

The Result of the Elections in Spain

(Continued from page 1)

on the basis of a genuinely universal and direct suffrage for men and women from the age of 18. In other words: to the non-democratic and tricky Cortes we must, at the present stage, oppose the genuinely democratic and honestly elected popular Cortes.

Weakness of Spanish Communism

5. Had the Communists tried today to turn their backs upon the Cortes setting up against it the slogan of Soviets and of the dictatorship of the proletariat, they would only have showed that they should not be taken seriously. There is not a single Communist in the Cortes (according to the Turkish press). It is obvious that the revolutionary wing is much stronger in action, in the struggle, than in parliamentary representation. Nevertheless, there exists a certain relationship between the strength of a revolutionary party and its parliamentary representation. The weakness of Spanish Communism has revealed itself completely. Under these conditions, to speak of the overthrow of bourgeois parliamentarism by the dictatorship of the proletariat would mean quite simply to play the role of simpletons and prattlers. The task is to become stronger on the basis of the parliamentary stage of the revolution and to assemble the masses around oneself. It is only in this way that parliamentarism can be vanquished. But it is precisely for this that it is indispensable at present to develop a violent agitation under the slogans of the most decisive and the most extreme democracy.

6. What are the criteria for putting forward these slogans? On the one hand, one must have in mind the general direction of the revolutionary development which determines our strategic line; on the other hand one must take into account the state of mind of the masses. The Communist who does not reckon with this last factor risks breaking his neck. Let us reflect a little on the question of knowing how the Spanish workers, the masses, look upon the present situation. Their leaders, the socialists, are in power. This increases the demands and the intransigence of the workers. Every striking worker will believe that he need not only have no fear of the government but, on the contrary, that help may be expected from it. The Communists must guide the thought of the workers precisely in this sense: "Demand everything from the government, since your leaders are to be found in this government". The socialists will reply to the workers' delegations that they have not the majority. The reply is clear: if the genuinely democratic right of suffrage is obtained, and if the coalition with the bourgeoisie is broken, the majority will be guaranteed. But that is just what the socialists do not want. Their position puts them into contradiction with the bold democratic slogans. If we simply oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat to the Cortes we will succeed in grouping the workers around the socialists, because both of them will say: The Communists want to command us. While by democratic slogans and by the rupture between the socialists and the bourgeoisie, we drive a wedge between the workers and the socialists and we thus prepare the next stage of the revolution.

The Slogan of Soviets

7. All the considerations mentioned above would remain a dead letter were we to confine ourselves to the democratic slogans in the parliamentary sense. There can be no question of this. The Communists participate in every strike, in every manifestation of protest, in every demonstration, they arouse ever more numerous strata. The Communists are with the masses and at the head of the masses in every fight. On the basis of these fights, the Communists put forward the slogan of Soviets and build up these Soviets on the first occasion as organizations of the proletariat united front. In the present stage, the Soviets can be nothing but this. But if they arise as fighting organizations of the proletariat united front, they will inevitably become, under the leadership of the Communist organs of the insurrection and then also the organs of power.

8. In developing boldly the agrarian program, one must in no case forget the independent role of the agricultural workers. This is the most important lever of the proletarian revolution in the country. With the peasants, the workers make an alliance, while the agricultural workers are a part of the proletariat itself. This profound difference must never be forgotten.

9. I learn from La Verite that the Stalinists accuse the whole Left Opposition as well as me personally of being against the immediate confiscation of landed property. Truly, it is hard to foresee in what direction the demagogic bureaucrats will turn. What does the "immediate" confiscation of the land signify? By whom? By what organizations? It is true that the incomparable Peri affirmed back in April that the Spanish peasants were building up Soviets and that the workers were following the Communists in masses. Naturally, we agree that the Soviets (or unions, or committees) should immediately take the land of the large landlords into their hands. Only, the peasants must be aroused. And for that, the workers must be torn away from the influence of the socialists. One does not go without the other. Would the Stalinists like to say that we favor landed property? But even in calumny there must be logic. How does the defense of landed property flow from the permanent revolution?

How? Let them endeavor to show us. **Stalinist Slander**
As for us, we will recall to them that when the Stalinists conducted in China the policy of the four classes the Political Bureau, under the leadership of Stalin sent telegrams to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party demanding the curbing of the peasant movement in order not to repulse the "revolutionary" generals. Stalin and Molotov introduced a small restriction into the agrarian program: the confiscation of the lands of the big landlords except for those belonging to the officers. But since all the landowners and the sons and nephews of the landowners entered into the army of Chiang Kai-Shek, the union of the "revolutionary" officers became a guarantee for the property of the landowners. This shameful chap-

ter in the history of the Stalinist leadership cannot be expunged. The Opposition found a copy of the telegram in the minutes of the Political Bureau. It denounced and denounced to shame this betrayal of the agrarian revolution. Now these gentlemen seek to attribute to us in Spain the crimes which they committed in China. They will not succeed: now the Opposition has its section in almost every country which will not permit them to spread lies and confusion with impunity. The Left Opposition will clarify all the fundamental disputed questions in the light of the Spanish revolution and it will take a gigantic step forward. Not for nothing is the revolution the locomotive of history.

LEON TROTSKY.

Kadikoy, July 1, 1931

The British Scene

MacDonald's 'Victories'

Only a full understanding of the rather stormy developments of the class struggle in England during recent years can explain the rise to power and a two year reign of the MacDonald Labor party leadership. But it must also lead to the conclusion that it has passed its zenith and is facing its period of decline, not merely by the Conservatives gaining at its expense but primarily by the coming turn towards the Left of the British working class. This grows inevitably out of the conflict of the shabby Fabian-imperialist position of this leadership with the actual needs of the working class.

The stormy strikes of 1917 to 1920 terminated in the defeat of Black Friday. In consequence of this defeat the British workers turned their attention to the political parliamentary field, to support of the labor party which became expressed in immense gains at the following elections of 1922. The Labor party polled 4,236,733 votes, almost doubling its vote at the preceding elections in 1918. Again in 1926, the general strike came to an inglorious defeat and once more the British workers put their faith in the labor party as expressed in the following elections of May 1929. It again immensely increased its vote, polling a total of about 8,000,000. For the second time it took over the government.

Struggles Looming

Without a question of a doubt serious economic struggles are once more looming in England. The all important question is: Will the British workers now know how to draw the correct political conclusion? Will it mark a period of growth for the Communist party?

The 1929 elections, if they recorded anything, recorded a victory of reformism over Communism. From the time of the general strike, the decline of influence of the Communist party seemingly correspond quite closely, in its relative proportion, to the growth of influence of the labor party. In future perspectives this must be seriously taken into account; and it becomes an imperative duty for the British C. P. first of all to furnish a sober analysis. One may begin by asking how did the party follow the advice given by Lenin to British Communists in his polemic against "Leftism" in Communism? This pamphlet, written in 1920 it will be recalled, proposed to the Communists to form

a bloc with the labor party against the reactionaries in power—to support (it) the same way as the rope supports the man who has hanged himself". It would, of course, be foolish to attempt to interpret such advice in the sense of applying literally or in essence at all times. But how far the British C. P. under the direction of Stalinism, has departed from this fundamental approach in two important situations first in a Right opportunist direction, later in a Leftist direction, has been clearly recorded by history.

The first instance we have in mind was the sorry role cut out for the Communists in the Anglo-Russian "Unity" Committee during and after the general strike. In the name of this spurious united front the Communist party apparently gained in influence and following, particularly for the Minority Movement. But it became only an influence gained for, and a following built around the "Left" deceivers, those who—also in the name of the united front—betrayed the strike. With the collapse of the strike and the final collapse of the Anglo-Russian "Unity" Committee, the influence and following remained by and large with the deceivers who had merely functioned temporarily as the "Left" shield for the utterly reactionary trade union leadership. From this blow, the British Communist Party has not yet recuperated. It could not then and could not since unmask these "Lefts" because the error of this spurious united front has remained uncondemned.

The "Third Period" in England

The second instance came after the Stalin directed Comintern had officially proclaimed the "third period". At the 1929 parliamentary elections, the C. P. entered its candidates under the slogans "class against class" and "fight all three capitalist parties" with the characterization of "social Fascism". As an analysis the former is of course, correct. Moreover, in the class struggle it is always a matter of class against class. But as a concrete slogan and with the combination of the latter it could not at all serve to win the workers. It repelled them and threw them back into the arms of the bourgeois pacifists of the labor party leadership. The brief experience of the nine months' government of these politicians in 1924 had by no means been sufficient for the Brit-

ish workers to recognize the banalities of their professed gradualness of socialism. On the other hand, had the C. P. understood correctly the revolutionary art of unmasking their deceptive reformist position it would at least have enabled it to secure the worker contacts which could become particularly valuable now with the additional experience of "labor" in office. However with the serious errors of the Anglo-Russian "Unity" Committee remaining uncondemned and unclarified; with the Stalinist revisionism saturating the core of its leadership, this could not be expected.

In the language of bourgeois diplomats the MacDonald government is credited with a "brilliant" record in colonial and foreign affairs. It upheld the British tradition of—continuity in foreign affairs, in other words it proved itself an effective agent in carrying on the policy of its imperialist predecessors. It has been characterized by that bourgeois diplomats call a "policy of firmness in Egypt and India", which means that the labor government has known how to interchange successfully "at the right moment" diplomatic trickery or open brutal suppression; to substitute machine guns and deadly poison gasses for the mere police lathi and cane to subjugate their rebellious colonial people. If the recognition of and trade relations with the Soviet Union re-established by the second MacDonald government has not yet brought a favorable trade balance to British capitalism, they undoubtedly still have hopes of reaching this point. At the Hague, the "little giant", Philip Snowden, in the words of the New York Current History, "presented British claims with a pertinacity which the most imperialistic conservative who ever lived could not have surpassed". Even Arthur Henderson has proven his "brilliance" in defending British imperialist interests in foreign affairs.

MacDonald's Imperialist Policy

But it is now in most recent European developments that these hybrid pietists, who abhor all force and violence,—except when in the interest of British imperialism—are again grasping for an opportunity "brilliantly" to serve these interests. While the American imperialists proceed in their ruthless expansion endeavoring to put the European powers on a par with them at this moment, through the Hoover moratorium, particularly directs a blow at France, demanding armament reductions. MacDonald also sees his opportunity. That the European bourgeois powers will fight more desperately between themselves for their diminishing rations is now being historically proven. The French bourgeoisie insists on stiff conditions for financial assistance to Germany. The MacDonald government squirming under the pressure its capitalist masters already suffer for the American colonies, fight the harder for its diminishing ration. It joins the demands for armament reductions—in France. On July 11, it organized a "peace" parade through London, winding up in Albert Hall. All three party leaders, MacDonald, Baldwin and Lloyd George, spoke—for peace. They professed armament reduction in England and strongly alluded to certain other powers (primarily France) who had immensely increased their armaments. While British imperialism is losing its world hegemony it fights desperately for a European hegemony. However, the French bourgeoisie have had the audacity even to surpass England in armament expenditures. According to the report of the World Peace Foundation, the figures for the last fiscal year were (at least the public figures) France \$446,980,000—England \$465,255,000. That heze-

mony within the capitalist world is determined by nothing but armed forces is perfectly well known to the pious gentlemen of the MacDonald government who look with horror toward force applied by proletarian revolutions. So while they talk peace and reduction of armaments they follow the tradition of "continuity of policy" of the imperialists of the previous cabinets. For purposes of public consumption MacDonald wound up his "peace" sermon at Albert Hall with the following drivel: "The problem that we have got to face is the man and the woman that can come up to the assault be beaten back, come back again, full of heart and spirit, knowing that

wrong will not triumph; but by the faith, the persistence, the energy and the determined human heart, that which we regard as precious, that which we regard as essential to the divine purposes of creation, is bound by patience, by energy and by faith to be carried to triumph issues in the course of world affairs."

But what his speech actually implied was a call upon all patriotic Britons to run more effectively to maintain by force the diminishing imperialist ration against the competing powers, this time particularly aiming at the former ally—France.

—ARNE SWABECK.

The Pittsburg Conference

(Continued from page 1)

only from below". All this in spite of the fact that the credentials committee showed that out of a total of 682 delegates, only 65 came from the U. M. W. A. (and they came mostly from minority groups in the mines and not the local unions—approximately three delegates to a mine group.)

Question of National Strike

The conference very properly decided not to call a national strike as yet. The credentials committee report showed that the delegation consisted of representatives of 35,279 miners still at work, and of 45,491 miners who were on strike. It therefore becomes absolutely necessary to spread and deepen the strike at this stage of the game. The national strike is still a matter of the future.

The six-hour day was incorporated into the program. No explanation was given as to why the eight-hour day slogan issued earlier in the strike was changed to the six. The R. I. U. U. gave the word and the "leaders" forgot that the seven-hour day prevails in the Soviet Union . . . and the program

was changed. What's an hour or two between friends?

Resolutions were adopted for the release of every class war prisoner possible—but of course, Morgenstern and Goodman were completely (or purposefully) forgotten—they are Left Oppositionists.

It can be said with absolute certainty that the delegates are returning home with renewed vigor to carry out the strike to a successful conclusion. And provided adequate relief reaches the field the strike has great possibilities. It can also be said with just as much assurance that the policies of Foster, Borich, and Company on the united front will constitute no help but rather a tremendous obstacle in the way of further growth of the Left wing in the mining industry, and in undermining the faith of the workers in the "progressives" of the Kenney, Howat, Muse type. These policies must be replaced by a correct approach to the needs of the present situation—a genuine united front.

—GEORGE CLARKE.

HELP THE PRESS OF THE SPANISH OPPOSITION

From our Spanish comrades we have received the following appeal:

"The developments which Spain is passing through today should be of the greatest interest and a serious lesson to the working class everywhere. How soon we shall arrive at the social revolution in Spain cannot be foretold, but the objective situation is obviously a revolutionary one. The Spanish Left Communist Opposition has great possibilities of development. We believe we do not exaggerate when we expect that within a short time the Left Opposition in Spain will be the most important section of the International Opposition. We have within our ranks very active comrades of considerable authority in the Spanish working class movement, as for example, comrades Andres Nin, Loredo Aparicio, Esteben Bilbao, Gorkin, Lacroix and Juan Andrade.

"But the difficulties we face are great. We have before us the official party, with its denunciation and slanders of us. Although the party has very little authority among the masses, it attempts to use the prestige of the Russian revolution to fight us and to split the Communist movement. We fight for unity of the Communist ranks. But we have not the funds to issue the necessary papers, leaflets, etc. We were able to start the publication of our theoretical organ thanks to the contribution of our French comrades. Can we count upon you to help us spread our revolutionary propaganda material to the Spanish speaking workers in the United States? Can we count upon you for financial sup-

port?"

This letter needs no comment except to emphasize the urgency of the request. Our comrades in Spain have an immense task before them. They are the only force which can really be counted upon to help unify the Communist movement and thus take the first steps toward preparing the Spanish working class for the proletarian revolution. We pass their appeal on to our readers and supporters. Will you help as generously as you can? Will you forward your contribution without delay for speedy transmission to our Spanish comrades? Send all funds to A. Gonzales, care of the Militant, 84 East 10th Street, New York City. All funds will be received and announced in these columns.

National Committee, Communist League of America, (Opposition)

ATTENTION, YOUTH!

The June 15th issue of the "Young Vanguard" contains our appeal to the convention of the Young Communist League. It summarizes in concise form the position of the Left Opposition youth. It can serve as a means of awakening interest in our platform among the more active and advanced Y. C. Leas. It is therefore important that it have a wide distribution of that issue among the Communist youth. Comrades should make efforts in this direction.

Problems of the Spanish Revolution

In a letter to comrade Lacroix, I presented some supplementary considerations on the subject of the situation in Spain. Unfortunately, I have not the complete information needed to know how the Spanish Communists of the various groupings pose the present political questions. The analysis of the revolutionary situation under these conditions is harder than playing chess without looking at the chess-board. There always remain questions which require a supplementary study. Before resorting to the press, I now want to pose these questions before you, and through you, before the Spanish Communists and before all the sections of the International Opposition.

The "Intermediate Revolution"

A considerable portion of my article on the dangers which threaten the Spanish revolution is devoted to showing that between the bourgeois-democratic revolution of April and the future proletarian revolution, there is no room for an intermediate worker-peasant revolution. In passing I emphasized that this does not mean that the party of the proletariat, "up to the final struggle", must occupy itself solely with accumulating forces. Such a conception would be anti-revolutionary and worthy of phillistines. If there cannot exist an intermediate revolution, an intermediate regime, there can on the contrary be intermediate manifestations of the masses, strikes, demonstrations, encounters with the police and the army, violent revolutionary collisions during which the Communists will naturally be in the front ranks of the fight. What is the possible historical sense of these intermediate struggles? On the one hand, they can provoke democratic changes in the bourgeois-republican regime and on the other hand, they can prepare the masses for the conquest

of power, for the creation of the proletarian regime.

The participation of the Communists in these struggles and above all their participation in the leadership of these struggles requires of them not only a clear comprehension of the development of the revolution as a whole, but also a capacity for issuing such specific burning and militant slogans which do not flow directly from the "program" but which are dictated by the circumstances of the day and lead the masses forward.

Everybody knows the enormous role played in 1917, during the Russian coalition of the socialist-conciliators and the liberals, by the Bolshevik slogan: "Down with the ten capitalist ministers!" The masses still had confidence in the socialist-conciliators, but the most confident masses always have an instinctive distrust of the bourgeoisie, of the exploiters, of the capitalists. It is upon this that the tactic of the Bolsheviks was based for a definite period. We did not say, "Down with the socialist ministers!" We did not even issue the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government" as a fighting and actual slogan. But for that, we always hit incessantly on the same nail: "Down with the ten capitalist ministers!" This slogan played an enormous role, since it permitted the masses to convince themselves that the socialist-conciliators thought much more of the capitalist ministers than of the working masses.

Slogans of this type correspond better than anything else to the present stage of the Spanish revolution. The proletarian vanguard is entirely interested in pushing the Spanish socialists to take the power into their hands. That is why the coalition must be broken up. The present task consists of the struggle to drive the bourgeois ministers out of the

coalition. Such a solution of this task or some other, is possible only in connection with important political events, under the drive of new movements of the masses, etc. Thus, under the drive of the movements of the masses in Russia, there was thrown overboard from the coalition government first Gutchev and Milukov and later on Prince Lvov; Kerensky was put at the head of the government, the number of "socialists" increased, etc. After the arrival of Lenin, the Bolshevik party did not solidary itself for an instant with Kerensky and the conciliators. But the party helped the masses to remove the bourgeoisie from power and to put the government of the conciliators to the test in action. It was an indispensable stage on the road of the rise of the Bolsheviks to power.

Communists and Socialist Workers

The elections to the Cortes will reveal, from what I can judge from here, an extreme weakness of the Right wing republicans, of the type of Zamora-Maura. They will give a preponderant advantage to the petty bourgeois conciliators of various colors: radicals, radical-socialists, and "socialists". In spite of this, one can predict with certitude that the socialists and the social-radicals will cling with all their strength to their Right wing allies. The slogan "Down with Zamora-Maura" is quite opportune. Only, one thing must be understood: the Communists make no agitation for the Leroux ministry, they take no responsibility for a socialist ministry, but at every given moment they direct their blows against the most determined and the most consistent class enemy, and by that they weaken the conciliators and clear the ground for the proletariat. The Communists say to the socialist workers: "You have confidence in your socialist leaders, compel them, then, to take power. We will help you partially, while having no confidence in them. And when they are in power, we will put them to the test and we shall see who was right—we or you."

This is dealt with above in connection

with the composition of the Cortes. But other events, as for example the repression against the masses, can confer an exceptional acuteness upon the slogan of "Down with Zamora-Maura". Victory in this field, that is, the resignation of Zamora, might, at the given stage, have almost the same significance for the subsequent development of the revolution as the resignation of Alfonso in April. In order to issue such slogans one must be guided not by doctrinaire abstractions but by the state of mind of the masses, by the reaction which each partial success produces upon the masses. The opposition pure and simple of the slogan of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" or of the "workers' and peasants' republic" to the present regime, is entirely inadequate, because these slogans do not move the masses.

As a counterpart to what has just been said, the question of "Social Fascism" comes forward again. This stupid invention of the terribly Leftist bureaucracy becomes today in Spain the greatest obstacle on the road of the revolution. Let us return again to the Russian experience. The Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionists, being in power, conducted the imperialist war, they defended the capitalists, they persecuted the soldiers, the peasants and the workers, they proceeded to arrest, they introduced capital punishment, they protected the assassins of the Bolsheviks, they compelled Lenin to lead an illegal existence, they kept the other leaders of Bolshevism in prison, they spread the worst slanders against them, etc., etc. All this was more than enough for calling them "social Fascist". But in 1917, this word did not even exist which did not, as is known, prevent the Bolsheviks from coming to power. After the terrible persecutions against the Bolsheviks in July-August the Bolsheviks sat together with the "social Fascists" in the organs of struggle against Kornilov. At the beginning of September, Lenin, from his secret hiding place, proposed to the Russian "Social Fascists" the following

compromises: "Break with the bourgeoisie, take over power and we Bolsheviks will fight inside the Soviets for power by normal (peaceful) means."

Had there been no difference between the conciliators and Kornilov, who was the genuine "Fascist", then no common struggle of the Bolsheviks and the conciliators against Kornilov would be possible. Yet this struggle played a great role in the development of the revolution, by repulsing the attack of the counter-revolution of the generals and by helping the Bolsheviks to tear the masses away completely from the conciliators.

The nature of the petty bourgeois democracy lies precisely in the fact that it swings between Communism and Fascism. During the revolution, these swings are particularly accentuated. To regard the Spanish socialists as a species of Fascism means to give up utilizing their inevitable swings to the Left; this means to cut off for oneself the road to the socialist and the syndicalist workers.

To conclude, I must emphasize that the merciless criticism of Spanish anarcho-syndicalism today presents the most important task, which must not be neglected for a single instant. At its top anarcho-syndicalism is the most masked the most perfidious and the most dangerous form of conciliation with the bourgeoisie. Among the workers who constitute the ranks of anarcho-syndicalism, there are potentially very great forces for the revolution. The fundamental task of the Communists here is the same as towards the socialists: to oppose the ranks to the top. However, the work must be carefully adapted to the specific spirit of trade union organization and to the specific character of the anarchist mask. On this point, in another letter.

I insist once more: The articles, resolutions, platforms etc., of the revolutionary organizations and groups in Spain must be assembled and translated into French, and sent to all the sections for translation into other languages.

LEON TROTSKY

Kadikoy, June 24, 1931