

EDITORIAL NOTES

THE DOWNFALL OF THE VOLKSZEITUNG

The retirement of Ludwig Lore from the editorship of the New York *Volkzeitung* signals the passing of the paper from the Right fringe of the Communist movement to the camp of social democracy. Dr. Lipshitz, the new editor, comes from the German Social Democratic Party and owes his election to the triumph of the Right wing socialist elements in the cooperative association which owns the paper. The new policy of the *Volkzeitung* reflects the decisive change, Half-and-half Communism which in this case—as always—prepared the way for outright socialist reformism is finally replaced by it.

This reactionary victory is a tragedy for the paper that spoke for the workers over many decades, not without effectiveness at times and not without honor on some crucial occasions when other organs faltered and betrayed their trust. It is likewise a tragedy for the man who stood at the helm and reflected in his own person the qualities of the *Volkzeitung* throughout those turbulent years. Ludwig Lore was the *Volkzeitung*. Its strong sides and its weak sides, its inconsistencies, its good intentions and its frequently dubious performances were of one piece with the personality of the man. The shift of control puts an end to the contradiction in the position of the paper. In the long run the change will help to clarify issues that have been muddled and confused in the German-American labor movement. The immediate effect will be to strengthen the reformist and reactionary elements.

The downfall of the *Volkzeitung* demonstrates once again, by an example close at hand, the instability and the transitory nature of in-between positions in our time. Since the world war the issue and the choice between social democracy and Communism has stood categorically. Nobody has been able to stand between them or to reconcile them. And nobody will. Lore's *Volkzeitung* aspired toward Communism. But it was never able to make the clean and final break with the routine, the traditions and the material interests that weighted it toward the past. The paper was bound up—through the shareholding cooperative and in a hundred other ways—with those sections of the German movement for whom socialism had long ceased to be a doctrine of action. Their deadly conservatizing influence was upon the paper all the time, paralyzing it at every turn with contradiction and confusion. The result was a mish-mash policy—to the right of official Communism and to the left of social democracy. Such a position, by its nature and by the nature of our epoch, can have only a transitory influence.

The exceptional personality of Lore endowed this policy with an abnormal endurance. But the life of the paper was fraught with continual crisis and a final show-down was inevitable. The speed with which this show-down came after the retirement of Lore from the editorship shows how shaky was the political foundation of the paper. In these events the similar doom of other political movements of the same kind is foreshadowed. The "left" socialists (such as the Mustelites) and the Right Communists (such as the Loveston faction) which—in different degrees and under somewhat different circumstances—repeat the experience of the *Volkzeitung* are marching towards the same fate. The middle ground between Communism and social democracy is quicksand.

The personal defeat of Ludwig Lore in the ruin of the paper which was his life is sad to contemplate. Among Communists, for whom political considerations are the decisive criterion, personal relations play a part that is necessarily subordinate. In that sense and for that reason we do not speak here as a friend. We went part of the way together, but our paths were not the same. In recent years they diverged more and more. But for all that we never lost a regard for the admirable personal qualities of the man. Among the people who have acquired prominence in the revolutionary labor movement of our day he has been distinguished by an integrity and dignity that is all too uncommon. He was not one of the office boys who take orders, nor one of the scamps who slander for hire and advance themselves by intrigue. In his rebellion against the regime which elevates this *canaille* Lore showed the character of a man and a fighter. In that fight we had common ground with him. It was his failure to bring the right political weapons to the fight that marked off his course from ours. And from this also arises his present political defeat.

HOW THEY PLAY WITH THE GREAT SLOGANS

The slogans of the Opposition travel a uniform course in the Communist International. First they are denounced as counter-revolutionary; then they are smuggled into the official policy in mutilated form and misapplied. This is happening now to the slogan advanced nearly two years ago by comrade Trotsky for economic collaboration between the capitalist countries and the Soviet Union and the extension of long-term credits. A great deal of ink was spilled in demonstrating the counter-revolutionary nature of this slogan. It was hailed on more than one occasion as the final proof of the "complete renegacy of the Trotskyites." Now things are beginning to look a little different. The logic of the situation has again collided with the

official policy. They are again beginning. In a cautious, surreptitious back-door manner, to appropriate an idea from the Opposition. We hear more and more talk about the necessity of credits to the Soviet Union.

In the New York *Herald Tribune* for December 11th there appeared a letter from the "Friends of the Soviet Union", signed by the national secretary, Marcel Scherer. Among other things it says the following:

"The Friends of the Soviet Union today are working for the immediate recognition of the Soviet government by the United States government, free trade relations and the extension of credits. This would bring vast Soviet orders to American factories—at the rate of \$1,000,000 of orders daily—and would give employment to hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers." (Our emphasis.)

That argument—as far as it goes—is unassailable. The trouble with it is that it presents only one side of the question, it is put forward by an improper agency and it is directed to the wrong address. The slogan should be addressed to the workers, rather than to the bourgeois press. It should be put forward by the party, instead of a cover organization the chief function of which is to provide a hunting ground for careerists and false friends of the Soviet Union who will desert it at the first sign of real danger. And it should emphasize also the need of the Soviet Union for economic collaboration with the advanced capitalist countries—enforced by the demand of the workers—in order that it may build its industry quickly and thus strengthen the economic foundations of the workers' rule.

To appeal to the workers for a slogan of long-term credits on the ground of their own immediate material interest in the alleviation of unemployment is quite correct. Its practicality in this respect can be easily demonstrated. And such an appeal to the material interest of the workers will move them faster, and in far greater numbers, than a thousand abstract arguments about the defense of the Soviet Union. But to develop the political implications of the movement and to strengthen its international spirit it is necessary to show to the workers that by helping themselves they are also helping the workers of the Soviet Union. This is the way to strengthen the bonds of internationalism; to make the workers feel that they are participating in the great economic advances of the Workers' state, not merely watching them from the sidelines. By presenting the slogan of the Opposition in its double aspect, and organizing a proletarian mass movement around it, the workers will begin to identify their own welfare with the fate of the Soviet Union. This is the chief aim and the chief value of the slogan.

Of course, one cannot talk in this straightforward and Marxist manner while the workers are being deluded with the fiction that Russia can build socialism alone without any outside help. It is this harmful fiction that stands in the way of a genuine application of the slogan and the organization of a great international movement around it. That is why it is sneaked in, distorted and then promulgated in a polite letter to the bourgeois press by a worthless substitute organization which—out of "friendship" for the Soviet Union—ought to be abolished.

But that is the way they do things. That is the way they play with the great slogans. But in spite of that the slogan of economic collaboration and long-term credits corresponds to reality. Its timeliness grows more obvious with every accentuation of the unemployment situation in the capitalist countries and the increasing difficulties in Soviet economy, which arise in part from the world economic crisis of capitalism. For that reason it will make its way through all machinations. The "counter-revolutionary" slogan of Trotskyism must and will become one of the international slogans of the Communist workers.

and the faint-hearts, would have nothing to do with Mooney. He was charged with dynamiting, and they fled in terror from the issue.

It remained for a mere handful of radicals to organize and lead the fight. The others followed, but they did not come in time. If Mooney's escape from the gallows was due to the handful of militants—who defended his cause against the world—and that is the indubitable fact—then the delay in organizing a great mass movement of defense, and the pussy-footing policies later introduced into it, were and remain responsible for his long imprisonment.

We face the same developments and the same dangers in the case of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer—the union workers who have been selected as the victims in the New York "dynamite plot". They are no longer deserted alone. The influence of their appeal gains ground from day to day. The militant activity of the Defense Committee is putting their case on the agenda of the labor movement. The blackguards and scoundrels who attacked the helpless prisoners in the first days of their arrest—who spread poisonous slanders against them in order to paralyze their defense—are being driven to cover. The honest and class-conscious elements in all workers' organizations are asserting themselves in favor of a united movement to defend the victims of the frame-up.

The greatest danger now is that the widespread and militant movement of labor protest, which alone can save them, will come too late. As in all the cases which the labor movement has known it is a race with time. Every day sees new forces recruited for the fight. But every day likewise draws us nearer to the trial where the scales will be tipped decisively one way or the other.

The labor movement of America has spoken out loud on many occasions against the frame-up system. But all too often this protest has been deferred until the prosecution has gained the advantage of a conviction on perjured evidence. This was the case with Sacco and Vanzetti, and all too many others. Let us hope it will not be the fate of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer.

The great task in protecting the labor movement from this heavy blow is to speed up the fight, to extend it on all fronts and unite all forces. Then it will be a movement for victory instead of a protest against defeat.

—J. P. C.

Official policy. They are again beginning. In a cautious, surreptitious back-door manner, to appropriate an idea from the Opposition. We hear more and more talk about the necessity of credits to the Soviet Union.

In the New York *Herald Tribune* for December 11th there appeared a letter from the "Friends of the Soviet Union", signed by the national secretary, Marcel Scherer. Among other things it says the following:

"The Friends of the Soviet Union today are working for the immediate recognition of the Soviet government by the United States government, free trade relations and the extension of credits. This would bring vast Soviet orders to American factories—at the rate of \$1,000,000 of orders daily—and would give employment to hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers." (Our emphasis.)

That argument—as far as it goes—is unassailable. The trouble with it is that it presents only one side of the question, it is put forward by an improper agency and it is directed to the wrong address. The slogan should be addressed to the workers, rather than to the bourgeois press. It should be put forward by the party, instead of a cover organization the chief function of which is to provide a hunting ground for careerists and false friends of the Soviet Union who will desert it at the first sign of real danger. And it should emphasize also the need of the Soviet Union for economic collaboration with the advanced capitalist countries—enforced by the demand of the workers—in order that it may build its industry quickly and thus strengthen the economic foundations of the workers' rule.

To appeal to the workers for a slogan of long-term credits on the ground of their own immediate material interest in the alleviation of unemployment is quite correct. Its practicality in this respect can be easily demonstrated. And such an appeal to the material interest of the workers will move them faster, and in far greater numbers, than a thousand abstract arguments about the defense of the Soviet Union. But to develop the political implications of the movement and to strengthen its international spirit it is necessary to show to the workers that by helping themselves they are also helping the workers of the Soviet Union. This is the way to strengthen the bonds of internationalism; to make the workers feel that they are participating in the great economic advances of the Workers' state, not merely watching them from the sidelines. By presenting the slogan of the Opposition in its double aspect, and organizing a proletarian mass movement around it, the workers will begin to identify their own welfare with the fate of the Soviet Union. This is the chief aim and the chief value of the slogan.

Of course, one cannot talk in this straightforward and Marxist manner while the workers are being deluded with the fiction that Russia can build socialism alone without any outside help. It is this harmful fiction that stands in the way of a genuine application of the slogan and the organization of a great international movement around it. That is why it is sneaked in, distorted and then promulgated in a polite letter to the bourgeois press by a worthless substitute organization which—out of "friendship" for the Soviet Union—ought to be abolished.

But that is the way they do things. That is the way they play with the great slogans. But in spite of that the slogan of economic collaboration and long-term credits corresponds to reality. Its timeliness grows more obvious with every accentuation of the unemployment situation in the capitalist countries and the increasing difficulties in Soviet economy, which arise in part from the world economic crisis of capitalism. For that reason it will make its way through all machinations. The "counter-revolutionary" slogan of Trotskyism must and will become one of the international slogans of the Communist workers.

and the faint-hearts, would have nothing to do with Mooney. He was charged with dynamiting, and they fled in terror from the issue.

It remained for a mere handful of radicals to organize and lead the fight. The others followed, but they did not come in time. If Mooney's escape from the gallows was due to the handful of militants—who defended his cause against the world—and that is the indubitable fact—then the delay in organizing a great mass movement of defense, and the pussy-footing policies later introduced into it, were and remain responsible for his long imprisonment.

We face the same developments and the same dangers in the case of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer—the union workers who have been selected as the victims in the New York "dynamite plot". They are no longer deserted alone. The influence of their appeal gains ground from day to day. The militant activity of the Defense Committee is putting their case on the agenda of the labor movement. The blackguards and scoundrels who attacked the helpless prisoners in the first days of their arrest—who spread poisonous slanders against them in order to paralyze their defense—are being driven to cover. The honest and class-conscious elements in all workers' organizations are asserting themselves in favor of a united movement to defend the victims of the frame-up.

The greatest danger now is that the widespread and militant movement of labor protest, which alone can save them, will come too late. As in all the cases which the labor movement has known it is a race with time. Every day sees new forces recruited for the fight. But every day likewise draws us nearer to the trial where the scales will be tipped decisively one way or the other.

The labor movement of America has spoken out loud on many occasions against the frame-up system. But all too often this protest has been deferred until the prosecution has gained the advantage of a conviction on perjured evidence. This was the case with Sacco and Vanzetti, and all too many others. Let us hope it will not be the fate of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer.

The great task in protecting the labor movement from this heavy blow is to speed up the fight, to extend it on all fronts and unite all forces. Then it will be a movement for victory instead of a protest against defeat.

—J. P. C.

Official policy. They are again beginning. In a cautious, surreptitious back-door manner, to appropriate an idea from the Opposition. We hear more and more talk about the necessity of credits to the Soviet Union.

In the New York *Herald Tribune* for December 11th there appeared a letter from the "Friends of the Soviet Union", signed by the national secretary, Marcel Scherer. Among other things it says the following:

"The Friends of the Soviet Union today are working for the immediate recognition of the Soviet government by the United States government, free trade relations and the extension of credits. This would bring vast Soviet orders to American factories—at the rate of \$1,000,000 of orders daily—and would give employment to hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers." (Our emphasis.)

That argument—as far as it goes—is unassailable. The trouble with it is that it presents only one side of the question, it is put forward by an improper agency and it is directed to the wrong address. The slogan should be addressed to the workers, rather than to the bourgeois press. It should be put forward by the party, instead of a cover organization the chief function of which is to provide a hunting ground for careerists and false friends of the Soviet Union who will desert it at the first sign of real danger. And it should emphasize also the need of the Soviet Union for economic collaboration with the advanced capitalist countries—enforced by the demand of the workers—in order that it may build its industry quickly and thus strengthen the economic foundations of the workers' rule.

To appeal to the workers for a slogan of long-term credits on the ground of their own immediate material interest in the alleviation of unemployment is quite correct. Its practicality in this respect can be easily demonstrated. And such an appeal to the material interest of the workers will move them faster, and in far greater numbers, than a thousand abstract arguments about the defense of the Soviet Union. But to develop the political implications of the movement and to strengthen its international spirit it is necessary to show to the workers that by helping themselves they are also helping the workers of the Soviet Union. This is the way to strengthen the bonds of internationalism; to make the workers feel that they are participating in the great economic advances of the Workers' state, not merely watching them from the sidelines. By presenting the slogan of the Opposition in its double aspect, and organizing a proletarian mass movement around it, the workers will begin to identify their own welfare with the fate of the Soviet Union. This is the chief aim and the chief value of the slogan.

Of course, one cannot talk in this straightforward and Marxist manner while the workers are being deluded with the fiction that Russia can build socialism alone without any outside help. It is this harmful fiction that stands in the way of a genuine application of the slogan and the organization of a great international movement around it. That is why it is sneaked in, distorted and then promulgated in a polite letter to the bourgeois press by a worthless substitute organization which—out of "friendship" for the Soviet Union—ought to be abolished.

But that is the way they do things. That is the way they play with the great slogans. But in spite of that the slogan of economic collaboration and long-term credits corresponds to reality. Its timeliness grows more obvious with every accentuation of the unemployment situation in the capitalist countries and the increasing difficulties in Soviet economy, which arise in part from the world economic crisis of capitalism. For that reason it will make its way through all machinations. The "counter-revolutionary" slogan of Trotskyism must and will become one of the international slogans of the Communist workers.

and the faint-hearts, would have nothing to do with Mooney. He was charged with dynamiting, and they fled in terror from the issue.

It remained for a mere handful of radicals to organize and lead the fight. The others followed, but they did not come in time. If Mooney's escape from the gallows was due to the handful of militants—who defended his cause against the world—and that is the indubitable fact—then the delay in organizing a great mass movement of defense, and the pussy-footing policies later introduced into it, were and remain responsible for his long imprisonment.

We face the same developments and the same dangers in the case of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer—the union workers who have been selected as the victims in the New York "dynamite plot". They are no longer deserted alone. The influence of their appeal gains ground from day to day. The militant activity of the Defense Committee is putting their case on the agenda of the labor movement. The blackguards and scoundrels who attacked the helpless prisoners in the first days of their arrest—who spread poisonous slanders against them in order to paralyze their defense—are being driven to cover. The honest and class-conscious elements in all workers' organizations are asserting themselves in favor of a united movement to defend the victims of the frame-up.

The greatest danger now is that the widespread and militant movement of labor protest, which alone can save them, will come too late. As in all the cases which the labor movement has known it is a race with time. Every day sees new forces recruited for the fight. But every day likewise draws us nearer to the trial where the scales will be tipped decisively one way or the other.

The labor movement of America has spoken out loud on many occasions against the frame-up system. But all too often this protest has been deferred until the prosecution has gained the advantage of a conviction on perjured evidence. This was the case with Sacco and Vanzetti, and all too many others. Let us hope it will not be the fate of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer.

The great task in protecting the labor movement from this heavy blow is to speed up the fight, to extend it on all fronts and unite all forces. Then it will be a movement for victory instead of a protest against defeat.

—J. P. C.

Official policy. They are again beginning. In a cautious, surreptitious back-door manner, to appropriate an idea from the Opposition. We hear more and more talk about the necessity of credits to the Soviet Union.

In the New York *Herald Tribune* for December 11th there appeared a letter from the "Friends of the Soviet Union", signed by the national secretary, Marcel Scherer. Among other things it says the following:

"The Friends of the Soviet Union today are working for the immediate recognition of the Soviet government by the United States government, free trade relations and the extension of credits. This would bring vast Soviet orders to American factories—at the rate of \$1,000,000 of orders daily—and would give employment to hundreds of thousands of unemployed workers." (Our emphasis.)

That argument—as far as it goes—is unassailable. The trouble with it is that it presents only one side of the question, it is put forward by an improper agency and it is directed to the wrong address. The slogan should be addressed to the workers, rather than to the bourgeois press. It should be put forward by the party, instead of a cover organization the chief function of which is to provide a hunting ground for careerists and false friends of the Soviet Union who will desert it at the first sign of real danger. And it should emphasize also the need of the Soviet Union for economic collaboration with the advanced capitalist countries—enforced by the demand of the workers—in order that it may build its industry quickly and thus strengthen the economic foundations of the workers' rule.

To appeal to the workers for a slogan of long-term credits on the ground of their own immediate material interest in the alleviation of unemployment is quite correct. Its practicality in this respect can be easily demonstrated. And such an appeal to the material interest of the workers will move them faster, and in far greater numbers, than a thousand abstract arguments about the defense of the Soviet Union. But to develop the political implications of the movement and to strengthen its international spirit it is necessary to show to the workers that by helping themselves they are also helping the workers of the Soviet Union. This is the way to strengthen the bonds of internationalism; to make the workers feel that they are participating in the great economic advances of the Workers' state, not merely watching them from the sidelines. By presenting the slogan of the Opposition in its double aspect, and organizing a proletarian mass movement around it, the workers will begin to identify their own welfare with the fate of the Soviet Union. This is the chief aim and the chief value of the slogan.

Of course, one cannot talk in this straightforward and Marxist manner while the workers are being deluded with the fiction that Russia can build socialism alone without any outside help. It is this harmful fiction that stands in the way of a genuine application of the slogan and the organization of a great international movement around it. That is why it is sneaked in, distorted and then promulgated in a polite letter to the bourgeois press by a worthless substitute organization which—out of "friendship" for the Soviet Union—ought to be abolished.

But that is the way they do things. That is the way they play with the great slogans. But in spite of that the slogan of economic collaboration and long-term credits corresponds to reality. Its timeliness grows more obvious with every accentuation of the unemployment situation in the capitalist countries and the increasing difficulties in Soviet economy, which arise in part from the world economic crisis of capitalism. For that reason it will make its way through all machinations. The "counter-revolutionary" slogan of Trotskyism must and will become one of the international slogans of the Communist workers.

and the faint-hearts, would have nothing to do with Mooney. He was charged with dynamiting, and they fled in terror from the issue.

It remained for a mere handful of radicals to organize and lead the fight. The others followed, but they did not come in time. If Mooney's escape from the gallows was due to the handful of militants—who defended his cause against the world—and that is the indubitable fact—then the delay in organizing a great mass movement of defense, and the pussy-footing policies later introduced into it, were and remain responsible for his long imprisonment.

We face the same developments and the same dangers in the case of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer—the union workers who have been selected as the victims in the New York "dynamite plot". They are no longer deserted alone. The influence of their appeal gains ground from day to day. The militant activity of the Defense Committee is putting their case on the agenda of the labor movement. The blackguards and scoundrels who attacked the helpless prisoners in the first days of their arrest—who spread poisonous slanders against them in order to paralyze their defense—are being driven to cover. The honest and class-conscious elements in all workers' organizations are asserting themselves in favor of a united movement to defend the victims of the frame-up.

The greatest danger now is that the widespread and militant movement of labor protest, which alone can save them, will come too late. As in all the cases which the labor movement has known it is a race with time. Every day sees new forces recruited for the fight. But every day likewise draws us nearer to the trial where the scales will be tipped decisively one way or the other.

The labor movement of America has spoken out loud on many occasions against the frame-up system. But all too often this protest has been deferred until the prosecution has gained the advantage of a conviction on perjured evidence. This was the case with Sacco and Vanzetti, and all too many others. Let us hope it will not be the fate of Soderberg, Bukner, and Trajer.

The great task in protecting the labor movement from this heavy blow is to speed up the fight, to extend it on all fronts and unite all forces. Then it will be a movement for victory instead of a protest against defeat.

—J. P. C.

New York Open Forum

NEW YORK—"The Soviet Union and the World Crisis" was discussed by comrade J. P. Cannon at the New York Forum of the Communist League of America (Opposition) at the Labor Temple last Friday. Many Party members were present and a lively question and discussion period ensued.

Since Christmas and New Year each fall on Friday, the Open Forum has been postponed for two weeks. The Forums will be resumed again on Friday, January 8th, 1932, at 8 P. M. at the Labor Temple, 2nd Ave. & 14th Street. The speaker and subject will be announced in a few days.

CHINA'S SILK INDUSTRY STAGNANT

SHANGHAI, (Fenprecor). The silk flature industry here remains in a condition of chronic stagnation. Of 106 flatures in this city, which is the main centre of the China industry, only 25, employing less than 10,000 workers, are functioning at the present time, all others having suspended operations.

Nearly 50,000 flature workers are unemployed and suffering great hardships. The China silk industry has been effectively throttled by Japanese competition and the boycott has afforded no relief.

Young Spartacus can be purchased at all newsstands, bookstores, meetings, etc.

where *The Militant* is now sold. If you are unable to get a copy at these places, write to Young Spartacus, 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

Attention! Minneapolis Open Forum

The Minneapolis Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) is conducting an Open Forum each Sunday afternoon at 3 P. M., at the new headquarters of the Branch as well as general public meetings on general subjects. Meetings have been held on the Spanish Revolution, the Manchurian Situation and other subjects.

Among the lectures arranged for forth coming weeks at the Minneapolis Forum are the following:

All meetings, unless otherwise mentioned are at 3 P. M.:

Sunday, January 3rd, 1932: Debate "Will A Farmer-Labor Party Emancipate the Workers?" Speaker for the Communist League, Vincent R. Dunne; F. L. P. speakers to be announced.

Sunday, January 10, 1932: "Tom Mooney and the American Frame-Up System." Speaker: Carl Cowl.

Sunday, January 17, 1932: "Imperialism; What Next?" Speaker: Vincent R. Dunne.

Sunday, January 24, 1932. DEBATE: "Evolution or Revolution." Speakers: Communist League and Socialist Party to be announced.

Sunday, January 31, 1932: "The Proposed Railroad Wage Reductions." Speaker: C. R. Hedlund.

All these lectures and debates will be held at the Workers Open Forum, 1530 East Franklin Ave., Minneapolis, Minn. The Admission is fr

Stalin and the Chinese Revolution

— Facts and Documents —

The Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927 remains the greatest event of modern history after the Revolution of 1917 in Russia. Over the problems of the Chinese Revolution the basic currents of Communism came to clash. The present official leader of the Comintern, Stalin, has shown himself in full stature in the events on the Chinese Revolution. The basic documents pertaining to the Chinese Revolution are dispersed, scattered, have been forgotten, some are carefully concealed.

On these pages we want to reproduce the basic stages of the Chinese Revolution in the light of articles and speeches of Stalin and his closest aids, and also decisions of the Comintern, dictated by Stalin. For this purpose we use genuine texts from our archives. We particularly print the excerpts from the speech of Chitarov, a young Stalinist, at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which were concealed from the Party by Stalin. The readers will convince themselves of the tremendous significance of the testimony of Chitarov, a young Stalinist functionary, careerist, a participant in the Chinese events, at present one of the leaders of the Y. C. I.

In order to make the facts and citations more comprehensible, we think it useful to remind the readers of the sequence of the most important events of the Chinese Revolution.

March 20th, 1926—the first overturn of Chiang Kai-Shek in Canton.

Autumn of 1926—the VII Plenum of the E. C. C. I. with the participation of a Chiang Kai-Shek delegate of the Kuo Min Tang.

April 13, 1927—the coup d'Etat of Chiang Kai-Shek in Shanghai.

The end of May, 1927—the counter-revolutionary overturn of the "Left" Kuo Min Tang in Wuhai.

The end of May, 1927—the VIII Plenum of the E. C. C. I. proclaims the duty of Communists to remain within the "Left" Kuo Min Tang.

August 1927—the Chinese Communist Party proclaims a course toward an uprising.

December, 1927—the Canton insurrection.

February, 1928—the IX Plenum of the E. C. C. I. proclaims for China the course toward an armed insurrection and Soviets.

July, 1928—the VI Congress of the Comintern renounces the slogan of armed insurrection as a practical slogan.

1. The Block of Four Classes

Stalin's Chinese policy was based on a block of four classes. Here is how the Berlin organ of the Mensheviks evaluated this policy:

"Even on the tenth of April (1927) Martynov argued in *Pravda* quite comprehensively and . . . altogether in Menshevik style the correctness of the official position, which persisted on the necessity of retaining the 'block of four classes', not to rush with the destruction of the coalition government, in which the workers are in session together with the big bourgeoisie, not to hang on to them prematurely 'Socialist tasks' (*Socialist-Ichlesky Vestnik* No. 8 April 23, 1927, page 4.)

What did the policy of coalition with the bourgeoisie look like? Let us bring an excerpt from the *Communist International* (theoretical organ—Ed.).

"On the fifth of January 1927, the Canton government made public a new law on strikes, in which the workers are prohibited from carrying weapons at demonstrations, from arresting merchants and industrialists, from confiscating their commodities, and which establishes compulsory arbitration for a series of conflicts. This law contains paragraphs limiting the interests of the workers . . . But along with these paragraphs there are others, which limit the freedom of strikes more than is required by the interests of defence during a Revolutionary war." (*Communist International* 1927, No. 82, page 11.)

In the rope placed upon the workers by the bourgeoisie the threads ("paragraphs") favorable to the workers are traced. The shortcoming of the noose is in the fact that it is tightened more than is required by the interests of defence" (of the Chinese bourgeoisie). This is written in the central organ of the Comintern. Who writes? Martynov. When does he write it? On the 25th of February, six weeks prior to the Shanghai blood bath.

2. The Perspectives of the Revolution According to Stalin

How did Stalin evaluate the perspectives of the revolution led by his ally Chiang Kai-Shek? Here are the least scandalous of the declarations of Stalin (the most scandalous were not published):

"The revolutionary armies in China (that is, the armies of Chiang Kai-Shek) are the most important factor in the struggle of the Chinese workers and peasants for their liberation. For the advancement of the Cantonese means a blow at imperialism, a blow at its agents in China, and the freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of organization for all revolutionary elements in China in general, for the workers in particular." ("On the Perspectives of the Chinese Revolution" page 46.)

"The army of Chiang Kai-Shek is the army of workers and peasants. It carries freedom for the whole population, for the workers in particular."

What is needed for the success of the revolution? Little:

"The student youth (the revolutionary students), the working youth, the peasant youth,—all this is a force that can

advance the revolution with seven league boots, if it should be subordinated to the ideological and political influence of the Kuo Min Tang". (*Ibid*, page 55).

In this manner the task of the Comintern consisted not in liberating the workers and peasants from the influence of the bourgeoisie, but, on the contrary, in subordinating them to their influence. This was written in the days when Chiang Kai-Shek, armed by Stalin, marched, at the head of the workers and peasants subordinated to him, "with seven league boots" towards . . . the Shanghai coup d'Etat.

4. The Strategy of Lenin and the Strategy of Stalin

What tasks did Lenin pose before the Comintern in relation to the backward countries?

"The necessity of a decisive struggle against the repainting of the bourgeois-democratic liberation currents in the backward countries into the color of Communism".

In executing this the Kuo Min Tang, which had promised to establish in China "not a bourgeois regime", was admitted into the Comintern.

Lenin, it is understood, recognized the necessity of temporary alliances with the bourgeois-democratic movement, but he understood by this, of course, not an alliance with the bourgeois parties, deceiving and betraying the petit-bourgeois revolutionary democracy (the peasants and the small city folk), but an alliance with the organizations and groupings of the masses themselves—against the national bourgeoisie. In what form, then, did Lenin visualize the alliance with the bourgeois democracy of the colonies? To these, too, he gives an answer in his thesis written for the Second Congress:

"The Communist International could enter into temporary alliances with the bourgeois democracy of the colonies and backward countries, but should by no means fuse with it and must unconditionally retain the independence of the proletarian movement even in its most embryonic form."

It seems that in executing the decisions of the Second Congress, the Communist Party was made to join the Kuo Min Tang and the Kuo Min Tang was admitted into the Comintern. All this in the aggregate is called Leninism.

5. The Government of Chiang Kai-Shek As A Live Refutation of The State

How the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union evaluated the government of Chiang Kai-Shek one year after the first Canton coup d'Etat (March 20, 1926) is well seen in the public speeches of the members of the Polit Bureau.

Here is how Katinin spoke in March, 1927 at the Moscow factory Gosznak:

"All the classes in China, beginning with the proletariat and ending with the bourgeoisie, hate the militarists as the puppets of foreign capital; all the classes in China equally consider the Canton government the national government of the whole of China." (*Isvestia*, March 6, 1927).

Another member of the Polit Bureau, Rudzutak, spoke a few days later at a gathering of the street car workers. The *Pravda* report states:

"Pausing further on the situation in China, comrade Rudzutak points out that the revolutionary government has behind it all the classes of China." (*Pravda*, March 9, 1927).

Voroshilov spoke in the same spirit more than once.

Truly in vain did Lenin clear the Marxian theory of the State from the petit-bourgeois garbage. The epigones succeeded in a short time to cover it with twice as much refuse.

Even on April 5 Stalin spoke in the Hall of Columns in defense of the Communists remaining in the Party of Chiang Kai-Shek, and what is more, he denied the danger of betrayal on the part of his ally: "Boredom is on guard!" The overturn occurred exactly one week later.

—J. D. TROTSKY.

(to be continued)

SECOND ISSUE OF YOUNG SPARTACUS IS OUT

The second, the January, issue of YOUNG SPARTACUS is out. It contains many interesting articles and educational features that are of value not only to the Communist youth, but also to the adult in the movement. There is a reprint of the historic words of Leon Trotsky at the time of the death of Lenin, "Farewell Hyteh", an article by George Ray on the student role in the Communist movement. The article by Joseph Carter, on Lenin, Liebknecht, Luxemburg stresses the determination displayed by these revolutionary leaders in continuing the struggle in spite of the fewness of followers that they at times had—and as the Left Opposition is now doing. Also this issue contains "Lenin's Will"—the statement of Lenin's still hidden from the Russian Communist Party by Stalin. On current events, there appears an article on the Marine Workers' Defense and a statement by one of the young defendants, William Trajer. Many other interesting features are to be found in this number.

The first issue was well received and widely circulated. Already the effects of the issuance of a Left Opposition youth paper can be seen, not the least of which is the beginnings of a "study corner" in the *Young Worker*. YOUNG SPARTACUS will continue to appear regularly. Copies of the first and second numbers can be obtained by writing to:

YOUNG SPARTACUS
84 East 10th Street,
New York, N. Y.

"The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word."

Communist Manifesto.

BOOKS BY Leon Trotsky

- 1. THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION**
86 pages, two-colored paper cover, 25c
Introduction by Max Shachtman
 - 2. THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL. A Criticism of Fundamentals**
Introduction by J. P. Cannon
140 pages, hard paper cover, 35c
 - 3. THE SPANISH REVOLUTION**
30 pages, paper cover, 10c
 - 4. THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER**
64 pages, paper cover, 15c
 - 5. THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA**
Introduction by Max Eastman
364 page book, formerly \$2.00; now \$1.00
 - 6. MY LIFE (Autobiography)**
600 pages, \$5.00
 - 7. COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM**
The Trade Union Question
Introduction by J. P. Cannon
64 pages, paper cover, 15c
- PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.
48 pages, paper cover, 15c
- SINCE LENIN DIED
By Max Eastman
158 page book, printed in London, 1924
- Special Rates in Bundles of 5 or more.
- Order through
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street,
New York, N. Y.