

# The Hunger March to Wash.

Now that the Washington Hunger Marchers have returned home with instructions to organize the class for immediate relief and unemployment insurance it is time to follow up our report of last week and to draw some lessons from the march. We can say that the spirit of the marchers on the way to Washington was excellent and that native-born workers, white and Negro constituted the majority of the marchers. It showed that the largest percent of the marchers were from the new layers of the class shifted forward by the crisis.

But overbalancing these good points, as well as the publicity obtained, are a whole series of negative points that can be traced back to the wrong Stalinist policies which we criticized in issues of the *Militant* previous to the Hunger March.

The 3000 delegates represented directly about 200,000 of the millions of unemployed American workers. The organizations represented were: the unemployed councils, TUUL unions, Left wing groups of AFL unions, the ILLD, the IWO and workers fraternal organizations and at most, a few A F of L locals, some of the delegates were elected at mass meetings held by the U. C. All in all, it was a "united front" of the party and its close sympathizers with special delegates from the Councils who could give the movement a real "American face". In other words, so far as a Leninist united front is concerned the Washington Hunger March was a failure. The other working class organizations, with their reactionary and reformist misleaders, were not represented. And the absence of delegates from these other organizations was not due to their elimination because the misleaders would not unite. Their absence as organizations was due to the fact that the party and the unemployed councils did not apply the united front to win the rank and file for the march and to expose the leadership IN ACTION.

The Communist party was in complete control, it dominated every fibre of the movement, and yet not once during the march did it show its face officially. No political parties were represented, not even the Communist party. To have one hundred percent control and not to be officially represented is to hide the face of the revolutionary vanguard of the class. Everybody knew the Communists held the leadership of the movement. Why fear to be officially represented and speak to the marchers as the Communist party?

The Workers' Congress held in Washington, supposed to be rudimentary and first steps toward educating the class to the idea of the American Soviets were mechanical gatherings where "leaders" made reports and delegates listened; where resolutions were carried unanimously but no conclusions or lessons drawn. Such is the way to alienate the American workers from the idea of Workers Congresses.

On the way to Washington some attention and some results were obtained in a demonstrative way, but in Washington we were practically held as prisoners under arrest. The Washington watchers of the parade were far from friendly, in fact in the main they could be catalogued as hostile. On the way home from Washington things were different. In the main it resulted in a rush for some. The spirit was low and confusion seemed to reign in the minds of a great number of delegates. They seemed bewildered as to what had been accomplished.

It was not the police and hostile capitalists we met all the way to and in Washington that changed the attitude of the delegates. It was internal factors of our own weakness. One critical stage where the change could be noticed was at the Second session of the Workers' Congress after the march, when comrade Benjamin was making a report, and said we knew Congress would not give us any relief but he did not explain what we did go to Washington for and substituted for this analysis the advice to go back home and organize the workers to carry on the struggle for the same demands. The reaction to these remarks was bewilderment and confusion, as if the delegates, at least a large section of those who made up the new layers into our ranks, came to Washington with the idea that they were coming to get some results and winter relief. From this point on the spirit lagged and sank to a low point.

The Stalinists can be blamed for this because the method of their propaganda, divorcing the immediate demands from the revolutionary goal and posing the immediate demands isolatedly and apart from the end, invites such a conclusion. To aim at Congress without this correct base for the program, with an extra-parliamentary form (mass pressure) but in reality resulting in the direction of creating parliamentary illusions within the class. At least this is what happened to many of the delegates. They came there expecting results from the "pressure" on Congress and when they found that this did not materialize they went away bewildered. They were not disillusioned. They came with illusions and went away confused.

We warned the Stalinists of this danger before. A movement of demonstrations without the base, without mass pressure, a top without a bottom, results in creating a shell without content. Without this class content, without Communist class directives of the party, it shifts into opportunist channels.

The New York and New England delegation rushed back home. A difficult spirit hung over the return. Returned delegates were instructed to make the report but the delegation as a whole failed to make reports along the way, until protests from the ranks forced a meeting in Newark.

In New York, for the first time, at a meeting to welcome the delegates at Cooper Union, Hathaway officially spoke for the party. By this time the pressure from the Left Opposition and the ranks itself forced the party to speak. Hathaway said the Communist party was proud of its part in making the Hunger March a success and giving it the issues of immediate relief and unemployment insurance. Weisman, at this meeting said, the party at no time concealed the fact that it supported the march.

Instead of correcting a mistake, this belated explanation made things worse. Delegates in the hall asked each other, why say this now? Why was this not said at the beginning? Some of the Western delegates did not know what the role of the party in the march was. They know it played a part but just what part they could not make out.

The party again failed to carry out a united front and again isolated the advanced layers from the class.

Benjamin made a speech on Monday when the question of a march was under discussion. The vague threat that we would march regardless of the authorities refusal, was picked up by the capitalist yellow sheets and flamed into

a direct revolutionary threat against the state. Of course Benjamin was only throwing a sop to the delegates. The C. I. picked up this story in the capitalist press and on the enemies' slander sent a cable asking if this was so. The alarm of Moscow can be understood when we turn to the fact that Stalinism has control. They are for demonstrations, "peaceful demonstrations", providing the activity of the American party in no way upsets the anxious plans of "the builders of socialism in one country". They want to obtain United States recognition. The leaders of the world revolution are so concerned over reports in the lying capitalist press because they subordinate the world revolution to maintain peaceful relations with the capitalist powers in order to... build socialism in one country.

-BILL KITTY.

## THE MILITANT

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.

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 16th St., N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD  
 Martin Abern James P. Cannon  
 Max Shachtman Maurice Spector  
 Arne Swaback  
 SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1932  
 Vol. 5, No. 51 Whole No. 147

# Leon Trotsky

---

## History of the Russian Revolution

---

Vol. One Vol. Two Vol. Three  
 \$4.00 \$3.50 \$3.50

BOXED SETS OF THREE  
 VOLUMES — \$10.00

POSTAGE ON ALL ORDERS: Extra

Send All Orders Immediately To  
**PIONEER PUBLISHERS**  
 84 East 10th Street, New York

# New Expulsions in the Comintern

(Continued from last issue)  
 In Germany, another pillar of the apparatus has—if not fallen, then at least been rudely disturbed. Out of a clear blue sky, the official party press in Germany has announced that Heinz Neumann was all along engaged in clandestine factional work against the Leninist Central Committee, its line and its leadership. What is more, the shortcomings, defects and errors made in the past (it appears that, after all, there were some made!), are to be ascribed to the work of Neumann.

The usual offensive has been opened up all along the line, not only in the German but in the international party press. The current issue of the *Communist International* (No. 17-18) contains an article by Piatnitsky which gives some idea of how heavy is the burden which the infallible bureaucracy is now shifting on to the shoulders of the latest scapegoat. The "line" in Germany for the last three or more years was held to be irreproachably "Leninist", as were the leaders who conceived it and those who carried it into effect. The criticisms directed against the party policy in Germany by the Left Opposition—criticisms which each new day confirmed with telling accuracy—were denounced in unmeasured terms as "counter-revolutionary". The theory of "social Fascism" ruled supreme, in all its worst aspects. But the accumulation of the terrific consequences of this policy has reached a height that can no longer be ignored. We now learn, therefore, that while the "general line" was correct, it was carried out in practice erroneously, from start to finish, and that the fault lies exclusively with yesterday's aide-de-camp of Stalin, Heinz Neumann.

**Who Is Heinz Neumann?**  
 Neumann occupies a rather sinister place in the history of the last decade of the Comintern. He not only adjusted himself with bland ease to every leadership chosen by or imposed upon the party—Brandler, Fischer, Ewert, Thaelmann—but was himself the actual political leader of the German party since the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern. An adventurer out of nowhere, of that peculiar stripe represented by John Pepper, he was known in informed circles as the direct representative of Stalin in Western Europe. In fact, he was, together with Lominadze, the principal organizer of that notorious "Corridor Congress" during the Sixth C. I. Congress in 1928 which corralled the majority of the delegates for Stalin from under the very nose of the official leader, Bucharin.

A few weeks ago, without the faintest preliminary warning, Neumann—a Neumann group, in fact!—was suddenly attacked in the open by the central organ of the German party. It is discovered at a single blow that the "Bolshevik Central Committee" has had differences of opinion with Neumann on a series of fundamental questions for a period of close to four years now.

The "differences" concern no small questions. Neumann, reads the bill of particulars, sought to replace the slogan of the "Red United Front" with that of the "Red workers' front"—although the indictment skips over the interesting question of wherein lay the distinction between the two. Further, Neumann is accused of "a lack of understanding of the importance of inner-trade union opposition work"—with the implication (entirely unwarranted, to be sure!) that the rest of the party leaders were not lacking in such an understanding. Moreover, he "coined the false formulation back in December 1930 concerning the Bruening government, according to which the Fascist dictatorship was already here". That it was the Left Opposition which first ridiculed this preposterous identification of Bruening with Fascism, is of course not even whispered by the Central Committee which has all the time been engaged in denouncing (together with Neumann!) the Opposition as "social Fascist" for its standpoint. That Neumann's contentions were idiotic

## «Traitors» and Scapegoats In the Bureaucracy

is perfectly obvious—today, apparently, even to the Central Committee. But does the fact that the latter advanced the identical contentions in every one of its pronouncements, exempt it from the same charge?

Finally, Neumann is taxed with having sought to "replace the main strategic slogan of the conquest of the majority of the working class with the slogan of the people's revolution". Unluckily for the Central Committee and its Stalinist commanders, it is impossible to burn up the mountain of documents on this score which have been written in the last two years. The nationalist degeneration of the party was the common work of Neumann, Thaelmann, Manuilsky and Stalin. They jointly demanded the "national emancipation of Germany"; they jointly participated in the infamous Fascist referendum in Prussia; they were jointly responsible for the nationalist-anti-Semitic fraternization with the Lieutenant Scherjagers, and more of the same.

The simple, incontestable fact is that Neumann is being made the goat for the second time: it happened once in 1927-1928, when he was made responsible for the made-to-order-in-Moscow putsch in Canton. The second time is now, when his narrow shoulders are being weighed down with all the crimes, blunders and stupidities of the central Stalinist apparatus in Germany which have set back the revolutionary movement in so dreadful a manner.

**Whole Spanish Leadership Expelled**  
 Neumann was given a comparatively light sentence. His character, or rather lack of it, makes it possible for him to adapt himself to the new circumstances. A shrug of the shoulders, a cynical grin, a statement of guilt—and a place is opened for him again in the apparatus. But the Neumanns of the Spanish party have not been let off so easily. No mere denunciation here. In this case we have the out-of-hand expulsion of nothing less than the whole party leadership!

The whole group in charge of the Spanish party from the days before the republican uprising down to yesterday, has been summarily expelled. In the text of the excommunication from Moscow, the ECCI declares that all four of the party's most prominent leaders, Bullejos, Adame, Trilla and Vega, are "traitors to the Spanish revolution, to the Spanish Communist Party and to the Communist International". As may be seen from these choice terms, it is a trifling matter....

The whys and wherefores of the case, the Stalinist center contemptuously refrains from specifying. That Bullejos and Co. are guilty of many things is beyond dispute. But in our eyes, their greatest crime consists in having followed slavishly and without dissent the disastrous instructions of Stalin, Manuilsky, Kun and Co. At every stage in the development of the Spanish revolution, the Comintern laid the basis for the tragedy of errors of Communism in Spain. In this sense the loyalty of Bullejos cannot be questioned.

(By the way, the "traitor" Bullejos, like Celor in France, Neumann in Germany, Varski in Poland, was in the forefront of the struggle against the Left Opposition. He not only wrote a pamphlet several months ago to prove that the "Trotskyists" were the agents of counter-revolution, but on more than one occasion he threatened to exterminate the Spanish Opposition center with the aid of "strong" and "piercing" arguments....)

If there is any doubt that the newly-expelled are simply scapegoats for Stalin, who must find some explanation for the calamity in Spain, it is enough to read the resolution of the Comintern published last May in the central theoretical organ of the Spanish party: "This leadership (i. e., the "traitors" Bullejos

and Trilla) which has given numerous proofs of heroism in the revolutionary struggle, holds our confidence." And again, in a resolution against the Right wing Maurin group, the Comintern expressed itself with regards to the Bullejos leadership in the following unmistakable terms: "The ECCI unreservedly approves the policy followed by the leadership of the Communist Party of Spain." Unreservedly! Ah, what a supreme contempt the bureaucrats have for the mental faculties of the workers in the ranks, of their powers of memory, that they can denounce today as traitors whom they have fought all along, those very people whom they supported without reservations only yesterday!

The fate of Bullejos is shared by a product of that stinking swamp which bears the name of Communism in Austria and from which so many thousands of Austrian workers have recoiled into the arms of Austro-Marxism. The victim in this instance is none other than the party leader of yesterday, Karl Tomann. Unfortunately, we know very little about his case, even less than about Bullejos, but the reports inform us that while in Moscow, Tomann was also expelled as a traitor. The thick wall of obscurity behind which these apparatus machinations take place is part and parcel of the whole Stalinist system.

**«Traitors» and Scapegoats**  
 In the best days of the Comintern, there were many traitors and turncoats to the revolution in the leadership of various parties. There was even the case of Dr. Paul Levi, for whom Lenin had such a high respect when he stood at the head of the German Communist Party. During the "March Action" in 1921, Levi stabbed the party and the embattled workers in the back. His action caused surprise and confusion to most of the Communists, although he had been slipping away from the Comintern prior to that event. But the settlement of accounts with Levi took place in the open, before the eyes of all, with the material available for study and decision. Levi parted with the Comintern because his views did not harmonize with those of the latter, because he refused to follow the path of Lenin with regard to Centrism in Italy or the situation in Germany.

Nowadays, the Stalinist system consists in finding "traitors" to serve as scapegoats for its own crimes and errors. It is not so much because they disagreed with Stalin that they are expelled or removed, but usually because they did not agree with the policy, did execute it as best those policies can be executed, or else because the confusion sewed in their own minds by the fantastic theories of Stalinism, disabled them from a sufficiently speedy re-orientation along a suddenly presented "new general line".

The latter is the case, on the whole, with Varski, Kostrzeva, Brand and their group who have just been expelled from the leadership of the Polish party and constituted a Right wing opposition. Varski felt more than at home during the whole period of the Right-Center bloc in the Comintern, the rule of Stalin-Bucharin from 1923 to 1928. He was the political genius who in 1927 greeted the reactionary Pilsudski coup d'Etat in Poland as the beginnings of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry"! The Stalinist swing to ultra-Leftism in 1929 left this Right wing group quite disoriented. It continued to cling for some time to the apparatus. The constant turns of the apparatus wheel finally threw it off at an angle, in the direction to which it was always inclined: the Right opposition.

At the same time, if we are to believe the report of the Warsaw organ of the Bund, a Left Opposition group has been formed with considerable support throughout the industrial centers of Poland and with strong roots in the Left wing trade union movement. The lateness of the appearance of an Opposition group in Poland may serve to bring it on the political scene in much stronger form than in many other countries. But on this score, we must await more authoritative details from our comrades abroad.

The recent expulsions in the Comintern are inseparably associated with the just concluded 12th Plenum. In virtually every case, those removed were most prominently associated with yesterday's ultra-Leftist and sectarian course. Their removal symbolizes the half-hearted turn to the Right which the 12th Plenum foreshadowed. We are apparently on the eve of one of those prolonged zig-zags to the Right which will make more ludicrous than ever the superficial Brandlerist standpoint that the essence of Stalin is "Leftism". It is neither that nor is it "Rightism" as such. As the sum of its two principal periods—from 1923 to 1928 and from 1929 to date—indicate, Stalinism represents the politically parasitic faction of bureaucratic Centrism, with a system of inner-party management all its own. The recent expulsions are eloquent in their significance. —MARSH.

We cannot refrain from adding a note on the recent expulsions in the Italian party over questions of policy which are clothed in total darkness, so far as the Stalinist press is concerned. Six comrades, Brightenti, Barioni, Drago, Sansane, La Camera and Gliodi, have been expelled from the party. In the Stalinist press, the names of the comrades are printed, together with the city each lives in and his home address! If this unprecedented act has any significance at all, it means that the comrades are being delivered into the hands of the police. That too is not in contradiction to the Stalinist system....

# «Unser Kampf» Tour Concludes with the Launching of Worker's Clubs

(Continued from previous issue)  
 In Kansas City we did not succeed in establishing contacts with the Jewish movement prior to our arrival but a lecture was arranged for us by "Shorty" Buehler who issued an English leaflet announcing that we were to speak in Jewish on the Left Opposition. In response to this leaflet came a number of English-speaking workers who requested us to hold a lecture in English. We readily consented and had a very spirited meeting. The few Stalinists in the audience by their arguments only helped us bring out in sharper relief the viewpoint of the Left Opposition. As a result of our short stay in Kansas City we now have a number of subscribers to *Unser Kampf* and a comrade in charge of the work who will try to broaden the circle of our readers.

In St. Louis we spent three days. Our activity was concentrated primarily upon laying a foundation for an *Unser Kampf* Club, since our circle of readers in this city makes the building of a club possible. Unfortunately, we could not stay much longer and we only succeeded in bringing together a group of people who constituted themselves as a provisional committee for the building of a club. Our lecture in St. Louis was attended by a small but attentive and responsive audience.

Our branch in St. Louis is concentrating its activities among the unemployed workers. They are under fire from two directions: the Stalinists are trying to isolate them, and the Citizens Unemployed League, under control of reactionaries and in which the Musteltes have a hand, is likewise combatting them. The Stalinists use all kinds of trickery and abuse in trying to keep our comrades out of the situation. For example, comrade Payer was elected by his branch of the ILLD as a delegate to the Hunger March. When he appeared with his bundle ready to leave for Washington he was promptly informed by the local Stalinist bureaucrats that a spee-

the meantime, cancelling his election for the Hunger March. When workers in his branch heard of this outrageous act, they protested vehemently. But it was too late. The marchers had already left and Payer was not permitted to go with them. Comrade Goldberg applied for membership to one of the branches of the Citizens Unemployed League. At the very meeting he was accepted, he moved that this branch send delegates to the Hunger March United Front Conference. This carried and comrade Goldberg was elected, participating very actively in the preparations for Hunger March. This act of the branch in sending a delegate to the "Communist" Hunger March terrified the officials at the head of the Citizens Unemployed League. Their primary concern is to get on the good side of the Chamber of Commerce and the police officials. They do not believe in struggle; their method is that of ingratiating themselves with the bosses and collecting a few crumbs. We had the occasion to be present at the meeting where the venom of the officials was directed against comrade Goldberg. They saw in him the danger of the organization being radicalized from within. A long letter of the Central Committee was read off to the branch in which it was condemned for participating in the Hunger March. When comrade Goldberg asked for the floor he was told by the president of the organization, Frank Wall, a renegade Communist, that he is not a member, that his membership was not approved by the membership committee consisting of three individuals who have the sole right of accepting or expelling members. The whole structure of the organization, according to the constitution Frank Wall read off, is that of a company union. To our amazement we found that Carl Lore, a Mustelite organizer, is one of the three on the membership committee. Apparently, they consider this "progressive" labor action.

—SYLVIA BLEEKER.  
—MORRIS LEWITT.

# Negotiations with Weisbord Suspended

This is the reply of the National Committee to the statement of comrade Weisbord:  
 COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF AMERICA (Opposition)  
 126 East 16th Street, N. Y. C.  
 October 31, 1932.

Dear comrade Weisbord:  
 In the *Militant* of October 1 and 8, the National Committee made public a statement of its views on the letter sent by the Communist League of Struggle in reply to the letter of comrade Trotsky. Our statement was aimed at facilitating the fusion of the Communist League of Struggle with the American section of the International Left Opposition on the basis of a clearly and honestly established agreement in principle, and without permitting matters of secondary importance to constitute an insurmountable obstacle. The National Committee must regretfully establish that the reply to its statement made by the Weisbord group, even less than its first letter, meets with the requirements which we consider necessary for a solution of the question. Instead of a clear statement of its point of view in the sense we indicated, the reply of the Weisbord group takes a step backward in this respect and attempts to defend the errors which have separated it from us. This is carried out behind a barrage of minor issues, real and alleged, with which is combined that petty, false and outrageously exaggerated criticism of our League, against which Weisbord has been cautioned before, especially in comrade Trotsky's letter. Finally the

whole tone of the reply in no way indicates a desire or intention to engage in a loyal and comradely collaboration with the Communist League of America. On the contrary. For these reasons the National Committee is compelled to suspend any further negotiations with the Weisbord group until such a time as the latter shall have established its position in a manner, as laid down in our statement of October 1 and 8, which we consider a minimum for the fusion of the two groups and the future discussion inside of the united organization of any serious differences of a secondary character which may have arisen or will arise.

National Committee,  
 Communist League of America,  
 Secretary.

(Copy of letter from Trotsky to Weisbord dated Oct. 13, 1932.)  
 Dear comrade Weisbord,

This is an answer to your letter, and through your mediation to the letter of your group. My delay in answering was due to my assurance that the *Militant*, contrary to our premature assumption, would answer your request. And, in point of fact, I find in the last issues my letter to you and your answer published integrally and even without any criticism in the same issues.

This procedure is very accommodating, perhaps a little too much so. If you still remember our discussion about the possibilities and methods of fusion, you will understand without any comment from me that I cannot find your steps

very happily chosen for the purpose, if the purpose remains that of fusion.

It is scarcely necessary to go into the details of your letter, I feel obliged to emphasize the fact that your treatment of the question of Centrism appears to me absolutely unsatisfactory. It is not a question of name, but of the political content of the Stalinist faction.

It is superfluous to repeat that I would be glad to observe a real coming-together between your group and our American section, but it is evident that in the present stage this procedure cannot be seriously influenced from abroad. It is a task between yourself and the League.

Prinkipo, Oct 13, 1932.

With Communist greetings,  
L. TROTSKY.

(Excerpt of letter from Trotsky to the National Committee dated Oct. 22, 1932, and regard to the above).

It appears that you were not sent a copy of my reply to comrade Weisbord. This reply I wrote before I had the opportunity to become acquainted with your comprehensive reply to the Weisbord group. You will notice, however, that our parallel actions quite well supplement one another.

L. TROTSKY.

Pressure of space compels us to omit from this issue the continuation of Jack Webor's series of articles on Japan. It will appear in the forthcoming number.