

# IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR

## Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

### Party and C.I. in England

LONDON.—Our party is admittedly weak, backward in revolutionary action, and shot through with social democratic tendencies. We are accustomed to blame "ourselves" for this. We have used self-criticism to the point of self-abasement. But is it only "ourselves" who are to blame? Is it not rather the fault of those in the Comintern who have neglected the British party and its difficulties—neglected not only the British party, but all those parties which, in capitalist countries, are striving to overthrow the bourgeoisie?

The course of events in the party leadership has been as follows: certain British comrades, by virtue of their militant activity, commended themselves to the Russian revolutionaries in the early days of the Comintern. They were taught some of the elements of Communism, and returned to England to lead the proletariat over the long and difficult course that lay ahead. From that time on, their assimilation of Marxism and Leninism ceased. They became bureaucrats divorced from the masses, immersed in routine work, and incapable of initiative, for initiative re-

quires some freedom of action for its development, and that is what our leaders lacked—in addition to theoretical understanding.

We think that the present leadership of the Comintern—the Stalin leadership, has allowed things to slide in most sections of the organization. It has been content to let our fossilized bureaucrats carry on here, provided sufficient reports were returned, Russian triumphs given publicity, and defence of the Soviet Union advocated. We say that the Five Year Plan has absorbed practically all the attention of our Russian comrades and that we have been forced into the position of mere distant admirers of Russian working class successes.

To back up this statement, we give the following extracts from recent speeches of two well known Russian party officials—comrades Molotov and Litvinoff. Molotov at the XVII Conference (Moscow) of the all union Communist Party on January 30th last, said: "The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear—it is a policy of peace. It is obvious to all that we are totally absorbed in peaceful construction in our country and are doing all in power to prevent all new imperialist attacks on the Socialist Republic." ("Moscow News", Feb. 2, 1932)

As if this was not enough to make clear the indifference of the Russian authorities to revolutionary work in capitalist countries, comrade Litvinoff on Feb. 11, at the Geneva "Disarmament" Conference, announced that, "The sole aim of the Soviet Government is to build up Socialism upon the territory of the Soviet Union!" ("Daily Worker" (London), Feb. 12, 1932)

This statement of Litvinoff's holds the key to the whole desperate situation of the revolutionary organizations outside the Soviet Union, and especially in Great Britain. It repeats plainly the assertion of Stalin that socialism can be confined to one country. This assertion was most glaringly made in an interview of Stalin with a United Press correspondent in December, 1930, when he was asked, "Can the capitalist and Communist systems co-exist peacefully?" Stalin replied: "It is possible, and the best proof is that they have lived peacefully (sic), side by side since the conclusion of the civil war and the intervention period." ("Moscow News", Dec. 17, 1930).

Radek followed this up six months later (at the Dzerzhinsky Club) with the statement, "Bolshevism is no article of export!" ("Moscow News", June 18, 1931)

Contrast the point of view thus expressed with the teaching of Lenin, who said: "It is as impossible to pass from capitalism to socialism without breaking national frameworks, as it was impossible to pass from feudalism to capitalism without adopting the idea as a nation." (Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 18, page 72)

The present leadership of the Communist International has, by its own statements—and action—travelled a long way from the decisions of the Second Congress (1920) of the International, where a resolution extracted from the statutes of the First International—was unanimously adopted. It was resolved at the Second Congress: "That the emancipation of labor is neither a local nor a national problem, but one of a social character embracing every civilized country, and the solution of which depends on the theoretical and practical cooperation of the most progressive countries."

The leadership of our British party should be the first to agree with the above resolution, for in an introduction to the Thesis on National and Colonial Questions of the Second Congress, the E. C. of the C. P. G. B. concluded with: "Finally, the ultimate aim is indicated in the World Soviet Republic, to be reached by an ever-expanding Federation of Soviet Republics, which shall organize world production, distribution and transport as a single problem. Already, the economic needs of today calls for this world economic organization, but the rival capitalist camps are from their nature incapable of unity. That task awaits the World Soviet!"

And no doubt the leading officials of our party do agree with the Second Congress resolution—"in principle". But in action they follow weekly the line laid down by the exponent of "socialism in one country".

Do we need a new line then? Certainly we do—a true Leninist line. We need also to get away from the apologetic attitude we have been adopting—of constantly blaming "ourselves" for all the faults and shortcomings of the British party. Of course we have faults, chiefly those of theoretical backwardness and of inexperience, but the roots of our extreme disability lie outside Britain; they are to be found in the policy of the Stalin leadership of the Comintern—most strikingly condemned by recent events concerning China, but always at fault in the past—a policy of going over the heads of the working class (e. g. flirting with Hicks, Purcell and Co.) of overestimating the strength and stability of capitalism (unpreparedness to meet the present world crisis) and of making everything subservient

to the immediate needs of the U. S. S. R., regardless of revolutionary problems confronting the proletariat of the capitalist countries.

Our new line, to which we, the party rank and file, must adopt ourselves, is a line of internationalism, of revolutionary action, of rapid expansion into the mass of the workers. We need to warmly greet workers outside the party, instead of lecturing them as inferior beings. Away with sectarianism! Into the masses! Concentrate on our own revolutionary problems! The best defence of the Soviet Union is a fierce and sustained attack on our bourgeoisie here. A new world revolutionary situation lies before us. Our own October is not far distant. The capitalist class is going to give us the war. Let us give it war in return—a civil war for the international revolution, for the dictatorship of the working class, for the World Soviet Republic.

—BRITISH WORKER.

### Rakovsky on the Five Year Plan

(Continued from last issue)

In the following metallurgical factories and types of enterprises, the amount of defective goods was:

Djerdjinsky factory (wrought iron plates)	32 per cent
Djerdjinsky and Petrovsky factory (steel parts)	40 per cent
Verkhny-Turinsk factory (steel parts)	100 per cent
Lapayevsky factory (sheet metal)	40 per cent
Nudjejdinsky factory (high quality steel)	30 per cent
Marti factory (steel)	32 per cent

This list can, of course, be increased many times. It is a matter, therefore, not of single defects, but of a whole system of producing defective goods. The

percentage of waste in the production of coal increased sharply, reaching in some instances as much as 18 per cent. Only 20 per cent of the bricks produced could stand up under the established methods of loading. Matters are still worse in light industries, in which textiles broke all records. According to the figures often quoted, the average percentage of defective goods in the different trusts was 50 per cent. The press also quotes the figures of the losses in millions of rubles, connected with this drop in quality. It is characteristic that the new factories do not remain behind in the percentages of defective goods. The textile factory of the Melange Syndicate, which has been recently constructed, produced in April, 93.98 per cent (!) and in May 92.37 per cent defective

goods. According to the figures of the People's Commissariat of Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, the percentage of defective goods in the needle industry amounted to 30 per cent this year as against 10 per cent last year. Defective goods in the production of rubber reaches 14 per cent, of shoes 13 per cent. There is literally not a single branch of industry where the problem of quality is not a very painful one, and there is almost not a single branch where the current year did not bring a deterioration of quality. It is clear, in connection with this, that where the produce has to go through several stages in the process of production or through several branches of industry, the poor quality in one branch is multiplied by the poor quality in all the other branches. To what conclusions does an examination of the question of quality bring us? There are two conclusions: (1) The deterioration of the quality of production makes the quantitative indices more or less fictitious. Even Kuibishev was compelled to admit this at a session of the presidium of the Supreme Economic Council, where he declared: "The figures of the tremendous growth of industry become relative if we take into consideration the qualitative changes." ("Ekonon. Zhizn", May 22, 1930) "Za Industrializatsiu" of July 18, expresses itself still more emphatically, when it declares that under such conditions "all our quantitative achievements would not amount to a farthing"

In a whole series of instances, the deterioration of quality not only annuls the quantitative achievements, but even converts them into the opposite. For example, in the survey regarding the work in the textile industry for the first half year ("Za Industrializatsiu", April 20) we read: "In many enterprises the plan of production is fulfilled at the expense of a growth in industrial losses and in defective goods among finished and half-finished manufactures. The ultimate result shows that this makes the quantitative achievements negligible and that it has incurred losses to the textile industry and to national economy as a whole. Finally, in several groups of commodities, the cost of production is not covered, not a speak of any accumulation". This is the reverse side of the high tempo of increasing production.

Only a comparison with the qualitative indices makes it possible to judge the quantitative indices. Without taking into account the quality of the products, the quantity figures represent a mere statistical fiction, which does not at all give a picture of the actual state of affairs. It is entirely clear that only by dividing the quantitative indices by the qualitative ones, can a true picture of reality be obtained. Such a picture would be considerably different from the one drawn in flippant articles by the official press. Unfortunately, there are not as yet such indices, with the help of which it would be possible to determine the level of the quality of production and through that, also the actual level of its quantitative growth. This is our first conclusion.

(2) The qualitative indices so far achieved, not only disclose the great relativity of the quantitative indices at the present, but also their possible trend in the future. At the same time, the qualitative indices also demonstrate indirectly the degree reached by the intensity of labor, with which they are closely bound up. Intensity of labor is driven to such limits that the worker who produces the amount demanded of him, is no longer able to direct his attention to the quality. All the data indicate that (further on, we shall once more come back to this) on the given technical basis, we have arrived very close to the boundary, beyond which a further increase in quantity through an increase in the intensity of labor can only be bought at the expense of a deterioration in quality. The quality of production is a signal warning that a further increase in quantity at the expense of an increase in the intensity of labor is no longer possible.

(To be continued)  
Barnaul, July-August 1930  
—CHRISTIAN RAKOVSKY.

\* These figures were taken from several issues of "Za Industrializatsiu" ("or Industrialization") and "Ekonomiticheskaya Zhizn" ("Economic Life") at the end of the first half of the fiscal year 1930. But if there has been any change since, then only for the worse.—Ch. R.

### A Few Lessons of the Anarchist Uprisings in Spain

The recent revolt in upper Llobregat, in Calient Suvia, Berga, Figols and Cardener had completely paralyzed the power of the exploiters for several days. The red flag of the workers waved over the city hall in several of the towns. All of the currents of the Spanish revolutionary movement again tested their theories in practice. The party press in America, which had ignored the Spanish revolution for months and months, all of a sudden broadcast the news that they had established Soviets in several towns in Spain. And among many other things, they said this, the Left Opposition was playing a counter-revolutionary role in the struggle. But a few days passed, and even the blind could see that, said to say, the Communist party was not leading the revolts. Nothing more is said or heard in the Party press or its meetings about Spain, yet the struggle has not stopped, in spite of the fact the Centrist press is silent now, as they were in the previous months.

The leadership of the National Confederation of Labor again showed its hand in stemming the tide rather than fanning the revolt. The vanguard action of the American Stalinites in proclaiming leadership of the struggles was followed by the tail-endism of the Spanish Stalinites in the struggle. The socialist and anarchist role adds new weight to their role of betrayals, all of which is summed up in a recent document of the Spanish Left Opposition published in *The Militant*, Feb. 27.

But since this document, we have new material on the Anarchists that further confirms the position of the Left Opposition on the role of the Anarchists in the Spanish revolution. The *Industrial Worker* of March 8, carried an article by de Guzman, from the "La Tierra", translated by M. Olay. This article proves the anarchists have learned nothing since their master, Bakunin "captured power" in Lyons, France in 1870.

In Spain, "Figols was the first town to revolt and the last to be entered by troops. The town was for five days, from Monday to Saturday, living a regime of libertarian communism." Libertarian communism? And we ask, what may libertarian communism be? We are informed that, "Anarchism has been a reality for a week. And at no place or time were there killings, robberies, and excesses which according to the detractors of anarchism are their very essence." These kind souls, these humanitarians, the subjective individuals are more concerned with the bourgeois opinion of them, than they are with the interest of the workers. What of it, if the bourgeois slander revolutionists, call them thieves, murderers, robbers and enemies of society? Can you expect anything else from the exploiters and their hunkies? Have exploiters ever called the exploited nice names when the slave class desire to throw off the burden of exploitation? If the exploiters confine their opposition to "nasty names" we would have no trouble in taking power, but sad to say, this slander is only a slight breeze of the hurricane they let loose on us ever chance we give them. The individualism of the anarchists is more concerned about their subjective feelings than about the interest of the workers.

The anarchists, to make sure the bourgeois learn how Christlike or Gandhian-like anarchism is—"generous and idealist spirits that they were—once triumphant with the social revolution proclaimed, did not think of squaring accounts; they did not want to shed blood, they did not even bother to humiliate them. They seized all arms to prevent the enemy from attacking them; they posted guards to avoid being surprised, and leaving everybody in absolute freedom they continued working the same as before, without thinking for a moment that the triumph of the social revolution would release them from digging coal from the entrails of the earth." More confusion in fewer words is very difficult to write. They "did not think of squaring accounts". They disarmed them and left everybody, "in absolute freedom". Without expropriating and imprisoning the main forces of the enemy class and finishing those who resist, without establishing a Red Guard, and a dictatorship of the proletariat,

they left the door wide open for the exploiters to return, to reorganize and to annihilate them. Their concept is to—decree the state out of existence; to simply proclaim the social revolution,—but reality is not so simple. You can proclaim the social revolution and raise the red flag today and tomorrow find white terror at its heights unless adequate steps are taken to follow up the first victory and to smash the enemy, to smash their state and all means of exploitation that goes with it and establish a workers' dictatorship.

These "generous and idealist spirits" who established "libertarian communism" say, "In every place the Civil Guards, sheltered in their barracks, where they take refuge; the bourgeoisie locked up in their homes, are left alone. The revolution had triumphed and the revolutionists cannot imitate their former oppressors, by forcing them and the others to share their ideas." This is nothing less than a betrayal of the workers. The anarchists do not know the elementary difference between a successful social revolution and a successful battle in a revolution, which, if not immediately followed up—will result in defeat. They do not know the elementary difference between the bourgeoisie as the ruling power. The former exploiters, "are left alone" by the anarchist leaders and the enemy reorganizes its forces after the first wave of revolt and comes back in the form of bourgeois terror, that should by all means cause us to congratulate and honor the "generous and idealist spirits", the anarchists of Spain! The anarchists in Lyons in 1870 decreed the state out of existence and established a "libertarian communism" but before 24 hours had passed, the state, in the form of the National guards, returned and dispersed the rebels. And once again history repeats itself, only this time as a farce.

### The Communists and the Agrarian Crisis

The confusion existing in the ranks of the Communist movement on the Agrarian question cannot be settled until we trace it to the source and at the same time present the determining factors of American agriculture. The agrarian question in America cannot be separated from the establishment of the Third International, after the successful Russian revolution and the establishment of the Soviet Power. Up to that time, the Second International had a bundle of confused ideas on the agrarian and colonial questions on the problem of the relationship between town and country. In fact, the Second International revised Marxism on this question, leaving the peasantry and colonies as open stamping grounds for imperialist robbery.

Marx and Engels present a clear analysis of this question in their writings and Lenin and Trotsky (Trotsky, "Our Revolution" 1905) brought this question down to practical working class politics in the 1905 period, so successfully carried out in the 1917 revolution by the Marxists. Through the Third International this material and these lessons have become the property of the whole class throughout the world, expressed by their vanguard. However, since the establishment of the Stalin regime and the gradual crowding to the background of the Marxian ideas, we have witnessed a revival of revisionism on this question. This time, from a different angle than that of the Second International.

This revisionism takes on two different forms, one in the colonial countries, and another in the advanced countries. In turn, the problem as a whole flows from the theory of socialism in one country. In the colonial countries, Stalinism poses the question of the 1905 revolution and not that of October 1917 and comes to the conclusion of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." Its concrete expressions have been manifold, with outstanding points of revision such as: the four-class-party in China, Workers and Peasants blocks, Peasant International etc. In the advanced capitalist countries and particularly in America its opposite expression is manifested. The problem of the farmers and the agrarian crisis is not understood and Centrist, in refusing to pose this question by showing the proper relation of town and country, has

left the door wide open for blunders. They have left unanswered the whole question of: What kind of a revolution? What will it look like? (Lenin and Trotsky answered this for Russia). We cannot be satisfied with merely saying: Soviets and dictatorship of the proletariat. What will the Soviets be like, when we take power, in comparison to the Soviets established by the first workers' class rule and in a backward country with the majority of peasants? In place of these answers we have revisionism for the advanced countries expressing itself as: The "peoples' revolution", Workers and Farmers parties and the Workers and Farmers Government; Self determination for the American Negro and the Anti-Imperialist League, etc.

One question we must settle and that will throw considerable light upon the problem for the advanced capitalist countries is the question of American agricultural conditions today. Once we lay down a Marxian analysis on this question we can more readily come to a proper understanding of the question. The problem for colonial countries will not be taken up here. We will confine ourself to advanced America.

**Agrarian Development under Capitalism**

A proper elevation of the problem calls for an understanding of its historical development and relation. Under pre-capitalist conditions agriculture and manufacturing were established as a unity with manufacturing subordinated to agriculture (manufacturing used in the obsolete sense—hand-tool production). "Domestic handicraft and manufacturing labor, as side issues to agriculture, which forms the basis, is the prerequisite of that mode of production upon which natural economy rests, in European antiquity and in Middle Ages as well as in the Indian commune of the present day, in which the traditional organization has not yet been destroyed. The capitalist mode of production completely dissolves this connection." (Marx: Capital, Vol. 3, page 913). The capitalist mode of production destroys this unity of agriculture and manufacturing and by the concentration of the means of production and their transformation into capital they are able to expropriate the direct producers and change them into wage workers. These wage workers are

(Continued on page 4)

**Have You Read These Works?**  
by LEON TROTSKY

ON THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY

- \*Draft Program of the Communist International—A Criticism of Fundamentals parts 1 and 3 140 pages, hard paper cover, 35c Cloth cover, \$1.00
- \*Strategy of the World Revolution Part 2 of the Draft Program 86 pages, paper cover 25c
- \*The Permanent Revolution 158 pages, paper cover 50c Cloth cover \$1.00

ON THE RUSSIAN QUESTION

History of the Russian Revolution Volume 1—The Overthrow of Czarism—\$4.00

By Special arrangements with the publishers we can offer this book to certificate holders for \$3.00. To members of the Communist League (O.) at \$3.50. Enclose 10c postage per copy with order.

- \*Problems of the Development of the U. S. S. R. 48 pages, paper cover, 15c
- The Real Situation in Russia 364 pages, cloth cover \$1.00
- Since Lenin Died by Max Eastman 158 pages, paper cover, 50c
- \*World Unemployment and the Five Year Plan Out of Print.

ON THE SPANISH QUESTION

- \*The Spanish Revolution 30 pages, paper cover, 10c
- \*The Spanish Revolution in Danger 64 pages, paper cover, 15c

ON THE TRADE UNION QUESTION

Communism and Syndicalism 64 pages, paper cover, 15c

ON THE GERMAN QUESTION

- \*Germany—The Key to the International Situation Shall Fascism Really Be Victorious? 48 pages, paper cover, 10c
- \*The Turn in the Communist International and the German Situation Out of Print.

In Preparation Problems of the Chinese Revolution 385 pages, cloth cover

\* Bound Volumes of the pamphlets indicated by \*—limited to 100 copies. Watch the MILITANT for prices. Let us know if interested.

SPECIAL RATES IN BUNDLE ORDERS

PIONEER PUBLISHERS  
84 East 10th Street,  
New York City

CHICAGO, ATTENTION! OPEN FORUM  
Subject: Einstein, the God Builder  
Speaker: HUGO OEHLEER  
Sunday, March 20th, 1932, 3 P. M.  
135 No. Western Avenue

THE MILITANT  
Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th St., N. Y.

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

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.

SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1932  
Vol. 5, No. 11 (Whole No. 107)  
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy.  
Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy.