of our new perspective. Here we may expect ever sharper conflicts. The Central Committee will defend Stalin and itself: therein lies its main objective. The worker Communists will demand honest answers and clear perspectives. While we stood on the position of reform, we did not advocate the breaking of discipline. Now the situation is radically changed. We will propose in the units the refusal to distribute worthless official literature, the boycott of the apparatus, the break with the C. E. C. It is understood that we will do all this tactfully and sensibly, considering the level of each unit and the circumstances. But our main line will be that of a new party. And we need not doubt that in spite of this line our relations with the revolutionary party units, in a new situation, in illegality, will be incomparably more friendly, than in the preceding period when we wanted to be only a faction.

We must not forget also that it is not a matter of the Communist party alone. The political collapse of the social democracy makes the appearance of a new "independent" party from its midst very probable. Can we suppose even for a moment that the Stalinist apparatus will be capable of attracting the left social democracy to its side, or even of influencing it in a revolutionary fashion? This is excluded beforehand. By their ultimatism, as well as by their whole past, which they do not want to and cannot renounce, the Stalinists will only slow up the development of the social democratic opposition, playing, in the service of Wels, the role of a garden scare-crow. From this point of view also, the perspective of a new party places itself imperatively on the order of the day.

No Illusions!

Behind the majority of political and logical objections, there really lurks an unexpressed sentimental consideration: the Stalinist apparatus is under the blows of Fascism, many devoted and unselfish comrades are trying with all their might to save the organization—is it permissible under such conditions to "discourage" the fighters? This argument can be best expressed by two lines from a verse of a Russian poet: "Elevating illusion is more precious to us than the darkness of bitter truth." But the philosophy of Pushkin is not the philosophy of Marxism. When, at the beginning of the century, we struggled against the petty bourgeois illusions and adventurism of the Social Revolutinaries, many good souls not only in the Narodnik camp, but even in our midst, indignantly broke with the Leninist **Iskra** which, you see, allowed itself to criticise terror unmercifullly at the time when the terrorists were perishing in the hangman's noose. We replied: the aim of our criticism consists precisely in tearing away the revolutionary heroes from individual terrorism and in leading them to the road of mass struggle. The illegal apparatus, appended to Manuilsky-Stalin, can bring nothing to the German proletariat save new misfortunes. We must say this openly and without delay, in order to save hundreds and thousands of revolutionaries from a fruitless waste of their energies.

L. TROTSKY

Prinkipo, April 9,1933

Huan Ping Betrays Chinese Party; Chen Du Siu Fights Kuomintang in Jail

The letter printed below was recently sent us by one of our Chinese comrades. More extensive reports on events in the Far East, the comrade says in a note, are soon forthcoming. —Ed.

Shanghai, China

Dear Comrades:

I am sorry to tell you about the near collapse of the Stalinist Party. Three months ago there was a great change in the Communist movement. Many faithful and important Stalinists are now registered in the Kuo Min Tang party. According to custom, when a renegade takes the step, he must register at the "Department of USSR Return Students, Registry of CEC of KMT Party." After registration they must officially publish a detailed account as to why and how they became renegades. These renegades all formerly belonged to the CEC of the CP.

The first brave renegade is Hwang-Pin. He was a member of Political Bureau of the Party. He went voluntarily to Nanking. When he registered, the Party not only did not know anything about his action but urged the workers to collect money for the support of his family and asked the "Human Rights Defense League" under the leadership of Mme. Sun Yet-Sen, to do something for him, that is to get his release. (But Hwang took a hundred thousand dollars from the KMT.) The Party also told the workingmen that "revolution ary" Hwang will be executed by the KMT. But only three days after our "revolutionary" Hwang dispatched a very brave article, "My Political Creed" to the Chinese press in which he tells us that according to his 15 years of revolutionary experience, the Communist movement has nothing to do with the national salvation that it rather forces upon China more colonization. The Chinese Communists, he says, take the roubles from USSR and spend it for themselves. "They have common ownership for women members." In conclusion he tells us that the only road to life is under the banner of KMT's **three principles!**

The same article is also signed by other Stalinists. One is the Chief of the Organization Committee of Y.C.L. and another is a member of the CEC and member of Red Trade Union International, his name is Yue-Fee.

Dear Comrades, these gentlemen were all well known pioneers of the **Anti "Counter-Revolutionary" Trotskist Struggle.**

After these renegades deserted, many party branches and cells through China were destroyed by the KMT and many revolutionists were arrested.

As to our Left Opposition since the "Old Man" (Chen Du-Siu) was arrested, no one cell has been destoyed by KMT. Our organization is strong and our comrades are faithful.

A very valuable bit of news is known about the "Old Man"; He was arrested about a half year ago and will stand trial in April. He has written a "defense" pleadnot guilty. This "defense" yesterday was sent here by his lawyer. Here in brief, are the details, as follows:

1) It is a classical type. This type is just the same as his "Declaration of Revolutionary Literature ten years ago. This Declaration marked a new period for Chinese life. 1925-27 revolution is its product.

2) Comrade Chen tells us why he transformed the literary revolution into the political revolution and why he became a Communist.

3) There follows, in detail, the aims of Communist Society.

4) The Communist party's new tactirs, follows the "Draft Pro gram" of L. D.

5) A condemnation of the KMT. "From the bourgeois point of view the meaning of nation contains 3 elements—but now the KM has cruelly beaten the people," handed over Manchuria to Japanese Imperi alism. In short, the KMT desn't really know its master—International Imperialism.

6) So he is not a traitor. For he did not sell his nation but rather worked to save the nation of oppressed people. Today the KMT doesn't command the army to fight against Japanese Imperialism but concentrates at Kiangsi to fight against the Red Army whose aim is to free China from the hand of international imperialism.

7) He is not guilty. His guilt is fighting against the KMT which now prepares to sell China to the Japanese and other Imperialists.

We are collecting money to publish this "Defense" and will translate it into German, English, etc. It can prove our "Trotskists" are quite different from the Stalinists. Though we are in prison we fight the KMT; but Stalinists capitulate to the KMT when free.

Comrades! tell this news to American workers.

HC

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

Lack of space and a delay in the mails have forced us to relegate several important documents on the Chicago congress to the next issue. Among these are the main resolution, and the motions and amendments presented by the delegation of the Left Opposition; supplementary notes by comrade Glotzer and an analytical article by comrade Cannon. In the ext issue also, the discussion on the new tasks in Germany, opened up by the article of comrade Trotsky, will be continued. Including among other things, a recent resolution of the N. E. C. of the German Opposition. An additional feature will be the Declaration of the International Left Opposition to the Anti-Fascist Congress, to be held in Copenhagen the coming month. A review and analysis of the reformist "Continental Congress" at Washington has also been withheld for lack of space, until nert week.

Chicago Symposium

(Continued from Page 1)

Opposition is in itself a tribute to the Left Opposition's great historic role in the struggle for united working class action as well as to its growing strength and influence.

Comrade Albert Glotzer, of the National Executive Committee, will represent the **Communist League (Left Opposition); Herbert Zam,** the **Communist Party-Opposition (Lovestonites); John Williamson,** Organizational Secretary of District 8, the **Communist Party, U. S. A.;** and **Hyman Scheid, socialist party.** The time: **Friday, May 19, at 8 p.m.** The place: **3322 W. Douglas Blvd.,** Chicago. Admission is 15 cents. The symposium is to be held under the auspices of the 6th Congressional District of the Socialist party.

Chicago workers, attend en masse.

Now on Sale on the Newsstands—25c a Copy

The MODERN MONTHLY

May, 1933 Issue

— CONTENTS —

"My Country 'Tis of Thee" (Cartoon)—Charles Pollock

A Southern Golgotha Hank Fuller

Nicholas Murray Butler: The Open Mind of Morningside McAlister Coleman

Scaffolding (Poem) Mary Lapsley

Excommunications and Exorcism as Critical Methods Max Eastman

Buffoloes, Moose and Babbitts Charles Ferguson

Barter: An Adventure in Stone Age Finance George Britt

Variations on a Baedecker (Poem)—Stanley Burnshaw

The Catholic Church and the Labor Movement David J. Saposs

It Fell Upon an Afternoon (Short Story)—Edwin Seaver

Student Forum

The Theatre

The Literary Front

The Literary Caravan

Reviews by Sidney Hook, Dale Warren, Benjamin Mandel, Will Herberg, Michael Blankfort.

Subscriptions: $2.50 per year $1.25 6 mos.

The MODERN MONTHLY Box 97, Sta. D, New York, N. Y.

Labor Writhes Under Nazi Whip

Only seven weeks were required for the German counter-revolution to complete its first stage. The Hitler government emerged on January 30. At its pompous session in Potsdam on March 21, the Reichstag sealed the fate of parliamentary democracy and conferred full power upon the government. That period decided for the time being the issue of Communism or Fascism in Germany. With that commences an entirely new historical period for the working class which will have its serious repercussions throughout the world. The German workers retreated without a struggle. The Communist party leaders were revealed as the organizers of defeat. Fascism remained the victor and has now been able to consolidate a virtual dictatorship.

But the Stalinist leaders continue in their previous course. In a manifesto issued from their place of refuge, dated March 15, it is said that: "Our party has fought in brilliant fashion.... Despite the pompous declarations of the government, March 5 is not a victory for Fascism, it shows on the contrary that the masses of the toiling people are resolved to wage the struggle ,boldly and courageously." And from the Stalinist headquarters it is maintained in Pravda of March 6: "The working masses of Germany cannot be intimidated either by provocation or slander. They are on the side of the Communist party and under its leadership will put an end to the Fascist regime."

It is necessary to make a correction here. The working masses were prevented from being on the side of the Communist party by the fatal policy of its leadership. And it is well to add that the new tasks in Germany will belong to the new Communist party which in no case will be organized by the Stalinists.

For the moment the sad truth must be recognized. It was the empty boastful phrases of Stalinism which contributed so much to render the party impotent of leadership. They have nothing to do with a Marxian analysis because they are not based upon reality and can result only in adding further confusion to the demoralization created by the serious defeat suffered. Above all, they do not correspond with the complete failure of resistance.

Parliamentary democracy took leave in a blaze of torchlights, ac-

Fascists Attack in the Guise of «Defense»

companied by the roar of guns and ringing of churchbells, blessed by the sermon in the Potsdam church over the text: "If god be with us (the Fascists) who can be against us." And the god who is always on the side of the strong bayonets found his rightful place in Fascist Germany. Hitler also fitted himself into this general setting and made a venture into the stratosphere by dedicating his address to the people "on the elevation of the soul." Now he will proceed the more ferociously on terra firma, in destroying the only progressive class and exterminating its organizations. He has already opened a number of concentration camps in which the most active Communist fighters and social democrats are to be interned and kept under the Fascist lash. One of these camps is located at Dachau near Munich. It has "accomodations" for 5,000. The other is located at Heuberg in Wurtemberg. While the activities took place in Potsdam, 400 Communist prisoners were on their way to the latter camp.

Fascist Strategy in Name of "Defense"

Chronologically one can trace the sweeping rapidity of the Fascist rise to the full fledged dictatorship and to the just as rapid, disorganized retreat of the Communist and social democratic movements. Its blunt strategy could become possible only in view of the failure of the proletarian leaders, Communists and Socialists alike. Their common failure prepared the road for Fascism. To recount this strategy has value not so much from the point of view of merely recording what has passed, but primarily for the sake of assimilating the lessons of these events for the future tasks.

As soon as Hitler and his lieutenants entered the government they set as their first aim the control of the police, not for the national coalition, but for the Fascists themselves. This they accomplished in the name of the defense and security of the people, strange as it may seem. Having the affairs of the interior regime of Prussia well guarded in the hands of Goering, they proceeded to appoint police commissioners for the other states, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, etc. These were not just mere chiefs of police but fully authorized commissioners whose powers were symbolized by the act of von Epp, commissioner for Bavaria, in appointing a new government for the state. Elsewhere within the various states and cities followed in rapid succession the removal of the elected governments, legislators, mayors and even regular functionaries and hired emlpoyees who did not swear to the Fascist colors. At first it took place by the more polite method of granting leaves of absence but later the victims were violently chased out. All were replaced by Fascists. Step by step with these inroads grew the suppression and complete proscription of the workers' press, their meetings and their organizations.

The Communist press and even the Socialist press formerly counting of 192 papers is entirely proscribed. The Communist auxiliaries, the Reichsbanner and other socialist organizations are dissolved and prohibited. These actions were supplemented right along with the necessary emergency decrees. But in all of these the Fascists had fully learned the art of taking the measures in the name of the defense and security of the people. The Fascist strategy managed to put the working class organizations in the position of being the offenders—the terrorist monster against which they were defending the people The workers who had cause to speak in the name of, and to take measures for, their own defense, and thereby the defense of the majority of the people, failed to do so. To put it more correctly, their parties to which they had given all their confidence—their workers' parties and more particularly their party leaders—failed to give such leadership, failed to give any leadership at all. The Fascist strategy, although crudely and clumsily carried out nevertheless became superior. The working class' lack of strategy, and where any was shown, its false strategy, hastened the defeat.

To fully comprehend the enormous chasm presented here it is necessary to make a historical comparison with the process of the Bolshevik revolution under Lenin and Trotsky. For example, at the time of the attempted Kornilov counter-revolution, the Bolsheviks mobilized the weight of the masses and through their deep antagonism to the Kornilovists impelled the Mensheviks to fight unitedly with them under the slogan of the defense of the people's revolution. Also, at the time of the Kerensky attempt to strip Petrograd of its revolutinary soldiers, the Bolsheviks frustrated it under the slogan of the "defense of the revolutionary capital." The subsequent breach with the army headquarter was made in the name of "defense of revolutionary order against counter-revolutionary attempt." And again, up until the very last days before the insurrection, the heavy attacks were made in the name of defense under the immediate leadership of formally established "Defense Committees." The Red Guard was organized and as late as October 22 defined to be: "An organization of the armed forces of the proletariat for the struggle against counter-revolution and the defense of the conquests of the revolution." No class-conscious worker will today deny the historical right and correctness as well as effectiveness of the Bolshevik strategy carried on in the name of defense. Yet these lessons have already been lost to the proletariat. Its leaders falsified the lessons of October.

—ARNE SWADECK

(Continued in the next issue)

Archio-Marxists Wage Independent Struggle in Elections in Greece

The events that took place during the last 12 months in Greece proved the correctness of the thesis of the first convention of the Greek Left Opposition which convened in March, 1932. The numerous strikes of May and June 1932 coupled with many peasant uprisings in almost every part of Grece and especially the General Strike in Athens and Piraeus showed that the revolutionary movement could have gained many victories once the activities of the working class were directed by genuine Workers' Councils supplemented by the peasants' committees. The Stalinists sabotaged this concrete proposal of the L. O. and the heroic struggles of the Greek proletariat were not guided by a central body of action. Also the peasant uprisings were drowned in blood because they were spontaneous and left without direction.

The high priests of Stalinism were unable to apply this method of action because of the contradiction with the famous "united front from below." The catastrophic results of this criminal policy created confusion among the workers engaged in the General Strike. The reformists were able to strengthen their position as a result of the Stalinist stupidities and the only section that kept high the banner of Communism was the Left Opposition. Despite the heavy sacrifices of the Opposition, including the death of Comrade Adamopoulos in the picket line, our comrades were unable to overcome the treachery of the reformists (whom the Stalinists assisted to a great extent by their "Social-Fascism" theory) in smashing their reluctance to fight when they saw clearly that the Strike was spreading to other cities of Greece and assuming an acute revolutionary character. Women and children joined their fathers and husbands on the picket line.

Stalinism in Greece, as in every other country where it is confronted with an actual struggle, succeeds only in one point, that is, in disgracing the name of Communism. Every action of the Stalinists shows this very clearly. The aim of the Left Opposition is one of defending the banner of Communism which centrism soils.

While Stalinism allies itself with every kind of petty-bourgeois element under the banner of the Workers' and Farmers' bloc, it refuses not only co-operation but even support to the Bolshevik-Leninists. It even resorts to physical violence to avoid co-operation of the Archio-Marxists with the party; it does not let them approach the masses near the party and never gives them the opportunity to speak. But while this policy is able quite often to stifle the voice of small Oppositional groups, it is unable to stifle the voice of the Archio-Marxists. The Greek Opposition has outstripped long ago the stage of a mere Opposition and is transformed into a positive Communist force and in a section of the working class is considered as the only guarantee of the revolution.

These conditions imposed upon our Greek comrades the duty of directly approaching the masses which Stalinism disappoints and which become passively inclined, giving an easy victory to the reactionaries. These duties our comrades understand very well and as a first step they decided to put up 5 independent candidates during the elections of last March 5, at the same time agitating for the other candidates of the party.

By running their candidates our comrades did not expect any tremendous victories. On the contrary, as Marxists they explained to the thousands of workers that gathered at their election rallies why they ran their candidates and what they could expect from the elections. Also they carried long articles in their daily paper **Pali Ton Taxeon** explaining in detail this important turn in policy.

First of all, they explained that they did not expect to get thousands of votes. For the two candidates of Athens, comrades George Vitsoris and Charalambos Alexopoulos, they expected 500 votes. For the Salonica candidates, comrades Alex is Sakkos and John Kefalas, 400. For the candidate of Oetylou, comrade Petro Androni 100. These expectations were realized with the exception of Salonica, where the reaction, attacked the Labor Centre, killed seven workers and wounded 105, confiscated the registration book of the workers and thus prevented them from voting. Comrade Androni was arrested during his election campaign and was beaten into unconsciousness.

The Archio-Marxists ran their five candidates primarily because the Stalinists did not run on a **Communist** ticket and, what is more important, in order to speak to the masses and prove that Communism is not responsible for the crimes of Stalinism.

The thousands of Stalinist votes are not a genuine proof that they are able to mobilize all these voters. On the contrary, they are platonic gestures of numerous petty-bourgeois and newly radicalized workers. The Stalinists, as usurpers of the October revolution, are able to get thousands of votes as official representatives of the Soviet Union.

In view of these favorable conditions of Stalinism, every vote of our comrades is a genuine vote for Communism. All the influence of Stalinism will be transferred to the Archio-Marxists once they succeed in sweeping Stalinism aside and building the United Communist Party. The most powerful struggle between Stalinism and Bolshevism is taking place at present in Greece and its development is earnestly followed by those who wish to see the rising of Bolshevism and the extermination of Stalinism as a prerequisite for the extension of the October Revolution. This struggle is not going to be confined only to the balot box but will extend to the broader arena of the daily class struggle. The financial disadvantages of the Left Opposition will be overcome. Money and whatever it can procure are not the decisive factors of the class struggle.

The **Daily Worker** of May 8 boasts about the gains of the "Red Opposition" in Salonica. Although we lack detailed information about recent election, we are in a position to state that the Stalinists in Salonica **always** were able to muster a majority on account of the support they get from the "Spartacus group" (a Left Opposition tendency).

But the **Daily Worker** fails to mention that on February 16, the Labor Center of Salonica was attacked by the police and soldiers of the Military Garrison and that the local Archio-Marxists were involved in the clash with them and 7 killed and 105 wounded. With the Left Opposition handicapped by such heavy casualties it is not surprising that in a small Union the Stalinists were able to muster a majority.

The Archio-Marxists have already made headway in the heavy task of creating a United Communist movement by sweeping aside the Stalinists. The very boastings of the Stalinists prove that the blows of the Greek Opposition are becoming effective. The development of the struggle will be reported regularly in the columns of the **Militant.**

A. CALDIS.

National Mooney Meet Prepares Broad Fight

Congress Elects National Council of Action; Left Opposition Among Many Groups Represented

(Continued from Page 1)

the Left Opp., Comrade Cannon declared: The Opposition does not consider the present congress as the culmination of the movement to free Tom Mooney, but rather as the beginning of the struggle, the basis upon which to broaden the entire movement. He proposed to begin a new series of local and district united front conferences mobilizing ever-broader sections of the working class, drawing in new forces into the united front, and preparing for a national and international Mooney Day. All this work, Cannon stated, must lead to the organization of another national congress with a goal of at least 10,000 delegates. "The policy for all this work," said Cannon, "which shall govern the activity of the leading committee on a national scale and all the local organizations is the policy of the united front of workers' organizations." He closed with the declaration that the Left Opposition would present motions on program and policy and along this line to the resalution committee. It was only following the speech of comrade Cannon that efforts were made by other speakers to touch upon the subject of policy and program.

With the first session drawing to a close, Muste in reporting for the presiding committee made the preposterous proposal to conclude the congress on th afternoon of the second day in order to bring the congress to a fitting climax with the Mooney Mass Meeting scheduled for six o'clock in the evening, at the Chicago Stadium. This proposal took the congress by surprise. The congress had no sooner settled down when this proposal for adjournment was made. Herbert Zam, the delegate of the Communist Party (Opposition) rose immediately on the floor to object to the proposal of the presiding committee. He was followed by a representative of the Proletarian party. An obvious confusion existed among all delegates, who found it difficult to understand the nature of this proposal. In speaking of this proposal, comrade Glotzer stated for the Left Opposition, that the most important task of the congress, policy and program, was still to be reported upon and discussed. He pointed out that until then the congress had merely reviewed the Mooney case; but it had not even elected a resolutions committee (scheduled for the next day) nor begun the decisive work for which the congress was called. Considerations of a financial character or the desire to bring the congress to a fitting climax could never outweigh the importance of the deliberations of the congress itself. Throughout the hall delegates rose in objection to the proposal of the committee. A motion was made to table the proposal until the following day. In observation of the mood of the delegates, the presiding committee accepted this substitute.

Election of Resolutions Committee

The second day of the congress opened with Wm. Leader in the chair. Discussion continued on the report of comrade Minor, while awaiting the proposal of the presiding committee for the Resolutions Committee. This committee was the most important of the congress. It had to take up the question of policy and program and report back to the congress floor. The committee was composed of delegates the Proletarian party, A. F. of L. locals, the socialist party, the YPSL, the YCL, the TUUL, the Communist party, other Mooney local conferences, and the Left Opposition (comrade Cannon.) The selection of comrade Cannon was more the result of pressure by certain delegations, rather than by the presiding committee in which the party had the majority. The proposal to add Zam to this committee, to represent the Right Opposition was defeated by the overwhelming Party vote. At the conclusion of this point, the resolutions committee went into session and the discussion of Minor's report continued.

Before the closing of the second day of the congress, it was decided to continue the congress on the third day as originally scheduled. The proposal was made the night before for adjournment, stood out even more ridiculous, on the second day, when it became clear that even after the second day, the congress had not yet concerned itself with the question of policy and program, or with a report of the resolutions committee.

In behalf of the presiding Committee, Bill Gebert proposed to adjourn the congress in time to permit the delegates to attend the May Day demonstrations held by both the socialist party and the May Day United Front Committee (Left wing.) This proposal was unanimously accepted by the congress. All delegates were to be present at the Mooney Mass meeting in the evening.

The Third Day of the Congress

The congress reconvened on May 2nd, at the Masonic Auditorium, with Joe Weber, of the TUUL, acting as chairman. The resolutions committee which could not conclude its work remained in session while the congress continued the original discussion on the report of Minor. During this discussion comrade Alber Goldman, the Chicago Attorney for the International Labor Defense took the floor. He made two criticisms of the congress which were by and large correct. Goldman stated that in calling this congress the policy of the Molders Committee should have been directed to the organization of a joint arrangements committee representative of the socialist party, the A. F. of L., the Communist party, the TUUL, etc. Such a committee should have then called the conference into existence. While this policy was finally adopted, Goldman declared that it was adopted somewhat too late to be of real effectiveness.

His second criticism was on the manner in which the congress was conducted; referring to the abnormally long discussion of a purely agitational character and the failure of the congress to spend the major part of its time on the question of policy and program.

Scott rose to answer Goldman, but his reply did not meet the criticisms made. During the course of his answer Scott made clear to the delegates that he was not a member of the Commuist Party nor the International Labor Defense.

Among the following speakers were Gebert and Zam. In the course of his speech Gebert again raised the question of the united front from below. In this he only reechoed the remarks of Amter, who had stressed sharply this same policy before. Zam declared his opposition to linking the general struggle for workers' rights, or the Scottsboro case, with the fight for the release of Tom Mooney. Speaking in the name of the Communist party (Opposition) he informed the congress that it was their position, that the congress and its policy confine itself exclusively with the issue of Tom Mooney, without raising the other questions of workers' rights.

The Reports of the Resolutions Committee

Discussion on the report of Minor closed with the arrival of the resolutions committee, which remained in session during the first part of the last day of the congress. C. A. Hathaway reported for the resolutions committee. On a number of minor resolutions there was agreement, but in discussions of the main resolution different points of view were presented. He said that resolutions presented by the Lovestoneites and the Left Opposition were tabled. Differences existed on the main resolution over one particular point upon which there will be a minority report by comrade Cannon. The I. W. W. presented separate resolutions favoring a boycott of California products and the calling of a general strike in the event that Mooney is not freed or continues to remain in prison. The resolutions committee while not opposing these resolutions in principle proposed their non- adoption by the congress, because of their inapplicability at the present stage of development of the workers' movement in this country.

Returning to the resolution, Hathaway declared that a sharp difference existed between the majority of the Resolution which says in effect: that during the existence of the united front, there shall be no attacks by the participating organizations upon each other, so long as each loyally carried out the decisions of the congress. Hathaway attempted to convey the idea that this does not mean to liquidate the independence of the organizations involved, or abolish the freedom of criticism—though in reality it is precisely a weapon which the misleaders of labor are looking for. This was a concession to the leaders of the A. F. of L. and the socialist party to get them into the united front, Hathaway said. It was designed to prevent them from saying that they could not participate in the united front because they refused to be attacked by the Communists. It is to show the workers that everything possible is done to pave the way for the participation of their organizations.

In making the minority report, comrade Cannon called attention to the fact that the resolution of the Opposition was not tabled, but all of its points were incorporated in the main resolution reported on by Hathaway. When this was done it was not necessary to fight for the separate adoption of the proposals of the Left Opposition. "We are interested in the adoption of a correct policy," comrade Cannon said, "and if you will table all our proposals as you have this one, we shall not object."

Speaking for the Left Opposition, Cannon declared that aside from one clause, he supported the resolution which was in general correct. The amendment made by Cannon read as follows: "Each organization entering the united front obligates itself to discipline in action but retains its full independence and its right to criticism." This clause would permit of no misunderstandings by anyone participating in the united front. It is the only correct basis upon which the united front can be organized. To do otherwise is to tie the hands of the revolutionary elements, which could react favorably only to the reformists.

Toward the close of his minority report, comrade Cannon read from the **Daily Worker** of April 30, the declaration of the Communist International, revising again its position on the united front and calling for the resumption of the tactic of the "united front from below." As a parting question Cannon asked whether this meant that the Party would now change its position again and revert to its old policy. This change of line by the C. I. caught the Party unawares and in replying to a similar question put by comrade Gerry Allard, Hathaway replied that this did not mean a revision of the line, but applied only to the May Day demonstrations.

The conference adjourned to move to the People's Auditorium for the final session of the congress. Discussion followed upon reconvening. Roger Baldwin before leaving the congress made a statement in complete support of the majority of the resolutions committee. A similar declaration was made by Sol

Highlight of Meet -- Clash Between Stalinists and L.O. on 'Non Aggression' Clause of Main Resolution

Larks, recently expelled from the YPSL, because of his struggle in support of the Mooney Congress and the united front. Larks is one of the leaders of theLeft wing in the YPSL and the socialist party. He supported the position of the majority on the non-agression clause because in his opinion it would make possible further proposals for united front action to the socialists. Williamson speaking for the Party, made a vicious attack upon Goldman, Zam and Cannon. Coming when it did, the speech mocked the whole effort of the party to force through the non-agression pact.

Glotzer Replies to the Critics of the Minority Report

Comrade Glotzer was given the floor in defense of the minority report. He declared that the main tactic of this congress should be the extension of the united front policy. The correct utilization of the united front tactic would make possible the increase of pressure upon the reformists. Only by such pressure will it be possible to force the leaders of the A. F. of L. and the socialist party into united front action. To expect this in any other way, for example, by a non-aggression pact, was a mere illusion. Paul Mattick, representative for United Workers Party, spoke again against the non-agression pact and called for rank and file control of the united front. He declared himself against the resolutions on boycott and united front. He was followed by Hansen, a member of the IWW, representing the Kentucky Miners, who spoke in favor of the resolutions on boycott and general strike.

A motion was introduced to close the discussion. In view of the fact that many speakers had not yet had the opportunity to present their positions on the floor, protests came from all parts of the hall. Zam particularly protested this action. He pointed out that he made an amendment to the resolution; that the amendment had not been presented to the congress and that no one had had an opportunity to speak for it on the floor. A period of bedlam seized hold of the conference. During the confusion the motion carried and Hathaway proceeded to sum up his report and the discusion. During his summary speech, Zam again demanded to be given the floor to present his amendment and defend his position. At this point, Hathaway made the motion to give Zam five minutes to present his motion and to speak in defense of it. The motion carried.

The essence of the amendment by Zam, was designed to confine the Congress to the one issue of Tom Mooney and to leave the general question of the struggle for workers' rights out of the main resolution. In continuing his summary Hathaway attempted to cover the struggle of the Left Opposition for correct policy by asserting that the Left Opposition was only interested in presenting its political program at the congress. This remark made little or no impression—it was an attempt to declare the position of the party against the Left Opposition.

Voting on the Resolutions

An endeavor was made to vote on the main resolution first thus making it unnecessary to vote on the various amendments proposed. Such a motion was carried. Here, comrade Cannon took the floor to object to the procedure and proposed voting first of all upon the various amendments and then in the main resolution. In making his statement comrade Cannon declared that the delegation of the Left Opposition in voting for its own amendment (see above) would at the same time vote for the general resolution, excluding that section containing the non-aggression clause. This proposal was carried and the voting proceeded on the different amendments.

The amendment proposed by the Left Opposition received 63 votes. This was the **largest minority vote** in the congress. It showed too, that next to the party, the Left Opposition was the strongest political factor in the congress. The boycott resolution of the I. W. W. received 27 votes, and their general strike resolution 57 votes. The amendment propsed by Zam got 51 votes. Thus, the overwhelming majority of delegates voted in favor of the general resolution.

The final report of the congress was the election of a permanent rommittee. The Presiding Committee proposed a committee of 43. The name of the committee was adopted as the: National Mooney Council of Action. Additional nominations were made to this Committee. Among those nominated was Zam. When the motion was made to elect the original 43, comrade Cannon in the name of the Left Opposition proposed voting individually on the additional nominations, because the the Left Opposition was in favor of a representative of the Communist Party (Opposition) since they represented a definite current in the working class movement, had their own press and organization. In addition, it was made clear that neither the party nor the Left Opposition could represent their point of view.

This proposal was defeated and the project of the presiding committee carried by an oferwhelming vote. The motion that of the permanent committee, those residing in New York City, shall compose the working committee, and that New York should be the central headquarters also carried. In addition, the presiding committee proposed that the secretary of the committee should be C. A. Hathaway. The last proposal carried without any objections. Among those on the National Mooney Council of Action are: A. Renner, Proletarian party; George Smirkin, YPSL; J. P. Cannon, Communist League of America (Left Opposition); Van Gilder, socialist party; R. M. Lovett, LID; Selena Burrell, Women's Auxiliary of the P.M.A.; Pat Ansbourv, Progressive Miners of America; L. Scott, Moulders Defense Committee, Chas. Bloom, A.F. ofL.; Emil Arnold, A. F. of L.; M. Olay, Anarchist; Robert Minor, C. P.; Wm. Patterson, I. L. D.; C. A. Hathaway, C P; J. Muste, CPLA; I. Amter, Unemployed Councils, J. B. Mathews, Socialist Party, Joe Weber, TUUL, and Alec Frazer of the Progressive Miners of America.

ALBERT GLOTZER

Sidelights of the Struggle on the Convention Floor

(Continued from Page 2)

ticism." Hathaway, speaking for the majority, and the Stalinists, and, having the backing of all right wing elements in the conference, voted us down but we obtained 63 votes—heavy trade union votes—for our amendment. This was the largest minority vote of the conference.

The Left Opposition voted for the main resolution with the above amendment. It was not the best resolution possible but was, in the main, presentable and laid the basis for a working agreement for the united front.

The Lovestone right wingers introduced an amendment on the Scottsboro case. The amendment of Zam's was a concrete expression of his position at the Chicago city conference a few weeks ago, when he tried to leave the Mooney case high and dry, divorced from every other issue and the class struggle. Zam proposed that the Mooney issue be the only issue of the Congress.

The original petition of the Stalinists was for a Mooney-Scottsboro Committee. In the Resolutions Committee this was amended after a fight, led by the Left Opposition. It was agreed that the Committee would be a Free Tom Mooney Committee and that we agitate for the Scottsboro case and cooperate with the defense. To affiliate with and be part of the Mooney united front it is necessary only to agree with the campaign to free Tom Mooney.

The Left Opposition differed with both the Lovestoneite and Stalinist positions. We were opposed to the Stalinist attempt to turn the Mooney Committee into a Mooney-Scottsboro Committee, but we were equally opposed to the Lovestone right wing attempt to separate the Mooney case from the Scottsboro case and other class struggle issues. Both the centrists and the Right wing confuse the question of organizational and propoganda relations, as well as the relations between different issues of the class struggle.

The final draft of the resolution had some bad points on this question and some wrong formulations, such as: "The unity of the workers and Negro people.". In the main, however, it was correct, and we found common ground on which to vote with the Stalinists.

The C. I. May Day Bombshell

After the Resolutions Committee had adopted a very good and correct formula on the united front with the exception of the sentence dealing with "no attacks" the Stalinist steering committee, Amter, etc., discovered, through our information that the **Daily Worker** that had arrive in the morning of this session carried a manifesto from the C. I. on May Day that again returned to the united front from below. It was a wrong position and a return to the old formula. At least one thing was clear, that the C. I. formula and the formula adopted at the Mooney Congress were two different positions. Which one will the Stalinists try to live up to? This is their contradiction. We will do all that is possible to help the party find its way to the correct Leninist united front position expressed, in the main, by the resolution of the Mooney Congress and not by the C. I. resolution.

The Left Opposition was on the Resolutions Committee of the Mooney Congress but unfortunately was not on the Resolutions Committee of the C. I.

If the Mooney movement slips back to the old Stalinist formula of the united front from below, the Socialist Party and A. F. L. leaders will be greatly strengthened and rendered a great service by us.

Hathaway and Borich, speaking in defense of a confused formula on the united front that has elements of both the Mooney Congress formula and the C. I. formula, said, in reference to the Socialist and A. F. L. leaders: "The leaders will never come into a united front of this kind," meaning the Chicago Mooney Congress. The leaders never decide the question of joining or boycotting a united front. This question is decided for them by the use of a Leninist policy of the united front by the revolutionists and the mass pressure of the workers upon and within their organization. If the united front policy is not correct and the pressure, consequently, not great enough then they will refuse. This the Stalinists must still learn, just as they must learn that we never must give up our independence or our right to political criticism in united fronts.

HUGO OEHLER

Prospects of Development of the Progressive Miners

(Continued from Page 1)

months on strike or unemployed, increased relief means strength to the Progressive Miners in their struggle against the Peabody forces. Governor Horner knew this and acted accordingly. The Right wing, the Musteites and the Right wing Socialists opposed the Hunger March from within, sabatoged it, fought against it, and in some cities the Right wing even allwed members of the Progressive Miners to be deputized to beat down the Hunger Marchers.

The struggle of the Progressive Miners for victory over the Peabody forces cannot be separated from the struggle of the unemployed workers, through mass pressure, for more relief. The Right wing element in the Progressive Miners Union have not only allowed this important weapon to lie idle and rust but have **attempted to prevent** the Left wing element from utilizing it in the struggle against the Operators. Has the Union officially taken one step in the direction of organizing the unemployed coal miners? No. Strike relief is the nearest they came to it, but that alone misses the mark entirely. The Progressive Miners Union must take up the activity for the unemployed miners inside and outside of the union. The Left wing must lead in this fight.

Red Baiting Campaign

Right on the heels of smashing the State Hunger March, the Peabody forces followed up in the suthern area by killing two Progressive Miners, arresting scores of others and terrorizing the Progressive Miners in their base of operation just outside of Franklin County. This in turn was followed up in quick order by an atack upon the Left wing forces of the Progressive Miners Union by a charge of Communism and through a red baiting campaign.

The aim of the Peabody forces was to divide the union forces, force the Right wing into retreat, and the left wing, under cover. They wanted the Right wing in the union to make a drive against the Communists and other Left wing elements and thereby, to further weaken the union—in order

The Tendencies in the Union and the Tasks Facing It

to facilitate a finishing blow in the Fall of the year. They did not succeed entirely in the last move, that of red baiting. However, the Left wing position was weakened because all those forces, with few exceptions, who were under attack, wasted their time trying to prove that they were not Reds, instead of pointing out the real aim of the bosses "red drive." The guns cannot be aimed at the Communists as Peabody desires if the union is to live; the guns must be aimed at the Peabody forces and expose the "Red drive" for what it is worth. To be called a Communist when one is only a left winger is an honor. For a Communist to deny being one in the Progressive Miners of America is a first rate mistake.

The Situation in Franklin County

We have already dealt in previous articles with the two year contract; the legalistic attitude of the leadership on the frame-up cases; and the factions in the Gillespie conference. More light can be thrown on this question, if we consider the two year contract in relation to the Franklin County strike. The situation in Franklin County was ripe for the strike weeks before the men were pulled out. The leadership held back, would hear nothing of it—until the Monday following the signing of the two year contract and then they were all for it. Did you ever hear of any worse strike strategy, or rather any better class collaboration "strike" strategy, than to sign a contract with a section of the small operators on Saturday and then to pull out the most strategical county in the state the following Monday? Even some of the Musetites in the field could not swallow this "strategy."

The Musteites play an odd role in the Progressive Miners of America. Most of their return students make good watchdogs against Communism in general. Tom Tippet is conducting classes in Economics and other subjects for the union. His first outline on Economics dealing with wages is as far from Marxism as Marxian Economics is from bourgeois Economics. He will succeed in sowing confusion and will help strengthen the Right wing elements or its "Left" cover within the Progressive Miners Union.

The Stalinist faction and their policies and blunders have been dealt with many times in the columns of the **Militant,** so we will only take up a couple of important aspects of the situation. The outstanding factor to consider when one speaks of Stalinism as the official representative of Communism in the Illinois coal fields is the fact that the "vanguard" has control of the majority of the unemployed councils and the progressives have control of the trade union and the strikes throughout the coal fields. This contradiction cannot be explained away with a jumble of words. It flows from the wrong international approach. The same contradiction was seen in Germany on an enlarged scale where the Communist party had "control of the unemployed" and the "social democrats were strong in the trade union field.

The greatest contradiction of the Left Opposition is the gulf between its trade union policy, which has been proven correct in the struggle of the Progressive Miners of America, and its lack of material forces. Due to this, the main line of march of our trade union policy is often blurred by the tactiacl shifts along this line and by mistakes of a member or two.

Tasks for Next Period

A fight against the Right wing class collaboration policy must be launched all along, up and down the line, in the Progressive Miners of America, if the union is to be strengthened in the coming period if it is to be in a position to fight the Peabody forces. The red baiting campaign in the union must stop and the Communists must have the rights of minority expression as well as members of any other political party. The Left wing forces must formulate a minimum program around which to unite. These steps must be taken at once in every mine town, in every local of the P. M. A., if we are to defeat the Peabody, Lewis, Horner outfit.

The class collaboration in policy of the leaders of the P.M.A. was adopted because they "wanted a breathing spell." But upon this false foundation they have been losing ground to the Lewis machine in many districts Breathing spells, as well as growth, cannot be had on the basis of class collaboration, if one has the interest of the workers at heart. Growth and consolidation is possible only on the basis of a Left wing policy, of class struggle.

Upon such a foundation the union was born, upon such a foundation the union will grow. Words about minority rights and expression, words about unity of all Left wing forces in the coal industry on a national scale, words about unemployment relief, words about the six hour day, words must be changed int action. Not the kind of action in the immediate past. Action where the Right wing sat in their swivel chairs answering phones, sending the militants to the front line to carry on the work and to be used as a cover for their Right wing policies. Individual militants and Left wing class struggle fighters may have the best of intentions, but as such they will only be tools in the hands of the Right wing unless they have behind them and are subordinated to, an organized Left wing.

The Right wing uses the Democratic party as their machine in union elections. The Left wing must organize all their forces for their struggles and their policies.

HUGO OEHLER

THE MILITANT

Entered as a second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3 1879.

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th St., N. Y. C.

EDITORIAL BOARD

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

Vol. 6, No. 26 Whole No. 173
Saturday, May 13, 1933

Subscription rate: $2.00 per year. Foreign $2.50. Five Cents per copy

The 30 Hour Bill: Stagger System and Wage Cuts

(Continued from Page 1)

Representative Connery asserted that unless the bill carried an amendment barring imports manufactured by industries operating on more than the thirty hours a week it would not carry. In this he was supported by those industries which are competing in the domestic market with the product of industries abroad. The administration is opposed to this provision. It contradicts all the presidential blah about trade agreements and freelly flowing international exchange (Ramsay Mac Donald).

William Green appeared before the House Labor Committee and opposed the minimum wage provision. (Later he appeared again and urged the passage of the bill as it stands.). The New York **World-Telegram** of May 1 reports that "Eastern representatives of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers are in favor of the principle of the six-hour day for railroad employes—with no reduction in pay. A resolution endorsing it is sent to President Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor Perkins, and chairmen of interested congressional committees."

Under the accumulating pressure the administration retreated. Senator Robinson, the administration's "whip", announced that the bill is "not now in the picture." The bill will probaby die in committee.

In the period when this bill which so vitally affects the working class was in the process of becoming legisation, the official Communist party, caught unawares, did not lift a finger to rally the masses aaginst its inimical provisions. The TUUL, to be sure, sent a representative to the Senate Judiciary Committee to put forward its view. That is one thing. Another is to organize a movement behind this delegation to give its view a force.

Why did the party stand by with folded hands? Why did it allow the initiative in opposing the bill to fall in the hands of Green and others?

The Seven Hour Day

There is a reason. The party was committed to the slogan of the

A Quick Turn in Policy on Part of the Stalinists

seven hour day without reduction in pay. It has never explained why. At the meeting of the Resolutions Committee, in the N. Y. May Day conference, in voting down our proposal for the inclusion of the six hour day slogan in the May Day Resolution, Winter explained that the A. F. of L. stood for the six-hour day and that the C. P. had to "distinguish itself from the demagogic A. F. of L. fakers!"

When the capitalists themselves proposed the six-hour day and the five-day, week they inadvertently exposed the bankruptcy of the party's position on the question. The Black Bill made it impossible for the party to advance the seven hour day any longer. And, as a matter of fact, the party press is now free of it.

Instead, with typical, bureaucratic cowardliness the Stalinists have changed the slogan without saying so, and without explanation to the party membership and the working class.

And to what have they changed the slogan! On April 8 the **Daily Worker** said that to the capitalist wage cutting bill we must oppose the slogan of a shorter work day without reduction in pay. This formulation is broad enough to include the I. W. W. slogan of the four hour day without reduction in pay. And it can also include the position of the A. F. of L. demagogic fakers for the six hour day, from whom, said Winter, the revolutionary movement must distinguish itself by the clock!

But the Stalinists were unable to crawl out of a bad situation by the use of an ambiguous and confusion-sowing slogan. The struggle against the bill requires concrete measures and definite slogans. The **Daily Worker** of April 20 carried an article by Stachel, in which he reports that the TUUL appeared before the Senate Judiciary Committee and proposed an amendment to the Black Bill providing for the six-hour day, five-day week with no reduction in pay advanced by the Left Opposition years before.

But the Stalinists do not say so openly to the party and the class. Worse! As yet they are confining the struggle to the parliamentary field. Appearances before the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Labor Committee (May 6) are undoubtedly correct. But when they are not backed by a mass movement they become opportunist.

That is how the question stands today. With a rise in the economic conjuncture the workers will begin to struggle against their bosses. A prominent place in these struggles will be occupied by the fight for the six hour day. If the party seriously means to influence these struggles in a revolutionary direction it must begin now to lay the ground.

It must begin to organize the movement. The first prerequisite for this is an open admission of the change in slogans and a Marxist explanation for it.

The second prerequisite is the organization of the movement. The positions of the leading working class organizations on the question makes the situation favorable. The A. F. of L. is officially on record for the six hour day. The railroad brotherhoods similarly. And the socialist party is also on record for it. A correct united front approach to these bodies by the party for a movement for this objective can yield fruitful results for the interests of the workers and Communism.

Over this possibility the policy laid down in the C. I. Manifesto hangs like an ominous cloud. This policy must be rejected. In its place we must adopt and apply the tactic of Leninist united front of workers' organizations.

T. STAMM

Chaco War Formally Declared

As this issue goes to press, it is announced that the war between Paraguay and Bolivia, which has been raging for nearly two years now, has been "offirially" declared. now, has been "officially" declared. A comprehensive article dealing with the Chaco mix up will appear in the forthcoming issue.