

The Banning of the Austrian C.P.

Vienna, May 28—On May 26th, the proscription of the Communist Party of Austria was signed by the Council of Ministers because of "its oft-times established danger to the state and its illegal activity."

With the proscription of a political party the Bonapartist Dollfuss regime has taken a significant step in its further development.

It must also be recognized that this time too "little" Dollfuss proceeded very skillfully about the work. It is no mere coincidence that at this same time Hitler's new measure which, by requiring a passport charge of 1000 Marks, practically stops the entire traffic of foreigners from Germany to Austria.

Importance of Foreign Traffic The tying up of the foreign traffic on the part of the German government serves the end of lifting the Austrian Nazis into the saddle of power and by this means, to bring about the integration of Austria with Hitler-Germany.

The Austrian Christian Socialists, however, do not desire to share the fate of the Centerists in Germany. Dollfuss carries on a desperate fight against his Brown shirt opponents and their backer, Hitler.

Workers Passive to Banning of C. P. A. This party, the oldest in the C.I., made it easy for him to play the strong man. The entire bourgeois press limits itself merely to the publication of the official report of the proscription. Only the Arbeiter Zeitung devotes a leading article to the event of May 27th, in which it shows that the Communists could complain to the Constitution, in case it still existed.

Dollfuss Strikes an Ominous Blow against the Austrian Proletariat

a counter-revolutionary. They had no ideas of their own and restricted themselves to being Stalinist loudspeakers in Austria. Nowhere could he have found such willing worshippers as here.

It became exceedingly futile in the weeks just passed, in which the situation became ever more critical, to look for the line of the C.P.A. That they could not trust in their lucky stars became clear even to the Vienna Stalin agents after the German catastrophe.

"C. P. A. Comes to Infamous End" The last possibility to obtain political significance and influence was cut off from the C.P.A. by the Comintern through the refusal to decide upon an international united front action against Fascism by direct negotiations between the Second

Versailles Revisionism Engenders New Social Chauvinist Wave

Bratislava, C. S. R. — For and against the revision of the border lines—that is the bone of contention in Europe. The line-up is not yet complete—the governments haven't got that far; neither economically, nor politically, nor strategically—the two fronts are still being prepared.

The line-up of the two fronts signifies—war preparations. The Four Power Pact stands only in appearance in contradiction to this fact. It is merely an episodic, a temporary agreement, a postponement so to speak. In the meantime, the working class and the Soviet Union is to be got rid of.

The Legitimists count mostly upon the monarchist Restoration. The Hungarian Nazis expect most of a Revision under the protection of Hitler. And the Goemboes wing considers itself as the most appropriate executive.

Workers Against All Capitalist Wars How does the Czechoslovak chap-

will, in spite of the circumstances, assure the extension of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and recreate the revolutionary vanguard in Austria together with all Communist and social democratic workers who are prepared to learn from the events and draw conclusions from them.

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

EDITORIAL BOARD Martin Abern James P. Cannon Max Shachtman Maurice Spector Arne Swabeck

Vol. 6, No. 32 (Whole No. 178) SATURDAY, JUNE 24, 1933 Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year Foreign \$2.50 5 cents per copy

If the number on your wrapper is 179 your subscription has expired. If you want to get the Militant promptly every week renew your subscription at once: \$2 per year for fifty two weekly issues; \$1 a half year for twenty six weekly issues.

THE MILITANT 126 East 16th St. N. Y. C.

The End of Austro-Marxism

The Austrian social democracy was highly esteemed even before the war among its brother parties for its statesman-like spirit.

After the war, socialist Austria became even more famous. And why not? If Stalin could undertake the building up of socialism in a single country, then the Austrian social democrats could tackle an even more complicated task, the task of building socialism in one little province, and even in a single city. They gave the new Austria "the most democratic constitution in the world" and created thereby the prerequisites for a socialization which was to be just as irresistible as it was peaceful.

And this achievement they brought about—as the highest triumph of socialist statesmanship—in unison with the Christian Socialists. But the red Vienna built cooperative houses and children's baths, overturned the whole educational system in a fashion hair-raising for the "blacks" (the clergy) and brought about other such bold changes. In short, the Austrian social democracy rose by its deeds and became the "Exemplary Party of the Second International," it became looked upon in the whole so-

A Review of the Past That Helps to Understand the Present

cialist world as if it were some miracle. Its prominent, after they had reconstituted the Second International, the bloc from Friedrich Adler to Noske, led on the floor at all the international congresses.

Under such circumstances it is self-evident that today, after the German social democracy has suffered a collapse unique in the history of the labor movement in its "struggle" against the swastika, all socialists turn their eyes to Austria, the exemplary little country of socialism, where Fascism, encouraged by Hitler's victory has just taken up the struggle for power. All socialists hearts and minds are stirred by the question: How will the Austrian social democracy stand up in this struggle? Will it not stand the test much better than the German party? Are not, looking aside from its striking qualities, the circumstances themselves auspicious for it?

The German working class was defeated because it was split, but the unity of the Austrian working class has never been seriously threatened by the Third International. The Communist Party of Austria has always been of negligible size, small, weak, unimportant.

No Balkanization of Europe, no European dream, no Revision or Counter-Revision—but struggle for the Soviet United States of Europe. — H. LENOROVICS

CHICAGO PICNIC SUNDAY, JULY 9, 1933 Forest Preserve—Western Ave and 87th Street GOOD TIME ASSURED Games — Refreshments — Sports Come early and enjoy the day. Sponsors: Chicago Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition)

A Half Year sub to the Militant is \$1. On a Club Plan with three others it is only 50 cents.

Its True Face In order to understand this as the only possible, as the self-evident thing, what this Austrian social democracy, praised in all tones and admired in all languages, really is—not in its own imagination, not in the imagination of its brother parties, but in actuality.

Heinrich Unger once said: Liberalism has a great future behind it. That can be said equally as well for the Austrian socialism. Its beginnings were auspicious. Under the leadership of Victor Adler the Austrian working class waged battles against the decayed Hapsburg monarchy which aroused the admiration of the old Engels. But ultimately, the Austrian state remained the victor in this struggle.

Not in open battle. It crushed its opponents gradually, and incorporated the Austrian social democracy slowly within itself. Thus arose Austro-Marxism.

If we look upon its fists and not upon its mouth, Austro-Marxism proves to be nothing else but reformism. Like every other form of reformism, it is the adaptation of the labor movement to the bourgeois state. Its subordination to the bourgeois state. What distinguishes it from the other forms of reformism, what allowed it to appear for a long time as something essentially different and unique was the circumstance that it assumed the task of adapting the labor movement to a state which was going to pieces.

Collusion With Hapsburg In this state, which could not live and could not die; whose existence was a lamentable drag; which had no friend if it did not pay him in cold cash—in this decadent world, the great Austro-Marxist idea was born: the renovation and entrenchment of the Hapsburg state in return for concessions to the working class. This program looked very new, very bold. It was like a creative thought in this world of fruitless pettiness. But in reality, this grandiloquent Austro-Marxist conception was only the translation of the common garden variety reformist program—cannon fodder for voting rights—into the Austrian.

Since then Austro-Marxism continually made state policies, no longer class policies. Its ideas revolved only around parliament. It emulated all the petty arts of parliamentary cretinism from the bourgeois parties. The Marxist conception that the liberation of the working class must be the work of the workers themselves was smiled upon as old fashioned.

(Continued in next issue) — AUSTRIACUS (From 'Unser Wort')

P.M.A. in Review

(Continued from Page 2)

and file miners, not in words, but in deeds. This applies with particular emphasis to the P.M.A., as it does generally to all unions. Conversely, a lack of inner-democracy, a rule of bureaucrats, is an indication of the need of this same bureaucracy which finds resentment apace in the rank and file.

In 1932, the struggles of the Illinois miners resulted in the organization of the Progressive Miners of America. The apparently immediate reason for this development lay in the struggle of the miners for democracy, for a rank and file union. Behind this struggle for democracy (which at that moment rose to its highest pitch through the big steal of the miners ballots on the wage cut) lay the real issue.

"Stabilization" of the P.M.A. Since that time much water has flowed under the bridge. The new union stabilized itself momentarily through the gain of local contracts throughout the state. It was able to make these gains only through a heroic struggle in which the union gave up many martyrs. Without this struggle the present solidification of the union would have been impossible. During the period

of conflict, when the union was earning the name of the Progressive Miners of America, all forces stood united at least on one question—the maintenance and stabilization of the organization. Everyone recognized that this was impossible without waging a fierce struggle for recognition and against the Lewis Union, which has within its ranks a minority of the miners, and the greatest number of these kept in the UMWA through coercion. It was this stage in the development of the union that pointed to its great future.

Recent months witness a recession in this policy of the P.M.A. The campaign of red baiting testified that something else is brewing. This can be described as a settling process. The early cry of building a national union has now become less sharp and the leadership wants to be respectable as well as respected. It is interested in the "legal" aspects of their existence. It wants peace in the Illinois coal fields and for this it even enters into false negotiations with the Lewis union. It promised two statements to Lewis: one calling for a referendum of the coal miners to ascertain their support of the two unions, the result of this vote deciding which union shall remain in Illinois (this correct proposal was naturally unacceptable to the Lewis machine); the other: that the unions function where they are a majority (a division of territory) declaring that they recognize the UMWA as an organization existing in the interests of the miners, i.e., a miners' organization.

A Glaring Error This latter statement reveals glaring errors which can react only against the P.M.A. In those areas where the UMWA is in the majority, it is so because the miners are compelled to remain in the union by force. In recognizing that the UMWA is a union existing in the interests of the coal miners, an actual betrayal of the interests of the P.M.A. is committed. For what reason, then, one may ask, should the P.M.A. exist? Its wage-scale is the same. If the Lewis union is an organization existing in the interests of the coal diggers, then why the organization of a new union? This second statement was a surrender to the Lewis interests, even though it was presented as a

concession, a compromise. Such a compromise can only cut the heart out of the new movement. Alongside with this gradually milder tone of the union, its attempts to be a "respectable" organization, to negotiate with Lewis, to put matters in the hands of the "impartial" Governor Horner, comes this red baiting campaign and the attempts to expel a number of Left wing elements from the P.M.A. One of the chief accomplishments of the P.M.A. was its invitation to all expelled UMWA militants, to join the P.M.A. But when after a few months of existence, it in turn, begins an expulsion campaign against these very persons, something is wrong in the union.

There exists a great contradiction in the P.M.A. The contradiction exists between the rank and file and the leadership. The rank and file is militant. It is serious. It has not carried on its valiant struggle for nothing. It sought to build an organization that would recoil at the mere mention of Lewisism. The leadership, however, which rose during the early struggles, is trying to check this militancy, to become respectable, to insure the existence of the union for at least two years through the contracts signed and is closely treading on false grounds. The leadership is adopting a course that is bringing it closer to class-collaboration. The miners on the contrary, want to continue the splendid struggle they began.

There is a great dissatisfaction in the ranks of the union against this policy of the leadership, which can have only one effect: that of weakening the new union and leading it to collapse. The weathervane is the drive made against the militants in the union and the raising of the red scare. We pointed out above, that for Lewis the destruction of the democracy in the union is the institution of his policy of class collaboration with the employers, to the detriment of the coal miners. These acts of the leadership of the P.M.A. do not stand on a much higher plane. It will become clearer day by day, that their weakening of the democratic rights of the members of the P.M.A. is only a reflection of the introduction and strengthening of such policies, as are coincident with the policies of Lewisism.

Gillespie Meet

(Continued from Page 2)

talism. Within the framework of the capitalist mode of production these contradictions cannot be solved. The seizure of power of Fascism in Germany has intensified the contradiction of world capitalism and has strengthened reaction throughout the world. The defeat of the German working class is a defeat of the whole world working class. The Industrial Control Bill, as a dictatorial measure over the working class, is part of this reaction and the struggle between the imperialist powers to gain a point of advantage for the struggle for the redistribution of the earth.

Subsidy to Decayed System The government partnership, thru the emergency law and the Industrial Control Bill, will result in government subsidy to the decayed industries of American capitalism, such as coal and railroads, etc. It is an attempt to uphold a tottering and decayed structure by shifting the burden upon the working class and by eliminating small exploiters. Trusts were opposed in the past but Carrels will now be organized by the government.

The big capitalists intend to eliminate the weak and small concerns in all industries as well as to establish a monopoly price of a group of favored capitalists. The Industrial Control Bill is an attempt to "organize" capitalist competition on a higher plane. It is an attempt to eliminate competition, but instead will lead to a greater anarchy of capitalist production. It will intensify all of the basic contradictions of American and world capitalism. The Industrial Control Bill is an attempt to hold up the falling rate of profit by the reorganization of industries and by beating down of the workers standards to a new low level. The agrarian crisis has prevented the farmers from paying the debts owed to the bankers. The Roosevelt measures to help the farmers is to help the farmers pay the bankers what they owe. This agrarian measure and the Banking Law, which gives the government unlimited power of inflation, were

necessary steps and parts of the big capitalists' plan that the Industrial Control Bill fits into.

The Industrial Control Bill and its arbitration scheme for labor and capital is an attempt to set up an elaborate class collaboration plan to head off the developing class struggle. It will establish dictatorial power over the American working class. The bill with a government inflation policy will establish a high MONEY wage but a VEILY LOW REAL WAGE for the American workers.

It is an attempt to side-step the dole and social insurance and in its place, give the equivalent of the dole, in the form of a money wage, through public works, which is nothing more nor less than a cloak for forced labor in exchange for relief.

The Europeanization of the American working class is at hand and with it goes the intensification of the class struggle. The Industrial Control Bill is an attempt to hold in check the rising tide of class struggle, and to place the workers in the harness of class collaboration. Our trade union movement is to be harassed to the capitalists and their state. Agents of the capitalists, the Lewises and Greens, will be selected to control the labor movement. A strike against the exploiters of labor will be a strike against the government. The struggle of the workers for our class interests will be outlawed. The June 11, 1933 Gillespie Trade Union Conference, called by the Progressive Trade Union Educational Committee, goes on record as opposed to the Industrial Control Bill and its sugar coated, class collaboration, anti-working class provisions. The Conference goes on record favoring the calling of a national united front conference of all labor organizations in the United States, to be held in Chicago in the future, to rally the American working class to fight the capitalist offensive, to map out a program of action to protect the workers interests and to rouse our class to action. The Conference gives the incoming national committee power to act for this united action, for joint action with all working class organizations. (Introduced by delegate, Hugo Oehler.

Danger Signals at London Meet

(Continued from page 1) Behind the Scenes The United States in the meantime has again risked a crisis in the conference by insisting that the question of stabilizing currency be postponed until American prices had risen to a "satisfactory" level. This meant that only "economic" questions outside of currency could be taken up for a period of weeks or more likely, months. The French threatened to split away, but have remained in. Under American pressure, the British have come out in favor of higher prices and cheap, plentiful credit. America meanwhile keeps the key to monetary policy—to inflate or not to inflate, how and how much to inflate—in its own hands. Talk and Action—la American In the currency committee itself it has stood for a policy of lowering the legal minimum gold reserves, using 20 percent silver to 80 percent gold in such reserves, and limiting the use of gold to international settlements and central banking reserves—in other words, making permanent and international at the present situation in the United States whereby a bank is not obliged to pay out gold against paper. The French with their affiliated gold standard satellites are fighting this proposal tooth and nail, as it will remove one of their strongest pieces from the chessboard—their powerful gold reserve position. In the economic committee, the American contribution so far has been a proposal for a 10 percent tariff reduction all around—hastily withdrawn by the American delegation itself and labeled as simply a "suggestion by the experts." This showed the emptiness of the phrases of the American delegate Hull in his opening speech on the desirability of lowering tariffs and on the harm done by economic nationalism. In fact, the whole Roosevelt policy, based on the manipulation through government agencies of American lines, is in sharp contradiction to the effort to obtain international agreement on currency, tariffs and trade, as was implied in a speech by the president of the world bank, himself an American. The battle behind the scenes continues, meanwhile. In the face of the palaver about international agreements on tariffs, France passed a law raising customs duties on American products 15 per cent before the conference opened, and a few days ago, before echoes from the speeches before the economic committee had died down, passed another bill raising the tariff on about a hundred products, mostly of German and American origin. Meantime the whole proceedings are being held up while the head of Roosevelt's "brain trust," Moley, arrives—in other words, until America places its fist on the agenda sheet. Behind the scenes also was the settlement of the question of June 15 payments on the war debts—France paying nothing, England and Italy making small "token" payments, the latter received with diplomatic irony as the "disappointment" which it might cause in certain circles because of its small amount. Litvinoff at London From the standpoint of the revolutionary workers, the outstanding development of the London economic conference so far has been Litvinoff's speech, which throws a glaring light on the extent to which the Menshevik degeneration of the Soviet regime has progressed. In the effort to adapt himself as closely as possible to the bourgeois diplomats by whom he was surrounded, the Soviet delegate deliberately blurred the lines between Soviet and bourgeois policy, did not refer to the interests of the working class, speaking as one diplomat to other diplomats, and tangled himself in hopeless contradictions while making the most impermissible concessions to the bourgeoisie. Standing on the basis of "socialism in one country," he, according to the Associated Press report, "urged recognition of the peaceful coexistence of the two systems—capitalism and socialism." Even for an American Stalinist editor, this was too much to swallow, so the Daily Worker kept this sentence out of its report. The "peaceful coexistence of capitalism and socialism" means the abandonment of the world revolution, nothing less—and not only as an immediate but as a long-term perspective, and to shove it off into the distant future, out of the reach of "practical" politics. Was he trying to fool the diplomats, while keeping his own mental reservations? Or is he fooling the working class instead? His conception of non-aggression goes far beyond the tariff/truce initiated by the United States, he said, "Speaking of a truce acknowledges the existence of a state of war. An armistice means cessation of all fighting, not merely abstention from the beginning of fresh battles. The same should be true of economic warfare." In other words, he claims to be even more of an economic pacifist than Roosevelt, by the degree that an "armistice" is more peaceful than a "truce." He is therefore in favor of removing the restrictions on international trade, just like his bourgeois colleagues. A Few Pointed Questions We must ask a serious question. Is the Soviet monopoly of foreign trade a hindrance to the international movement of goods or is it not? Does Litvinoff (comrade Litvinoff) propose to liquidate the Soviet monopoly of foreign trade, one

Exclude L.O. at Anti-Fascist Meet

(Continued from Page 1) caused the Comintern bureaucracy to work so diligently to keep the delegates of the International Left Opposition away from its halls. It feared the concrete proposals of the Left Opposition for the organization of the European Anti-Fascist united front from organization to organization, beginning with the problem of Austria and proceeding onto a wider plane. For the Stalinist bureaucracy is afraid of its own shadow. It has lost all actual faith in working class action. It is interested only in maintaining its own dwindling and undermined prestige. And for that purpose the united front masquerade a la Barbusse is sufficient for it. But the last word has not yet been said. The Left Opposition will not allow the Stalinist organizers of defeat to cover up their already overblown crimes with new crimes. The Left Opposition will continue to expose mercilessly the shameful maneuver at Paris and its Stalinist initiators. It will work tirelessly to make the truth known to the workers of the world and to organize genuine, effective united front action that meets the needs of the real situation. —S. G. "Germany Is Not Italy" A damnable and blighting catch phrase ran through the ranks of the German proletariat, wandering through all the organizations of the working class. They consoled each other with it. It was thought up and set in circulation by frightened, helpless bureaucrats, at their wits' end. "Germany is not Italy," "Germany is not Italy,"—in pompous and heroic speeches and numberless newspaper articles, the incantation was thrown again and again at the masses. "Germany is not Italy." This mystical dictum, not good enough to hypnotize rabbits, was considered sufficiently potent to put to sleep the best organized worker class of the capitalist world. "Germany is not Italy" blabbered the degenerate social democratic bureaucrats out the windows of their offices. "Germany is not Italy" echoed in the high places of the Stalinist Comintern, in the Communist Party of Germany, in all other sections of the C. I. "The Twelfth Plenum has... shown that there is not—and there cannot be—such a thing as a so-called 'classical' Fascism, and that all theories derived from the history of Italian Fascism, regarding the necessity of first striking down the working class, are bloodless abstractions." (Communist International, January 10, 1933, page 19.) Didn't the Stalinists give unabashed henchman's service to the Social Democracy in that way? Did that not amount to actually facilitating Hitler's accession to power? The Left Opposition raised its voice in warning: "The coming of the German Nazis to power would mean, first of all, the destruction of the flower of the German proletariat, the annihilation of its organizations, the eradication of its belief in itself and in its future. In accordance with the greater maturity and acuteness of the social contradictions prevalent in Germany, the hellish work of the Italian Fascism will probably appear as a pale, almost humane, experiment, in comparison with the work of the German National Socialists." (Trotsky, Shall Fascism Really Be Victorious?, Nov. 1931.) The bureaucrats, left without any plausible arguments, maligned and persecuted us and attempted to hide their panicky helplessness behind the phrase: "Germany is not Italy!" This they still chanted when the boots of the Nazi storm troopers were already trampling the ground of the most active proletarian forces of Germany. And even today the bureaucracy, which events have already proved bankrupt, cannot separate itself from the slogan grown dear to its heart. They hope, and say so, that the economic crisis will by itself finish off Hitler. Socialist Hopes For Mercy Shattered Hitler came to power, and there was not even the slightest talk regarding cooperation with the Social Democrats. All the secret hopes of the treacherous bureaucracy had vanished. The theories, and the practice, that Stalinism derived therefrom, also vanished. The first blow of Fascism was meant for the revolutionary proletariat as embodied in C. P. G. But the accusation leveled against the S. P. G. on the occasion of the Reichstag fire already suggested that the Socialists would be the next victims. The Welles and Breitscheldts tried to win a reprieve. They moved away from the Marxism that they never belonged to. They "tolerated" the persecutions of C. P. G. They "tolerated" the bloody deeds perpetrated by the Fascists on the social democratic workers and the members of the free trade unions. Wells, too, protested (though he knew better) against the so-called exaggerations of German excesses abroad. He even went so far as to resign his post in the administrative circle of the Second International. True as it was absurd, —the S. P. G. hoped for mercy; it hoped to be granted a sort of role as his Nazi Majesty's most obedient opposition. But Fascism, which had thrived on social democratic toleration, never thought of tolerating the S. P. G. in its turn. The First of May came. Zeorgiebel, who on his way was quite ready to murder 35 workers, was

August 4, 1914 and May 17, 1933

(Continued from Page 1) kicked out to the devil, and Hitler arranged the miserable comedy of the "National Holiday." Hardly had Leipart returned from marching behind the Swastika banner when he was called back to be incarcerated in the famous "sick-house". The free trade unions became Fascist. A week later, the S. P. G., too, was done away with. "Fascism, nourished by the Social Democracy, will be obliged to break the head of the Social Democracy in order to arrive at power." (Trotsky, November 1929.) Where were now the speculations of the social democratic bureaucracy? Where were the fancy theories of Stalinism? III. The odor of the decay of the beheaded social democracy contaminated the air. The vote for Hitler at the recent "great statement on foreign affairs" was—temporarily—the last link in the chain of treason. It was the consequence and crowning of the nigh 20 year old policy of coalition and toleration. This crime threatened to pull down the entire Second International. The pure instinct of self-preservation has led the leading spirits of the Second International to move away from the latest acts in Germany. But they are moving away only from one section of the social democratic fraction. They are not moving away from the policy, the natural result of which was the vote for Hitler. On May 18, 1933, the bureau of the Labor and Socialist International assembled in Paris under the chairmanship of Vandervelde for a "thorough consideration of the most recent events in Germany." It drafted the following resolution to be presented in the Reichstag: "The Labor-Socialist International is convinced that the consent of a number of the social democratic deputies of the German Reichstag to a resolution expressing unreserved solidarity with the recent declaration of the German government, does not express the true convictions of the German working class. It declares that the support of that declaration contradicts the principles of the Labor-Socialist International..." In a late issue of the Vienna Arbeiter Zeitung, Oda Oldberg "examines" editorially the last Reichstag vote of the German social democracy and asks the following questions: "Do these people really believe that the German workers will understand this attitude, that they will be able to make out this pattern of lies and facts in which formal justice and cunning injustice are so cleverly intertwined? The workers will not understand; the sacrifice has been in vain. The workers will consider themselves betrayed... With Hitler no pacts should have ever been attempted." This is actually said: "they will consider themselves betrayed." Here is the true face of the Second International. They—the workers—will only "consider" themselves betrayed. Haven't they been betrayed? Olberg and the Arbeiter Zeitung are silent on this count. Leon Blum, shedding some light on the history of the Reichstag vote, declares: "The question of participation of the social democratic delegates in the last session of the Reichstag was the theme of the conference of the newly elected party presidium. This conference expressed itself unanimously against the participation of the social democratic delegates in the Reichstag vote. There was for the social democratic delegates only one attitude possible—and that dictated by the conscience of the Socialist International—to declare the Hitler comedy null and void by their absence,—to unmask the Reichstag comedy as the ironic

of the pillars of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as Stalin proposed in 1923, or does he propose to keep it? If he proposes to keep it, why does he not say so? Is it because that would compel him to point out that after all, there is a difference between the Soviet State and bourgeois states? And would not this raise a question in the minds of the conference about the "peaceful coexistence of capitalism and socialism"? The part of his speech which interested the conference most was his plea for "lengthened credits and normal conditions for Soviet exports", with an offer to buy a billion dollars' worth of additional commodities under these conditions. To raise the demand for "long-term credits for the Soviet Union" is counter-revolutionary Trotskyism when addressed to the working class, and constitutes grounds for expulsion, as in the case of J. L. Murphy of the British C. P.; but it is perfectly all right as long as it is addressed to the bourgeoisie only. But what is the purpose of these long-term credits? To relieve a critical situation in the U. S. S. R.? No—no such situation exists, according to the Foreign Commissioner. On the contrary, prosperity prevails throughout the Soviet Union and it has not been touched by the world crisis (so that there is a difference after all between capitalism and socialism). The real reason for Litvinoff's proposal, in his own words, as quoted by the New York Times, is: "We merely wish to set this conference along the path which, in our opinion, is most likely to lead to effective results in alleviating the crisis." (Clearly the crisis which is to be alleviated is the crisis of capitalism. When the German social democracy at its Leipzig conference in 1930 proposed itself to the bourgeoisie as the "doctors of sick capitalism", Communists answered correctly that what capitalism needs is not a doctor but an undertaker. Which role is Litvinoff proposing for the Soviet Union? The Left Opposition has for years been advocating long-term credits to the Soviet Union, and economic collaboration between the Soviet Union and advanced capitalist countries—but always on a revolutionary basis, always pointing out the value of these demands in mobilizing the masses. What Litvinoff says today as the Stalinist line was rejected a year and a half ago by Trotsky as—Stalinist slanders against the Left Opposition! In What Next?, page 175, we read, "During the first stage of the crisis—more than two years ago—we posed this question (Soviet-German collaboration, B. J. F.) in print. And the Stalinists immediately set up a hue and cry that we believe in the peaceful coexistence of socialism and capitalism, that we want to save capitalism, etc." This was written by comrade Trotsky early in 1932. However, if Litvinoff really presented the line which we have a right to expect from a Communist appearing in negotiations before bourgeois diplomats, if he talked to them as Trotsky talked to Kuehnmann at Brest-Litovsk, or Chicherin to Lloyd George, or Rakovsky to the French concessionaires, and if his correct revolutionary line has been perverted by the bourgeois press, then the Stalinists owe it to the revolutionary movement to denounce the reports given by the Associated Press and the New York Times as distortions and forgeries, and to present an authentic and full report of Litvinoff's speech at the London Conference. Hugenberg's "Feeler" Two days after Litvinoff spoke, Hugenberg made an open demand for support for Germany in regaining its African colonies and "opening up territories for settlement and construction of great works of peace". Undoubtedly it is correct to see in this a declaration of intention to seize and exploit the Soviet Union. Hitler, as comrade Trotsky points out, is playing for the gradual arming of Germany after the failure of disarmament and in the name of the defense of Europe against Bolshevism, against the desire of the German Nationalists for quick "results". He at once repudiated Hugenberg's statement as being purely personal, forced him to return to Berlin, and emphasized his repudiation by forcing the dissolution of the Nationalist "Battle Ring" and the integration of the Stahlhelm into the Nazi movement. Pravda reacted to the Hugenberg statement with "the first Soviet editorial in denunciation of Hitler-ite Germany", as the New York Times correspondent remarks. What a degeneration—the smashing of the German proletariat brought forward not a single word of protest from the Soviet Union; only when its elementary, "national" interests were involved did it raise its voice! The editorial in Pravda said, "Hitlerism is being forced by economic and financial difficulties to adopt a policy of military adventure by which Germany hopes to re-establish her shattered prestige." This is precisely what comrade Trotsky said—a year before Hitler took power, in the April 1932 issue of the American liberal magazine, the Forum. The difference is that the Left Opposition foresaw, while the Stalinists run after the tail-end of events; that we distinguished between the policies of the Nationalists and those of Hitler, and above all, proposed a policy of initiative and preparation for action instead of the "khvostism",

Workers Must Organize and Fight Against State Capitalist Measures

(Continued from Page 1) capitalists will make the future of the workers under the "new deal" worse than the past. The "Century of Progress" witnessed the further centralization and concentration of wealth and capital in the hands of fewer and fewer capitalists while the vast majority have been driven to deeper levels of misery and degradation. The working class battle against the capitalist offensive organized by the Industrial Control Bill will have to be fought in the sphere of unemployment relief, the struggle for wages, hours, and the unionization of the workers into class struggle unions. To do this, the working class must be told what the "planned economy" means. The Communists must present a Marxist analysis, organize the class, especially to head off the action of the Greens, Wells and Lewises, who desire to utilize the State capitalist measures for their class collaboration schemes. The Workers' Answer: Class Struggle Organization It is not difficult to understand that a law which gives the capitalist and workers "equality" on paper means nothing in reality, except giving the strongest organized force the right to do what it pleases. In this case the capitalists are well organized and entrenched. In addition it is they who have made the laws of the "game" which we must play. Our lack of pressure, due to the lack of any worthwhile, powerful, organized industrial unions as well as to a blundering leadership within the Communists ranks (that of the Stalinists) gives the capitalists the overwhelming odds in deciding the whole question. There is only one way the working class can answer the capitalists and their Industrial Control Laws: The organization of powerful industrial unions of class struggle, capable of bringing working class pressure upon the capitalist system. Upon such a foundation, the American working class can build a movement that will become powerful enough to abolish capitalism. We must oppose the Industrial Control Law; present a correct analysis of the Industrial Control Law; agitate and propagate to rally the class; organize a powerful Left wing in the A. F. L.; unite all the Left wing forces nationally such as the TUUL, the FTUFC, the CPLA, etc. for common action; amalgamate the craft unions, such as the 21 railroad union, etc. We must answer the capitalist drive with a powerful united front drive of the workers against the capitalist offensive. —HUGO OEHLER. Hitler Clashes with Hugenberg (Continued from Page 1) thine his remarks Minor snarled "get away from here, your time is up." Then Minor and following him, Alexander started harranguing those present in a fashion to make a Holy Roller preacher blush with envy. No answers to our arguments. No comradely discussion. Instead—vituperation, slander and hysteria. Minor almost outdid himself in trying to create a lynch spirit in the audience. But Minor's demagogic and vituperation was answered subtly by the workers present. When the appeal came for workers in the audience to join the party—not a single worker responded. The chairman hastily adjourned the meeting. —M. G. The "planned economy" of the

WORKS by TROTSKY
ON GERMANY: THE ONLY ROAD, WHAT NEXT?
ON RUSSIA: PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF U.S.S.R.
ON SPAIN: THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER
ON THE TRADE UNION QUESTION: COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM
ON THE THEORY OF SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY AND THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION: THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION, THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION
ON CHINA: PROBLEMS OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 EAST 10th STREET, N. Y. C.