

An Admission of Bankruptcy

Several weeks ago, when we carried an article in *The Militant* entitled "The Right Wing International on the Verge of Collapse", the Lovestone sheet waxed indignant, confounded us together with the genuine liars from the Stalinist camp and in a feigned gesture of contemptuous pride, stuck out its chest—upon which, alas, blows are soon to pound in loud repentance.

A Damaging Admission

Three weeks later—we can hardly believe our eyes—the columns of the *Workers' Age* itself carry statements to this effect: "The International Communist Opposition (read: the International Right wing—Ed.), considered as a political unity, as a cohesive, smoothly functioning international faction in the U. I. has failed to measure up to the tasks which the situation in the world labor movement and in the Comintern has placed before it. The International Communist Opposition (read: the Right wing—Ed.) today is in a serious crisis, political as well as organizational" (*Workers' Age*, June 25.)

But even more damning than these admissions, which the Right wing leaders are forced to make before their alarmed and awakening rank and file, is their confession that there never actually was anything like an organized international Right wing. The "Resolution on the International Conference", from which the above passage was quoted, tells us that "except for the transmission of correspondence between the various groups, the International Center has hardly functioned." (!) That this was the case all along we have never doubted and we have more than once pointed out that the Right wing were merely drawing thereby the logical practical conclusions flowing from the theory of socialism in one country.

The "Resolution on the International Conference" is Lovestone's Declaration of Bankruptcy. Seen in the light of recent developments, it represents an attempt of Lovestone to square himself with his taskmasters of tomorrow by cutting himself away from his allies of today.

The chief manifestations of this crisis... the resolution says, "is the fact that the substantial unanimity in principles (?) upon which it (the Right wing international—Ed.) was built up has now to a considerable extent been reduced to merely agreement on tactical questions".

Here we have, then, on black and white, an avowal from the lips of Lovestone himself that his international alliance has no principle basis. But—there remains the basis of agreements on tactical questions. What tactical questions? Is it the tactical question of reform of the Communist International or the establishment of a new International? His resolution itself tells us that "There are some (Swedish Opposition) who regard the present crisis in the world Communist movement as essentially ineradicable on the basis of the rehabilitation of the existing Communist International."

Is it the tactical question on how to negotiate for readmission into the Communist International? Let us see. While Lovestone carries on negotiations with Comintern representatives in America, his erstwhile allies in Germany, the Brandierites, write in their resolution:

Brandier's View

"The International Communist Opposition (Right wing—Ed.) and the organizations belonging to it reject the maneuvers of the officials of the C. I. and their sections in approaching individual national organizations, local groups or individual members for the purpose of re-joining, so far as to play them off against one another." (*Gegen den Strom*, June 18, 1932). This declaration on the part of the Brandierites gives the lie, by the way, to the Lovestones contention, in their "answer" to us referred to above, that "the unity moves... which the C. P. Majority Group (Lovestoneites) have made, have been made with the full knowledge and approval of the German Opposition (Brandierites)..." (*Workers' Age*, May 21). But this is just

another typical trick of the Lovestone fakery and does not surprise anyone who knows them. Lovestone pulled his followers into the Brandierist camp in the dark of night. There is no reason why he should be expected to pull them out of it by any different methods.

Is it perhaps, we ask ourselves in exhaustion, the tactical question of the attitude towards the Left Opposition that the Right wingers agree on. Even there, no agreement exists. The Lovestone resolution tells us:

"In general, only a few of the Opposition groups have worked out a definite viewpoint on the question of Trotskyism". But it does admit that "in the now-expelled minority of the German Opposition and in the group around Neurath in the Czech Opposition, definite and avowed Trotskyist tendencies have become manifest". He merely forgets to mention that the reason why "only a few of the Opposition groups have worked out a definite viewpoint on the question of Trotskyism" is that they are not quite safe with their rank and file on this point.

Finally, the resolution informs us. "There is not sufficient agreement, on the question of Centrism (the Left wing reformists) and the relations of the Opposition towards it... In the discussion which arose in the International Communist Opposition (Right wing), the existence of certain uncertainty on and even toleration of centrism in a number of Opposition groups become visible." The fact that Centrism has been tolerated in a number of groups with which he has been associated for nearly two years does not, however, restrain Lovestone from giving the following, altogether baseless, estimate of the relationship between the Left Opposition and Centrism.

A Right Wing Lie

"... Trotsky himself has inflated a deliberate policy of political rapprochement (sic) with the Centrist organizations, a move generally welcomed by the latter. It is not an altogether unfamiliar role for Trotsky to play as the crystalizing force for various Centrist tendencies as a grouping. The political platform of this new Trotskyist alliance can be clearly seen from recent developments (which developments?): Trotsky lends the Centrists the much needed mantle of revolutionary integrity, while they agree to operate as the West European supporters of the Trotsky faction in the C. P. S. U." Truly conceived according to the traditional Lovestonetite horse-trade criterion. But comrade Trotsky and the Russian Opposition will thank Lovestone very kindly for this very Lovestonish "political platform" and remind him that we—the Left Opposition have got an International Center and that it does function and not only "for the transmission of correspondence between the various groups."

The only thing that stands out clearly in this confused, equivocal, characteristically opportunist "Resolution on the International Conference" is the resumption by Lovestone of the fight with all the necessary flourishes, against—"counter-revolutionary Trotskyism", in this document, still—the "counter-revolutionary phase of Trotskyism". The hazy charges of "Thermidorian accusations of Trotskyism against the Soviet State and the C. P. S. U.", with which the Right wing fishermen hope to hook their rank and file bait. The talk about our "scepticism as to the possibilities of socialist construction (!) in the U. S. S. R.—is beneath reply. And so on.

Lovestone must ingratiate himself once more with the top sergeants of the Stalin faction. There is no better way for him to do this, there is nothing more palatable of flattery for these subalterns in the cloaks of generals than subsistence in the fight against Trotskyism. And Lovestone is an expert in this.

The negotiations for the re-establishment of the Right-Center bloc are going on full blast. The Right wing is toppling over. No time must be lost.

And so Lovestone makes haste, digs up his old clothes—"principles" and "tactics"—rushes over to the pawnshop of Uncle Stalin, gets the pure coin of a new assignment in the fight against "Trotskyism" and a new lease of political life for himself. But these are hard times. And who knows how long this coin will last?

—SAM GORDON.

Smash Hitler Now

(Continued from page 1)

united front of the Communist party with the Social Democratic Party and the reformist trade unions, are still being taken half-heartedly and in a distorted manner. But a start has been made.

A Complete Revision Needed

If matters are to rest with this "start" the danger will remain in all its force. We already have more than an inkling of what Hitler's victory would mean. The increasing arrogance of the Fascists, the daily assassination of radical workers in the streets, is a foretaste of what the Brown-Shirts would give the workers if they gained power. The negotiations at Lausanne between von Papen and Herriot for the establishment of an alliance which can be directed only against the Soviet Union, is another indication of what Hitler will aim at—for von Papen is only warming the seat of power for the Austrian adventurer. After babbling for years their abstract slogans of "defend the Soviet Union!" the bureaucrats averred themselves to be incompetent to deal with the most actual threat to the existence of the workers' republic. The best defense of it at the present stage is a smashing defeat of Hitlerism. The latter can only be accomplished by a fundamental, open, serious revision of the criminal policy thus far pursued by Stalinism.

Days count now. The time to fight Hitlerism is not after it has conquered power, but before. The way to fight it is to throw overboard the vapors about "social fascism" and to set up a genuine united front for the extra-parliamentary mass struggle against Fascism. The Bolshevik pointed the way in 1917. The German Bolsheviks must tread the same path, and do it without delay.

EXTRA! EXTRA! FINE DISCOVERED IN S. L. P.

It is hard to believe it. We simply refuse to believe it. Even the *Weekly People* is in doubt, though the story appeared on the front page of a recent issue of the official organ of the Socialist Labor Party. The story is that the section organizer of the South Bend section of the S. L. P. was arrested and charged with making bombs in co-operation with an individual alleged to be a stool-pigeon for the Bendix corporation. Of course the scoundrel was immediately expelled from the S. L. P. and the figurative tin can tied to his coat tail. But what bothers the *Weekly People* and indeed ourselves is how in hades did he manage to be elected section organizer in the S. L. P. and what the hell was he doing there anyhow? As the W. P. truly observes, the S. L. P. is down on anarchists, wobblers and Communists and repeatedly warns the government and all detective agencies that when an S. L. P. member is mistaken for a character dangerous to the existing order he is confused with a couple of other fellows.

THE MILITANT
Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition)
at 64 East 16th 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.
Vol. 5, No. 28 (Whole No. 124)
Saturday, JULY 9, 1932
Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates: 3 cents per copy.

Stalinism's Straits; Opposition's Rise

(Continued from page 1)

ship is decomposing the Communist ranks, destroying the will of some, causing aversion in others.

Redoubled Blows at the Opposition

The settlement for the sins of several periods of epigone errors and crimes is face to face with us. Doomed by history, the Centrist bureaucracy with redoubled efforts clutches after tried methods. Having fallen into a vice between its classes enemies and the consequences of its own crimes, it redoubles, trebles its blows against the Left Opposition.

Seemingly everything has been tried already: vilifications, arrests, exiles, and firing squads. But no! In the Stalinist kitchen new dishes are being prepared from the deceits and dregs of hatred and perfidy. Not so very long ago, Pravda reproduced photographic fascimiles of articles by Polish Fascists, passing out falsifications for the sacred truth. It was only yesterday that *Investia* reprinted with raptures the canards of a German Fascist sheet on the hoardings regarding the conspiracy of the Left Opposition with the social democracy. The matter did not rest here. A certain Buechner is writing, on instructions from the Stalinist bureau, a German book in which he attempts to link the Left Opposition with the police. Everything that was written and said in 1917 by the Mensheviks, the Social Revolutionists and the Kadets is here surpassed not only in stupidity but also in villainy.

When demonstrating the inner depravity of Bolshevism, the Mensheviks clutched at least at facts: they cited Malinovsky, a member of the C. E. C. who was put by the police into the State Duma. They cited that the police department assigned its secret agents to sustain that course, which was directed toward a split of the Bolsheviks with the Mensheviks. And finally, they cited that Ludendorff "patronized" Lenin, by bringing him through in a sealed train. The Bolsheviks replied with contempt to the scoundrels who attempted to turn the plots of the police, against the most revolutionary party, into a polemical weapon against that same party. Today Stalin completely repeats the tactics of Millukov, Kerenky, Tseretelli, and Dan. With the sole difference that Stalin lacks even a vestige of facts. He manufactures them. The shady personage who writes under the name Buechner, relates that it seems that Trotsky's "Autobiography" is published in Warsaw by the political police. And this canard is published in all languages; on this they desire to educate the Communist youth.

A certain Hungarian Fascist "dedicates" his book to Trotsky, and expresses his ironical "thanks", in which hatred masquerades as wit. What conclusions could one draw from this episode? Did not revolutionists apply, only with greater success, that same method against their class enemies? Did not Lenin print his thanks to the English paper "Times" for some articles, or other, which he utilized in his own way? But there is a scoundrel to be found who in the columns of Pravda speaks out on this foundation of a union between Trotsky and the Fascists.

In an article I expressed myself to the effect that Japanese imperialism would hardly dare to throw an open challenge to the Soviet Union before it intrenches itself in Manchuria. In this connection the central organ of the American Communist (!!) Party writes that Trotsky acts in the interests of the Japanese. To explain this away by stupidity would be too superficial; after all, stupidity has its limits. Here we have to deal with a corrupt functionary who will stop at nothing in order to earn his salary. The purport of my article was to the effect that a struggle with the Red Army is too hard a nut for the teeth of Japanese militarism. The General Staff in Tokio has reasons to believe that I am better able to evaluate the strength of the Red Army than the New York yawpers who are under

orders to snap at my calves. It is self-evident, of course, that great world problems are not resolved by isolated articles. But if one was to weigh the influence of articles, then my evaluation of the Red Army and the perspectives of the Soviet-Japanese War could serve in Japan only those elements that desire to hinder the war. But is it possible to answer barking and howling with arguments?

The "United Front": Who with Whom?

These gentlemen depict Rakovsky as an enemy of the Soviet Union. For that, they seek a champion in Barbusse who in turn wants to lean on Vandervelde. With his hat in hand the Stalinist bureaucracy is now begging alms from the petty bourgeois pacifists. And inflexible warriors such as Sosnovsky, heroes of the Civil War, such as Muralov and Gruenstein, such as hundreds and thousands of Bolshevik-Leninists, are in isolation and confinement, bound hand and foot.

Giving us over into the hands of the bourgeois police, the Stalinists declaim about our united front with the bourgeois counter-revolution. But in the eyes of the working class the capitalist governments of the world are aiding Stalin to surround the Oppositionists with a circle of barbed wire. No matter how Stalin's agents lie, this single fact exposes to the ultimate the actual grouping of forces.

They wish to tie us with the Japanese staff and the Polish police. Kerenky in his time tried already to tie up the Bolsheviks with the German staff and the Czarist police. Kerenky proceeded with this all the more licentiously the hotter the ground under his feet became. Today he has found imitators. And of what sort? These people shot down Blumkins and sent out in their stead Agabekovs. We brand the name Agabekov on your foreheads. With this brand you shall walk about to the end of your days.

What does Stalin want? He wants to utilize the war danger for a new and if possible, physical annihilation of Bolshevik-Leninists. Letters from the U. S. S. R., that have reached us lately bear witness to the fact that the Left Opposition is achieving now throughout the entire land a second enrollment. In the industrial centers, in plants, factories and mines a new generation of Bolshevik-Leninists has appeared. Creative ideas do not die. Political facts teach. The Left Opposition has demonstrated that it is unconquerable.

Stalin on the contrary has compromised himself on all sides. During the XVII conference he disgracefully kept silent on all problems. Not a word about the problems of Soviet economy! Not a word about the problems of Soviet economy! Not a word about the situation in Germany! "The Chief" who in the most responsible situations recognizes himself that he had best keep quiet, is a complete political bankrupt. Already

THE BOOK ON CHINA

Revolutionary, Marxist dynamite. That's what *Problems of the Chinese Revolution* is! No one who is not a case-hardened, irredeemable bureaucrat can read it and remain unaffected by it. Its argument, supported by documents, is conclusive, unanswerable. The story of how the documents came into our hands reads like a piece of detective fiction. Suppressed speeches, documents smuggled out of the U. S. S. R., the proceedings of a whole plenum suppressed, articles written for Pravda and circulated illegally, all these are contained for the first time in their entirety—in any language—in *Problems of the Chinese Revolution*.

Its publication is a significant achievement from the point of view of revolutionary publications. No publishing house to our knowledge has ever put out a work of this size at this price. Its low price is no accident. The book is priced so low because of the absolute necessity of spreading it far and wide in the shortest possible time.

In the circles closest to Stalin—we are written from Moscow—the functionaries are ironically whispering "Hadn't we better ask for instructions from Rakovsky or Trotsky?" Out of this bureaucratic impotence has been born the most recent international campaign against the Left Opposition.

The work done by the Bolshevik-Leninists has not been done in vain. The fundamental documents and works of the Left Opposition have been issued in all languages of the civilized and semi-civilized world. In tens of countries there exist Oppositionist cadres that are to the marrow of their bones saturated with conviction in their correctness and in their historic right to victory. A great and an ineradicable conquest!

Unable to answer our criticism, enmeshed in contradictions, convicted by events, forced to keep quiet on the basic problems of politics, the Stalinist clique is making a final attempt to separate us from the official Communist parties by a criminological-political novel, the ineptitude of which in no wise palliates its villainy.

The Stalinists by their persecutions would like to push us on the road of a second party and the Fourth international. They understand that a fatal error of this type on the part of the Opposition, if it would not nullify altogether all its successes, would for years slow up its ascent. To counterpose oneself inimically to the Communist parties would mean under the given conditions to fulfill the program of the centrist lauraucacy. No, that is not our road! The intrigues of Stalin, his Buechners and his Agabekovs, exposed and unexposed, will not force us to change our course. We stand on the soil of the first four Congresses of the Comintern, and the doctrines and traditions of Bolshevism. The lessons of the October revolution, we and only we are applying to all the tasks of the world proletariat. Over our heads waves the banner of the Third International. We lay all claim to its historical inheritance.

The Opposition is Invincible!

Proletarian politics knows neither the feeling of chagrin nor the feeling of revenge. It is directed by revolutionary expediency. Before the working masses of the U. S. S. R. and of the entire world the Bolshevik-Leninists repeat, "Today, as on the day when we first raised the voice of warning against the epigone bureaucracy, we are ready to a man to place ourselves at the disposal of the Comintern and of the Soviet state for the most common, the most onerous, and the most dangerous work. We are bound thereby to preserve steadfastly the discipline of action. Our condition is this alone: within the framework of the Comintern we must have the possibility of defending our ideas, i. e., the ideas of Marxism, in conformance with the elementary principles of party democracy."

We know that the Stalinists will not accept our proposal: they lack the guts for it. In order to agree to it, they must not be afraid of us. But therein is the whole business, it is the fear of the Left Opposition that is at present one of the most important springs of activity of the utterly compromised apparatus.

We seek not friendship with the bureaucracy but a fighting collaboration with the proletarian vanguard. In reply to provocations and the abject plots of the Stalinists, the Bolshevik-Leninists will come more closely to the Communist mass. As before, so now, our adherents will not limit themselves to exposing political mistakes and the crimes of leadership. Hand in hand with the rank and file of the party members they will fight for the banner of Communism—in the strike, in the street demonstration, in the election campaign, and in the more decisive battles when their hour shall strike.

Stalin may be able to make short shrift of individual Bolsheviks. But he will not strangle Bolshevism. The victory of the Left Opposition is assured by history. Prinkipo, June 16, 1932.

—L. TROTSKY.

STALIN'S
POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY
By Leon Trotsky

(Continued from last issue)

17. Forcing his way through from abroad at last, Lenin reads and fulminates against the "Kautskianist" Pravda (Lenin's own expression). Stalin steps aside. At the time when Kamenev defends himself, Stalin remains silent. Gradually, he enters on the new official line laid down by Lenin. But we cannot find one independent thought, one generalization over which it is worth stopping. When circumstances permit, Stalin stands between Kamenev and Lenin. Thus, four days before the October overturn, when Lenin demanded the expulsion of Zinoviev and Kamenev, Stalin declared in Pravda that he didn't see any principle difference (See in the same issue the article, "An Awl in a Sack").

18. Stalin did not occupy an independent position during the period of the Brest negotiations. He wavered, waited and remained silent. At the last moment he voted for Lenin's proposals. Stalin's confused and helpless position at that period is sufficiently clearly, though not fully characterized by even the officially dressed up report of the C. C. (See "An Awl in a Sack").

19. In the period of the civil war, Stalin was against the principles laid down as a basis for the creation of the Red Army, and behind the scenes, inspired the so-called "military" opposition against Lenin and Trotsky. Facts bearing on this are partly set forth in Trotsky's "Autobiography" (Vol. 2, page 167, "Military Opposition"). See also Markin's article in No. 12-13, *Bulletin of the Russian Opposition*, page 36.

20. In 1922, during Lenin's illness and Trotsky's leave of absence, Stalin, under the influence of Sokolnikov, carries a resolution undermining the monopoly of foreign trade. Thanks to the vigorous protests of Lenin and Trotsky this resolution was withdrawn (See "A Letter to the Bureau of Party History" by Trotsky).

21. In the same period, on the national question, Stalin occupies a position which Lenin accuses of bureaucratic and chauvinistic tendencies. Stalin, on his part, accuses Lenin of national liberalism (see "A Letter to the Bureau of Party History" by Trotsky).

22. What was Stalin's conduct on the question of the German revolution in 1923? Here again, as in March 1917, he had to orient himself independently in a question on a large scale: Lenin was ill, a struggle was being waged against Trotsky. Here is what Stalin wrote to Zinoviev and Bucharin in August 1923 about the situation in Germany: "Should the Communists (at the present stage) strive to seize power without the social democracy—are they ripe for this already,—this in my opinion is the question. On seizing the power we had in Russia such reserves as: (a) peace, (b) land to the peasants, (c) the support of the great majority of the working class, (d) the sympathy of the peasantry. The German Communists have nothing like this now. True, they have the Soviet Union as a neighbor which we didn't have, but what can we give them at this moment? If now in Germany the power, so to say, will fall and the Communists will seize it, they will fall through with a crash. This is the 'best' case. And in the worst—they'll be smashed to bits and thrown back. The thing is not in this, that Brandier wants to teach the masses, but that the bourgeoisie plus the Right social democracy would surely turn this teaching demonstration into a general slaughter (at present they have all the chances for it) and would destroy them. Certainly the Fascists are not napping, but it is more advantageous to us for the Fascists to attack first: this will rally the whole working class around the Communists. (Germany is not Bulgaria). Besides, the Fascists in Germany, according to the data we have, are

weak. In my estimation the Germans must be restrained, not spurred on."

In this manner, in August 1923, when the German revolution was knocking at all doors, Stalin reckoned that Brandier had to be restrained, not spurred on. For missing the revolutionary situation in Germany Stalin carries the weightiest share of the responsibility. He supported the procrastinators, the sceptics, the delayers in Germany. In a question of world-wide historical importance he not accidentally took an opportunist position: in reality he only continued that policy which in March 1917 he conducted in Russia.

23. After the revolutionary situation was ruined by passivity and indecision, Stalin for a long time defended the Brandierist C. C. against Trotsky, in this way defending himself. Thus December 17, 1924—a year after the wreck in Germany—Stalin wrote: "This peculiarity must not be forgotten for a moment. It particularly has to be remembered in analyzing the events in the fall of 1923. First of all it has to be remembered by comrade Trotsky who indiscriminately (!) traces an analogy (!) between the October revolution and the revolution in Germany, and unceasingly flays the German Communist party." (Questions of Leninism, 1928 edition, Page 171.)

In this manner Trotsky was guilty in those days of saying Brandierism and not patronizing it. From this it is clearly seen how fit are Stalin and his Molotov for the struggle against the Rights in Germany.

24. The year 1924—a year of great turn. In the spring of this year Stalin

still repeats the old formulas about the impossibility of building socialism in one country, and a backward one at that. In the fall of the same year he breaks with Marx and Lenin in the fundamental question of the proletarian revolution and constructs his theory of socialism in a single country. Properly speaking this theory was nowhere unfolded or even expounded in a positive form by Stalin. It is based on two deliberately falsified quotations from Lenin. To not one refutation of it has Stalin responded. The theory of socialism in one country has an administrative not a theoretical basis.

25. In the same year Stalin creates a theory of a dual composition, i. e., a two class party of workers and peasants for the East. This is a break with Marxism and the entire history of Bolshevism in the fundamental question of the class character of the party. Even the Comintern in 1928 was compelled to retreat from a theory that for a long time ruined the Communist parties of the East. But the great discovery continues to figure even today in Stalin's "Questions of Leninism".

26. In the same year, Stalin conducts the subordination of Chinese Communism to the bourgeois party, the Kuo Min Tang, designating the latter as the "worker's and peasants' party" according to the model invented by himself. The Chinese workers and peasants are politically enslaved to the bourgeoisie by the authority of the Comintern. Stalin organized in China that division of labor which Lenin prevented him from organizing in Russia in 1917: Chinese workers and peasants are "connatural".

Kai Shek is "consolidated". Stalin's policy was the direct and immediate cause of the wreck of the Chinese revolution.

27. Stalin's position—his zig zags—on the questions of Soviet economy are too fresh in the memory of our readers and we therefore do not stop to comment on them here.

28. In conclusion we recall Lenin's Testament. It is not a question of a polemical article or speech in which one can justifiably surmise unavoidable exaggerations flowing from the heated struggle. No, in the Testament Lenin, calmly weighing each word, gives his last advice to the party, appraising each of his co-workers on the basis of the entire experience of their work together. What does he say about Stalin? (a) "rude", (b) "disloyal", (c) inclined to "misuse of power". Deduction: "to be removed from the post of general secretary".

A few weeks later Lenin dictated a note to Stalin in which he declared his intention of "breaking off all personal and comradely relations" with him. This was one of the last expressions of Lenin's will. All these facts are established in the records of the July plenum of the C. C. of 1927.

Such are some of the landmarks of Stalin's political biography. They give a sufficiently complete picture in which energy, will and determination are combined with empiricism, near-sightedness, organic inclination to opportunist decisions in big questions, personal rudeness, disloyalty and a readiness to abuse power.