

A.F.L. and 6-Hour Day

(Continued from page 1)
 measure is purely a parliamentary legislative one. It is not so much its proposed scheme of insurance upon a state basis, although it absolves the federal government from responsibility, which is important. No, it is rather the fact that these officials can now foresee the possibility of capitalism actually being compelled to accede to a measure of unemployment insurance. They therefore found it necessary to give allegiance, at least in words. And what with the traditional A. F. of L. "non-partisan" political policy—which objectively is partisan to capitalism—as a legislative proposal only it can mean nothing but a continuation of beging capitalist politicians for favors. The working class, however, from a long range perspective, is confronted not only with the question of the necessity of obtaining this measure, it is confronted much more definitely with the question of strengthening its class position in the struggle for this immediate objective.

Toward Social Reformism

That the official A. F. of L. direction is making a bend toward social reformism is only further substantiated by the fact that the Cincinnati convention also went on record against the sales tax. It was branded as a device to soak the poor and then for good measure the convention went on record to soak the rich by a proposal for increased income and inheritance taxation. But that this bend is essentially with the objective of more effective opposition to the advance of communism was very well attested to in the unanimous greeting of the remarks of the American Legion national commander before the convention. He proclaimed that the Legion and the A. F. of L. would have to do the bulk of the fighting against Communism.

In this connection it is necessary again to examine the approach of the official party leadership to the trade unions on the question of relief measures for the unemployed. In that respect, the same as in regard to the general working class problems, it has proven true to its Centrist position. It has sown confusion and harm, combining the adventurist policy of isolation from the unions with a lagging behind, dragged at the rear of events. The party leadership did not approach the unions as living organisms, subject to changes dictated by the economic structure within which they function. The party leadership did not at all press forward endeavoring to take its part in determining and speeding the direction of the change. When it should have been pressing relentlessly upon the A. F. of L. and its leadership for a united struggle for unemployment relief it continued the opposite course of seeking to withdraw these activities from the unions. Today when the party should be in the midst of building up strong Left wing groups within the A. F. of L. in preparation for the coming serious battles, it is still way behind, agitating from the outside in a manner which widens the separation of the vanguard from the trade unions. Meanwhile, this has facilitated the efforts of the A. F. of L. officialdom to again reinforce its position of domination over the rank and file membership by giving paper allegiance to progressive measures.

Are there Signs of Coming Struggles?

Outstanding today is the fact of the general trade union retreat in face of wage cuts, all along the line. Practically throughout, the officials have been the most active sponsors for acceptance on the general plea of hard times for industry and easy replacement of labor. But within the general retreat there are sufficient indications of what is coming. It is established by the fact of union membership refusal to accept wage cuts and strikes despite the easy

conditions of labor replacement, as well as by the fact of oppositions crystallizing against attempted official sell-outs. Throughout the southern textile fields there have been during the recent months a wave of strikes against the inhuman conditions under which unskilled workers reach as low as \$5.00 weekly wages. Thus while labor is still cheap in the south, the additional bourbons' boats of it being contented definitely belongs to the past.

Undoubtedly the officialdom considers as a bad omen certain rumblings of revolt amongst unions of the skilled crafts. Therefore they feel the necessity of stopping a little livelier. In the New York Typographical local, the "Big Six," very strong opposition developed to the international president Howard's proposal to accept a wage cut. In the big electricians' local number refused to accept a wage cut sponsored by the officials. And to register their opposition further they carried through to victory their fight against the reactionary local machine of president Frank Wilson, despite its support from the international office. But largest of all is looming on the horizon of future indications the revolt of the Illinois coal miners.

These manifestations are small but they point to much more serious clashes with the continuing wage cuts and the ever more persistent demands from the employers for new and additional cuts. The large centralized banking corporations not only make these demands in more definite terms upon the interlocking industrial concerns but they also press the government into action, from the federal down to the municipalities. Hoover has already responded, setting an example in his message to congress, advocating a wage cut for all federal employees down to the lowest brackets, where it hits the hardest, to those earning \$1,000 yearly.

The Six Hour Day Slogan

We have often repeated the contention that as a means of issuing out of the crisis the American capitalists will resort to further lowering of living. This proof of this contention is at hand. This proof forms a part of our conclusion of coming serious struggles. And it is important to remember, that, though yet in retreat, the American workers have not been defeated. On the contrary, they can fully be depended upon to put their strength to the test in battle. It is in this connection that real attention must be paid to the proposal adopted by the A. F. of L. convention for the six hour day, the five day week, without reduction of pay.

As already mentioned, the resolutions adopted are only a paper allegiance so far as the reactionary leaders are concerned. Towards them it is necessary to be more vigilant and more watchful than ever. Not only to watch their resolutions but also to watch their fingers. Yet the resolution is of enormous importance both in respect to the condition which called for its adoption and in respect to the opportunity it offers. There is the possibility of making it a real live slogan, of making it a central slogan which will help to turn the workers' retreat into its opposite, into the direction of the offensive. From this we can begin to perceive the enormous significance of this slogan from the standpoint of class relations, that is when this slogan is really taken up seriously and actively and pressed forward by the revolutionists and militants.

Even in what is indicated by the acceptance of the six hour day at Cincinnati, and despite how little it is taken serious by its sponsors, there is nevertheless a powerful substantiation of the correctness of the Left Opposition in proposing it as a central slogan. But what will it mean to the Stalinist leaders of the official party? Will they insist that the A. F. of L. bureaucrats should make a little step backward and give lip service instead

to a proposal for the seven hour day? It would be inconceivable to think that the party leaders should not want to have the trade unions adopt their slogans. The chief "theoretician," Browder, last year, in arguing against our advocacy of the six hour day slogan, said that as against the slogan for the seven hour day leads in the direction of the "revolutionary working class solution" of the unemployment problem. But why there is such a distinction, he failed entirely to make clear. And the reason is because it cannot be made clear. It cannot be defended any more than the general false Stalinist views of policy for the revolutionary and working class movement can be defended.

But the Stalinist party leaders have made the additional mistake of obscuring the shorter workday proposal in its present program of immediate demands. Is that accidental, or is that a part of their general failure to pursue a strategy in which the slogans of today become preparations for the struggles of tomorrow? Are they content to leave that field entirely to the whims of reactionary trade union leaders and the social reformists? Are they content to let that slogan rest in Green's hands? That that would mean leaving it in the hands of the agents of the class enemy.

Green spoke strong words in his favor at the Cincinnati convention. He spoke for strikes to secure this measure. Other worthies seconded him. Is it then not time now to begin to call them to the test in action before the working class whom they are supposed to lead? The method by which to do this is through the building of a Left wing movement within the A. F. of L. The very least that this A. F. of L. convention action should call for from the Communists is to undertake now and in earnest the task of arousing the labor movement as a whole to an actual struggle for the six hour day, the five day week, with no reduction of pay.

—ARNE SAWBECK

PAMPHLETS WANTED

We are now completely out of the Bound Volumes of comrade Trotsky's pamphlets. But the demand still continues. This leaves us no choice but to make another attempt to bind some more. This is where the difficulty comes in. As you remember we advertised the Bound Volumes as containing some pamphlets that were out of print and unobtainable except in these Bound Volumes. That was true. But now that the Bound Volumes are all gone, these pamphlets are unobtainable anywhere, even by us.

In order to bind additional sets we need the following pamphlets: **The Draft Program; The Turn in the C. I.; Germany—The Key to the International Situation; and World Unemployment and the Five Year Plan.** If our comrades will send these pamphlets to us we will be able to go ahead with the binding. We need lots of them. The more we receive the more we will be able to bind.

We ask for these pamphlets on the following terms. We are absolutely unable to pay for them with money. We can issue credit slips for the amount of the pamphlets against any accompanying or future order that the comrade may make. But these orders must be for literature. We are strongly against applying them to sub extensions and renewals. And the pamphlets must be in good condition.

LEON TROTSKY

Soviet Economy in Danger

The Situation on the Eve of the Second Five Year Plan

(Continued from last issue)

But one of the most important disproportions consists in the fact that the availability of money, in the language of monetary circulation, this is what is called inflation. In the language of planned economy this signifies exaggerated plans, incorrect division of forces and means, in particular, between the production of objects for consumption and the production of means for production. From that time when the correlation of prices began to turn against the city, the latter safe-guarder itself by "freezing" the goods, i. e., they were simply not put into circulation, but kept in hand to be distributed bureaucratically. This signified that only the pecuniary shadow of the scissors had closed its blades, while their material disproportion still remained. But the peasant is little interested in shadows. The absence of commodities has pushed him and continues to push him in the direction of a strike in breadstuffs: he does not want to part with his grain for money.

Not having become a matter of simple and profitable exchange for both sides, the provision of foodstuffs and agricultural raw material has remained as hitherto "a political campaign," "militant drive," requiring each time the mobilization of the State and party apparatus. "Many kolkhozes," Pravda cautiously reports (September 26), "resist the collection of grain, hiding their stocks". We know what the word "many" signifies in such a context. If the exchange between the village and the city were advantageous, then the peasants would have no cause whatever to "hide their stocks"; but if the exchange is not advantageous, i. e., if it takes the form of compulsory transfer, then all the kolkhozes, and not "many" as well as the individual proprietors. The duties of the peasants in supplying meat provisions are officially invested at present with the character of a natural tax in kind, with all the ensuing repressive consequences. The economic results of the 100 percent collectivization are designated much more correctly by these facts than by the bald statistics of collectivized hectares.

The fact that severe laws were passed

L. Trotsky---Bonapartism in Germany

(Continued from page 1)

First, was not a "bonapartist" one, not only because Napoleon himself was a doubtful Buonapart by blood, but also because his relations to classes, especially to the peasantry and to the lumpen-proletariat was not at all the same as that of Napoleon the First. Moreover, classical bonapartism grew out of the epoch of gigantic war victories, which the second Empire did not know at all. But if we should look for the repetition of all the traits of bonapartism, we will find that bonapartism is a one-time unrepeatable occurrence, that means that in general bonapartism does not exist but that there once was a general Bonapart, born in Corsica. The matter stands no different with liberalism and with all other generalized terms of history. When one speaks by analogy of bonapartism, it is necessary to state precisely which of its traits found their fullest expression under present historical conditions.

Present-day German bonapartism has a very complex and so to say combined character. The government of Papen would have been impossible without Fascism. But Fascism is not in power. And the government of Papen is not Fascism. On the other hand, the government of Papen, at any rate in its present form, would have been impossible without Hindenburg, who inspite of the final prostration of Germany in the war, signifies in the memory of wide masses great victories of Germany and symbolizes the army. The second election of Hindenburg had all the characteristics of a "plebiscite". Many millions of workers, petty bourgeois and peasants (Social-democracy and Centre) voted for Hindenburg. They did not see in him any one political program. They wanted first of all to avoid civil war and raised Hindenburg on their shoulders as a super-arbiter, as an arbitration judge of the nation. But precisely this is the most important function of bonapartism: raising itself over the two struggling camps in order to preserve property and order, it suppresses civil war, or precedes it, or does not allow it to rekindle. Speaking of Papen we cannot forget Hindenburg on whom rests the sanction of the social democracy. The combined character of German bonapartism expressed itself in the fact that the demagogic work of catching the masses for Hindenburg was performed by two big independent parties: the social democracy and national socialism. If they are both astonished at the results of their work this does not change the matter one whit.

The social democracy asserts that Fascism is the product of communism. This is correct in so far as there would have been no necessity at all in Fascism without the sharpening of the class struggle, without the revolutionary proletariat, without the crisis of capitalist society. The flunkeish theory of Wells-Gilferding-Otto Bauer has no other meaning. Yes, Fascism is a reaction of bourgeois society to the threat of proletarian revolution. But precisely because this threat is not an imminent one today, that the ruling classes make an attempt to get along without a civil war by the medium of a bonapartist dictatorship.

Objecting to our characterization of the

government of Hindenburg-Papen-Schleicher, the Brandlerites refer to Marx and express thereby an ironic hope that his authority may also have weight with us. It is difficult to be made fools of in a more flagrant manner (?). The fact is that Marx and Engels wrote not only of bonapartism of the two Bonaparts but also of other species thereof. Beginning, it seems, with the year 1864, they have likened not once the "national" regime of Bismark to French bonapartism. And this in spite of the fact that Bismark was not a pseudo-radical demagogue and so far as we know, was not supported by the peasantry. The Iron Chancellor was not raised to power as a result of a plebiscite, but was duly appointed by his legitimate and hereditary king. And never-the-less Marx and Engels are right. Bismark made us in a bonapartist fashion of the antagonism between the propertied classes, and the rising proletariat, overcoming in this way the antagonism within the two propertied classes, between the Junkerdom and the bourgeoisie, and raised a military-police apparatus over the nation. The policy of Bismark is not that very tradition to which the "theoreticians" of present German bonapartism refer. True, Bismark solved in his fashion the problem of German unity, of the external greatness of Germany. Papen however so far only promises to obtain for Germany "equality" on the international arena. Not a small difference! But we were not trying to prove that the bonapartism of Papen is of the same calibre as the bonapartism of Bismark. Napoleon the Third was also only a parody of his pretended uncle.

The reference to Marx as seen has a slovenly character. That Thalheimer does not understand the dialectics of Marxism we suspected long ago. But, we must admit, we thought that at least he knew the texts of Marx and Engels. We take this opportunity to correct our mistake.

Our characteristic of the presidential government rejected by the Brandlerites received a very brilliant confirmation from a very unexpected and in its way "authoritative" source. With regard to the dissolution of the "five-day" Reichstag DAZ (Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung—organ of heavy industry) quoted on August 28th in a long article the work of Marx "The 18th Brumaire"—for what purpose? No more and no less than in support of the historical and political rights of the president to put his boot on the neck of people's representation. The organ of heavy industry risked at a difficult moment drinking from the poisoned wells of Marxism. With a remarkable adroitness the paper takes from the immortal pamphlet a long quotation explaining how and why the French president as the incarnation of the "nation" obtained a preponderance over the split up parliament. The same article of the DAZ reminds very apropos how in the spring of 1890 Bismark developed a plan for a most suitable governmental change. Napoleon the Third and Bismark as forerunners of presidential government are called by the right name by the Berlin newspaper which in August at least played the role of an official organ.

To quote "The 18th Brumaire of Louis Napoleon" in reference to the "July 20th

of von Papen" is of course very risky since Marx characterized the regime of Napoleon in the most acid terms as the regime of adventurists, crooks and pimps. Actually DAZ could be brought to punishment for a malicious slander of the government. But if we should leave aside this indirect inconvenience, there remains nevertheless the doubtless fact that the historic instinct brought DAZ to the proper place. Unfortunately one can not say the same of the theoretical wisdom of Thalheimer.

Bonapartism of the era of the decline of capitalism differs widely from bonapartism of the era of ascension of bourgeois society. German bonapartism is not supported directly by the petty bourgeoisie of the country and village, and this is not accidental. Precisely therefore we wrote at one time of the weakness of the government of Papen which holds on only by the neutralization of two camps: the proletariat and the fascists.

But behind Papen stand the great landowners, finance capital, generals—so to speak other "Marxists". Do not the propertied classes in itself present a great force? This argument proves once more that it is much easier to understand class relations in their general sociological outline than in a concrete historical form. Yes, immediately behind Papen stand the propertied heights and they only; precisely therein is contained the cause of his weakness.

Under the conditions of present-day capitalism a government which would not be the agency of finance capital is in general impossible. But of all possible agencies the government of Papen is the least stable one. If the ruling classes could rule directly, they would have no need either of parliamentarism, or of social democracy, or of Fascism. The government of Papen reveals too clearly finance capital, leaving it even without the sanctified order by the Prussian commissar Brakht. Just because the extra-party, "national" government is in fact able to speak only in the name of the social heights, capital is ever more careful not to identify itself with the government of Papen. DAZ wants to find for the presidential government support in the national-socialist masses and in the language of ultimatums demands of Papen a bloc with Hitler which means capitulation to him.

In evaluating the "strength" of the presidential government we must not forget the circumstance, that if finance capital stand behind Papen, this does not at all mean that it falls together with him. Finance capital has innumerable more possibilities than Hindenburg-Papen-Schleicher. In case of the sharpening of contradictions there remains the reserve of pure Fascism. In case of the lowering of contradictions one will maneuver until the time when the proletariat puts its knee on its chest. For how long Papen will maneuver the near future will show.

These lines will appear in the press when the new elections to the Reichstag will have already passed. The bonapartist nature of the "anti-French" government of Papen will inevitably reveal itself with a new force, but also its weakness. We will take this up again in due time.

Prinkipo, October 30, 1932.

—L. TROTSKY.

Weisbord and the Hunger March

In the struggle between the Stalinist faction of the party and the Left Opposition on the question of correct policy in the Hunger March, the Left Opposition has carried on a fight in the most important large cities as reported in the Militant. Weisbord issued a leaflet to the New York Ratification Conference and signed the leaflet, "Communist League of Struggle, (Adhering to the International (Trotsky) Opposition)". The position of Weisbord is false and has nothing in common with the position of the Left Opposition.

Many workers confused this leaflet and the insane policy advocated with that of the Communist League of America. The bureaucrats knew the difference but cleverly utilized the leaflet to "expose the program of the Left Opposition". If this leaflet represented the program of our American section we would deserve condemnation.

The following are several of the outstanding mistakes of the leaflet. More mistakes in a one page leaflet are difficult to conceive of.

According to Weisbord, "The present March cannot merely be an 'exposure' of the government. To a considerable extent this has already been done." The "considerable extent" to which "the government has been exposed", in Weisbord's mind, will be best seen from the infantile Leftism of the "concrete" proposals he makes later on.

Weisbord makes the astonishing "demand for the nationalization of the key industries, for the opening of factories under workers control so that the necessary products can be turned over to unemployed and starving workers." This

demand at this stage of class relations in the United States falls outside the bounds of Communist demands and plays into the hands of class collaborationism. Anyone who advocates the nationalization of industry and workers control of industries in the present condition of the United States has forgotten, or did not know the most elementary education of the Communists, let alone that of the Left Opposition.

The leaflet demands "A great demonstration in Washington threatening drastic action by the masses should the demands be turned down." Weisbord wants us to threaten drastic action. Good. But what action? He answers by saying that "A call for a national general strike to take place on the date set for Congress to act to put pressure on Congress and to support the Hunger March, should be issued by the Hunger Marchers in Washington." A general strike, a national general strike to be called, not by organized unions or mass movement or by the party but by the Hunger Marchers! A general strike is a class weapon of first importance but when played with, as it is by Weisbord, it becomes a mistake of first magnitude—an adventurist piece of ultra-Leftism proposed out of all relationship to the actual situation and the state of mind and organization of the masses.

This leaflet and these ideas are part of the program and base upon which Weisbord wants to base his "mass work". Stalinism has its brand of "mass work". The American section of the International Left Opposition will continue its activity toward greater class activity, but always upon the basis of Marxian policies.

The Conditions and Methods of Planned Economy

Of what sort are the organs of constructing and applying the plan? What are the methods of checking and regulating it? What are the conditions for its success?

Three systems must be subjected in this connection to a brief analysis: (1) special state organs, i. e., the hierarchical system of plan commissions, in the center, as well as locally; (2) trade, as a system of market regulation; (3) Soviet democracy, as a system of living reaction of the masses upon the structure of economy.

If there existed the universal mind, that projected itself into the scientific fancy of Laplace; a mind that would register simultaneously all the processes of nature and of society, that could measure the dynamics of their motion, that could forecast the results of their inter-reactions, such a mind, of course, could a priori draw up a faultless and an exhaustive economic plan, beginning with the number of hectares of wheat and down to the last button for a vest. In truth, the bureaucracy often conceives that just such a mind is at its disposal; that is why it so easily frees itself from the control of the market and of Soviet democracy. But, in reality, the bureaucracy errs frightfully in its appraisal of its spiritual resources. In its creativeness, it is obliged perforce, in actual performance, to defend upon the proportions (and with equal justice one may say, the disproportions) it has inherited from capitalist Russia: upon the data of the economic structure of contemporary capitalist nations; and finally, upon the experience of successes and mistakes of the Soviet economy itself. But even the most correct combination of all these elements will allow only of constructing a most imperfect wire skeleton of a plan, and not more.

The innumerable living participants of economy, State as well as private, collective as well as individual, must give notice of their needs and of their relative strength not only through the statistical determinations of plan commissions but by the direct pressure of supply and demand. The plan is checked and, to a considerable measure, realized through the market. The regulation of the market itself must depend upon the

we see it, Preobrazhensky himself, in any event, was much too hasty in getting down on his knees before the Stalinist bureaucracy.

tendencies that are brought out through its medium. The blueprints produced by the offices must demonstrate their economic expediency through commercial calculation. The system of transitional economy is unthinkable without the control of the rouble. This presupposes, in its turn, that the rouble equals itself. Without a firm monetary unit, commercial accounting can only increase the chaos.

The processes of economic construction are not as yet taking place within a classless society. The questions relating to the allotment of the national income compose the central shaft of the plan. It shifts with the direct development of the class-struggle and that of social groups, and among them, the various strata of the proletariat itself. These are the most important social and economic questions: the link between the city and the village, i. e., the balance between that which industry obtains from rural economy and that which it supplies to it; the interrelation between accumulation and consumption, between the fund for capital construction and the fund for labor wages; the regulation of wages for various categories of labor (skilled and unskilled workers, government employees, specialists the managing bureaucracy); and finally, the allotment of that share of national income which falls to the village, between the various strata of the peasantry—all these questions by their very nature do not allow of the a priori decisions of the bureaucracy, that has fenced itself off from the interference of interested millions.

The struggle between living interests, as the fundamental factor of planning, leads us into the domain of politics, which is concentrated economics. The instrument of the social groups of Soviet society are (should be): the Soviets, the trade unions, the co-operatives, and first of all the ruling party. Only through the inter-reaction of the three elements, State planning, the market, and Soviet democracy, can be realized the correct management of the economy of the transitional epoch, and only thus can be assured—not the complete surmounting of contradictions and disproportions within a few years (this is Utopia!)—but their mitigation, and, through just that, the strengthening of the material bases of the dictatorship of the proletariat until the moment when a new and victorious revolution will widen the arena of socialist planning and will reconstruct the system.

(To be continued)