

bourgeoisie and the abandonment of Leninism in the national and colonial questions is shown by the catastrophic course followed by the Comintern in the Chinese Revolution. That it leads to the conversion of the Communist Parties into pacifist instruments of defense, instead of instruments for organizing the armed insurrection in their own country primarily, is shown by the petty-bourgeois anti-cruiser petition campaign of the German Party.

All these lines of policy are consciously or unconsciously based on the need of preventing military intervention against the Soviet Union so that an isolated socialist construction can be completed there. The net result of this opportunist conception and course is the increasing danger of imperialism war against the Soviet Union, for revisionism here as everywhere brings neither revolution nor reform.

The growing war danger comes at a time when the crisis in Russia is reaching a sharp point. The departure from the proletarian revolutionary path, coincident with the beginning of the fight to cut the Leninist Opposition led by L. D. Trotsky from the Party, has reached a stage where the enemy classes have grown to an alarming extent and exert a tremendous pressure upon the Party and State apparatus. From Bucharin's: "Peasants, enrich yourselves" and the theory that the Kulak would grow into socialism, it has been a short step to the present situation where the exploiting elements in the village (the Kulaks) have stepped forth into the arena with confidence, boldness and arrogance to demand increased concessions and political rights. From the brutal campaign to suppress Party democracy in the fight against the Leninist Opposition it has been a short step to the consolidation of a bureaucratic apparatus through which the new bourgeoisie exerts its ever-increasing pressure. Never before have the Kulaks, the Nepmen, the bureaucrats been so strong, so imperious in their demands, so threatening in their progress. The policy of the Stalin regime, which is based less and less on a class foundation, and more and more on a bureaucratic agglomeration, is undermining the positions of the proletarian dictatorship and permitting the rapid advancement of the classes alien to the proletariat whose program is the break-down of the foreign trade monopoly, the recognition of the czarist debts, entrance into the League of Nations, unlimited concessions to international capital—particularly a rapprochement with American imperialism—the moderation of the pace of industrialization, penetration of the cooperatives and the Soviets, and the attainment of the suffrage hitherto reserved to the toiling masses. This is the program and the danger of Thermidor. It is the restoration of capitalism, in the beginning, probably, still under the present social forms.

The line of the present Stalin regime in this situation is a zig-zag between capitulation in deeds to the Right and temporary jumps to the Left, that is, one step forward and two steps backward.

The Leninist Opposition on the contrary has been fighting tooth and nail against this imminent danger to the Revolution. It has unfurled the banner of Leninism and stood by it in the face of an unprecedented campaign of slander and persecution. In the struggle against the Opposition and away from the line of Bolshevism, the present regime has by its very nature been compelled to resort to the bureaucratization of the Communist International, for under normal conditions of Party democracy and free discussion, such caricatures as are now offered the revolutionary workers in the name of Leninism, would be categorically rejected by the members of the International. To maintain its unprincipled domination, the present regime has therefore resorted to the suppression of discussion, the expulsion of Communists, to violence, to arrests, imprisonment, exile and deportation. In the name of Bolshevism, a campaign has been carried on particularly since the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, which has as its net result the elimination of all elements who questioned the opportunist course of the Comintern. It has abolished Party democracy and replaced it by control from above by irresponsible, appointed functionaries. Bureaucratic command and decree have been substituted for ideological discussion and leadership. The mechanical reorganization of Party leaderships solely on the basis of their unhesitating readiness to endorse whatever is done by the Stalinist regime and to condemn whatever is done by the Leninist Opposition is a daily occurrence. The influence and strength of the most important Communist Parties have been reduced to an alarming extent (Germany, Czechoslovakia, France, England, United States, etc., etc.); it has brought about the development in the leading Parties of the Comintern of Right wing or Centrist leadership and line and

the rending of these Parties by violent factional struggles that are reflections of the internal struggle in the C.P.S.U. The expulsion of the Leninist Opposition in all countries was achieved. The revisionist theories behind the opportunist line of Stalinism (socialism in one country, etc., etc.) flowered to full bloom.

## The Smoke-screen of "Trotskyism"

To conceal the essence of its Right wing deviations and bureaucratic misdeeds, the Stalin regime invented the myth of "Trotskyism" which it represents as the real danger to Leninism. Trotsky's differences of political line with Lenin were liquidated in 1917, on L. D. Trotsky's acceptance of the April Theses of Lenin and his entrance into the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party on the basis of his agreement with the tenets of Bolshevism. But even those pre-revolutionary differences were never as great as the differences of the Stalin-Bucharin regime now with the principles of Leninism. Differences between Lenin and Trotsky after 1917 rose out of the efforts of the two leaders of the Revolution to solve concrete problems on the basis of the same theoretical program, and were never so great as the differences between the present ruling faction and Lenin. The Opposition will fight against the falsification of the history of the Party and the Revolution for factional ends, which has assumed such monstrous proportions in the demagogic campaign against L. D. Trotsky in whom we recognize Lenin's chief collaborator in the leadership of the Russian Revolution and today the foremost representative of Leninism in the world.

The Opposition is not conducting a war for "Trotskyism"; such a political tendency does not exist. It is fighting for the principles of Leninism. In the Soviet Union, under the rain of calumny and repression, the Leninist Opposition led by its inspiring leader comrade Trotsky has fought persistently against all forms of revisionism and opportunism and for Bolshevism. The Opposition has sounded the alarm against the Thermidorian danger and proposed a correct policy to combat it in favor of the further socialist development of the country—in the period of retarded world revolution—through a correct policy of the distribution of the national income, through taxation of the Nepman and the Kulak to accelerate the process of industrialization and to improve the conditions of the workers, through credits and other cooperative assistance to the poor peasantry, through a correct price policy, and so forth. The Leninist Opposition is organizing the workers for the defense of the Russian Revolution on two fronts of essentially the same enemy: against imperialist intervention from without and against the danger of Thermidor from within. Such a real defense, based on a correct class policy, can be accomplished only if the deep-going reforms proposed by the Opposition are adopted and an end is made to the splitting of the Communist Party and the imprisonment and exile of thousands of the best Bolsheviks. The leadership which organized the defense of the Soviet Union under the direction of Lenin is still best able to carry it out today.

## War Danger and the Defense of U.S.S.R.

The problem of the defense of the Soviet Union and the victory of October is inseparably bound up with the struggle against the danger of war. The inevitability of imperialist war inherent in the basic contradictions of capitalist society is not removed by the temporary and partial current stabilization. Indeed, the war danger proceeds from the innate contradictions of the stabilization process, that is, contradictions and antagonisms of capitalist imperialism which have again grown acute by reason of the world struggle for markets. What we are witnessing in the present period is an intensified, feverish armaments and militarization race preparatory to the actual outbreak of war. Combined with this is the customary accompaniment of imperialist jockeying for positions, formation of alliances and breaking of others, and diplomatic juggling. In this pre-war period, the imperialists in their respective countries have the open or semi-concealed support of the social democrats and the labor bureaucracy (armaments program of the German S.D.P.; Boncour's militarization plan in France; Henderson, MacDonald and Co. in England; the American Federation of Labor's open pro-imperialist, pro-militarist position

and the endorsement by the Socialist Party of the Kellogg pact, etc., etc.) To complete the picture are the innumerable conferences that help delude the workers and develop pacifist illusions among them: Locarno and Kellogg pacts, "disarmament" proposals, and the like.

The existence of the Soviet Union with a proletarian dictatorship supported by the foreign trade monopoly, bars the way to a "free market" for capitalism of one-sixth of the globe. This intensifies the antagonisms of the whole of the imperialist powers against the U.S.S.R. and the tendencies towards the formation of an anti-Soviet bloc for intervention, which has so far been retarded by the mutual rivalries of the imperialist powers and their desire for a more "favorable" moment of internal difficulties of the Soviet Union, and through fear of the revolutionary action of the masses at home. The opportunist policies of the Stalin regime have weakened the international position of the Soviet Union. The by no means unavoidable defeats of the Chinese Revolution and the great British strikes have enhanced the confidence of the bourgeoisie and weakened the power of resistance of the workers. The best defense of the Soviet Union is the building of the revolutionary capacities of the Communist Parties. The fear of an insurrection at home, led by the Communist Party, is the greatest restraining influence upon the bourgeoisie against intervention.

The events of the past two years have made it necessary to restate the Leninist viewpoint on the revolutionary struggle against imperialism war. The policy of the Stalin regime has, in theory and practice, forsaken this line. It has set up a conception of some "super-historical" recipe to be used in fighting the war danger. The fight against the war danger and intervention in the U.S.S.R. has been "abstracted" from the general revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Considerations of a "diplomatic nature," for "Soviet State reasons," "for special circumstances" have been advanced to replace the basic and permanent considerations of general revolutionary policy, instead of the one being an indivisible part of the other. This was true in the Stalin-Bucharin policy in the Anglo-Russian Committee, where they capitulated before Purcell-Hicks-Citrine and Co., because the latter would allegedly prevent Chamberlain and Baldwin from conducting their imperialist intervention policy. Reformist methods here also produced catastrophe results. It was true in the policy followed in the Chinese Revolution, where the revolutionary movement was sacrificed by the Stalin-Bucharin line for the sake of maintaining alliances with the "anti-imperialist" generals of the Chiang Kai-Shek, Feng Yu-Hsiang stripe. It remains true today in the non-Leninist policy pursued in the so-called League Against Imperialism, where uncritical combinations are made from above with petty-bourgeois, reformist, and nationalist elements who are in many instances neither more nor less than the bell-wethers of imperialism. It is true in the case of the Soviet Union's signing of the Kellogg Pact without denouncing it as a cover behind which the imperialists are preparing the imperialist war and the anti-Soviet intervention. This opportunist line only adds to the illusions of the masses, and disarms them before their enemies.

The only road for the revolutionary struggle against war is that indicated by the teachings of Lenin on the question, in his writings during the last war so admirably summarized in his Theses of Instructions to Our Delegation to the Hague Conference. The Communists must relentlessly combat all pacifist illusions among the workers, point out to them the inevitability of imperialist war, teach and train them that it can only be overcome by the socialist revolution of the proletariat. We must show that there are no "exceptional circumstances" to justify an opportunist or capitulationist policy in which the interests of one section of the

## THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Opposition Group in the Workers (Communist) Party of America

Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Publishers address at 340 East 19th Street, New York, N. Y. — Telephone: Gramercy 3411.

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per year. Foreign, \$1.50 5c per copy Bunde rate, 3c per copy.

Editor

James P. Cannon

Associate Editors

Martin Abern

Max Shachtman

Maurice Spector

VOL. II. FEBRUARY 15, 1929. No. 4.

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.

proletariat result in sacrificing those of the proletariat as a whole.

The impending war situation makes the American Communists particularly responsible and their tasks especially great and difficult. This is especially so since the present situation is characterized by a world struggle essentially between American and British imperialism. The antagonisms between these two powers become sharper and more intense every day, and may lead to the actual outbreak of military operations at a least expected moment.

## The Role of American Imperialism

Every estimate of the present situation must proceed from the fact that the world center of economic gravity has shifted to the United States. American imperialism now levies tribute from practically all the capitalist countries of the world. This development, which has risen to its height in the period after the world war, has bound up the fate of American imperialism with the economy of the whole world in an inextricable form. No analysis of its future economic course, internally as well as externally, can be made without a consideration of its international position.

The effect of America's direct intervention in European affairs after the war was the temporary, partial stabilization of European capitalism. This stabilization occurred in direct connection with the defeat of the German proletariat in 1923 and resulted in the consolidation of social democracy for the time. In turn it enabled the United States to avoid the convulsions that would have affected it inevitably in the event of the development of the revolutionary wave in Europe.

The United States has expanded its productive capacity which has brought about a further contraction of markets for European capitalism and consequently a contraction of the European market itself. The post-war chaos of Europe has made it impossible for the debtors of that continent to present a sufficiently consolidated united front to which they are inclined. The very strength and expansion of American imperialism has laid the foundation for the most violent struggles in Europe and in the colonial countries. The European powers must fight among themselves for a larger ration in world economy, and against the United States for the same reason. The pacifist effect which American intervention had upon the European situation in the beginning is now being transformed by the processes of development into a revolutionizing effect. American imperialism is now beginning to look for a solution of its own approaching internal convulsions at the expense of Europe, and primarily of Germany, and increased exploitation and imperialist raids on Latin America and China.

The present Experts' Conference on the Dawes Plan is becoming a focal point of this contradiction. The report of the Reparations Agent in Germany of 1928, which, contrary to the 1927 report, gave an optimistic analysis of the situation, was made with an eye to "solving" the conflict between reparations payments and the Allied debt to the United States by increased pressure on Germany. The proposal to issue bonds, protected by lien on the German railways, to cover the Dawes payments—and by payments of reparations to the Allies enable the latter to pay their debts to America—will only lead to the multiplication of difficulties. For the United States to carry even one-half of such a bond issue, involving something like two billion dollars for its share, would mean that the important banks of this country would add almost twenty per cent to their present holdings in investments and in government and other securities. An absorption of such an amount by the American banks which, according to the "Magazine of Wall Street," are "today water-logged with securities which they never ought to have bought at all" would result "at this critical moment of our financial history" in bank inflation.

The inability of the "Experts" to solve the reparations and debts problems in a satisfactory manner is an earnest of the developing position of the United States with regard to Europe.

At the same time, in the desperate struggle of the European powers to maintain their heads above the wave of American world domination they have even succeeded to a partial extent in regaining their position in world production. As between the periods of 1920-1924 and 1927, the share of Europe in world production of anthracite, iron, steel and the consumption of cotton has increased an average of 9.22 percent, while the share of the United States has decreased an average of 7.55 percent.

A most bitter competition for markets is becoming sharper in every corner of the world, primarily between the United States and Britain. There has even developed the movement to raise the already tremendously high tariff walls of the United States in the coming session of Congress.

It is not necessary nor it is correct to view the United States as "about to reach the apex of its growth" in order to see and understand the maturing crisis in the country. American imperialism, by the very fact that it is developing in a different period from that of the rise of Great Britain—the period of war and revolution, and national and colonial uprisings—is therefore doomed to a much more rapid tempo of the development of its internal and international contradictions than was England. And this is true precisely because of the phenomenally rapid expansion it has experienced in the past decade.

## The Present Economic Situation and the Working-class

The present economic situation in the United States is characterized by the following features:

The contraction of the world market by the stabilization of European capitalism and the decrease in the rate of the rise of American exports. The sharpening of the competition in the East and in Latin America between the United States and the European powers (England, Germany, etc.)

The tremendous concentration of industry and the intensification of rationalization, whereby technical progress has outstripped the expansion of the home market. There is a growing disproportion between the rate of expansion of productive capacity and the rate of growth of production and consumption. The opening up of the South to industrialization on a higher technical level, instead of creating a "New Ruhr" (Lovestone) only brings with it new contradictions. The newly-proletarianized population of the South will not develop an addition to the home market to absorb sufficiently the growth of production, and the hopes placed in the "new South" will further be partially offset by the intensification of the coal and textile crises in the North.

The home market has been further contracted by the creation of a standing army of unemployed workers numbering several millions. Although the index figure for production of big industry has risen from 146 in 1919 to 171 in 1927 (1914 equals 100), the index for workers employed in big industry has fallen from 129 in 1919 to 114 in 1927 (1914 equals 100), although population growth for the same years was from 106 to 120 respectively. In addition, there has been an influx into the ranks of the unemployed of declassed farmers. The agricultural production index figure for 1918-1919 was 132 (1900 equals 100) and rose to 148 in 1924. Active participants in agriculture fell in the same period from 106 to 100, although the agricultural population grew—also in the same period—from 112 to 115. These figures further indicate that although in certain specific and by no means general cases real wages have increased, the wages of the American working class, and therefore their purchasing power, has on the whole decreased. This tendency is being accelerated by the growing series of wage cuts.

American capitalism has been unable to overcome the serious depressions in agriculture and in the coal, oil, textile, lumber, shipping and other industries, nor will it be able to prevent the coming decline in iron and steel and automobile industries.

The rapid increase in brokerage loans, in face of an average trading volume of more than five million shares a day, presages the beginning of the end of the "bull" market, far more profound than the price fall of June 1928. The fact that rates for stock-market loans had to be doubled and quadrupled has caused the more realistic of the bourgeois economists to be very cautious in their predictions for the coming year.

The fate of American imperialism, we repeat, is now bound up with its dependence on world economy. Conversely, the situation in Europe is directly linked with the development of American national economy. The United States will seek to use Europe as a shield to take the blows of its own difficulties. This will in turn create such situations in Europe, above all in Germany, where, with proper revolutionary leadership, a new wave of proletarian revolt will be initiated, or the relations between England and America will come to the breaking point. This rapidly materializing

process will change the co-relation of forces—in the United States in favor of the revolutionary proletariat, by undermining the base of the American labor aristocracy.

Meanwhile, the internal contradictions of American imperialism, bound up with its world economic interdependence, are maturing a severe crisis which is fore-shadowed by the current partial industrial depression. The present situation, which is only the harbinger of this coming crisis, has already brought to a high level the process of rationalization and attack upon the standards of the working class that is causing it to move progressively away from its previous inertia into a period of struggles. The realization of the crisis which will intensify the process of rationalization, unemployment, and lead to severer attacks on the living standards of the workers, will result in an even broader basis for the radicalization of the American workers and their entry into struggle. This process of radicalization is taking place now. It is a process which must be analyzed not only in comparison with the Leftward movement of the European workers, but chiefly in comparison with the historical backwardness of the American working class. Upon this development is conditioned the coming period of struggles of the American workers and the necessity for the revolutionary Party to understand it and prepare itself properly, for it.

## Results of the Elections

The results of the recent presidential elections were nothing but a barometer, and a weak, inaccurate, distorted barometer, of the developments and perspective outlined above. The victory of the Republican Party and its candidate, Hoover, signified the still growing power—accompanied though it is by sharpening contradictions—of American capitalism, and the grip of the main Party of the bourgeoisie on the masses. This power was sufficient for the Republicans to break through the "solid South" for the first time since the Civil War, aided by those irresistible economic forces which have been undermining the social-political basis of the traditional Democratic Party for the past decades.

The election as a whole, however, makes it impossible for anyone to speak unconditionally of "a conservative landslide" or "a victory for reaction" or "a defeat for Smith." The vote for Smith by no means represented entirely a vote of satisfaction with the present state of affairs. The nature of the Smith vote disputes this. In the first place he received such a tremendous vote as has rarely before been received even by the winning candidate, which does not contribute at all to the theory of the "destruction" of the Democratic Party. His vote, furthermore, was composed largely of workers in the big industrial centers where he made tremendous gains, and of the hard-pressed petty-bourgeoisie and farmers.

Millions of workers saw in Smith, his record and his program, a possibility of change from the rule of finance capital, the eight-year orgy of corruption, reaction and imperialist policy of the Republican wing of capitalism. Votes which would otherwise have been cast for the socialist and even the Communist Parties went this time to Smith on the basis of the popular American belief that "he has a good chance to get in." It is entirely true that the workers who cast their votes for Smith were deluded and betrayed, that Smith in actuality is as much the instrument of imperialism as Hoover. But hundreds of thousands if not millions of workers did not vote for him as an instrument of reaction and an opponent of change. Smith, with his hypocritical "friendship for labor," his "pro-labor" record and program, succeeded in deceiving his working class support into voting for him as an "opponent" of the current reaction.

The vote against Hoover expressed to a certain extent the growing radicalization of the masses on an American scale, and with parliamentary limitations. Political developments have lagged historically behind economic developments. Proceeding from the fundamental viewpoint of the historical backwardness of the American workers it is apparent that the anti-Hoover vote was a political, that is, an insufficient, a distorted, an even reactionary, expression of the radicalizing processes taking place in the economic life of the American working class. In the present period, a Leftward drift of the workers in Europe will express itself, for example, in a desertion from the social democracy and a growth of the power and influence of the Communists. In the United States, such a drift assumes much more moderate and backward forms.

Neither does our analysis signify that the elections were the best available barometer of the