

LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

Stalinists Sabotage United Front

St. Louis.—The Unity Conference held in St. Louis by the Unemployed Councils unanimously passed the demand of the Left Opposition for a standing committee of each organization to compose a United Front Unemployed Conference Committee. And from this committee trade union and organizational committees were to be elected to work for the Permanent United Front movement and the calling of the second conference.

The bureaucrats did not dare to come before the workers with any opposition to this. The committee was supposed to hold its first meeting at the Labor Lyceum on Tuesday, Feb. 21st. The Opposition and its auxiliary organizations sent three delegates to this meeting.

Two Unemployment Conferences

Philadelphia. Last week saw two "United Front" conferences in Philadelphia on unemployment. One was sponsored by the Communist Unemployed Councils; the other by the Socialists.

Last Sunday, February 19, the Unemployed Councils' "Conference Against the State's Commissionary Relief Plan meeting, 200 delegates representing about 150 organizations, and many visitors enthusiastically greeted the first marked turn in Phila. of the Official C. P. organizations toward a broader united front.

far reaching enough program to cope with the unemployment problem. It narrowed its aims down to the State Hunger March and Demonstration. No organizational report was discussed by the delegates. Our resolution was unreported by the committee and comrade Roberts had to force the issue from the floor.

The final action that the conference took is indeed significant. The S. P. conference was called to meet the following Saturday. In New York you recall, party leaders attacked our comrade's proposal to send delegates to a similar meeting, because we would increase the prestige of the fakers.

That the party leadership, just breaking out of their long third period stage had no intention of a real Leninist United Front and prepare to jointly work and fight for their program to the extent of offering proportional representation is I think undeniable.

The Socialist "Conference on Unemployment" (Saturday, Feb. 25) resembled even in many of its details what the reports bring us of the similar conference of the S. P. in New York City.

I am told the Yipsels had a difficult time to get in! Comrade Kornfeld who came representing the Hosiery Workers' Union, and a few others who did get in, demanded our admittance to no avail.

What shall we do—the resolution we had—calling for joint sessions was not admitted. The task remains, to prove our sincere desire for united action of the working class against hunger—our willingness to show our program in action—for approval of the working class; to propose this must be done by the Executive Committee of our Conference—a joint meeting of both committees and the calling of a conference with proportional representation.

I.L.D. Expels St. Louis Oppositionist

St. Louis.—Although the Beezy branch of the I.L.D. has an average attendance of about ten, the last meeting was filled to overflowing with the tense and heated faces of the South Side branch of the Communist party—not five of whom carry membership cards in the I.L.D.

The first order on the agenda was the report of the I.L.D. delegates to the Unity Conference. In his report Payer outlined the general program adopted by the United Front Unemployed Conference. This included demands of immediate relief, unemployment insurance, six-hour day and Long Term credits to the Soviet Union; the formation of a permanent U. F. U. C. consisting of one delegate from each organization to carry out the fol-

lowing activities; arrange March 4th joint demonstration for immediate relief; send speakers to all working class organizations in the city asking for a speaker from each tendency; issue 20,000 popular leaflets explaining the aims of the U. F. U. C. program; make arrangements for the calling of a second conference; organize a trade union committee to concentrate on getting union support.

Payer introduced the motion that "the Beezy branch, I. L. D. requests the C. C. of the Unemployed Councils to carry out the decisions of the united front unemployed conference by immediately calling the proposed meeting of the U. F. U. C. committee consisting of one delegate from each organization represented at the conference." The vote was 4 affirmative and 20 negative, three abstain—all the Stalinists naturally voted against.

Then a Stalinist motion—"To accept the report of all delegates to the conference with the exception of Payers'." On the question (by Casano) as to what was wrong with Payer's report none of the Stalinists could give a reason. However they replied by voting—22 affirmative, 5 negative.

Then another Stalinist motion "to get down to business" to expel Payer from the branch because of being a "disrupter". In the discussion that followed Payer endeavored to show that it was the organization and not he. He pointed out his record in the I.L.D. branch since organized; showed how all committees, all delegations to which he was elected were sabotaged by the higher S. E. C. Due to interruptions from the Stalinists he was not allowed to continue.

Payer was then ordered to leave the hall. After Payer left, one of the newer Stalinists, Horrum, thinking to further expose "Trotskyism" made a motion for an open discussion on the "Trotskyists" with speakers from both sides. Pandemonium broke loose. The Stalinists themselves split on the question. The voting was 10 negative and 8 affirmative with 8 abstaining. The motion lost, but only by a small margin.

At the very same time Payer was being expelled at the South Side I. L. D. the following motion was made and vigorously defended on the floor at the North Side Mooney branch of the I.L.D. by George Roberts and Harry Goldberger: "The Mooney branch protests to the National Committee, I. L. D., against the expulsion of workers from I.L.D. branches because of their political affiliations, in particular, members of the Communist League of America (Opposition) called 'Trotskyists'. We demand their immediate reinstatement in order to maintain the I.L.D. as a broad defense organization of all workers." The motion was lost but also by a narrow margin; 7 negative, 5 affirmative with 7 abstentions.

International Pre-Conference of the Left Opposition Presents Thesis

(We begin today with the publication of the most important of the theses adopted at the international Pre-Conference of the International Left Opposition which concluded its sessions last month in Paris. Representatives were sent from the Russian, Greek, Swiss, American and other sections of the Opposition. The theses which we reprint here is now up for discussion in the membership of the Opposition, for final adoption at the regular international conference which is planned for convocation later in the year.—Ed.)

The task of the coming Conference of the Left Opposition (Bolshevik-Leninists) consists of accepting a clear and precisely-formulated platform and organizational status, as well as of selecting the leading bodies. The preceding theoretical, political and organizational work of the Left Opposition in various countries, especially in the last four years, has created sufficiently prerequisites for the solution of this task.

The fundamental programmatic and political documents of the Left Opposition are issued in no less than 15 languages. The Left Opposition disposes of 32 periodical publications in 16 countries. It has reorganized and strengthened its sections in 9 countries and in the past three years created new sections in 7 countries. But the most important and most valuable achievement is the undeniable raising of the theoretical level of the International Left Opposition, the growth of its ideological solidity and of its revolutionary initiative. The Organ of the Left Opposition in the U. S. S. R.

More will be heard from St. Louis later. Already the Stalinist bureaucratic have pointed (publicly) to other members of the L. O. and to sympathizers and stated that "they were next". We will naturally fight against the expulsions with all our forces by relentlessly exposing the absolute bankruptcy of the Stalinist bureaucrats—in whose hands the working class defense movement has actually lost in membership (10,000 members in 1929—only 8,500 in 1932!) despite the most favorable objective circumstances.

Communist workers: Why is the Communist International silent about the crisis in Germany? Why is Stalin silent?

A Political Swindle Exposed

(Continued from Page 1)

Opposition pleads guilty. In theory and practice, Brandlerism has already been tested: in 1923, when it led the German working class to defeat and demoralization, as attested, among more decisive things, by dozens of articles and speeches by the same Lovestone, from 1923 to 1929!

While we are on the subject of Messrs. Swindlers and Forgers of the Lovestone group, it is instructive to point out that in their whole "critical review" on the theme of the German crisis, Lovestone does not mention by a single word the role of the Communist International and its "leader" Stalin! Not a word about the criminal silence of the C. I. Not a syllable about Stalin's treacherous muteness on what is happening in Germany. And for cause!

"Hugenberg's government represents the quintessence of social parasitism. But just because of this, when it became necessary, in its pure state, it became impossible. Hugenberg requires a screen. As yet today, he cannot hide behind the mantle of a Kaiser, and he is forced to resort to the brown shirt of the Nazi. If one cannot obtain the sanction of the highest heavenly powers through the monarchy for the property owners, there remains the sanction of the reactionary and unbridled rabble. The investiture of Hitler with power served a twofold purpose: first, to decorate the camarilla of property owners with the leaders of a 'national movement'; and secondly, to place the fighting forces of Fascism at the direct disposal of the proprietors."

Further on in the same article: "When the official Communist party states that the social democracy is the most important prop of bourgeois domination, it repeats only that idea which served as the point of departure for the organization of the Third International. When the bourgeoisie invites it to power, the social democracy casts its vote for the capitalist regime. The social democracy tolerates (suffers) any bourgeois government that tolerates the social democracy. But even when completely discarded from power, the social democracy continues to support bourgeois society, recommending to the workers that they conserve their forces for battles, for which it is prepared never to issue a call. By paralyzing the revolutionary energy of the proletariat, the social democracy provides bourgeois society with an opportunity to remain alive under conditions when it is no longer capable of living, thus turning Fascism into a political necessity."

As for branding the Brandlerist theory and practise of the "united front" opportunist, the Left

An End to Stalinist Confusion -- For the United Front!

In the Daily Worker of Monday, February 20, Max Bedacht, member of the Central Committee of the Communist party writes: "They, too, (the Left Opposition and others) come with the proposals of united fronts between the Communists and the Social-Democratic parties and accuse the Communist party of splitting the workers because it insists on addressing its call for a united front not to the Noske, the Scheidemanns and the Wels, but to the masses of social democratic workers." (Our emphasis—G. R.)

Thus it is clear, according to Bedacht, that the German Communist Party is opposed to addressing

A Mistake in the Daily Worker

The Daily Worker of March 6, prints a picture of Joseph Stalin with the following caption: "The above picture, printed for the first time in the United States, shows Joseph Stalin, present secretary of the Communist party, Soviet Union, as he appeared in 1919 on the south front in the struggle against the white guard bands of Denikin and Wrangel, who unsuccessfully attempted to invade the Soviet Union." The Daily Worker here makes a little error. The photograph is well known to us. It is a picture of Stalin at a masquerade ball in Moscow two years ago, where he disguised himself as the Organizer of the Red Army. He lost first costume prize only to Martinov, who appeared at the ball disguised as a Bolshevik.

The Militant

Entered as a second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. Under the act of March 3, 1879. Published three times a week by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 126 East 11th Street, New York.

EDITORIAL BOARD: Martin Aberg James P. Cannon Max Shachtman Maurice Spector Arne Swaback

Monday MARCH 6, 1933 Vol. VI, No. 16 (Whole No 163)

Subscription: \$2.00 per year, Foreign \$2.50. One cent a copy.

a united front proposal to the Social Democratic party. It stands for the so-called united front from below. Since such, according to Bedacht, is the position of the German Communist Party perhaps he can explain the following incident reported in the Daily Worker, Feb. 15, 1933. We quote directly from the Inprecor cable to the Daily Worker:

"The Central Committee of the Reichstag met today under the chairmanship of the Socialist Deputy Loebe, whereupon the Fascist deputies repeated their tactics of howling down Loebe and preventing a session of the Committee. He therefore, again declared the session adjourned; whereupon the Fascists pushed him from the chairman's table. The Communists, Socialists and other oppositional members then left the room...."

"In the afternoon the members of the oppositional parties met to discuss the situation. The Socialists declared the Constitution had been violated and proposed that protests be made to the Fascist president of the Reichstag, Goering, and to President Hindenburg. The Communists declared such protests were useless, and proposed a new meeting of the Control Committee to be defended by detachments of the Anti-Fascist League and the Reichsbanner." (Our emphasis—G. R., Daily Worker, 2-15-33.)

Therefore, we would like to know, and let Bedacht or any other member of the Central Committee answer: If the Stalinists are opposed to making proposals to the leaders of the Social Democratic party, why did they propose common action in the Reichstag, leaders of the Social Democratic party to defend the Reichstag Control Committee from the disruptive actions of the Fascists?

Was this proposal in line with the party policy of only the united front from below?

Why are the Stalinists for a parliamentary united front, with the leaders of the Social Democratic party in the Reichstag, which is a united front purely from the top, and opposed to a united front with the Social Democratic party on the basis of a common minimum program of struggle against Fascism, which will draw the masses into action?

If the Stalinists can propose a united front of the Anti-Fascist League (controlled by the Com-

ment superfluous!

Nation-wide Bank Crisis Breaks Out

(Continued from Page 1) carrying through its own solution of the crisis.

Party and Crisis Under such conditions, a banking crisis like the present would have the profoundest social results. It would be part of a general retreat in struggle of a demoralized, organized, well-staffed and victorious army of the proletariat.

As things stand, we cannot assign it any such importance. It becomes one of a series of episodes in the development of the crisis, like the heavy gold withdrawals of September-October 1931 and April-June 1932, which were met by temporary financial manipulations on the one hand, and increas-

ed pressure on the workers and the masses in general on the other. Just what manipulations will be invoked in this particular case is not of great consequence; it may be the issue of Clearing House scrip, or a tax on gold, or an embargo on gold exports, or a guarantee of deposits by the government of a banking pool, etc. That increased exploitation of the masses will be the next step to be attempted is the one thing sure.

The main point is that the bourgeoisie, panicky and demoralized as it is, can and will find its way out of such immediate predicaments as the present banking crisis, on the backs of the proletariat and the working masses, unless the masses are organized for struggle under the leadership of a powerful Communist party. The rearming and development of the Party to a scale commensurate with its tasks is the basic function of the Left Opposition.

—B. J. FIELD.

Trotsky's Genius Denied

With this headline, today's World Telegram prints a United Press dispatch from Moscow which reads as follows:

"Leon Trotsky's leadership of the Red Army during the Civil War period is bitterly attacked in a speech delivered by Gliment Voroshilov, present commissar of war, made public today. Voroshilov denied the world-wide belief that Trotsky, now in exile, possesses great military genius. He claims that Joseph Stalin 'really saved the situation on all endangered fronts', and that the Red Army was built up to an imposing strength in spite of Trotsky's inefficiency."

Voroshilov is spitting in the wind. Better men than he have tried in the last ten years to re-write the history of the party and the Red Army as it never happened. The "world-wide belief" was not founded on myth and falsification, as is the fable manufactured by Stalin and his clique. To take but one quotation out of hundreds in those days, we cite from Gorky's memoirs of Lenin, written in 1924:

"Yes, I have often heard him (Lenin) praise his comrades. And he knew how to do justice to the energies of even those with whom he was supposed to be personally unsympathetic. Surprised by the flattering appreciation he showed for one of them, I remarked that a good many people might be amazed by it. 'Yes, yes, I know. They tell a lot of lies about my relations with him. Yes, they tell a lot of lies—and especially about me and Trotsky.'"

"Fouling on the table, he declared: 'Show me another man who could organize in a year an almost model army and win the respect of military experts besides. We've got that man. We've got everything. And so we'll do wonders.'"

Comment superfluous!

It was and remains in the highest degree characteristic of centrism that for long periods it went hand in hand with the right as the current mode, and never made a bloc with the Bolshevik-Leninists against the Right. As to the Right wing on an international scale, like every form of opportunism it is marked by an extraordinary variety and contradictoriness among its national constituents, while they all have in common hostility to the Bolshevik-Leninists.

In the U. S. S. R., under the conditions of the dictatorship, in the absence of legal opposition parties, the Right Opposition inevitably becomes the tool whereby the class forces which are hostile to the proletariat exert their pressure—therein consists the main danger of the Right Opposition; on the other hand, the consciousness of this danger paralyzes those leaders of the Right Opposition who through their whole past are bound to the Communist party all the shades up with the Party. In capitalist countries, where to the right of reformism can spread themselves, the Right wing (Brandlerists) has no field of activity. Insofar as the Right Opposition has mass organizations, it turns them over directly or indirectly to the social democracy (Czecho-Slovakia, Sweden), except for the revolutionary elements who find their way to the Bolshevik-Leninists (Czecho-Slovakia, Poland). The Brandlerist elements who have remained independent here and there (Grimy, U. S. A.) build their calculations on being called back and pardoned sooner or later by the Stalinist bureaucracy; in the name of this perspective they carry on a campaign of lies and slander against the Left Opposition quite in the spirit of Stalinism.

To be continued

OFF THE PRESS!

Two New Pamphlets By LEON TROTSKY Soviet Economy In Danger In Defense of the Russian Revolution 72 Pages 10 cents 48 Pages 5 cents 3 for twenty-five cents Minimum number per order 5 Postage 1c extra per copy PIONEER PUBLISHERS 84 East 10th Street, New York