

IN THE INTERNATIONAL OF LABOR
Reviews and News of the Working Class and Revolutionary Movements

Int. Right Wing on Verge of Disruption
Leader of Czech Group Protest Brandler-Thalheimer Slanders Against Trotsky

We are bringing below a letter sent by Alois Neurath, one of the chiefs of the Brandler Right wing in Czechoslovakia, to his Berlin friends. The whole spirit of this document is indicative of the ferment that is taking place in the Right wing International. Faced with serious tests of Communist struggle, the fungus growth of Brandlerism is rapidly disintegrating. The splitting away of the Walcher-Froelich group in Germany, the decomposition of the Right wing in Czechoslovakia and Austria have caused a panic among the summits of the Brandler organization. Brandler has sent out a heart-rending appeal for an international meet of the stress on the extraordinary importance of the American Lovestone group participating in it. What will Brandler do when he discovers that his American bulwark is also breaking up and capitulating to the Stalinists? That is not very hard to guess. . . . The internal situation in the camp of world Communism is clearing up. Only the collapse of the Right wing will permit the voice of the Left Opposition to be heard all the more strongly by all the worker Communists.

whatever it does in the rest of the world is false—in the Arpo and in Gogen den Strom. Naturally, you have the right of propagating this view in the name of your group. But since the unification of the various foreign groups has resulted in an international opposition, the impression must not be given, as long as no discussion has taken place, that your position is in accord with that of the other groups. That is by no means the case.

How unsufferable this condition has become, may be seen, among other things, from the position you take toward Trotsky. In the article cited above, you reprint part of Trotsky's work What Next You add there the remark "And with regard to the step Walcher-Froelich have taken, he says that it means a step forward".

You have, of course, read Trotsky's pamphlet quite thoroughly. You are therefore consciously calumniating, for you know well that Trotsky did not write that, but the contrary, Trotsky writes: "The minority considers an independent and active policy necessary, that is directed not only against Reméle, but against the course and the regime of the Stalin bureaucracy in the U. S. S. R. and in the Comintern. If we interpret the position of Walcher-Froelich correctly, on the basis of the as yet inadequate material we have at

hand, then it means a step forward in this question."

This is what Trotsky writes, and at that, at a time when he could not have known that Walcher and Froelich had given up their organizational independence and gone over directly to the S. A. P. Trotsky therefore emphasizes the independent policy of this group and calls that a step forward. Why, then, do you deceive the readers of the Arpo so manifestly? Why the manifest calumination? Does Trotsky welcome their going over to the S. A. P.? These are just the methods of their sections. When, on the basis of such slanders, you come to the conclusion that Walcher is creating out of the S. A. P. an auxiliary troop for Trotsky's Russian factional struggle, you overlook entirely and completely that another conclusion must follow from this: Namely, that you want to make not only out of the C. P. G. O. (Brandler group), but of the other opposition groups, auxiliary troops for Stalin in the Russian factional struggle.

The opposition arose and could only exist in the struggle against Stalin's national and international policies, since and in so far as these policies, in their entirety contradict the Leninist fundamentals. When you returned from the Soviet Union, you yourselves took that

position. Only gradually you left this position. Since you could not and did not want to attain a firm position against Stalin's policies, disintegration has become the fate of the C. P. G. O. The international opposition cannot avoid this fate, if it will not decide to take a critical position toward the internal policy of the C. P. S. U. as well as to the whole policy of the Comintern, the mistakes of which have their roots in the erroneous policy of the C. P. S. U. Precisely the events in Germany make the duty of all oppositionists to draw the line, clearly and distinctly, before the criminally erroneous policy of the C. I. Personally, I am completely in accord with the views Trotsky has expressed on Fascism, on the tasks of the C. P. G. and particularly those contained in his great work, What Next?

In my opinion, they contain the most astute analysis of the present situation in Germany from the point of view of Marxism-Leninism, the clearest presentation of the present tasks of the C. P. G. and the opposition, respectively. To be honest, it is impossible to vacillate between the fundamental views which Trotsky develops and the present C. I. policy. Either the one or the other. You have decided—that is perfectly clear today—for Stalin, only you do not want to say so openly. The revolutionary working class will decide—the longer it takes, the more certain will be their decision—for the fundamental views developed by Trotsky. This my firm conviction. . . .

With Communist greetings, (Signed) NEURATH.

GERMAN SKETCHES

Lieutenant Scheringer These days, the former Reichswehr lieutenant, Scheringer, was sentenced to an additional two and a half years of fortress confinement by the Reich's Court for so-called Literary High Treason. This is a purely arbitrary act, an act of revenge on the part of the bourgeoisie against an outsider who is striving toward Communism. It is an act that demands the sharpest protest from all proletarians, one that casts ample light on brutal class justice in Germany. But for Communists, the question cannot end there. For, it is also a question of ideological struggle against all those who wipe out the boundaries between Fascism and Communism and it has become a vital question for the Communist party at a moment when at least 200,000 followers of the C. P. G. voted Fascist in the second ballot of the presidential elections. But Scheringer, whose pamphlets have been far more spread as texts for the younger generation of the C. P. G. than the Communist Manifesto, is the ideological pioneer of this development. Scheringer is not even today a Communist, but a National-Bolshevik. L. Trotsky wrote very correctly about him in August 1931:

"Scheringer and Stenbeck-Fermor (another recent national-Bolshevik proselyte—Ed.) regard the task of the Communist party very graciously as that of a direct continuation of the Hohenzollern war. They are prepared—temporarily in words—to accept the "people's revolution," if it can serve them as a means of mobilizing the workers for their "revolutionary" war."

Three months ago, at a public meeting in Berlin, in which the present writer was the speaker, Count Stenbeck-Fermor raised a hue and cry about Trotsky's "calumniation" of Scheringer. But for a clarification of the actual state of affairs, it is sufficient to quote what Scheringer—whom we cannot deny a clear, firm and incorruptible character—said on April 8, 1932 before court:

"For me the desire of national liberation was the point of departure that led to my development toward Communism. As long as the working class is oppressed by the capitalists of Germany itself, a national liberation is impossible. "Only social liberation will give the laboring people a fatherland and this social liberation can be attained only by the revolutionary working class under the leadership of the Communist party. That is also the way by which we shall come to national liberation."

The words of Karl Liebknecht: "Our enemy is in our own country" are given this variation by Scheringer: "Our enemy is not in Russia, but in the capitalist West." But the Roté Fahne and its Brandlerist lick-spittles far from carefully and tactfully criticizing this declare it to be 100 per cent Bolshevism. It is being proved more and more that it was not Scheringer who came to the party, but

the party who came to Scheringer. Today, when the fruits of this fatal development are already becoming visible, the warning words of L. D. Trotsky in August 1931 are doubly appropriate:

"The party may, of course, utilize even such individual metamorphoses as a means of disintegrating the camp of the Fascists. The crime of the Stalinist bureaucracy—yes, the direct crime—consists in this: that it declares its solidarity with these elements, that it identifies the voice of the party with their voices, that it renounces the exposures of their nationalist and militarist tendencies, that it transforms the thoroughly petty bourgeois, reactionary-utopian and chauvinist pamphlet of Scheringer into a new bible of the proletarian."

Comrade Pruegel. It is hard to assume that before April 10, anyone outside of East Reinickendorf, a working class district of Berlin, ever heard of comrade Pruegel, and it is hard to assume that he will play a very great role in the future. He is one of those hundreds of small functionaries, who, after five years of graveyard silence in the party, has dared in an unclear, timid but nevertheless distinct voice to get up against the bureaucrats in a membership meeting, to reject the blabber about the guilt of the members for the defeats of the party and to begin to discuss the political mistakes of the party leadership, particularly in the question of the united front. That is why this unfortunate comrade Pruegel serves the bureaucrat Ulbricht, the "leader of the Berlin proletarian", as scapegoat to the extent of a whole page in the Roté Fahne of April 10. The bureaucracy is beginning to feel the ground tremble under their feet. They are faced with an elementary Berlin party workers conference after the first ballot in the recent presidential elections, that the conference had to be adjourned and the next one packed with especially picked people. (Comrade Pruegel published documents on this affair). The bureaucracy is pouncing on these nameless functionaries with a mixed feeling of hatred and fear. They want to uproot the germs, they want to crush these nameless objects before the Opposition finds leaders with names.

Externally, the party shows, despite the heavy defeats, as yet a firm and fearless appearance. Internally, the disintegration has reached an extraordinary degree. The spirit of ideological and actual capitulation, raised on the garbage heap of the "national program", has taken the form of numbers in the 200,000 voters who went over from Thaelmann to Hitler in the run-off elections. In the party itself it has long been obvious. The sympathies of the unemployed Communists for the "honest, active" Nazis, the readiness with which they discuss with them and not with the social democratic workers, the anxious and almost sympathetic reading of the Nazi press, the open opinion that Hitler should be voted for "in order to hasten the decision"—all these are enough alarm signals.

All this will, however, force the Pruegels, if we take Pruegel as an example, to throw off their irresolution. Already five units in Berlin-Charlottenburg have adopted a resolution against social Fascism with a crushing majority. The workers' Opposition is beginning to bear fruit. We greet those nameless fighters who no longer fear the filthy attacks of the bureaucracy. Only in their struggle lies the guarantee for the salvation of the party and for victory. —E. BAUER.

The Negro and the Class Struggle

(Continued from last issue)

But the solution cannot be brought closer by artificial slogans, such as the slogan of Self Determination. We must minimize the desires of the Negro Petty-Bourgeoisie and enlarge the form of the proletarian interest of the Negro who is, like the white worker, choked with bourgeois ideology. Nationalism must be won as allies to the proletariat, if they are oppressed minorities. But in winning them as allies we do not approach the workers of this nationality or race as such. This would be national opportunism. We approach these workers as workers. We know the bourgeois element of the national minorities under Czarism were no better and often worse than the dominating bourgeoisie against the workers. Likewise the Negro bourgeois elements have already proven they can outstrip their white masters. We want allies, but not on the basis of concessions and compromises on principles. But the Negro proletariat is no Negro ally—he is a worker. The cropper and dirt farmer are allies and must be won as such. But in this relation the Negro industrial and agriculture worker is decisive.

A compromise on principle means that the "allies" have captured the proletariat. The program of the Communists (Marxists) is the only one possible for the American Negro for social, political and economic equality and freedom. The road is the road of class struggle, not that of "preparation stages"—self determination, democratic dictatorship of the Proletariat and Peasantry, four class party, workers and peasant parties, peoples revolution, etc.—which give the petty-bourgeois Negroes organizational and political control. Preparation stages in struggles are necessary, but not compromises on principle, passed off as preparation stages.

We must consider slogans and tactics for the race form of the class struggle. This is essential in order to defeat the bosses' tactics of divide and rule. Slogans and tactics against the legal and extra-legal discrimination and lynch laws are the order of the day. A will to fight the battles of the Negro masses, as the party has already de-

monstrated, is a big step forward. Let us not step backward into the swamp of national reformism.

The Negro of America was not snatched from a State or Nation in Africa with national aspirations and ideologies. Neither has America given the Negro as a Negro the material base for nationalism as such. The class struggle of the Negro is not cloaked in a national form (complicated with the national bourgeois influence) that calls for the slogan of self determination at special stages and under special conditions in the struggle. It is cloaked in the race form. The American Negro bourgeois elements are no ally of ours. The problem is complicated enough without adding the national complex to it, which in this case can only result in national reformism.

The racial form of social conflicts has taken the national form where the racial group obtained an economic unit. This has been the case in the past. Blood ties, gens and clans in the process of development from primitive Communism through the stages to an exploiter's society, naturally crystallized as such. But the American Negro presents no such picture. His is a different and far more difficult problem.

The Socialist tells us in substance, that the workers must not seize power in backward countries. We must let the bourgeois revolution take its course develop its industries (nationalism), and then we will win it over. Stalinism tells us that we must move the American Negro into the feeling of national consciousness through the slogan of Self Determination. Of course Stalinism will say, "No, not national consciousness". But we will answer: The slogan of Self Determination for a racial group that does not have a material base for such has even less logic than the socialist position. At least, these non-Marxists speak of a material base for bourgeois power, in one form or the other, in back-

ward sections. When the proletariat takes power, the Negro worker will take his place as an equal with the white worker. Where the Negroes are the majority (parts of South, etc.), this majority will dominate the Soviets.

The Negro worker and farmer, being even more oppressed and exploited than his white brother requires special consideration from the revolutionary party, even though, economically, he is a worker or dirt farmer. This double exploitation and class suppression is carried out through the race form of the class struggle, which does not include the national form in the political sense. Nationalism says, because the Negro constitutes a doubly exploited racial minority, and regardless of the argument on nationalism, it is proper to present the slogan of Self Determination for oppressed racial minorities as well as national minorities.

Let us consider it in this light for a moment, in spite of the arguments already presented. Adding to what has been said about the slogan of self determination, we must say that it can only be realized, so far as the American Negro is concerned, after the overthrow of capitalism in the South, which means the overthrow of American imperialism as such. Is this transition step needed then? The victory of the proletariat includes within it the solution of the double exploitation of the Negro masses. As for the Negro bourgeoisie, the Negro and white workers will take care of them just as they will take care of the white exploiters. The Soviets of the South will solve this problem, even though special efforts will have to be leveled against reactionary ideological carry-overs. But the main struggle against the reaction is in the struggle against the Negroes, but the slogan as a means of winning the Negro masses today for the proletarian revolution? Yes, the

Nine Years of the Struggle of the Left Opposition

The German Revolution of 1923 and the «Lessons of October»

(Continued from last issue)

In 1917, the main leaders of the Bolsheviks, before and after Lenin's arrival from Switzerland, had adopted anything but a revolutionary position. Kamenev and Stalin had been for supporting the bourgeois republic "from the Left", and for the continuation of a "revolutionary war" in defense . . . of the Provisional government. Zinoviev, Kamenev, Rykov, Nogin, Lunatcharsky, Losovsky, Yaroslavsky, Molotov, Tomsky—all of them were either opposed to the October insurrection or in favor of a Menshevik-Bolshevik coalition government. Some of them—like Zinoviev and Kamenev—adopted such a position, even after the Bolshevik seizure of power, that Lenin, who had worked together with them for decades, did not hesitate to denounce them as "strike-breakers and deserters". Trotsky's recollection of these facts and his explanation of them, their causes and effects, opened up a new campaign against "Trotskyism", in which, as had already become customary, the real issues objectively raised by Trotsky were deliberately concealed or smothered under by the bureaucracy. What might have been a brightly illuminated campaign of instruction and enlightenment for the international Communist movements on the art and problems of insurrection was treacherously converted by Zinoviev-Stalin-and-Co. into a lynching campaign against the Opposition and its leader.

It is interesting to note, in passing, the characteristic manner in which the campaign was conducted on an international scale. Letters and telegraphic commands were dispatched by Zinoviev through the Comintern apparatus to the Central Committees of all the national Communist parties with the demand that Trotsky's "Lessons of October" be repudiated and the "Old Guard" of the Russian Central Committee endorsed. Everywhere the wheels were set into motion for the routine of adopting resolutions without discussion or understanding. Petty bureaucrats were found in every party who were ready to condemn or endorse whatever they were told to; those that refused, were systematically undermined, attacked and harassed until their places were taken by obedient apparatus servants.

In the United States, more characteristically, the party membership was brow-beaten and blackjacked into a condemnation of "The Lessons of October" without ever having read it! The obscure "Imprecor" containing the document was never sent here. The work was published only long afterwards in England, by a non-Communist, and although perhaps one or two people out of a million in this country have ever read it, the American party was nevertheless one of the first to rush to the assistance of the Comintern bureaucracy with a sharp condemnation of the "Trotskyist attack upon

the Old Guard". Since then such a procedure has been raised to the level of a routine system. . . .

The attempt was subsequently made, as we mentioned, to make Brandler the scapegoat for the whole defeat. This attempt was resisted by Trotsky, who knew the real source of the catastrophic policy pursued. Because he opposed the policy of finding scapegoats, the legend was thereupon circulated that Trotsky was a defender of the German party leaders. There is not and never was the faintest sign of truth in the legend. Not only did Brandler and Thalheimer promptly join Zinoviev and Co. with a condemnation of "The Lessons of October" (they were among the first, as a matter of fact), but it was later proved by documentary evidence that it was Stalin and Zinoviev who not merely defended Brandler but have been the ones mainly responsible for the German policy in 1923.

In 1926, after Zinoviev had broken with Stalin, he made public a letter which Stalin had written to him and Bucharin on the eve of the German defeat. The letter gives us the measure of the man, his limited, myopic outlook, his disastrous political course, his ineradicable co-responsibility for the calamity in Germany and its subsequent consequences:

The confidential archives of most of the other leaders would undoubtedly reveal similar documents to indicate that in 1923 they played the same role in the

German revolution, with fatal results, as they sought to play in the Russian revolution of 1917 but were prevented from playing by the sharp intervention of Lenin and Trotsky.

The defeat of the German revolution, plus the crushing of the September 1923 insurrection in Bulgaria and the Estonian putsch of 1924, marked a sharp turn in the history of the Communist International. It not only opened up the epoch of "bourgeois stabilization" in Europe and the ebbing of the revolutionary high-tide, but inaugurated a period of reaction in the Soviet republic and the International. Above all, it was the objective cause for the introduction and the triumph of the reactionary theory of "socialism in one country". It is with this question, and with the Fifth Congress—the first non-Leninist gathering—of the International, that we shall deal in the next article. —MAX SHACHTMAN.

SPARTACUS YOUTH CLUB NOTICE

The Spartacus Youth Club has changed the night of its meeting. It will now meet Friday evenings, 8:00 P. M. at Stuyvesant Casino. This will enable many comrades to attend who could not do so when the club met on Friday, May 13, 8:00 P. M. at Stuyvesant Casino, 2nd Ave., and 9th St.

Now on the Press!
Problems of the Chinese Revolution
by LEON TROTSKY

THE 1925-27 CHINESE REVOLUTION WAS ONE OF THE FIRST WORLD-IMPORTANT POLITICAL EVENTS IN WHICH TROTSKY'S OPPOSITION TO THE POLICY OF STALIN MANIFESTED ITSELF IN THE CONCRETE. IN THIS BOOK, QUOTATIONS FROM STALIN'S OWN WRITTEN WORDS AND SPEECHES ARE GIVEN AS WELL AS THOSE OF TROTSKY'S AND HIS SUPPORTERS.

READ THIS HISTORICAL DOCUMENT. COMPARE THE PROPOSED POLICIES OF THAT DAY WITH SUBSEQUENT EVENTS IN THE CHINESE REVOLUTION, THEN DECIDE WHO WAS CORRECT. THE LEFT OPPOSITION DOES NOT FEAR YOUR JUDGMENT AFTER YOU HAVE SERIOUSLY READ AND STUDIED THIS BOOK.

PAPER COVER \$1.00 CLOTH BOOK \$1.50

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

Money Is Needed

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

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