

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

A Letter From England

LONDON, ENGLAND

No doubt you already heard of the expulsion of J. T. Murphy from the Communist Party of Great Britain. Since the struggle between Murphy and the political bureau of the party began over the question of credits to the Soviet Union, details of the discussion which led to J. T. Murphy's resignation and subsequent expulsion may be of interest to American comrades.

It must be remembered that Murphy is an old member of the party and has been for years on the central committee. He was for two years the British party's Comintern representative, one of the ablest men—maintaining all due proportions produced by the British party, an effective speaker and writer and a capable politician. Murphy was, moreover, foremost in the fight against "Trotskyism". He wrote the preface to the English edition of the "Errors of Trotskyism" and at the party's convention of 1927 moved the resolution endorsing Trotsky's expulsion from the party. It will be seen that J. T. Murphy has an excellent record in the service of Stalin.

In the April number of the Communist Review, Murphy advanced the slogan of "Credits to the Soviet Union". He prefaced this with a vicious attack on the Left Opposition and, having cleared himself of any suspicion in this direction, proceeded to argue that the slogan of "Credits" would be an effective weapon to aid the Soviet Union. The article appeared. Nothing was said. The May issue of the Communist Review contained no suggestion that there was any disagreement save that Murphy was no longer editor.

Then, on May 11, there appeared a statement in the Daily Worker that Murphy was expelled for the propagation of "anti-working class views and the desertion of the working class fight against war, starvation and repression at a decisively critical stage in the class struggle". Murphy's arguments were that the more credits we could obtain, the more trade there would be between Britain and Russia, the less inclined the capitalists would be to declare war on the Soviet Union. The political bureau correctly drew attention to certain statements in the article which would weaken the agitation against the war menace. But on the central point of the quarrel the political bureau was silent. They avoided any definite statements on whether or no the slogan of "Credits" was correct. All they did was to point

to Manchuria and scream about war, not to say that such a slogan was not needed at this stage and to condemn Murphy for "moving nearer to the position of the counter-revolutionary Trotskyists".

Murphy has since published articles in the socialist press, admitting that he did advance arguments which tended to cover up the danger of war. His articles fail to explain why the discussion conducted between himself and the politburo was kept secret and why, when attacked, he resigned from the party. The discussion commenced, according to Murphy, in March if not earlier. The article in which he openly advocated credits appeared in April. All those C. P. members who are now rushing into print to denounce Murphy saw it and read it and by their silence accepted it until told by the secretariat—Rust and Polit—to do otherwise. For over two months the politburo and Murphy concealed their differences from the membership and only Murphy's resignation forced the matter into the open. Not open struggle, not education of the membership by open political discussion, but diplomatic correspondence and the covering up of differences within the leadership—this is the line of the political bureau and Murphy.

Murphy started by accepting the theory of "socialism in one country" and built up his arguments for the "Credits" slogan on it. As a result, his tree bore reformist fruits. The politburo, in reply, avoided the question. The U. S. S. R. needs credits, is at this moment

negotiating for them, but the politburo believes with Stalin that diplomatic negotiation can secure more than mass pressure. This, they say, is a matter for the Soviet diplomats—keep the workers out of this.

It is here that our group of the Left Opposition takes up the matter. Making use of comrade Trotsky's pamphlet—Unemployment and the Five Year Plan—we are urging in the party that such a slogan can be an effective part of our immediate struggle. Those who argue that the U. S. S. R. is independent of world economy are going to find it very difficult to explain why the Soviet Union is negotiating credits and why we cannot advance it as a main slogan in the present stage of the struggle. But then, clear explanations and the honest facing of political issues is not the strong point of the party leadership. Molotov, Stalin have spoken—means must be found to agree.

—ANGLICUS.

TROTSKY'S PAMPHLETS
Draft Program of the Communist International
Strategy of the World Revolution
World Unemployment and the Five Year Plan
Problems of the Development of the U. S. S. R.
The Turn in the C. I. and the Situation in Germany
Germany—The Key to the International Situation
The Spanish Revolution in Danger
Communism and Syndicalism
Bound in One Volume, Attractive Cloth Cover
Pamphlets marked (\*) out of print, available only in Bound Volumes.
PRICE TWO DOLLARS.

Nine Years of the Struggle of the Left Opposition
The Anglo-Russian Committee and the British General Strike

(Continued from last issue)
The Test of Events

The first really serious test of the Anglo-Russian Committee was the British general strike of 1926 which broke out in the midst of the great miners' strike. So all the assurances of friendship for Russia, of loyalty to British labor and enmity to British imperialism, freely given by Purcell and Co., were subjected to a decisive test in the fumes of the general strike. And just as the Opposition had warned, the British General Council, its Left wing as well as its Right wing, revealed its disgraceful cowardice and treachery, its fundamental loyalty to British imperialism, its hatred and fear of the revolutionary proletariat. After nine days of the general strike, in which a revolutionary situation was engendered, in which the strength of the ruling class rested not so much upon its immediate ranks as it did in the strength which the labor leaders, Left and Right, enjoyed in the working class, the General Council deliberately delivered the death blow to the general strike and to the miners whom all the other workers had struck to defend. In face of the extremely militant mood of the workers, in face of the pitiful helplessness of the bourgeoisie, in face of such phenomena as the refusal of numerous armed regiments to proceed against the strikers, all the trade union lackeys of the ruling class rushed to the king's ministers to confer with the king's ministers on how to crush the movement. The "red" veneer with which the "Left" labor leaders had coated themselves was wiped off in a patriotic frenzy. The financial aid sent the striking miners from Russia was indignantly returned with the epithet of "the damned Russian gold". The red flag was hastily dropped for the Union Jack. Purcell and Co. proved to be not the "organizational center that embraces the international forces of the proletariat for the struggle", but a most reliable prop of a desperate ruling class. Had the whole affair been played out according to the plot of a stage drama, it could not have presented a more annihilating indictment of the Stalinist view and confirmation of the Opposition's.

And where was the Committee as a whole during these stirring days of magnificent struggle and base treachery? As Kautsky said plaintively about his Second International: it was only an instrument of peace: in times of acute conflict, it was worthless.

More correctly, it was worthless to the revolutionists, to Soviet Russia. But to the British labor fakery it had a distinct value. Purcell, Hicks, Swales and Citrine utilized to the maximum the prestige accruing to them out of their formal and inexpensive collaboration with the Bolshevik representatives in the Anglo-Russian Committee. Instead of helping to emancipate the British masses from the chains of their false leaders, the A. R. C. served these leaders as a "Bolshevik" shield from the blows of the rank and file, and particularly of the British Communists. Purcell could easily defend his treason from the attacks of "his own" Communists by saying: "The Russian Communists are different, as you see, they do not attack me as you do. Quite the contrary, they sit together with us in friendly conference."

The Demands of the Opposition
What did the Opposition demand? That

the prestige enjoyed among the British workers by the A. R. C. and by its Russian half in particular should be utilized to expose the treason of the British leaders. It demanded a demonstrative break with Purcell and Co. because of their open betrayal, so that the latter could no longer hide behind the Russian trade unions. Stalin and Bucharin violently opposed the break—the same Stalin and his apparatus (it seems incredible!) who today consider it a crime to propose a united front not only to the Purcells but even to the ordinary, misguided "social fascist" worker who still follows the Purcells.

The Committee was now beginning to be justified by Bucharin and Co. on the grounds of "political", of "Soviet", of "diplomatic" requirements. And it is allegedly on this basis that a disgraceful "united front" was maintained with Purcell and Co. for more than a year after the abominable betrayal of the general strike! The Anglo-Russian Committee, it was argued, would prevent British intervention against Russia and thereby enable the Soviet republic . . . to build up socialism undisturbed. This fatal tragedy was played until the Berlin Committee conference in April 1927. What was accomplished then? Did the Committee protest the bombardment of Nanking by British imperialism? No! Did it protest the British raid on Arcos in London? No! Did it say a word about the treachery of its British half during the general strike and the miners' strike? No! Then what did it do? It adopted a resolution in which the Russians declare together with the Englishmen:

1. "The only representatives and spokesmen of the trade union movement are the Congress of the British Trade Unions and its General Council;
2. "Esteems, at the same time, that the fraternal union between the trade union movements of the two countries, in-

corporated in the Anglo-Russian Committee, cannot and must not violate or restrict their rights and autonomy as the directing organs of the trade union movement in the respective countries; nor interfere in any manner whatsoever in their internal affairs".

This document, which could not but have a stunning effect upon the British revolutionists, marked the high water mark of the Stalin-Bucharin capitulation to Purcell and Co. (who in turn "capitulated" to Baldwin and the British bourgeoisie at every decisive moment)—and all in the name of the theory of "socialism in one country".

The Anglo-Russian Committee was one disappointment after another to those who sowed illusions about it and those who accepted these illusions as Bolshevism. It was a signpost on the road of degeneration of the ruling regime in the Russian party and the International. It was one of the natural fruits of the theory of national socialism. It was the best example of how the united front should never be made. Its only positive aspects were its negative aspects, that is, the only good to come out of the whole experiment was in learning from its fundamental defects and avoiding them in the future.

But to learn—is forbidden. To learn from this tragic experience which set back the British revolutionary movement for years and hurt the Soviet republic, means to reveal the deep abyss of revisionism into which Stalin and Bucharin had dragged the International. And in forbidding it, its lessons remain unavailable to the Communist masses. Yesterday's mistakes lie at the bottom of the innumerable blunders (this time in the opposite direction) which are being made today. But the Opposition is working with history at its side and therein lies the great hope for the coming day.
—MAX SHACHTMAN.

Off the Press Today!
Problems of the Chinese Revolution
by LEON TROTSKY
ANOTHER HISTORICAL DOCUMENT FROM THE PEN OF COMRADE TROTSKY. FACTS AND DOCUMENTS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION OF 1925-27.
From the Table of Contents:
The Chinese Revolution and the Theses of Comrade Stalin
The Sure Road The Canton Insurrection
The Chinese Question after the Sixth Congress
The Strangled Revolution What Is Happening in China?
A Strangled Revolution and Its Strangers
Stalin and the Chinese Revolution
Zinoviev's Theses on the Chinese Revolution.
READ AND STUDY THIS SEARCHING AND ALL-SIDED ANALYSIS OF THE EPOCH-MAKING CHINESE REVOLUTION.
450 PAGES CLOTH COVER \$1.50 PAPER \$1.00
Free Paper Copy with a Year Sub to THE MILITANT
NOW ON SALE
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

BOOKS BY TROTSKY
PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION
450 pages Cloth cover \$1.50 paper cover 1.00
GERMANY — THE KEY TO THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION\* —SHALL FASCISM REALLY BE VICTORIOUS?
48 pages paper cover 10c
HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—Vol. 1
522 pages Retail at \$4
By Special arrangements with the publishers of this book we can offer it to certificate holders at \$3
DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
A Criticism and Fundamentals\*
Part 1 of 3 140 pages, cloth bound \$1.00
STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION\*
Part 2 of the Draft Program
86 pages 25c
THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION
158 pages paper cover 50c cloth cover \$1.00
PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.\*
48 pages paper cover 15c
THE SPANISH REVOLUTION\*
30 pages paper cover 10c
THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER\*
64 pages paper cover 15c
COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM\*
64 pages paper cover 15c
THE TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION\*
(out of print) 10c
WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN\*
48 pages paper cover 10c (Out of Print)
THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA\*
384 pages cloth cover \$1.00
SINCE LENIN DIED
by Max Eastman
158 pages paper cover 50c (out of print)
Bound Volume of all the pamphlets indicated by \* Only 100 copies available. Cloth cover \$2.00
SPECIAL RATES IN BUNDLE ORDERS
In Preparation
WHAT NEXT—VITAL QUESTIONS FOR THE GERMAN PROLETARIAT
200 pages paper cover 50c
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

Trotsky on the Labor Party Question

I have reread the theses of the Second Conference of the American League concerning the question of the Labor Party. I find it excellent in every part and I subscribe to it with both hands. I find it necessary to emphasize my full agreement with those theses all the more as my interview to the New York Times of March 1932 gave rise to misunderstanding and misinterpretation, especially on the part of the Lovestone group.

1. What was my idea on the "Labor Party" in that statement? I stated that American politics will be Europeanized in the sense that the inevitable and imminent development of a party of the working class will totally change the political face of the U. S. This is a commonplace for a Marxist. The question was not of a "Labor Party" in the specific British sense of that word but in the general European sense without designating what form such a party would take or what phases it would go through. There was not the slightest necessity in that interview to enter into the internal tactical differences within the Communist ranks. The translation of my interview from the Russian text, which employs the words "rabochaya partia", into the English was defective in that it permitted one to make a concrete and specific interpretation of what should have been general.

2. One can declare that even the general term "party of the working class" does not exclude a "Labor Party" in the British sense. Be that as it may.

However, such an analysis has nothing to do with a precise tactical question. We can admit hypothetically that the American trade union bureaucracy will be forced, under certain historical conditions, to imitate the British trade union bureaucracy in creating a kind of party based upon the trade unions. But that eventuality, which appears to me to be very problematical, does not constitute an aim for which the Communists must strive and on which one must concentrate the attention of the proletarian vanguard.

3. A long period of confusion in the Comintern led many people to forget a very simple but absolutely irrevocable principle: that a Marxist, a proletarian revolutionist, cannot present himself before the working class with two banners. He cannot say at a workers' meeting: I have a ticket for a first class party and another, cheaper ticket for the backward workers. If I am a Communist, I must fight for the Communist party.

4. One can say that under the American conditions a "Labor Party" in the British sense would be a progressive step and by recognizing this and stating so, we ourselves, even though indirectly, help to establish such a party. But that is precisely the reason I will never assume the responsibility to affirm abstractly and dogmatically that the creation of a "Labor Party" would be a "progressive step" even in the United States because I do not know under what circumstances, under what guidance, and for what purposes that party would be created. It seems to me more probable that especially in America, which does not possess any important traditions of independent political action by the working class (as Chartism in England, for example) and where the trade union bureaucracy is more reactionary and corrupted than it was at the height of the British Empire, the creation of a "Labor Party" could be provoked only by mighty revolutionary pressure from the working masses and by the growing threat of Communism. It is absolutely clear that under these conditions the Labour Party would signify, not a progressive step but a hindrance to the progressive evolution of the working class.

5. In what form the party of the working class will become a genuine mass party in the United States in the immediate future we cannot prophesy because the socialist and "Labor" parties differ greatly in the various countries, even in Europe. In Belgium, for example, we see an intermediary sort of party, arise. Certainly the phases of development of the proletarian party in America will be sui generis (unique). We can only affirm with the greatest assurance: Especially since the U. S., in the period from 1921 to 1924 has already had an important rehearsal in the creation of a "Labor" or "Farmer-Labor" Party, a resurrection of a similar movement cannot be a simple repetition of that experience but a far more pregnant and more crystallized movement, i. e., either under the guidance of the revolutionary Communist party or under the guidance of reformist elements against the growing Communist party. And if even in 1921-1924 the Communist party did not find great possibilities for independent action inside the organization of an inchoate "Labor Party" it would have less possibility in the new phase of an analogous movement.

6. One can imagine that the trade union bureaucracy and its socialist and left democratic advisers may show themselves to be more perspicacious and begin the formation of a "Labor Party" before the revolutionary movement becomes too threatening. In view of the growing imperialism and provincial narrowness of the American labor bureaucracy and the aristocracy of labor, such perspicacity seems very improbable. The failure of such an attempt in the past shows as that the bureaucracy, so tenacious in its immediate aims, is absolutely incapable of systematic political action on a great scale even in the interests of capitalist society. The bureaucracy must receive a blow on the skull before taking such a "radical" initiative. However, if the creation of a "Labor Party" would prevent, in a certain period great successes of Communism, our elementary duty must be, not to proclaim the progressiveness of the "Labor Party" but its insufficiency, ambiguity, and limitedness and its historical role as a hindrance to the proletarian revolution.

the great new school which searches everywhere for some method that goes over its feeble head.

8. To consider a "Labor Party" as an integrated series of united fronts signifies a misunderstanding of the notions both of the united front and of the party. The united front is determined by concrete circumstances, for concrete aims. The party is permanent. In a united front we leave our hands free to break with our temporary allies. In a common party with these allies we are bound by discipline and even by the fact of the party itself. The experience of the Kuo Min Tang and of the Anglo-Russian Committee must be well understood. The strategic line dictated by the lack of a spirit of independence of the Communist party and by the desire to enter into the "big" party (Kuo Min Tang, "Labor Party") produced inevitably all the consequences of the opportunist adaptation to the will of the allies, and through them, to that of the enemy. We must educate our cadres to believe in the invincibility of the Communist idea and in the future of the Communist party. The parallel struggle for another party inevitably produces in their minds, a duality and turns them on the road of opportunism.

9. The policy of the united front has not only its great advantages but its limits and its dangers as well. The united front, even in the form of temporary blocs, often impels one to opportunist deviations which are frequently fatal, as for example, with Brandier in 1923. That danger becomes absolutely predominant in a situation in which the so-called Communist party becomes a part of a "Labor Party" created by the grace of the propaganda and action of the Communist party itself.

10. That the "Labor Party" can become an arena of successful struggle for us and that the "Labor Party", created as a barrier to Communism can, under certain circumstances, strengthen the Communist party is true, but only under the condition that we consider the "Labor Party" not as "our" party but as an arena in which we are acting as an absolutely independent Communist party.

11. All the resolutions about the British Labor Party must be evaluated not as they were written before the experiences of the Comintern and the British Communist Party in that regard, but in the light of that experience. The attempt to apply them mechanically now, in 1932, to the American conditions, is characteristic of the epigones' mind and has nothing to do with Marxism and Leninism.

12. It is not necessary to say that the idea of a Farmer-Labor party is a treacherous mockery of Marxism. Prinkipo, May 19, 1932.

—L. TROTSKY.

June «Young Spartacus» Out

The June issue of the Young Spartacus is off the press. Among its contents are: Japan's War Threat to Soviet Union. Growth of the Fascist Danger in Germany.

A unity appeal of the National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) to the Young Communist League.
On Memorial Day and National Youth Day
On International coordination of Left Opposition Youth
Reports of activities of American Opposition Youth
Students struggle against increased fees.

Child Labor Legislation
Review of Foster's Towards Soviet America.

Comrade Trotsky's Appeal to the C. C. of the Soviet Union
The comrades should order bundles of this issue and distribute them to young workers and students. It is particularly necessary to reach the members of the Young Communist League with our unity appeal.

FOR AN 8 PAGE PAPER
The National Youth Committee at a recent meeting decided to launch a campaign for the issuance of an eight page Young Spartacus by September. This can be done if the youth and adult comrades will cooperate.

Get busy on the job. Send in subs and orders for bundles. Form a Spartacus Youth Club wherever a branch of the Communist League exists.

N. Y. SPARTACUS YOUTH CLUB MEETS
The New York Spartacus Youth Club meets each Friday evening, 8:00 P. M., at the Stuyvesant Casino, 9th Street and Second Avenue. At these meetings a short business agenda is combined with a discussion on current questions or historical and theoretical problems. A beach party is being planned for the near future.
Young workers and students are invited to attend and participate in these discussions. If more information is desired it can be obtained from the Club president, Herbert Capelis, 84 E. 10th Street, New York City.
READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO YOUNG SPARTACUS