

Opposition at Chicago

C. L. A. Delegates Defend Lenin View at Anti-War Meet

(Continued from page 1)
 tant pacifist minority who were determined from the outset that the congress set forth as its principle line and perspective, the struggle against ALL war and to prevent it from adopting a clear, distinct class position. The bulk of the congress received with smiles and tolerance the remarks of an old woman who neither felt nor understood the historic epoch in which she lives. In the evening the congress split into study groups to discuss the various phases of war and militarism.

Thus ended the first day, without actually having discussed or acted upon the really important questions of how the students shall fight against war and under what kind of a program this struggle should be carried on. This phase of the work remained for the second and final day of the Congress. Particularly here, was expressed a weak point of the Congress. Obviously, the questions of how the struggle should be carried on, under what program, the question of permanent organization, the adoption of resolutions, when crowded into one day would make impossible a thorough and clear discussion. The weakness was even more pronounced since prior to the congress no statements or resolutions were presented by the Committee, upon the basis of which the discussion could proceed. The procedure allowed for the presentation of resolutions by the Resolutions Committee their immediate discussion and adoption.

Left Opposition Issues Statement

On the morning of the first day, the Spartacus Youth Clubs of the Communist League of America, distributed a statement to the delegates with an exposition of its views on the Congress and its program (the statement appears in this issue of the Militant). This was the only expression of the Communist position presented to the delegates prior to the Congress. As it turned out, this statement proved to be decisive in the decisions of the Congress. It warned the students of the impermissibility of individual action of the student body and proposed united action with the working youth under the leadership of the working class. The statement continued to point out that war was the product of the social system and that its elimination would come about with the abolition of capitalism. "This congress," the statement read, "must renounce all hopes in the League of Nations, of capitalist 'disarmament' and of all pacifist illusions. It must denounce the humbug of national defense as propounded by pacifists since this serves to oppress and divide the smaller nations. It must announce its support of wars of national liberation of colonial peoples. It must unequivocally declare its support and defense of the Soviet Union and call for economic collaboration with the Worker's Land. This Congress must establish that the only solution to the problem of militarism and war is the revolutionary one."

The statement made a profound impression on the revolutionary elements present. It struck the first militant chord in the initial stage of the congress that was characterized by vagueness and confusion. It was only after the report of Donald Henderson on "How Shall Students Fight War" that the congress began to arrive at a program and resolutions. In the afternoon of the second day the reports of the Resolutions Committee opened up the vital part of the congress. The initial resolution on the endorsement of the pledge of the Amsterdam Congress brought the first real discord in the Congress. The pacifists and the Socialists protested that such a resolution could not be accepted by them if the resolution implied support of all the deliberations of Amsterdam. Upon being assured that this was not implied in the resolution, that to vote for it meant only to endorse the anti-war pledge, the resolution was carried!

The resolution on the fight against the ROTC witnessed a second conflict. An amendment by Henderson called for "loving from within" policy and found the pacifists again in protest on the basis that it was unethical to join an organization in order to destroy it, particularly when it is proposed to fight it openly. Here again Henderson explained that his amendment implied such a tactic only where compulsory military drill in the schools existed. With this explanation, the pacifists finally agreed not to block the progress of the congress, in spite of their disagreement. The resolution on the recognition of the Soviet Union likewise witnessed a sharp discussion because of the clause calling for defense of the USSR, but it was nevertheless carried unanimously.

The significance of these struggles indicated that the congress would face ever greater difficulty with the pacifists and socialists as the reports of the Resolutions Committee progressed. A resolution on students rights was carried unanimously. Shorter resolutions; against the anti-Semitic pogroms in Poland, endorsement of the Anti-War Congress in Montevideo, and protest to the Chicago School Board for the expulsion of Milton Glitsky on account of his fight against the ROTC were carried unanimously.

Left Wing Pressure Effective
 The main resolution then followed. It was around this "Draft Resolution" that the political basis for the later threatened split, was laid. The delegates of the Left Opposition introduced a resolution to the Resolutions Committee for adoption as the main resolution of the congress. This resolution contained the essential political points of the statement issued by the Spartacus Youth Clubs. Attached to the resolution was

another one on the "Defense of the Soviet Union", which called for unconditional defense, to campaign for economic collaboration, the extension of long-term credits, and recognition. The resolution signed by sixteen student delegates and four alternate delegates was not accepted by the committee. Instead the congress was presented with a committee resolution. The resolution of the Committee, drawn up hurriedly, contained in essence the main points of the Opposition resolution.


What came as a distinct surprise, was that the resolution adopted a revolutionary approach in contradistinction to the prevailing attitude prior to the congress. Even at the congress it was difficult to ascertain the character of the resolutions. It was clear that the pressure of the Opposition, plus the fact that the Communist representation was overwhelming, forced the adoption of a revolutionary resolution. Had the organizers felt no pressure from the Opposition delegates, and had the strength of the pacifists and socialist been greater, the resolution would have been an extremely watery and opportunist one. As it was, the Opposition delegates found it possible to accept the resolution.

Kyerson, one of the Canadian delegates and a member of the YCL proposed a lengthy amendment to the main resolution on the causes of war, that was unanimously accepted. This amendment was taken from the Opposition resolution. Another amendment calling for unconditional defense of the Soviet Union was introduced by comrade Caplan-sky, also from Canada. This amendment was overwhelmingly defeated by the mass of delegates, through the leadership of the Y. C. L. and N. S. L. delegates, who under pressure of the pacifists and socialists, contended that it was sufficient to call for the defense of the Soviet Union. To introduce the clause calling for unconditional defense would make impossible unity on the resolution, was the argument introduced by the Stalinists.

The points of the resolution of the Committee were accepted one by one without apparent objection from the Right wing in the congress. It was quite clear that the pacifists and socialists, were willing to concede the resolutions because of the overwhelming number of Left wing delegates and were awaiting only the practical program of action. In fact, their leaders stated openly on the floor, that they felt that any objections on their part to the resolutions, would be of no avail and they were willing to let them by with the hopes of working out a common agreement in a fight on the campus against war (each in his own way—A.). But the peace was abruptly ended. An amendment was introduced calling attention to the betrayals of the Socialist International during the last war, and to prevent any future betrayals of a similar nature. Upon the introduction of this amendment the Socialist delegation, under the leadership of Amicus Most,

Leon Trotsky

**History of the
Russian
Revolution**



PUBLISHERS PRICE

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

OUR PRICE

\$3 per Volume

\$9 the Boxed Set

POSTAGE ON ALL ORDERS: Extra

Send All Orders Immediately To

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 East 10th Street, New York

representing the Rand School, warned the congress that if this amendment was carried the Socialist delegation could not continue in the united front. The pacifists joined in the cry. Once more the Communists, through their spokesman, Henderson, had to explain that calling attention to the past betrayal was not an attack on the Socialist party! The amendment was carried with the addition that too in all who betrayed the working class during the war. (The Socialists made a pointed reference to

William Z. Foster, for selling Liberty Bonds.)

Split Threatens
 In voting upon the section of the resolution containing the tasks of the congress, the socialists raised strenuous objections to point B which read: "To support the American Committee for the Struggle Against War which in response to the Amsterdam Congress is leading an effective movement of workers and intellectuals against war." The Socialists tried to read into this point the thought that it meant acceptance of Amsterdam and its decisions, and warned the conference that it should delete this point or else the socialists could no longer cooperate with the congress and would bolt. For a time it appeared that the Socialists, with the aid of the pacifists would split the conference. The proposal to delete was not accepted.

The elections of the resident executive committee brought out once more the tenseness of the situation. The pacifists would not accept on the committee unless the Socialists participated. Their attitude was predicated on the idea that a united front without the socialists would mean Communist domination and they would not participate in such a movement. It was here that the socialists announced their intention to split the conference. The reason given was the adoption of point B in the resolution. Under these conditions it appeared that the conference would break-up.

A motion introduced by a member of the NSL called for rescinding the disputed point B in the draft resolution. This motion was made with the aim of preventing the socialists from splitting the conference and to gain their adherence to it. The motion to withdraw this section witnessed an intense discussion in which the Communists split their vote. Henderson opposed the motion, but to no avail. The pacifists pleaded for the passage of the motion in order to maintain the unity of the congress. The socialists demanded that the motion be passed, holding the threat of split over the congress. Under these conditions point B was withdrawn from the resolution by above majority vote.

The congress closed with the election of the executive committee and a delegate to the Anti-war congress in Montevideo. Among those elected to the executive committee were, Joe Cohen and Edmund Stevens, of the National Students League, Maguy Geltman, NSL and Left Oppositionist, Monroe Sweetland of the League for Industrial Democracy and member of the Socialist Party, and Morris Skop, a pacifist. Carl Geiser was elected delegate to the Montevideo congress.

Thus the congress ended. Its future is extremely dubious. What success can an "independent" movement of the student have in the struggle against war? What will be the relation of this movement to the revolutionary struggle of the workers who alone form only class capable of carrying through and directing a correct struggle against war? How will the pacifists reconcile themselves to a congress which adopted the political position of opposition to imperialist war and support of the class war of the proletariat? These questions remain to be answered.

—ADERAHBE.

Wall Street Rulers Force Wage Cut On the Teachers of New York City

The teachers are going to have their pay cut. Wall Street decided that. The City of New York which spends from twenty-five to thirty-three percent of its budget on interest on loans made to it by Wall Street, recently applied again to the bankers for additional financial assistance. The men who overthrew Herriot and the Belgian ministry told our city moguls to economize to the tune of forty million. Twenty million, they said, must come out of the wages of the policemen, the firemen, the city employees and the teachers.

The city employees did nothing about it. The policemen and firemen took it lying down. But the teachers showed active resentment. A number of organizations representing the more advanced minority attempted to fight. They called conferences, sent delegations to Albany to plead their case with the state legislature and the chief executive of the state. Their fight ran a short course and ended in defeat. The poor showing they made was due to the fact that the overwhelming majority of the teachers are full of illusions about society and the state they teach their pupils. The Times quoted one of their spokesmen as saying that the teachers had no faith in the city politicians but trusted the state legislature. Such political naivete made the teachers easy prey for the experienced sharks in Albany. After much fruitless rushing to and fro the teachers' delegations (except the small teachers' Committee to protect salaries) decided not to oppose the wage cut but to "compromise" by "protecting" the legislation reserving to the state legislature the right to cut their wages; their pension rights, and other such fol-de-rol which will go by the board under the next assault by Wall Street. A third item in their "compromise" was the attempt to limit the reduction to two years.

Just before the special session of the legislature got around to this particular item on the agenda of the bankers' instructions a delegation of teachers went up to Albany to see Roosevelt, Lehman et al, about this compromise. When they broached this ultimatum to Roosevelt he told them that he would relay it to New York. Dejectedly but still hopefully the delegation filed into an anteroom, here they cooled their heels for two hours while the wires hummed between Albany and New York. Finally, Roosevelt told them that the bankers were opposed to the time limit. Meekly they accepted the decision. That was the inevitable conclusion of their fight under the circumstances of their lack of class consciousness, lack of organization and their poor fighting method.

Further attacks on the living conditions of the teachers are foreshadowed. Roosevelt recently announced that the state will be about \$100,000,000 short by the middle of 1933. He suggests that a large share of this deficit will be made up by a drastic cut in the appropriations for education.

The attacks on their standards will compel the teachers to resist. To make their resistance effective they must make clear to themselves what they are resisting. The bankers, of course, are the

people who initiate these attacks. But they are routed through the state apparatus. In defense of their interests the teachers are brought into conflict with the state bureaucracy.

Against its crushing weight they cannot contend alone. They must seek support among the classes whose economic and social interests impel them to struggle against the capitalist state. They can find allies among the petty bourgeoisie. They can enlist the aid of the taxpayers' associations; social service organizations; women's clubs, etc. Their support, in the long run, will amount to paper resolutions passed at conferences in expensive hotels; futile appeals to the state legislature the Board of Estimate and every board which will allow steam to be let off in its presence; and "moral support" in the press. But when it comes to a showdown these doughty knights of democracy, good-will and what not will leave them in the lurch. The class which lives in eternal hope of becoming big bourgeois and in everlasting fear of being pushed into the proletariat by the bourgeoisie cannot be counted on to risk its stakes in a fight against the stronghold of world reaction.

The teachers will have to seek and find allies in their own class, the working class. This raises the question of the relation of the teachers to the working class movement. The relation must be the central axis of their program. On this point they must strive to attain the greatest possible clarity. They must formulate their relation to the working class movement on class lines. To do this they must slough off their illusions. They must become clear on their class position in society, the class nature of their conflict with the capitalist state, their need of fighting support against it. In a word they must develop class consciousness.

The problem of which current-reactionary, socialist or Communist—to ally themselves with has already sought the teachers out and is pressing for solution. The Communists have begun to penetrate their ranks. They are not alone in the effort to win influence among the teachers. Others groups and interests are attempting the same thing in the interest of patriotism and paycuts, of reform and milk-and-water protest. If the Communists pursue a correct policy they can win the teachers for Communism.

These are the basic considerations which the teachers must take into account in formulating their program. According to the answer they give to these questions will depend the organizations they build. The question of organization is a very complicated one. At the present time there are about seventy organizations among the approximately 40,000 teachers in New York City. They range all the way from a Teachers' Welfare League through the Teachers Union of the American Federation of Teachers in the AF of L to the Teachers Committee to Protect Salaries organized by the Educational Workers League of the TUUL. We will return to this aspect of the situation in an early issue.

—T. STAMM

The Left Wing Victory in the I. L. G. W. U.

nal assistance from the Left to the process of restoring the Right wing union to a considerable extent, a process which was furthered from the Right by the combined efforts of the police and the bosses. The Industrial Union, which started out with such great promise, was reduced by the erroneous course of its leadership, to a sect embracing little more than the Communist elements. The advent of this new situation, this new relationship of forces, was first ignored entirely by the official Left wing. Then it was ignored, despite the fact that we of the Left Opposition did not cease to call attention to the need of orienting the Left wing's policy on the basis of it. When it was finally given a grudging half-recognition, the Stalinists advocated that infantile "radical" course of boycotting the Right wing union and isolating themselves from the workers by a categorical refusal to participate in what they called the "company union".

At one time, this sectarian madness reached the point where the Left wing workers were kept from going out on strike after a call for one had been issued by the Right wing union. This surrender of the workers to the mercies of the Right wing-Forwards skates, afforded the Lovestonites their opportunity to act for a time as a sort of rallying ground for those militants in the Right wing union who would not reconcile themselves to the policies and leadership of their organization.

Defeat For Lovestonites

The Lovestone liquidators, however, in whose direction the Stalinist policy drove scores of workers, did not require very much time in which to discredit themselves. Their panic-mongering, their demands for a disorganized, every-man-for-himself dissolution of the Left wing, alienated from them the more advanced Left wingers. Others who supported them for a longer period of time, dropped away after the collapse of the notorious united front with Levy and Co. whom the Lovestonites lifted into the saddle of Local 1, only to be kicked in the face (as should have been foreseen) the minute these petty bourgeois labor politicians arrived in power. At the first serious test, as the Lovestonites later lamented, Mr. Levy joined hands with the reactionary union priesthood against the progressive and Left wing forces. The discreditment of the Lovestonites, an inevitable product of their whole course, is revealed in their crushing defeat at the recent elections. For the

party to reduce them to impotence, it was enough to borrow a little from the Lovestone platform, and more from the Left Opposition, and make a half-turn away from yesterday's sectarianism. The fact that the Lovestonites supported the reactionary Right wing as against the Left in such a key question as the choosing of the Election Objections committee, did not help raise their prestige in the eyes of the serious progressive and Left wing forces. Unprincipledness and the opportunist game of hide-and-seek between the Right wing and the Left which the Lovestone group has played, has received a well-merited punishment. It should now be clear to all that the Left wing will progress in the needle trades, as in every other field, only in the process of liquidating the liquidators, or relentlessly combatting the Lovestone group and nullifying its influence.

The majority of the workers in the Right wing union voted for the Left slate in spite of the fact that the Left wing presented no concrete program, unless one can dignify with that designation the general phrases concerning a "fight to improve conditions". This fact speaks eloquently for the tremendous resources available to the Left wing in the reactionary unions, resources which it has only begun to tap. That it is an annihilating refutation of all the marble-headed theories and practices of "social Fascism", goes without saying. The workers in the Right wing union, suffering bitterly in the present crisis without their leaders taking a single step to improve their conditions have turned, and rightly so, to the Left wing movement for guidance and leadership.

But it is precisely on this score that the Left wing is defective. To retire on its laurels, to become intoxicated with its victories, would mean that the Left wing has learned nothing from the instructive experience of the last four years or more. What will the Left wing propose to do in those locals of the ILGWU which have entrusted them with the leadership? It is essential to put the official Left wing either has no clear the point squarely, for it is plain that perspective, or else has a false perspective about which it keeps quiet now and which it plans to unfold in a series of accomplished facts.

What Will Left Wing Do Now?

Does it intend to utilize its leading positions in the Right wing union for the purpose of breaking away little

splinters to be added to the Left wing Industrial Union? Such a course would not only restore the Left wing to yesterday's isolation and gain for it the resentment and disillusionment of the workers, but would make the future progress of the movement increasingly difficult. The masses will tolerate a blunder here and a blunder there; they will forget or overlook a great deal; but they will not stand for a policy of permanent blundering.

Or will the Left wing utilize its victories for the purpose of carrying on a genuine fight for the unity of the needle trades workers in one union, an aim which corresponds to the needs and aspirations of the harshly exploited, bedeviled and split-up workers? If it carries on a petty sectarian game of victories behind the backs of the masses, if it does not carry on the fight for unity as the Left Opposition has outlined it, then the recent triumphs will fade away like a plucked flower at night. The new leaders of Locals 1 and 9 must immediately make use of their advantageous positions to demand the unification of all the organized needle trades workers. That is now the key question, directly connected with the problem of organizing the resistance of the needle trades workers to the violent encroachments that have been made on their standards of living. It is to this question that we shall return in an early issue. —S.

SILENT CAL SILENT

Calvin Coolidge, who came into national notoriety by claiming to have broken the Boston police strike, and then presided for six years over the most mediocre administration in modern times, has just died. He was the author of: "Profits and civilization go hand in hand." He was said to be a very civilized man. With his death, his claim to Silence has become irrefutably established.

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 Shechtman Maurice Spector
 Arne Swabeck

SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 1933
 Vol. 6, No. 1 Whole No. 148

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

On our return trip to N. Y. we made short stops in Chicago, Cleveland, Youngstown and New Castle. The Chicago Unser Kampf Club had in the meantime, since its organization a few weeks earlier, arranged a lecture for us at which we spoke to about fifty workers on the Program of the Left Opposition. The discussion lasted till the early hours of the morning and four workers joined up with the club at this lecture.

We also had lectures on the same topic in Cleveland and Youngstown. In New Castle we met, informally, with the members of our branch and sympathizers. We discussed many problems facing the revolutionary movement today. We were very much impressed with this type of workers from the mills who are utilizing this plague of unemployment for the broadening of their Marxian arsenal. Our comrades in New Castle are a promise for the development of future struggles among the steel workers.

In Pittsburgh we established connections among the Jewish workers for the first time. The newly formed branch arranged a lecture for us at which we had an attendance of over forty workers who heard for the first time what the program of the Left Opposition was. We succeeded in getting some subs for

the «Unser Kampf» and we now have a comrade in charge of the work in this locality.

From Pittsburgh we proceeded to Philadelphia which we made preparations for a lecture to be held at a future date. We also stopped off in Trenton, making arrangements for a lecture on the program of the Left Opposition to be held on the fourth of January.

On the whole we visited over twenty cities on this tour, holding about the same number of public meetings at which we addressed close to a thousand workers—an element who in their bulk had not been reached hitherto by the ideas of the Left Opposition. This was our first tour of the kind where we made an effort to reach the Jewish speaking worker. As a result of this tour, we now have three functioning Unser Kampf Clubs outside of New York (Toronto, Chicago, Minneapolis) with one in the process of formation in St. Louis, with small groups or individuals doing the work of Unser Kampf in sixteen cities. With this organized base we feel confident that we will now be able to proceed with the regular issuance of Unser Kampf, building up the existing clubs and preparing the grounds for new ones.

—MORRIS LEWIT.
 —SYLVIA BLEEKER.

BOUND VOLUMES
 of the
MILITANT

OLD FORMAT	NEW FORMAT
from Vol. 1, No. 1 to Vol. 4, No. 12 Nov. 15, 1928—June 15, 1931 71 Issues	from Vol. 4, No. 13 to Vol. 5, No. 51 July 4, 1931—Dec' 31, 1932 76 Issues
\$10	\$5

Order from
THE MILITANT
 126 East 16th Street,
 New York City