

Lenin's Work Lives in the Opposition!

Continued from Page 1
graded all the theoretical thought in the movement today and transformed it into a sleight-of-hand game for jugglers and scamps. For the neo-Leninists of Stalin's school, theory is no longer an instrument, a guide to action, a subject for considered reflection, a weapon against the enemies of the proletariat inside and outside the movement. It has been converted into convenient and constantly changed formulae, recast and readapted to "justify" each new blunder and crime of the leadership.

Exceptionalist or Internationalist?

The essence of Leninism is the application of the teachings of Marx and Engels to the period of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. The theories of Lenin are just as little "Russian" as those of Marx were "German". The favorite argument of the social reformists and revisionists in past decades—and even now—has been that while Marxism might be applicable to Europe, or to Europe of the last century, it did not apply to the United States, for example, or to Europe today. The argument of all national and social reformists today, of those to whom the name of socialist or revolutionary still applies only because of past associations, is that Leninism might be suitable for "backward Russia" but that it does not apply to highly developed industrial countries. The arch-type of this school is the Austrian social democracy. The new and shame-faced converts to this idea are the Right wing groups in the Communist movement. For them, Lenin's essence lies not so much in his internationalism as it does in his "exceptionalism". A recent article by one of the Right wing spokesmen even speaks of "Lenin the Exceptionalist!"

It is of course unnecessary to share the conception of the present Communist party leadership, according to which the stage and rate of development of the situation in every country is unchanged and unchangeable—an enormous idiosyncrasy which only strengthens the hand of the Right wing—in order to reject out of hand the vulgar national "Communism" of the latter. What essentially characterized Lenin was not his emphasis upon the national peculiarities of the struggle in each country, but the fundamentally international features of the Communist party. On more than a hundred occasions, Lenin underlined the fact that while there were differences in the stage of development of the various countries, the basic tenets of Bolshevism were universally applicable despite these differences. "We have now considerable experience, of an international scope, which pretty definitely establishes the fact that some fundamental features of our revolution are not local, not peculiarly national, not Russian only, but that they are of international significance. And I say 'international significance' not in the broad sense of the word; not some features, but all fundamental and secondary features are in the sense of their influence upon other countries, of international significance." (—Lenin, our emphasis.)

From Hillquit to Lovestone

The spokesmen for the opposing viewpoint used to be Hillquit, Longuet, Wallhead, Crispin and Bauer. Later on, they were Lazzari, Frossard, Phillips Price and Levi. Today they are Thalheimer, Sellier, Huber and Lovestone. And while these names are mentioned, let it be added that Lovestone is one hundred percent correct when he writes in a recent number of his paper that while he and his co-thinkers are condemned for "exceptionalism" in every part of the world, it is not only practiced but is the official theory of Stalin in the Soviet Union in the form of "socialism in one country."

In spite of either Stalin or Thalheimer, Leninism and internationalism are as inseparable as Leninism and "national

communism" are incompatible. The man who stands out in his work is not so much Lenin the Russian Bolshevik, but Lenin the international revolutionist who led the Left wing in the Second International, who laid the foundation stone for the Third, who poured out his vitriolic denunciation upon the heads of traitors who gave lip-service to "internationalism" and sent their followers into the trenches in order to defend their "national interests"; Lenin the internationalist, who considered the Russian revolution as a temporary outpost of the world's working class, a fortress to be defended at all costs until the workers of other countries could save it for socialism by overthrowing their own bourgeoisie.

That it is necessary to emphasize and argue these features in Lenin's theoretical

in that fact, Stalinism can exist only at the expense of Leninism. It can live only by concealing or lying about Lenin's views.

Nowhere in history can a parallel be found to the six years of misrepresentation to which the official apparatus has subjected Lenin. Not even the falsification of Marx by the reformists before the war can equal—for cynical distortion, for disloyalty, for deliberate organized and outrageous lying—the campaign by Stalin-Bucharin-Zinoviev to devitalize Lenin. The most incredible enormities have been committed in an attempt to cover up the sins of Centrism and the Right wing in the Communist movement with the name of Lenin. So deeply ingrained in this horrible desecration have the Stalinist functionaries become that they can calmly reprint an article from

ficial and solemnly accepted version of Lenin, his work and his views.

It is in this abominable falsification of Lenin, that the greatest danger lies to the revolutionary movement. The big problem now is to unearth Lenin's truth from beneath the garbage of falsehood and revision and to reestablish it as the guide of the movement, just as Lenin reestablished the principles of Marxism in spite of their emasculation by the Kautskys of the world. That task has been assumed by the International Leninist Opposition. It is being carried out under the leadership of the greatest living revolutionist, L. D. Trotsky, the closest comrade of Lenin, the exiled warrior who provokes venomous fear of those who floated to the top in the swamp of centrism and inspires a deep regard and devotion to Bolshevism in every proletarian fighter. Not only on the anniversaries of Lenin, but every day in the year, the militants in our ranks will reconsecrate themselves to this task, for without being equipped with the teachings of Lenin the proletariat is unarmed and helpless, and cannot accomplish its destiny. In the struggle for Bolshevism carried on by the International Opposition, Lenin and Leninism live.

M. S.

CARRY OUT LENIN'S WILL!

Lenin's Last Words to the Party, Still Suppressed by the Stalinists

By the stability of the Central Committee, of which I spoke before, I mean measures to prevent a split, so far as such measures can be taken. For, of course, the White Guard in Russkye Mysl (I think it was S. E. Oldenburg) was right when, in the first place, in his play against Soviet Russia he banked on the hope of a split in our party, and when, in the second place, he banked for that split on serious disagreements in our party.

Our party rests upon two classes, and for that reason its instability is possible, and if there cannot exist an agreement between these classes its fall is inevitable. In such an event it would be useless to take any measures or in general to discuss the stability of our Central Committee. In such an event no measures would prove capable of preventing a split. But I trust that is too remote future, and too improbable an event, to talk about.

I have in mind stability as a guarantee against a split in the near future, and I intend to examine here a series of considerations of a purely personal character.

I think that the fundamental factor in the matter of stability—from this point of view—is such members of the Central Committee as Stalin and Trotsky. The relation between them constitutes, in my opinion, a big half of the danger of that split, which might be avoided, and the avoidance of which might be promoted in my opinion, by raising the number of members of the Central Committee to fifty or one hundred.

Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands; and I am not sure that he always knows how to use that power with sufficient caution. On the other hand comrade Trotsky, as was proved by his struggle against the Central Committee in connection with the question of the People's Commissariat of Ways and Communication, is distinguished not only by his exceptional ability—personally he is to be sure, the most able man in the present Central Committee, but also by his too far-reaching self-confidence and a disposition to be far too much attracted by the purely administrative side of affairs.

These two qualities of the two most able leaders of the present Central Committee might, quite innocently, lead to a split, if our party does not take measures

to prevent it, a split might arise unexpectedly.

I will not further characterize the other members of the Central Committee as to their personal qualities. I will only remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kameneff were not, of course, accidental, but that it ought as little to be used against them as the non-Bolshevism of Trotsky.

Of the younger members of the Central Committee, I want to say a few words about Piatakov and Bucharin. They are, in my opinion, the most able forces (among the youngest), and in regard to them it is necessary to bear in mind the following: Bucharin is not only the most valuable and biggest theoretician of the Party, but also may legitimately be considered the favorite of the whole party; but his theoretical views can only with the very greatest doubt be regarded as fully Marxist, for there is something scholastic in him (he never has learned, and I think never fully understood the dialectic.)

And then Piatakov—a man undoubtedly distinguished in will and ability, but too much given over to the administrative side of things to be relied on in a serious political question.

Of course, both these remarks are made by me merely with a view of the present time, or supposing that these two able and loyal workers may not find an occasion to supplement their knowledge and correct their one-sidedness.

December 25, 1922
Postscript: Stalin is too rude, and this fault, entirely supportable in relations among us Communists, becomes unsupportable in the office of General Secretary. Therefore, I propose to the comrades to find a way to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority—namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious, etc. This circumstance may seem an insignificant trifle, but I think that from the point of view of preventing a split and from the point of view of the relation between Stalin and Trotsky which I discussed above, it is not a trifle, or it is such a trifle as may acquire a decisive significance.

LENIN

January 4, 1923

conceptions, despite the fact that they are the very heart of his works, is only an indication of the extremes to which the false disciples of Leninism have gone to suppress, distort and falsify his views. The greatest crime of Stalinism lies precisely

Pravda on the 50th birthday of Stalin which is an insult to the intelligence of the reader and to the memory of Lenin. Stalin, upon whose removal from the post of party secretary Lenin insisted as one of the means of preventing a party split, whom Lenin denounced as rude and disloyal, is described as Lenin's loyal disciple! Stalin, who considered Lenin's contribution to the discussion on national questions as "superfluous", at whose activity in Georgia Lenin said he was "outraged", is characterized as the greatest theoretician of the Bolshevik party on the national question! Stalin is even credited with organizing and leading the Red Army to victory against the counter-revolution! A few years ago such hair-raising insolence would have been considered the work of a humorist or a madman. Today it is part of the of-

Ford's Parts Factories Drive Workers

By ROBERT L. CRUDEN

DETROIT—(FP)—While Ford is reaping the harvest of a high wage propaganda, workers are working in plants making Ford parts straining under the 12-hour day and low wages.

Ford gets his wheels from the Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Corp. This plant runs its men seven days a week, two 12-hour shifts a day. A worker, if he is lucky, may make 65 cents an hour—but he'll be more than lucky if he is able to walk up the street to get a car. The speed maintained on the Ford wheel line is terrific. Kelsey workers told Federated Press. "If you thought Ford speed could only hold eight hours a day you ought to work on our line," said one worker. "We have a Ford boss and for 12 hours we got to go like shots out of hell. But you can't keep it up long. Three or four weeks lay you out."

The Briggs Mfg. Co. makes many Ford bodies. This plant is notorious among auto workers for its low wages, high accident rate and shameless exploitation of women workers. According to the state law, women are supposed to have stools when working. Very few women with whom your correspondent has talked have had these. Women are not supposed to work more than 54 hours per week but workers are not lacking who claim that they had to punch two separate time cards in order to evade the law. Attempts to have these women persecute have failed because they fear that if they do they will not be able to get a job in Detroit again, thanks to the blacklist and spy system.

This corporation recently took back some of its old workers—at 42 cents an hour. The workers have to work at high speed among machinery which for the most part is quite unprotected. A steady stream of Briggs workers pours into the company hospital all the time the plant is running, having lost their fingers, hands or whatnot.

Visitors are barred from the Briggs plants. From such sources as these the Ford fortunes rise. These are the "economics of production" which make possible the low priced Ford and high Ford profits.

PITTSBURG—(FP)—Trustification of Pittsburgh's taxicab companies has been followed by a walkout of 1,500 taxi-drivers. The first act of the taxi merger was to cut wages, and the next act in the labor drama saw 1,000 drivers in Moose Hall to form a union.

The merger was effected by the Parmelee system. Within 48 hours after the announcement of the reduction, all the drivers involved had signed up in the union with demands for recognition, a 40% flat commission and a 10-hour day. The company flatly refused to receive a union committee or discuss their demands.

The new union men, meeting in Moose Hall pledged their solidarity while news was brought that drivers of an independent firm had walked out in sympathy with the strikers, making similar demands.

Subscribe to the MILITANT
\$2.00 a year

MEMORIAL MEETING

on

Saturday, January 25, 1930

at the

Militant Hall.

25 Third Ave. (Near 8th St.)

WELL KNOWN SPEAKERS

Admission Free

Auspices: New York Branch, Communist League of America

**LENIN
LIEBKNECHT
LUXEMBURG**