

# C.P. Expels Albert Goldman

(Continued from Page 1)

I was opposed to the joining of the Scottsboro issue with the Mooney issue. I was not given a chance at the Congress to explain my position. The joining of the two issues in such a mechanical manner was harmful both to the Mooney issue and to the Scottsboro issue. But I would have voted with the party had I been asked to attend the fraction meeting and given a chance to make my position clear.

But the expulsion had to come. The violation of discipline at the Mooney Congress was but the pretext. My views on the various problems confronting the American movement and the world movement are such that a conflict between myself and the party leadership was inevitable. If the party permitted freedom of discussion, that conflict would run its natural course within the party; but without freedom of discussion a breach of discipline is inevitable.

A typical example of the dishonesty typical example of the dishonesty that characterized the district eight leaders in my whole conflict with them. There is practically not a single, whole sentence in the statement which is not either a downright distortion of the facts or a willful misinterpretation. Without claiming that there is a sharp line of demarcation between a plain statement of fact or, in plainer English, a downright lie) and an answer, for the purpose of convenience, will deal with these two types of falsehoods under different headings.

The answer does not assume to enter into a detailed explanation of the various problems which I discussed in articles and speeches within the last eight months. It confines itself merely to a simple denial and a short explanation of all the distortions contained in the statement.

### I. DISTORTIONS OF FACT

(1) "He (Goldman) was previously expelled from the Party for his opposition to the policy of the Communist Party in the Trade Unions."

I was never expelled from the party for that reason or any other reason. I was not opposed to the policy of the Communist party in the trade unions, during the years 1929-25 when I was active in the underground party. I was opposed to the policy of some of the party leaders of those days in their tactic of the united front from above with the Hillman-Levine gang of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a tactic which, at that time, killed the Left wing in the Amalgamated and which to a large extent explains its pitiable weakness at present.

The above falsehood has a source which, to those who are acquainted with events of that period, is quite obvious. Undoubtedly the secretariat accepted the word of that ignorant confuser par excellence, Robert Minor. It was he who asked me not to attack the Hillman leadership at the 1922 Amalgamated convention. It was he who was most completely taken in by the shrewd and slippery Hillman. It was he who fought me bitterly at the fraction meeting of the comrades in the needle trades, subsequent to the convention. There was a complete united front between him and Hillman against the Left wingers. As a result of this unholy alliance, Minor took advantage of the vicious frame-up of Hillman and Levine against me, on the basis of which I was expelled from the Amalgamated as a spy.

Rumors pointing the finger of suspicion against me began to be circulated in the party two years after everyone knew about the frame-up and during which time I was very active in the underground party. I demanded an immediate investigation, and refrained from activity in the meantime. A committee to investigate was appointed, and not until the united front between Minor and Hillman was broken up did the committee come out with a statement branding the action of Hillman and Levine as a frame-up to get me out of the Amalgamated. I was then studying law and did not go back to party activity, but I was never expelled.

(2) "...Goldman at that time (during the united front conference held in October 1932 in Chicago) defended the leaders of the Socialist Party against the Communist Party position.

After a stupid and violent attack on Bordets and the Socialist Party leadership by Williamson of the Communist Party, an attack which alienated all the rank and file of the non-party organizations, I was called upon to make a collection speech. I stated that I, for one, would accept the Socialist leaders who came into the united front at their word, and would criticize them only on the basis of their action in the united front struggle. In an article in the December issue of *The Communist*, (an article which was not listed in the table of contents, and which was printed immediately after Williamson's reply—all for the purpose of giving as little prominence to it as possible) I developed my position and criticized my own statement. I refer everyone to the statement that I defended the leaders of the Socialist Party.

(3) "On the occasions he defended the position of the Second International and that of the counter-revolutionary renegade, Trotsky..." He slandered the Communist Party of Germany..."

I made, indicating that I defended the position of the Second International. I have said many things about the united front, and about the German situation which were in agreement with Trotsky's ideas. I do not apologize for that. As there are many party rules saying that one must first find out what Trotsky has said, and then say the exact opposite? The claim is constantly made that Trotsky was expelled for violation of discipline and not for his ideas. If that is so, (and I am not naive enough to believe it) is it not possible to agree with Trotsky and still be a good party member?

In the course of a discussion with the District Committee on my views, I explicitly stated that I do not consider Cannon and Lovestone counter-revolutionaries. I am still of that opinion. By virtue of what rule in the party or the Communist International, is one liable to expulsion for such an opinion? If there is such a rule, let it be made public immediately!

In what way did I slander the Communist Party of Germany? By saying that its united front tactics were incorrect? Let me call attention to the fact that when the party leaders were grandiloquently proclaiming that the Communist Party of Germany will crush the Fascists, I was warning everyone of the impending calamity. It gives me no satisfaction whatever to say that I was right. The real truth of the matter is that when one criticizes the leaders of the party, it is called slander; and when the party leaders slander everyone who disagrees with them, it is called criticism.

(4) "He developed a theory that only a united front with leaders is possible."

What a shameful untruth! One must lose all hope in the possibility of a successful Communist movement when leaders can stoop to such misrepresentations. Fortunately we understand very well, that the Communist movement is only temporarily burdened with such "leaders", who depend upon lies and repression for their control of the Communist party. All I can say is, where and when did I say or write anything justifying this slander?

(5) "He persistently resisted the independent role of the party in the united front, objecting to every political criticism of the American Federation of Labor or the Socialist Party leaders."

I did not object to political criticism, but I did object to vile and stupid attacks which had the inevitable result of alienating all the non-party people from us.

(6) "The letter of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, he interpreted as agreeing with his position."

This charge is exceedingly humorous. I did not, as a matter of fact, make that claim. How could I make that claim, when my position was that we should criticize the socialist leaders, but mainly on the basis of the issues involved in the particular united front action, whereas the Communist International came out with its advice to the various parties to refrain from criticism? It seems that many party members were of the opinion that my position was endorsed by the Communist International, and to counteract that opinion, the district leaders attributed it to me.

(7) "At the 'Free Tom Mooney' Congress, he made a speech in which he held the Communist Party and the Tom Mooney Molders' Defense Committee responsible for the absence of delegates from the Socialist Party."

I did not say a word about the

Communist Party. In short, my criticism of the method of calling the Congress was that it was called under the auspices of one organization, whereas it should have been called by a provisional committee representing all tendencies in the labor movement. This very idea was advocated by the party about eight weeks before the Congress. I said that the ones who called the Congress thought of the united front tactic as something which permits one organization to invite all other organizations to its affair. One organization decides to have a congress or a hunger-march or what not, and then graciously sends an invitation to all other organizations to join it. I pointed out that the proper way is to make all organizations feel that they are participating in the calling of the united front conference. Had this been done, we would have been able to swing many more Socialist party locals and American Federation of Labor locals away from the reactionary leadership. The criticism was leveled at the Tom Mooney Molders' Defense Committee and not a word was said about the Communist party.

### II. Willful Misinterpretations

(1) "Goldman developed a theory... that there can be no united front of unorganized workers, therefore laying down a right wing theoretical justification against any activities in the shops where the masses of workers are unorganized."

A real gem of logic, worthy of the leaders of district eight! How the conclusion follows from the premise is a mystery which only the logicians of district eight can solve.

The statement I made in an article which was not published for one reason or other, but which the district eight bureaucrats misquoted and misinterpreted was that the united front presupposed the existence of organizations differing on fundamental principles, but agreeing to act together on some immediate issue; that the necessary attempts to organize the unorganized workers around some immediate issue would not by any stretch of imagination be considered a united front. Where, then, does the idea that there should be no activities in the shops come from? Ask the leadership of district eight! They will tell you that to invite workers to one of our dances constitutes a united front that when Negro and white workers struggle together, it is a united front; and will probably furnish you with similar examples of their conception of a united front. Can we not, must we not, establish a school where district eight leaders and similar leaders could be compelled to attend classes in the A B C of Communism?

(2) "He also developed a 'Leftist' theory against the united front campaign of the Communist party in election campaigns, declaring that in the elections there can be no united front of the workers since the workers already support different political parties..." He sharply opposed the policy of the Workers' Ticket charging that this is a reformist policy to appeal to the members of the American Federation of Labor and Socialist Party, to join with the Communist Party in the election struggles."

What a jumble of misrepresentations and half-truths! Had the article which I wrote on the subject been published, I could easily refer the reader to it and the whole issue as to what I wrote would be settled. But the article was not published, so that all I can do is to give its leading ideas. I said in that article that the

united front has as its main purpose the involving of large masses of workers of different organizations in a struggle against the capitalist class on the basis of an immediate issue. I further stated that the main purpose of our parliamentary campaign should be the education of the workers in the principles of Communism; that this can best be done if the Communist party has its own candidates and conducts its campaign on its own platform; that a united front for the purpose of electing someone to a capitalist legislature is opportunistic. I did not altogether exclude the possibility of a united front on the parliamentary field, but very severely criticized the tactics as pursued in Chicago.

Why then deliberately lie in attributing to me as the reason for my opposition to the united front on the parliamentary field, "since the workers already support different political parties"? Why give the absolutely false impression that my opposition to the Workers' Ticket was based on the fact that this is a "reformist" policy to the appeal to the members of the American Federation of Labor and Socialist Party, to join with the Communist Party in the election struggles?

Of course the lies and distortions have only one reason. To discredit with the workers who will never get a chance to read my reply to the slanderous statement.

(3) "He did not participate in any mass activity, and abstained from work in mass organizations, confining his activity to that of a lawyer, appearing in a number of cases in court, and occasionally as a speaker for the 'Friends of the Soviet Union.'"

I do not of course claim that I did the most important work in the party. I did not organize any party units, nor did I organize any unemployed councils or industrial unions. But the statement above quoted leaves the impression that I handled very few cases and did practically nothing else besides.

For the last four years I have handled very few cases and did practically nothing else besides. For the last four years I have handled hundreds of cases for the International Labor Defense. There were times when I appeared in court every day for weeks and weeks. I spoke at least an average of three times a week, before different branches of various organizations.

I do not say this with any feeling that I did a lot for the movement, but simply to show the dishonesty contained in the above statement of the secretariat.

### III.

If freedom of discussion were to exist in the party had I been given an opportunity to talk to the membership on the various problems that I raised in my articles; had two articles which I wrote dealing with the united front on the parliamentary field and with the slogan of amalgamation of the unemployed workers' organizations been published; had I felt that the district leaders were honestly opposed to me but were willing to permit me to discuss all the vital issues before the membership, I would now feel extremely vexed at myself for my breach of discipline at the Mooney Congress. I do not think that expulsion would have been merited, but I would feel that almost any other punishment would be well deserved. Communist discipline is something that cannot be taken too seriously. But when Communist discipline is used to trap a comrade who has ideas, it assumes a formal and obnoxious character, far removed from the ideas of Communist discipline as taught by Lenin.

Everyone knew I was a delegate to the Mooney Congress, I am quite positive that the fact that I was a delegate reached the ears of the leaders of district eight before the Congress convened. Why was I not invited to the fraction meeting where I should have been given a chance to present my views on the conduct of the Congress and on the advisability of joining the Scottsboro and Mooney issues? On the one hand, I am kept out of the fraction meeting and on the other hand, if I say anything contrary to the decision of the fraction, I violate discipline. "Heads I win—tails you lose!"

Yes, I violated discipline, but under the circumstances expulsion is not justified, and since expulsion was decided upon, it is obvious that the real reason is not my conduct at the Mooney Congress, but the fact that for the past six months or so I have dared to come out with theories of the united front tactic and with an explanation of the German situation not to the liking of the district eight leadership.

I cannot deny that expulsion would be a terrible blow. No real Communist would take expulsion from the party calmly. On the other hand, no real Communist surrenders the most cherished possession of a revolutionist, intellectual honesty and independence and integrity. Party membership and intellectual honesty should never conflict. If there is a conflict, if the party does not permit freedom of discussion within the limits of Communist discipline, if a party member must conceal his views in order to remain in the party, the expulsion is no longer a disgrace, but a badge of honor.

We to the party that must resort to repression and expulsion to compel members to agree with the leadership! Has it come to such a TWENTY-TWO My expulsion indicates that it has. The affirmation of the expulsion by the Central Committee of the party will prove conclusively that there is no room for a thinking revolutionist within the party.

—ALBERT GOLDMAN.

# Perspectives for American Labor

Although American capitalism is entering, or has entered, the upward swing of a new cycle, it is reasonable to assume that the perspectives of the near future point to a growing radicalization of the American masses.

While it might seem as if the United States stands as a refutation of Marxism, due to the fact that it possesses both the most highly developed forms of the capitalist mode of production and the least (or near the least) developed revolutionary working class, in reality this contradiction is no refutation at all. On the contrary, it can be understood to its fullest extent only by means of an analysis based on the larger content of Marxism.

The political lag of the American working class is the result of peculiarities of national development. In the past the consciousness of the American workers as a class rose to a certain level as a result of various stages of American economic development only to subside under the influence of a subsequent period of comparative "prosperity". American historical development (with the opportunity of individual escape from the working class by means of a limited success as a farmer, small merchant or professional man) operated as a safety valve preventing the rise of the American proletariat as a political factor in the social life of American capitalism. The American wage earner viewed himself as a potential capitalist rather than as a member of the working class. His ideology was that of the petty bourgeois and he failed to recognize the desirability of acting as a mass.

But today the peculiar historical conditions which drilled the philosophy of individualism so deeply into the minds of the American workers are no longer present. They are succumbing, or have succumbed, to the march of economic development. The frontier is closed. No longer is it possible for any appreciable number of workers to rise out of their class by becoming small farmers or by entering the permanently over-crowded professions. The small farmer has been reduced to the economic status of the "poor peasant" of Europe. American schools and colleges are turning out thousands of young persons, trained for professional service, for whom there is no employment. The possibility of a success as a small merchant has been reduced to the neighborhood of zero by a rise in the minimum amount of capital necessary "to start in business for oneself" and by the invasion of large scale capital (with its superior technique, greater control over sources of supply and similar advantages) into such hitherto neglected fields as retail distribution, to such an extent that in 1929 it made a total of 21.5 percent of all retail sales.

At the same time, American workers are beginning to realize that their interests and those of the capitalists represent two antagonistic poles. They are becoming aware that a rise in productivity does not necessarily result in a corresponding rise in their so-called share of the national profit. And to this fact that a cyclical recovery will not bring a substantial restoration of the depressed American standard of living and it is easy to believe that the awakening process will continue.

### Archbishop and F.S.U.

(Continued from Page 1)

after this anti-Soviet speech: "In behalf of our organization, the F. S. U., we thank the Archbishop Benjamin and his secretary, Mr. Hieromonk Dimitri for being present here tonight." And then followed hand shakings between the two counter-revolutionary white guards and the two Friends of the Soviet Union", Dr. Le Roy and B. Freedman. Sarcastic laughter greeted this very dignified ceremony from various parts of the hall.

Open air meetings conducted by the Left Opposition are systematically broken up by the Stalinists while a class enemy is given all opportunities to express anti-Soviet propaganda from the platform of a party-controlled organization. Left Oppositionists are being expelled, not only from the party but also from auxiliary organizations by the same leaders who shake hands with White Guard Wrangelites. The earnest Communist must ponder over these facts.

Party members should demand an explanation from their leadership. Instead of repudiating this affair the *Daily Worker* has maintained complete silence in it. The proletarian elements in the F. S. U. (if there are any) should demand an accounting from their leadership for this shameful business.

The Left Opposition most sharply condemns this dangerous infamy of the party leaders, who by their silence share the responsibility for it. The depths of Stalinist degeneration as revealed in this criminal episode, which is only symptomatic, makes the fight of the Left Opposition for a return to the policies of Lenin and Trotsky more necessary, more imperative than ever before.

—J. KAMIAT.

"They in our ranks who erroneously act along the line of a belief in the existence of a basic contradiction between bourgeois democracy and Fascism, between the Social Democracy and Hitler's party, are harmful and fatal to the Communist movement. Indeed this is our chief danger." (Manninsky: Report at the XI Plenum of the E. C. C. I., April 1931; Communist International, number 16, April 1931, page 703).

FROM "LENINISM VERSUS STALINISM"

labor power is a commodity. As such its true value is determined by the value of the physical minimum of requirements necessary to reproduce that labor power from day to day plus certain requirements dictated by natural conditions and by the particular social level of the United States. However, by reason of its being a commodity, labor power is amenable to the invisible laws governing all commodities. It is influenced by the factors of supply and demand, being forced below or carried above its true value according as the available supply of labor power is above or below demand. But with the tremendous technological advance of production in recent years there exists a permanent and relatively growing over-supply of labor power. While a cyclical recovery would cause them to rise slightly above their present level, as a result of the absorption of a part of the over-supply of labor power, from that point they would once more recede.

Thus we are led to believe that the period of "prosperity" existing between 1923 and 1929, as far as the workers are concerned, has passed never to return. It is estimated that improvement of productive technique has progressed to the point where a return to the production levels of 1928-29, which is not likely, could be made today with the re-employment of not more than 50 percent of the 16 million American workers unemployed at present. Thus, the United States will enter any period of cyclical recovery with a permanent industrial reserve army of at least 8 million persons. Nor will this army shrink. On the contrary, it is reasonable to presuppose its further growth. The technological displacement of workers will continue. Each year an influx of young persons who have attained "working age" will swell the ranks of available workers. So take it, all in all, it may be said that the American period of high wages is a thing of the past.

In 1929 the United States definitely joined Europe in a condition of general capitalist decline. Its industrial activity, held up by the export of capital between 1923-29, permanently slackened. The general crisis of capitalism laid it by the heels and today America is confronted by an accumulation of surplus capital seeking investment, excess plant capacity, over-capitalization in expectation of high monopoly profits, restricted markets and other phenomena characteristic of the period of capitalist decay.

However, this does not mean that cyclical variations are excluded. On the contrary, one is beginning to

### Nazis Cut Wages

(Continued from Page 1)

cuts, so that they could not participate in the third meeting (all the meetings took place on the same day), was the wage cut dictated against the will of the men. Besides, the three-day work week was lengthened, at the expense of the workers, to six days.

Here the struggle against the Jews was exposed most clearly. This shop belongs to an enormous English-Jewish concern. Since this German shop, as a result of the seasonal summer slackness and the allegedly excessive wages, could not bring a return on the capital invested by the English Jews, 350 German office employees and workers have to starve. This is how the struggle against Jewish finance-capitalists in practice. Two English Jews with a fortune of hundreds of millions of marks and a so-called German capitalist of Aryan origin, who piled up a huge fortune during the war and did not have to give up a single penny of it (probably because he was a brave German "front soldier"), get their money at the expense of the workers. But the little Jews are harassed in the meanest fashion. That is the Nazi program in its purest form. The capitalist, whether Jew or Christian, must live. The proletariat can starve.

But all these glories will not last long. Already a ferment is beginning, not only among the class-conscious proletariat, but even in middle-class circles which until recently celebrated Hitler with enthusiasm as the savior. Already the dissatisfaction is finding frequent expression. Most often in this way—"To hell with Hitler, to hell with the damned leaders of the workers' parties, the social-democrats and the Communists, and the trade unions, who have betrayed us and sold us out. Something else has got to come. Leaders like Lenin and Trotsky, that's what we need. Then we'll be there. Then God help the rascals from all camps!"

That is what one hears, still hesitating, cautious, unclear. That is the beginning. Now our work is commencing.

IN THE NEXT ISSUE

take place now. But all phases of the business cycle—bull, average production, boom and crisis—now on, will occur on a generally descending curve in contradistinction to a formerly ascending one. They will take place within a restrictive circle dictated by the present stage of development of the international economic and social relationships of world imperialism. Boom will be extremely short-lived and succeeded by crises of unusual length and depth.

(Continued in next issue)

### Parliamentary Criticism

(Cont. from Page 1)

parliamentary paper, *Monde* are keeping watch over you! And, as if to complete the picture of political decay, the same number of the *Rundschau* prints a leading article on the present relations between Germany and Austria. A revolutionary phillistine relates that "for the first time" (!) in the relations of the two countries, "Hitler has recourse to reprisals against Austria to force measures of internal policy from that government". For the first time in the relations of the two states! The article concludes with the following remarkable words: "The relations between Germany and Austria have never been, since the existence of the Empire, as bad as they are at this moment. Such is the practical result of Hitler's foreign policy." It is somewhat unbearable to read this philology which is worthy of a conservative Privatdozent (professor). Hitler is conducting a policy of counter-revolutionary realism in Austria. He wins over the petty-bourgeois masses by digging the ground from under unstable Austrian Bonapartism. With obstinacy and perseverance, Hitler is changing the relationship of forces in his favor. He does not fear the straining of relations with Dollfus. In that he distinguishes himself—and distinguishes himself to his advantage—from Otto Bauer and from... the Stalinist bureaucracy which does not view the reversals between Austria and Germany from the standpoint of the class struggle but from the standpoint of diplomatic criticism.

Moscow's enthusiasm for the Paris Congress called to replace the revolutionary struggle in Austria, and the indignation at Basle over the policy of Hitler who does not fear, in the struggle against the Austrian masses, to dispute with Dollfus himself—"there is no animal stronger than a cat", says the mouse—this enthusiasm and this indignation complement each other as two forms of parliamentary and diplomatic criticism. By a minute part the whole can be judged. In many cases one can precisely determine the sickness by a symptom. These two articles are enough—one in *Pravda*, the other in the *Rundschau*—to say: perhaps the Centrist bureaucracy has adequate means at its disposal to hire expensive halls in Paris and to publish bulky papers in Basle, but Bureaucratic Centristism as a revolutionary current is dead, it decomposes before our eyes and poisons the atmosphere.

—L. TROTSKY.

### London Meet Splits

(Continued from Page 1)

we can more successfully attack the rest of the world".

To help cover up the real policies of concentrated attack on international markets, they set up a utopian nationalistic ideal of high prices, stabilized for a generation, of a nationally managed currency, of broader purchasing power for the masses in the face of rising prices, of improved conditions for agriculture as against industry, of a general return to the "prosperous period" of 1924-1925. The realities, however, are not stabilization but the wildest speculation; not the stimulation of agriculture, but the elimination of the small farmer; not greater purchasing power for the masses, but less purchasing power due to inflation and the tying up of the trade unions, hand and foot, with the ropes of the Industrial Recovery Act.

The combination of open force with sentimental hypocrisy, of ruthless driving toward a fixed goal with apparent vacillation, of an open splitting of the London conference with pious attempts to keep it going, are Roosevelt's distinct contribution to the technique of aggressive imperialism.

—B. J. F.

### COMRADE MILICENT SHOOTER

We have received the sad news from abroad that one of the first supporters of the Left Opposition in England, comrade Milicent Shooter, passed away at her home in Helston, Cornwall. Comrade Shooter rallied to *The Militant* with contributions, both literary and financial, from its very inception. We wish to record our appreciation at the excellent Jimmy Higgins work she carried on to the limit of her capacity in Great Britain and our deep grief at losing a faithful comrade-in-arms, who remained with us to her last day.

## WORKS by TROTSKY

- ON GERMANY**
  - THE ONLY ROAD** 25 192 pages paper cover .35
  - 100 pages .25 cloth over .65
  - Postage—.06 extra per copy
- ON RUSSIA**
  - PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF U.S.S.R.**
  - Price .15 Postage—.01 extra per copy
- ON SPAIN**
  - THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER**
  - Price .15 Postage—.01 extra per copy
- ON THE TRADE UNION QUESTION**
  - COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM**
  - Price .15 Postage—.01 extra per copy
- ON THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY AND THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION**
  - THE STRATEGY OF THE PERMANENT WORLD REVOLUTION**
  - .25 180 pages paper cover .50
  - Postage—.06 extra per copy cloth cover 1.00
  - Postage—.06 extra per copy
- ON CHINA**
  - PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION**
  - 450 pages paper cover 1.00 cloth cover 1.50
  - Postage—.06 extra per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

84 EAST 10th STREET, N. Y. C.