

# The "New Turn" Twists the "New Line"

## An Analysis of the CC Thesis for the Convention

by Herbert Zam

Under the present conditions of terror in the Party it can hardly be expected that the Daily Worker will publish an objective and Leninist analysis of the recent thesis of the Politburo proposed to the coming Party Convention. Yet no thesis ever required a more serious examination on the part of the Party membership. The following article—which expresses the line of the CP-Majority Group—presents a general examination of the CC Thesis from the point of view of the recent "new turn" in the line of the Communist International.

The American Party is now participating in a pre-convention discussion. Of course, it is with extreme difficulty that one is able to find "discussers." After the warning given by Pope Browder at the last plenum, nobody dares try his hand at analysis, criticism or proposals. Even the loudest shouters for the "new line" and the latest "new turn" of the "new line" stand aghast at the depth of stupidity and chaos into which the present leadership of the Comintern and of the American Party have sunk. If the Party membership is shocked and speechless, let them but remember that this

situation is the logical consequence of the developments that have taken place in the Comintern in the last two years. Is it to be expected that after expelling and politically destroying those who contributed most to the Party's line in the days when it was based on the realities of life, after adopting a wild ultra-left line and putting into the leadership ultra-left political imbeciles and adventurers—is it not too much to expect a better analysis or a better thesis—a better political line from the leadership of the Comintern and of the American Party?

the new turn. It took a few more cables and a special representative to do it, but they finally got there.

### The World Situation and the Crisis in the U. S. A.

In essence, the present line of the ECCI and of the American leadership consists in this: In the United States there is a crisis—in other countries, maybe there will be one later. The *Pravda* declares (March 1) "the fundamental feature" of the present period to be "the economic crisis in the United States." And Manuisky declares: "In describing the development of the world economic crisis one can distinguish four types of countries. In the first place the United States of America. Secondly, Eastern and Central Europe. Thirdly, the colonies and semi-colonies: India, China and South America. Fourthly, countries in which the business situation might be described as that which precedes a crisis; these countries include Western Europe, France, Great Britain and partly also the Scandinavian countries." About France he says: "We cannot say of France that it already shows palpable signs of a crisis." Regarding England: "In Great Britain the chronic depression still continues, altho this country made some headway last year." So, this is what has become of the deep-going economic crisis which would be capitalism's second 1914 and usher in a few more Soviet Republics. Is it possible that such people can still be maintained at the head of the International Communist movement and direct its fate?

But this is not all. What has become of capitalist stabilization. The Tenth Plenum destroyed it. Kuusinen declared that it had never existed. Bittelmann and Don shattered it in the U. S. A. Remmele undermined it in Germany. It was rotten and shaking and decayed in the entire capitalist world. Not so the brave Manuisky! Hear him: "The crisis indicates the commencement of the decay of capitalist stabilization. It is not the end of the capitalist stabilization which is approaching but the beginning of the decay, for the decay of the capitalist stabilization would mean the collapse of the system, i.e. the rise of an objectively revolutionary situation in the capitalist countries..." No, Comrade Manuisky? Then what is the meaning of the following in the *Pravda* of April 22. "It is difficult to imagine more favorable objective conditions for the widening and deepening of the revolutionary upsurge, ... for the transformation of this revolutionary upsurge into a revolutionary situation into an immediate struggle for power." The present leadership of the ECCI are like a troupe of magicians who for the amusement of the audience can produce from their pocket, hats or sleeves any desired object—world-wide crisis, revolutionary situation, revolutionary upsurge, struggle for power—and make them disappear again when the show is over.

We have seen that the ECCI and the American CC make the crisis hinge upon the United States. But here also, there is a new turn. At the same that they insist that "the crisis in the United States is the most important and essential part of the world economic crisis", the ECCI thru the mouth of Manuisky, hastens to add that "the crisis in the United States has not yet reached that degree of acuteness which characterized the crisis of 1920." It is even more interesting to see what consequences the ECCI draws for the United States. Will American imperialism be destroyed? Will stabilization be shattered? Not at all! Manuisky comes to the conclusion that the economic crisis

will lead to the strengthening of American imperialism all along the front! Listen to him:

"The most important of such factors (consequences of the crisis) is the aggressiveness of the United States. The forms of this aggressiveness will be various. In the first place the economic form. Hitherto America has exported but little of its total production, about 8%. In view of the huge extent of the production of the United States, the increased export of American goods by only a few per cent threatens its rivals in the world market with a disaster.

"The export of capital will serve in the hands of the United States the same purpose of weakening its rivals.

"American capital will rapidly capture the leading positions in the world arena in the most flourishing spheres of industry: the electric, the chemical, the automobile industry, etc. But in addition to the economic forms of pressure, the aggressiveness of the United States will also find expression in military and political forms.

"A new period of colonization is opening in the history of American imperialism."

Thus speaks, in the name of the ECCI, the hero of the "third period." Thus speak the people who called us agents of American imperialism when we refused to agree that American imperialism was being shattered a year ago, before the "crisis." These are the people who condemned us as renegades because we emphasized the rapid industrialization of the South. But now, as the result of their "crisis" they see nothing wrong in predicting an era of unparalleled victories for American imperialism, a "new period of colonization."

This, then is the content of the "new turn" of the ECCI. The world-wide economic crisis of yesterday first began to have uneven developments, then became limited to the United States and now the United States is faced with a "new period of colonization." It is for these people that the Program of the Comintern declares, very appropriately: "Communism also has to contend against a number of petty bourgeois tendencies . . . These tendencies which are distinguished for their extreme political instability, often cover up a right wing policy with left wing phraseology or drop into adventurism, substitute noisy political gesticulation for objective estimation of forces, and often tumble from astounding heights of revolutionary bombast to profound depths of pessimism and downright capitulation before the enemy."

Of course it is to be expected that the various Parties will lag behind somewhat in executing this latest "new turn." Already various "leaders" have fallen victim because of their slowness: Reimann and Fried in Checho-Slovakia, Merker in Germany, etc. The American Party "leaders" are still very slow and may also produce some victims. It must not be forgotten, however, that the American "leaders" repeat every sound from Moscow, even if it is only a faint echo, and never have the courage to voice any disagreements, as was done by Reimann, Fried and Merker. But such a sudden turn is bound to confuse the "turners." That has already been indicated by the quotations from the *Daily Worker* editorials after the "new turn." The thesis of the CC naturally bears the earmarks of this lagging behind the ECCI's turn. Thus the thesis speaks of the "growth of the world crisis" instead of Manuisky's "approach." "This crisis spreads thruout the capitalist world . . .", the "uneven development" being inserted out of respect for Manuisky's "new turn." Instead of Manuisky's "commencement of the decay of stabilization," the CC thesis sees the acceleration of "the shattering of capitalist stabilization." Manuisky does not know whether the economic crisis "will grow into a general political crisis," but the CC thesis already describes it as a "general crisis of world capitalism." Thus it is seen that even in the analysis

# The Lessons of May Day

By B. KALFIDES

May Day, the working class holiday, the symbol of class struggle and of the united front of all the forces of labor, regardless of race or color of present political opinions, was celebrated this year by the Party in a way that is the absolute opposite of the historical significance and meaning of May Day.

The so-called united front conference was really a fake gesture to the traditions of May Day to fool the workers and the Party membership. The conference was a congregation of the Party and its auxiliary organizations. All other workers organizations were excluded as "social-fascists."

At the first conference it was decided that we were going to "seize Union Square." We were going to proceed from our union headquarters (Hotel and Cafeteria Workers Union) at 10 o'clock in the morning and to be at Union Square at 11 o'clock—exactly at the time when the war veterans and all fascist organizations were going to hold their anti-labor anti-Communist meeting.

In our union, notices were put up demanding that all ex-service men register and be mobilized for the coming clash. At the May Day mobilization meeting volunteers for the Workers Defense Corps were asked to go down to the Workers Center to be trained. A provisional hospital was formed with nurses and doctors and medical supplies for the coming battles.

On the other side, Police Commissioner Whalen mobilized all available force of the police. The fascist organizations mobilized the gangsters and sluggers of New York in order to smash the Communist movement.

It was evident that the Party leaders were playing into the hands of Whalen. Comrade Bedacht made a speech at the Bronx Coliseum in bravado-bombastic fashion: "Whalen or no Whalen, we demonstrate at Union Square at 11 o'clock."

Under these circumstances, we, who are fighting for the Party to return to a Leninist line, appealed to the Party membership to force the adventurist left leadership of our Party to retreat from the dangerous trap that was arranged by the Tammany Hall Commissioner Whalen. For this our Party leaders called Comrade Gitlow and the others "traitors" and "agents of Whalen." That was what appeared in the *Daily Worker*. But only a few days later the official leaders of the Party sent a special messenger to apply for a permit to demonstrate at Rutgers Square and to parade to Union Square after the veterans' demonstration was over. Under the pressure of the membership and the workers, the present leaders of our party were forced to retreat. The tone of the *Daily Worker* changed—the slogan was issued that the workers should keep away from Union Square while the veterans were there.

The retreat was made but Gitlow and the CP-Majority Group which had urged the retreat were still abused as traitors and renegades.

The retreat was called a victory by the unprincipled Party leaders. But we, the Party membership, should not let ourselves be deceived. This is a pre-convention period. We should discuss the meaning of the original irresponsible adventurist policy of our Party leadership. It is up to us to discuss also how the retreat was made. It is up to the Party membership to draw the lessons and the

of the world situation, the CC thesis has maintained essentially the same attitude as before the "new turn," but by the pressure of cables has been compelled to add on some phraseology of the "new turn."

(Concluded in next issue)

## I. THE ESTIMATION OF THE OBJECTIVE SITUATION The World Economic Crisis and Stabilization

The ultra-left line, which began over 2 years ago as a revision of the fundamental methods and basic tactical principles of Leninism, was first embodied in complete form in the Tenth Plenum decisions. Since then, all the parties have been driven mercilessly along this ultra-left line, regardless of the cost in membership and influence among the workers. But, a short while ago, faced by the growing crisis in the ranks of the Parties and increasing difficulties in the Soviet Union as a result of this line, the leadership of the Russian Party and of the Executive Committee of the CI was compelled to execute its latest "new turn" which in reality was an attempt to cover the content of the ultra-left line with more palatable phraseology, to find scape-goats for the disastrous effects of this ultra-left line, and to allay the discontent of the membership by a fake struggle against the "ultra-left." It is in the light of these developments that the Party membership must analyze the latest position of the leadership on various questions. The present "line" of the ECCI and of the American leadership represents the super-imposition of the phraseology of the "new turn" (as adopted by the Enlarged Presidium) upon the ultra-left content of the "new line" (as adopted at the Tenth Plenum).

The central question which brings into bold relief the bankruptcy of the present leadership, and the rock upon which it will eventually be wrecked is the analysis of the present world situation. It is in this analysis that the phraseology of the latest "new turn" is most evident. The present world situation was first analyzed by the ECCI and by all the Party leaderships as a "deep-going, world-wide economic crisis."

The Political Committee in its thesis on the "Economic Crisis and the Party Tasks" declared:

"The main outlines of the deep-going economic crisis now gripping United States capitalism are already clear. We are witnessing a cyclical economic crisis of capitalism which in the conditions of the third period of the general crisis of capitalism . . . is already very deep and will become one of the most far-reaching economic crises in the history of capitalism, involving the whole capitalist world." (emphasis mine—H.Z.)

The height of this analysis was reached when the *Daily Worker* declared, in accordance with the CC analysis, that this was "Capitalism's Second 1914" and elaborated:

"The economic and unemployment crisis is mounting to heights which can very well produce results as profound as those of the cataclysm of 1914-18.

... Coming out of the present deep-going economic disturbances, growing more acute each day and spreading to the farthest ends of the capitalist world—can very likely come again the question of the struggle for class power by the workers in more than one capitalist country."

But this was not to last for long. In the latest thesis of the CC we find suddenly—wonder of wonders!—the "uneven development of the crisis." Only a short while ago, we were expelled for believing in this heresy, and it was forbidden even to know how to spell it. But now it is again respectable. But of course this "unevenness" was not discovered in the United States. It is one of the products of the latest "new turn" and was given life at the last Enlarged Presidium by none other than the many-sided Manuisky. No, Manuisky retreated even further, and in that respect the American CC is still behind the "new turn." For according to Manuisky, the economic crisis is not here yet. It is only "approaching"! Again and again he emphasizes this point: "The approach of the world economic crisis is now an indisputable fact." "Today, the approach of the world economic crisis is no longer disputed." "The approach of the crisis confirms" . . . etc. But does this new analysis—this deep-going retreat from the old position—prevent the American Party leadership and the ECCI leadership from shouting the same ultra-left phrases, all over again? Not at all! On March 20, that is after the Enlarged Presidium, the *Daily Worker* proclaims in an editorial on the first page, entitled "The Class Struggle Sharpens on World-Wide Front" that " . . . Other developments are furnishing the greatest possibility that has ever been seen for the mobilization of the working class and oppressed peoples against the imperialist war makers. The whole capitalist world system is in the midst of a rapidly deepening crisis."—(my emphasis—H.Z.) And as late as April 24 the *Daily Worker* could still see " . . . the spreading of the economic crisis to all sections of economy and to all the world."—(my emphasis—H.Z.) The *Daily Worker* could still declare: "In its world-wide growth the crisis shows the same deepening."—"The capitalist world is in crisis."—"The crisis deepens." Where is the "uneven development" here? And who will maintain now that the present crisis offers greater opportunities for revolution than ever before—greater than 1917, greater than 1919-21, greater than 1923? In fact, the *Daily Worker* and the American leadership was a little late in adopting