

LENIN ON ORGANIZATION The most important publication for workers issued in many years. Writings and speeches of a great leader on the fund a mental question of organization. No worker's library can be complete without this invaluable work. Cloth \$1.50 The Favorite Restaurant of Radicals and Their Friends "JOHN'S" Italian Dishes a Specialty 302 E. 12th STREET, BROOKLYN BRANCH. NEW YORK CITY 7 Willoughby St. Popular For Its Good Food, Reasonable Prices and Interesting Companionship - Private Dining Room for Parties -John Pucciatti, Prop. Phone Stuyvesant 3816 For the Youth of America There is no better reading matter than the only working class youth paper YOUNG WORKER

Subscribe Now

\$1.00 a Year 50c Six Months USE THIS BLANK:

THE YOUNG WORKER, 1113 Washington Blvd. CHICAGO, ILL.

Enclosed find \$..... for months. Send The Young Worker to:

Name .	 		
Address	 		
City	 	State	



Position and Opposition in the C. P. S. U.

By Max Bedacht

IN the Russian revolution the rebellious proletarian masses made the revolutionary theories of Marx and Lenin a historic force which transformed these theories into revolutionary realities. These realities became examples conveying a far better understanding of Marxism and Leninism than was possible heretofore. But these realities of the Russian revolution do more than that. The experiences of the proletarian revolution in Russia turn into a school in which the great masses of workers of the world learn their first elementary revolutionary lessons.

lution obtain the chorus without which its solo will become a swan song in all agricultural nations." But never did we grasp the full meaning of this wisdom until the practice of the Russian revolution drove home to us all of its implications. The economic backwardness and the resulting numerical preponderance of the peasantry accentuated this problem for Russia but did not create it exclusively for that country. And the accentuated form in which it arose for the Russian revolution helped considerably to open our eyes to the same problem at home.

Social-Democrats and other enemies of revolution are very vociferous in their assertion that the lessons of the Russian revolution are really negligible. Even where they can find no fault with the policies and tactics of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, these opponents of a militant proletariat maintain that condition in Russia differ so decisively from conditions in the more advanced capitalist countries, that the Russian experiences become inapplicable in these countries, and are therefore worthless. Only a minute's consideration is needed to perceive the utter incorrectness of this assertion. The comparative backwardness of Russia did not in the main, create unique problems confronting only the Russian revolution and not existing for the revolution



Steering by the old and tried compass.

in other countries; it merely accentuated all of the problems of revolution for Russia. This accentuation is in itself an educational force. The outstanding intensity of many of these problems in Russia helped us revolutionists to perceive and understand the identical, though perhaps quantitatively less outsanding problem at home.

It is true that Marx had already taught us: "Only if we succeed in moving the peasant (farming) mass to a coalition with the proletariat will the proletarian revo-

us are the problems of the proletarian dictatorship and of the socialist construction. The difficulties of these tasks are greatly multiplied by the backwardness of Russia. But the very multiplication of these difficulties in Russia helps us to understand and prevents us from underestimating the identical problems and difficulties at home. The need of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement is nowhere any less emphatic than in Russia, even though the difficulty of winning and maintaining this hegemony is nowhere greater than in Russia. The experiences of the Bolsheviks in Russia in achieving and maintaining this hegemony supplies the revolutionists of the world with a textbook on that science.

Not less important for

Understanding this we can readily see how important it is for us to have a clear knowledge of all the problems and difficulties of the Russian Revolution and of its leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We see how all of the problems of that party are our problems and how the successes or failures of that Party become the successes or failures of the international proletarian revolutionary movement. The importance of all of the problems and tasks of the Russian revolu-

681

efficiency of labor without eating up the material means necessary for this reconstruction.

Of course, the opposition does not openly state that it wants to have the ultimate aim suffer by its proposed immedate and unwarranted concessions of the revolutionary state to short-sighted elements among the workers. On the contrary. They emphasize that the ultimate aim must not suffer. Therefore, they propose to shift the burden of socialist construction almost completely from the workers to the peasants. And because figures speak so loud that they cannot successfully disregard them and because these figures say with unmistakable clarity that this shifting means an abandonment of the tasks of socialist reconstruction, therefore the opposition finally lands in the camp of Trotzky: It loses hope in the possibility of success, for the Russian revolution. It accepts Trotzky's statement that: "Without direct state support of the European proletariat it is impossible for the working class of Russia to maintain its temporary

power and to transform it into a permanent socialist dictatorship."

Thus, set into motion by the apparent contradiction between ultimate aim and immediate interest of the proletariat and lacking the balance of the stabilizing influence of Leninisť theory and practice, the opposition slides into the morass of Trotzky's theory of "permanent revolution," which its leader only recently denounced most The theory of bitterly. permanent revolution was a correct conclusion from revolutionary necessity under pre-imperialist capitalism. Under imperialism the theory of permanent revolution became a theory of hopelessness.

first in the revolution because only those countries possessed the two decisive factors in sufficient quantity. And only in those countries can the inner contradictions of capital have sufficent latitude to produce a revolutionary situation and a revolutionary ideology among the proletariat.

But capitalism has not stood still at the stage of 1847. It proceeded in its onward march into the stage of imperialism. Imperialism is the last stage of capitalism and the first stage of the proletarian revolution. But while imperialism has put the proletarian revolution on the order of the day, it has also changed the conditions of this proletarian revolution; in fact, it really produced them. Under imperialism it is not the strongest and furthest developed country which presents the first front attack to the revolution, but it is the weakest point in the international front of monopolist capitalism. This weakest point must not necessarily be the most backward country, but it may be that (and it was that

in the case of Russia). Under imperialism the inner contradictions of capitalism extend their play from the field of capitalism within certain countries to the field of international conditions and relations of capitalism. And when this play produces its catastrophy it is no longer the catastrophy of capitalism in one country, but of capitalism itself. And the pressure put upon capitalism by such a catastrophy makes possible the breaking of the chain of capitalist power and rule not at its strongest, but at its weakest And when the chain of the imperialist front reaches the breaking point

INDUSTRY INDUSTRY INDUSTRY INDUSTRY INDUSTRY INDUSTRY INDUSTRY

Squeezing out the NEP man.

The Theory of Permanent Revolution.

Considering the conditions under which a proletarian revolution would have to exert itself, in those days, Engels wrote in 1847 in his "Principles of Communism" that the victory of the proletariat is impossible in one country alone. This statement of Engels has been remixed and rebaked by Trotzky and is presented now, in 1926—not 1847—as the theory of permanent revolution.

Under pre-imperialist capitalism the problem of proletarian revolution differed radically from the same problem today, under imperialism. The need and possibility of revolution then rested on two factors:

The economic ripeness of the country (capitalism).
The existence of the physical force of revolution (proletariat).

On this basis the conclusion was natural and correct that the highest developed countries will and must be because in the imperialist contradictions and struggles for control over the world one link of this chain is decisively weakened, then the hour of revolution has arrived for the country which presents this weakened link in the chain. And at this hour the proletariat of this country and its revolutionary leaders cannot push their revolutionary responsibility from them with the phrase: "Our country is not yet ripe for revolution." This ripeness is not attested to by mere economic statistics. Only the dynamic forces of revolution itself can produce and proclaim it.

poir.

Because of this the revolutionary proletariat everywhere must always be prepared for the revolution. It must make its preparations according to the conditions it lives in. Everywhere the revolutionary alliance of the proletariat with the non-proletarian classes against capitalist rule becomes as indispensable duty of revolutionary preparation. In some countries these allies supply a

The Soviet Economy on the Ninth Anniversary

Agricultural Economy.

WHOLESALE production of agricultural economy at pre-war prices:

In	1923-24	8,858,000,000	roubles
In	1924-25	9,535,000,000	"
In	1925-26	11,306,000,000	59

Industry.

Wholesale production of the entire industry of the U. S. S. R. at pre-war prices:

In	1923-24	3,414,000,000	roubles
In	1924-25	5,039,000,000	"
In	1925-26,	6,923,000,000	"

Tempo of Development of National Economy.

The above tables show that industry develops at a much faster rate than agricultural economy: The increase of agricultural economy in the last two years amounts to 26.2%, whereas the increase of industry amounts to 102.9%.

Thanks to such rapid growth of the industry, its relative weight in the whole system of national economy of the Soviet Union was considerably raised, reaching, already at the beginning of the 1925-26 economic year, almost pre-war conditions.



At the end of the current year the relative importance of industry in the whole production of the country grew to 39%, thus being already above the pre-war level.

Production of Means of Production and Articles of Consumption.

The steady growth of production of the means of production from year to year can be illustrated by the following diagram:



The Role of Private Capital in Industry.

The following figures show the role of government, cooperative and private (including also concession) sectors in industry, generally in the U.S.S.R.:

(In million roubles at pre-war prices) 1924-25 1925-26 % Growth during one year

Heavy Government		
Industry 3,760	5,333	42
Coop. Industry 233	338	45
Private Industry 1,046	1,252	. 20

The sector of private industries includes the entire petty-handicraft industry. The production of private industry recorded in 1925-26 amounts to 241 million roubles, which is about 4%. But even with the petty private handicraft industry, the following percentage corelation of wholesale production in the government, cooperative and private industries is obtained:



1924-25

1925-20







Govern | Co-op ment | eratire Hinte Industry Industry Industry

As can be seen from the diagram, along with the steady growth of big government industries, the relative importance of private capital in the production of the U. S. S. R. drops from year to year. In 1925-26 the government and cooperative industries already furnished above 81% of the entire production placed on the market. That of private capital, including also the production of hundreds of thousands of petty handicraft workers, amounted only to 18.9%.

It should be noted here that in the general total of capital funds of industry the proportion of private capital is still smaller. This is because i nthe largest capijority of enterprises of private industry (to this belong enterprises employing from 15 workers and having one motor, or from 30 workers without a motor) the enterpreneurs are not the owners. These are government enterprises which were rented to them on definite terms for a definite limited period.

Commodity Turnover.

The participation of the government, cooperative and private sectors in the trade turnover in the whole of the U. S. S. R. is expressed in the following figures:

Government Coop. Private Total

In	1923-24	2,750	3,976	9,751
In	1924-254,855	5,137	3,700	13,692
In	1925-266,954	8,654	4,860	20,468

Percentage Corelation of the Government, Cooperative and Private Commodity Turnover.



As is seen from the given tables of 1923-24, government and cooperative trade amounted only to 59% of the entire commodity turnover. In 1924-25, this percentage grew to 73%, and in 1925-26, to 77%; whereas the percentage of private capital correspondingly dropped from 40.8% to 23.7%.

Here one must bear in mind that this percentage includes also the entire private petty-trade. As regards the retail commodity turnover, notwithstanding its 2.2% growth in recent years, the relative importance of the government and its cooperative division increased from 78.2% to 90.6%; while the relative importance of private trade dropped from 21.8% to 9.4%.

Ultra-Left Menshevism

By Heinz Neumann

(Continued from last month.)

III. The Objective Role of the Ultra Lefts.

THERE are three sections of the Comintern in which the Ultra-Left has developed in what might be called classical form. It achieved the greatest influence within and, for a period of greater or lesser extent, even the leadership of the German, Polish, and Italian parties. Today, however, it has been completely demolished in all of these; it has lost its proletarian following and forms now no more than a hopeless minority altho it is precisely at this time that it makes the most noise and presents a definite danger thru its international connections.

This "geographical" distribution of the Ultra-Left is in no sense an accident; on the contrary it has very significant political causes. In what way do Germany, Poland and Italy differ from the other capitalist countries? Germany, Poland and Italy—in spite of certain great differences among themselves—manifest certain political peculiarities which are common to them and which do not apply to other states.

1. All three countries adopt a special attitude to international politics. In spite of the fact that Italy and Poland are formally among the "victorious" states and that pre-war Germany was a great and leading power, all three are victims of the imperialist war. All three are great powers with imperialist ambitions. But they are great powers of second rank. Their development comes into conflict with the iron ring of the great powers of the first rank: America, England, and France. Economically these "great powers of second rank" are held bound and plundered by Anglo-American financecapital (Dawes Plan, war debts, loans). Politically, they are subject to the arbitrary dictates of the real victors, in spite of the brave words of their ministers and occasional militaristic raids (with the approval of the creditor states). The bourgeoisie of Germany, Poland and Italy throws the cloak of nationalist phrases over the selling out of its national independence to the foreign banks. The ruined petty bourgeois masses take these phrases seriously and become inflated with a patriotic ideology.

2. Thru the peculiarity of their international situation all three countries are driven into a contradictory external policy. As aspirants for a new independent imperialist career they stand for the free rule of finance capital in world politics and therefore participate in the League of Nations, the fighting organization of British imperialism. As the objects and the victims of foreign finance capital they strive to free themselves of its dicstate the nature of this definite "level of culture), why should we not begin with the conquest of the prerequisites for this definite level, and then stride forward to catch up the civilization of the other peoples, with the facilities afforded by the workers' and peasants' government, and the Soviet organization? ...

"You say that civilization is necessary for the establishment of Socialism. Very good. Now why cannot we first create among us such prerequisites to civilization as the abolition of the large landowners and of the Russian capitalists, after which we can proceed to Socialism? In what books have you read that such changes are impermissible or impossible in an ordinary historical period?"

It is clear that while Lenin did not theoretically synonimize civilization and culture, yet he did not see any danger in the practice of interchangeable use of these terms.

Why could Lenin do that without doing violence even to the meaning of the word "civilization?" Because aside from the exact meaning of the term in social science the word has also acquired a popular and current meaning, denoting a certain level of cultural achievements. It is useless to argue with the millions who use the term in this current meaning, that their use of the word is completely wrong. Lenin argues with them that this cultural level, called civilization (not synonimous with the same scientific term), can also be achieved under proletarian rule.

We find, therefore, that Comrade Kanter conceived his article in a too academic manner. Yet the question has sufficient theoretical importance to justify the publication of the article. No matter how we may use the word "civilization," we must never be misled about the meaning of it. Only correct understanding of this meaning can enable us to subordinate any use of the word to the aim not of glorifying present day civilization, but of identifying it with capitalism itself. It will then be also possible to identify Communism with a higher form of social structure. Although this higher form will destroy civilization, yet it will not do that by reverting society to barbarism, but by replacinng it with an infinitely higher cultural level than civilization could ever attain under the handicaps of capitalism.



710

WORKERS MONTHLY

of the petty-bourgeois anarchist-artist, of the age of great machine industrialism. The artist may stand aghast in horror at the sight of the brute machine—or he may yield his understanding admiration for its cold grandeur. "Attracted and influenced by machinery," many of the Cubists and their followers believe "that if we live in a mechanical age (note the tone of vain regret!—Apex.) it is not inappropriate that mechanism should play a part in our painting." (p. 103.) The very method and technique of Cubism—"with its repetition and sharp distinctions of planes"—is the method springing from the overbalancing power of the giant Machine.

The war threw individual man into huge masses mechanically manipulated as part of a machine process; it therefore gave a splendid field for the technique of the Cubists and the Vorticists. It is interesting to note that, with the war over, only those artists who turned to the industrial worker as an element in the machine process maintained their style, for "industrialism, like war, treats man as part of a great machine.... Unless we are afflicted with another war, it is in industrialism and in industrialism alone, that the Cubist will find his right material." (p. 128.)

But Cubism and its varieties—tho art of the machine is no proletarian art. It does not spring from the conditions and the life of the proletariat. The Cubist is no industrial proletarian and his aspect of the world of the machine is not that of the worker. The Cubist is the petty-bourgeois individualist-artist who has suddenly awakened to the great fact that the world has found a new master, the Machine. He neither understands nor dominates the machine. He is overwhelmed by it. It is the petty bourgeois reacting to the machine. As to proletarian art—that is another story...

We have touched but few of the thought-provoking points raised by Mr. Rutter. The book is well worth reading and studying. It will reward the reader with a better appreciation and understanding of art as an expression of the universal life-process of man.

-Apex.

LENIN ON ORGANIZATION

The most important publication for workers issued in many years. Writings and speeches of a great leader on the fund a mental question of organization. No worker's library can be complete without this invaluable work.



To Make Working Class Children Happier and Better Little Rebels



A Special Price is Made to Enable More Children to Own



Color Plates by Lydia Gibson Formerly 75 Cents

Now 50 Cents

Offer Good for One Month Only

A book of beautiful stories that are sure to be liked by both grownups and children. Thousands of copies were sold immediately on its publication. Over twenty black and white illustrations and four full-page color plates illustrate these splendid stories that breed the fighting spirit of revolt.

THE DAILY WORKER PUBLISHING CO., 1113 W. Washington Blvd. Chicago, III.



LEFT WING vs. RIGHT WING



CLASS STRUGGLE vs. CLASS COLLABORATION

What is the meaning of this conflict? What lies behind it? What is its history? These questions are answered in the following timely publications:

CLASS COLLABORATION-HOW IT WORKS

By Bertram D. Wolfe

\$.10

A brilliant study of the various methods by which the capitalist class attempts to corrupt the labor movement and bribe its most important sections. Specific illustrations are given from the history of the American labor movement. The pamphlet is readable and valuable thruout.

CLASS STRUGGLE vs. CLASS COLLABORATION

By Earl R. Browder

\$.10

A keen analysis of modern class collaboration schemes such as the B. & O. Plan, Labor Banking and Workers' Education. An indispensable book for anyone who is interested in the modern developments in the labor movement.

PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION or KAUTSKY THE RENEGADE

By N. Lenin

\$.25

Lenin led the fight of the revolutionists against the reformists and diluters of Marxism for 20 years. In this book he delivers an annihilating attack cn Kautsky, the chief theoretician of the Mensheviks. Communists would do well to read and re-read this book.



COMPANY UNIONS

By Robert W. Dunn, with conclusions by Wm. Z. Foster \$.25

A careful analysis of this peculiar American institution giving the fundamental reasons for its adoption by many of the leading employers of this country. The pamphlet is the result of extensive investigation by an expert student of the subject.

THE GENERAL STRIKE AND THE GENERAL BETRAYAL

By John Pepper

\$.25

An exposure of the class collaboration policy at work in the great struggle of the British proletariat against the ruling class of England.

MARX AND ENGELS ON REVOLUTION IN AMERICA

By Heinz Neuman

\$.10

The great leaders who first clearly formulated Communist principles also foresaw the role of America and its working class. This splendid little pamphlet should be read by every American worker.

WHITHER ENGLAND?

By Leon Trotsky Cloth bound \$1.75 A strong argument against the theory of gradualism and class peace as expressed by the reformists of the British labor movement.

Order from the

DAILY WORKER

PUBLISHING COMPANY 1113 W. WASHINGTON BLVD. Chicago – ILL.

- The Source of All Communist Literature -