

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Vol. III, No. 5.

Telephone: DRYdock 1656

NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, February 1, 1930

PRICE 5 CENTS

Police Murder Steve Katovis

Naval Conclave Shows No Unity

More than one week of the London Naval Conference has already passed by without much more being accomplished towards the "limitation of armaments", than the coming to the fore of a number of conflicts and disputes between France and Italy, Japan and England and the like. In face of the obvious striving of each of the imperialist powers involved to hold as much strength as possible against its nearest rival gives the lie to all the pretensions of the diplomatic pirates to "disarmament".

Italo-French Conflict

The first part of the conference, as soon as it gets down to "work", will be the developing conflict between Italian and French imperialism for Mediterranean power. Italy is playing hard for support from the United States for parity with France, which will give Mussolini a bigger advantage in his attempts to become an even stronger Mediterranean force. The contention of Italy is that its naval strength as compared with that of France should be estimated not so much on the basis of the present situation and relations of forces, as on the "prospective" position of Italy. In other words, Italy has in mind such an extension of its imperialist interests as will place it on an "equal plane" with France in the immediate future. How this virtually unconcealed declaration of Italy's belligerent intentions can be reconciled with all the high-sounding phrases about permanent peace in the Kellogg Pact naturally remains unexplained by the imperialist statesmen.

There is very little if any prospect that a "satisfactory" agreement between the two Mediterranean rivals will be reached at this conference. The past history of imperialism indicates the contrary, that is, that decisive questions of power are only delayed temporarily around imperialists' discussion tables and are determined definitely in actual warfare.

Another rift in the conference lute is the attitude of Japan, which is seeking agreement on its cruiser proposals. Japan is dominated by fear of England's position in the Orient and wants to be in a better position to counteract British imperialist progress by adding to its own cruiser strength. At the same time, it has raised the "delicate" question of merchantmen, which was passed over with vague words at the Washington conference. The Japanese point out that there is nothing in the Washington agreement that prevents merchant ships from mounting guns greater than six inches providing they are built in a manner that makes this technically possible.

Merchantmen Limitation Hits England

There is no doubt that the United States is far from displeased at this question being raised, for a delimitation of the use of merchantmen in war time (regardless of the fact that they would be used—agreement or no agreement) can only serve to handicap England. That is because England possesses, in merchant ships of 4,000 tons or more and a speed of 15 knots, about 3,150,000 tons compared with only 880,000 American tons and 250,000 Japanese. The exclusion of merchantmen would therefore give America a theoretical advantage of some 2,700,000 tons. Needless to say, England will balk like a mule at such a proposal.

Green Stabs Marion and Gastonia

A Federated Press dispatch from Richmond, Va., reports that in a speech there William Green, president of the A. F. of L., disclaimed all connection and responsibility of the Federation with the Marion strike situation, where six strikers were massacred by company thugs, or with Gastonia, where six workers face life long imprisonment in a frame-up over the killing of a cop. Green's role in the labor movement has rarely been expressed more brazenly than in this incident. He is not only crawling before the Southern mill owners, pleading with them to recognize him as best labor overseer for the bosses, but is deliberately stabbing the Marion and Gastonia workers in the back. His speech gives the Southern reactionaries an open hand.

"So far as I am concerned, you can repeat all the Marions and Gastonias you want"—that is the essence of Green's remarks. Green is presuming to speak in the name of the A. F. of L. Every militant worker in the A. F. of L. must reply by repudiating Green and his crew and driving them out of the labor movement where they are working in the interests of labor's class enemy.

Communist Worker Shot Down in Cold Blood

Steve Katovis, member of the Building Maintenance Workers Union and the Communist Party, is dead. He was shot in the back by Patrolman Harry Kirtz of the New York police force in a conflict that followed an attempt by police to break up a mass meeting called to express solidarity with the members of the Food Clerks' Union on strike against Miller's Market in the Bronx.

Steve Katovis is the first workers to be shot by the police in a labor struggle in New York for years. The uniformed thugs have received their orders to club and shoot in order to prevent the organization of the rising spirit of the workers. A victim had to be found in order to warn the workers, who are losing their jobs in the industrial depression or having their wages cut, that they can expect any resistance to be met by the most violent and murderous repression by the police. The capitalist class is desperately afraid of the development of a militant movement of the American workers. It will use the most brutal measures to crush even the first signs of such a movement.

Savage Attack on Demonstration

The demonstration of the Communist Party at the City Hall following the death of comrade Katovis was the occasion for another manifestation of Cossack Sadism. The police of Mr. Whalen, under whose administration New York's underworld of gambling, bootlegging, racketeering thugery and general corruption have had free rein, sailed into the peacefully assembled workers with a bloodthirsty fury that has not been equalled in New York since the days of the war hysteria. Participants in

the demonstration as well as bystanders and curiosity seekers were mercilessly clubbed and pummelled by the "brave" police, on foot and horseback, armed with night-sticks, black jacks, brass knuckles and pistols.

Hundreds received at least one or more blows from the police; more than a score were severely beaten. Party leaders who attempted to speak were beaten and kicked while they lay on the pavement. Robert Minor of the Daily Worker had to be treated by a doctor for injuries, as were a half dozen or more others. Comrade George Clark, of the Communist League (Opposition), was beaten about the face and head by a number of police. A virtual reign of terror existed for almost an hour.

The attitude of the capitalist press towards this demonstration of police horrors was characteristic. The Telegram announced: "Curb Demonstration of 1,000 Communists, but Sticks Fall on Many Innocents". That is, the clubbing of Communists is quite in order, but "innocents" (!) must not suffer. The Mirror, the morons' picture paper, could find nothing wrong with the savagery of the police except that it made martyrs out of the Reds and helped to manufacture more of them! And it is no less characteristic that Norman Thomas, repeated the profound subway philosophy in his "protest" telegram to the mayor, of the Mirror. Instead of a call to the workers to protest the police terror and find ways of crushing it, Thomas wired the mayor—placing the responsibility for the cracked skulls and bleeding faces of the workers upon the Communists: "Why unnecessarily gratify Communists' mania for martyrs?"

United Front against Police Terror

Not a "mania for martyrs" is involved, but the capitalist and police "mania" for smashing every working class organization. As usual, they begin their attacks upon the most militant section of the working class, the Communists. The assault upon the Communists is a forerunner and an inseparable part of the attack upon the working class as a whole. That is why every worker must help to repulse and defeat this attack. The Communist movement by itself—in the present stage of its numerical and political weakness—cannot successfully defeat the police terror. For that purpose it is essential to set large masses of workers into action. It is necessary to develop a broad movement of the workers and all labor organizations ready to form a united front to drive back the monster of police brutality. The conscious workers, who detest the Cossacks and their deeds, can be rallied for such a movement if they are not repulsed by narrow sectarianism but approached in a spirit of proletarian solidarity. The savagery of the police, who can carry out their jobs with less difficulty when the Communists are separated from the rest of the labor movement can be overcome when the courageous handful of revolutionary workers succeed in rallying the fraternal support of tens of thousands of workers.

This can and must be done. The movement resulting from it will be the best memorial to Steve Katovis, the martyred worker-rebel, and the most effective reply to capitalist terrorism.

Mexico Breaks with Soviet Union

Following directly upon the United States visit of president-elect Ortiz Rubio, Mexico announced that it had broken all diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. The Mexican diplomatic representative in Moscow has asked for his passports, and preparations are being made for the return home of the Soviet minister to Mexico. The pretext for the break in relations were the Communist demonstrations in the United States during Rubio's visit, in which workers protested against the savage campaign of repression and murder of workers and revolutionists that the present Mexican government has been conducting for the past period.

The break does not come as a particular surprise to those acquainted with the development of relations between Mexico and the United States in the last couple of years. The pressure of American imperialism on Mexico, directly exercised by the House of Morgan through its partner Morrow, who was obligingly made Mexican ambassador by Washington, has resulted in the Mexican puppet government being entrained more firmly behind American finance capital. The resistance to American imperialist encroachments offered by the workers and peasants has been ruthlessly suppressed by both the Calles and the Gil governments. Rubio's present action indicates that he will follow directly in the footsteps of his bought-off predecessors.

The "reasons" given for the break are the hackneyed ones of "Bolshevik propaganda" in Mexico. The fact that Bolshevism naturally grows out of the soil of the class struggle in Mexico as it does in every other country is conveniently ignored by the American-controlled Mexican

government. What it is really interested in, is to give every assurance to its American masters in Wall Street and Washington that it will have nothing to do with the workers republic in Russia.

That the break is part of the international campaign of the bourgeois world, headed by the U. S., to press against the Soviet Union is only too plain. The fact that the Soviet Union has moved to the Left in the past period, under the pressure of the workers and the fight of the Russian Opposition, has been a sad disappointment to the imperialist world which hoped that the movement to the Right would continue uninterruptedly to the point where Russia could be made a colony divided among the imperialist bandits. The intervention of Stimson in the Manchurian situation, the threats of Henderson and MacDonald to break off relations with Russia, the recent intimation from Washington that the present "radical policy of the Soviets makes recognition an indefinitely postponed issue", and the present action of Mexico, are all part of one attempt to force Russia further away from the socialist path and toward the road of compromise with imperialism.

As for Mexico's "reasons" for the break, they become pitifully thin when it is known that no protest at all is made by its marionette rulers against the bold and ruthless "propaganda", both verbal and military that the United States conducts in Mexico 365 days in the year.

WHITTINSVILLE, Mass.—(FP)—Hard times in the textile industry have knocked 75 more workers out of jobs at the Whittin Machine Works. Although the number normally employed is between 3,000 and 3,500 only 2,000 are on the job now.

BOSTON—Benito Mussolini, Italy's leading Fascist, has been invited to speak at the American Legion convention in Boston this year. The American reactionaries feel an international solidarity with their Italian brothers.

After the Miners' Strike

Operators and Reactionary Union Leaders vs. the Illinois Miners

By Joseph Angelo

The fighting tradition of the Illinois coal-miners is not dead; and the events of last December—the strike of the National Miners Union, despite many avoidable shortcomings and the court injunction squabble between Lewis vs. Fishwick with no bread in the homes of many miners—has made it more alive.

Of course, the strike of the National Miners Union has been defeated, by the combined efforts of the state government, the coal-operators and the Lewis-Fishwick machine. But, beneath the defeat the miners are stirring and this liable to flare up into a statewide struggle any day. The coal operators-Lewis-Fishwick machine, with the support of the state government are desperately fighting to crush this rising tide of militant feeling among the miners.

Labor Bosses As Operators' Tools

The reason for this is obvious. Capitalism cannot live as at present organized without longer hours, lower wages, speed-up systems, etc. And the coal-operators with the support of their agents, the Lewis-Fishwick machine, have not even concealed their true objectives. Today hundreds upon hundreds of militant miners that participated in the last National Miners Union strike are being fired from their jobs by the bosses, and their places filled with unemployed miners brought in special trains by the Lewis-Fishwick funkeys from mining camps where the mines have been closed down many years. But this does not solve the problem because these new miners soon realize that they are up against the same problem that their black-listed brothers were. They soon realize that one of the obstacles in their road to better conditions is the Lewis-Fishwick machine, which must be replaced before any gains can be made.

It is either Fishwick or Lewis that comes to the aid of the coal-operators whenever it is necessary, as for instance in an editorial of a recent issue of the Illinois Miner, where Fishwick wrote that after the contract of the Indiana miners expires next April 1st, the Illinois miners will not strike to support their brother miners in Indiana to renew their contract nor to fight for better working conditions. Fishwick here, as always, is not expressing the sentiments of the Illinois miners or helping the Indiana miners, on the contrary Fishwick here is the official mouthpiece of the coal-operators and by such action gives direct support to the coal-operators and stabs the Indiana miners in the back and at the same time tries to shatter the militancy of the Illinois miners.

And Lewis is not one whit better. Already while speculating on the outcome of the injunction trial, his henchmen, instead of organizing West Virginia and Kentucky are gathering hordes of unemployed miners and promising them that in case of a favorable decision, he will ship them into Illinois to replace those miners that refuse to accept his orders.

Although the trial to set aside the injunction began on December 18th, the judge has not yet rendered a decision, but the consensus among the miners is that Fishwick, because of the support of the majority of the coal-operators of Illinois and the state political administration will get a more favorable decision than Lewis. But Lewis, also, because of the support from certain influential coal-operators will be able to appeal the injunction to a higher court.

Trial Served Good Purpose

Regardless of the final outcome of the injunction trial, it has served a good purpose. It tore the false mask from both Lewis and Fishwick and showed that both of them are crooks, election swindlers, agents of the coal-operators, grafters and

unfit to handle any affairs pertaining to the mine workers. The trial was like a match put to a cannon. It has awakened many miners and it marks the end of a rotten episode in the life of the coal-miners and the beginning of a period of growth of the National Miners Union. Both Lewis and Fishwick are playing hookey from the graveyard.

The National Miners Union is growing slowly from mining camp to mining camp while the Lewis-Fishwick company union is declining every day at an increasing speed. The miners are for the National Miners Union and the experience of a strike has had a tremendous effect in awakening the militancy of the miners. Whatever mistakes the National Miners Union made in the course of the last strike, the Stalin-Foster leadership is responsible and the members of the Communist Party must see that the mistakes are corrected. The policy of trying to side-track and lying about such militant and staunch fighters as John Watt of Springfield, Ed Morgan of Staunton, Fritz Bode of Taylorville and Luke Coffey

Prospects for New Struggles in New Bedford

New Bedford textile workers who made history in 1928 under the militant leadership of the National Textile Workers Union are again going into action. With almost half of the 30,000 textile workers of the city unemployed they are demanding immediate action to meet the critical situation.

Whether the N. T. W. U. will be able to meet the present tasks is difficult to determine at present. Two of the leaders of the struggle of two years ago, Eli Keller and Ellen Dawson, have been eliminated from the union on purely Communist Party lines while Raphael Pires, the editor of the Communist Party newspaper in the Portuguese language published in New Bedford has likewise been eliminated at the behest of the Stalinists. It is not necessary to defend Dawson, Keller, Pires and others for their support of the Right wing program of Lovestone. It is necessary to show that the Party's narrow faction game is being allowed to weaken the union struggle. Only those who believe in a certain interpretation of Communism, will be allowed to lead the New Bedford masses, says the official Communist Party. This is similar to decisions made in the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union and other organizations. Such a policy can only lead to chaos and defeat for the working masses. A struggle of the broad masses cannot be based at the present stage upon a faction of a political party, but upon all workers who want to fight under a militant banner.

Just as in 1928 when the N. T. W. U. had to fight on two fronts, that is against the mill owners and the United Textile Workers Union led by William Batty, so will its present organization drive which may lead to a new strike, also be fought on two fronts. Under such conditions, the broadest possible basis for support must be obtained and all sections of the working class be allowed to participate in the struggle.

The prospects for developing the National Textile Workers Union in New Bedford into a powerful organization are unusually bright. In fact, the actual dues-paying membership in that city is larger than in any other part of the country. It is no exaggeration to state that the only organized mass base of the union at present

of Belleville and trying to replace them with faddlers from Chicago and preachers of the Latter Day Saints and Nazarene sects as was done in Taylorville, is not a correct policy with which to build the National Miners Union and must be corrected. These men have been in the forefront of all the great struggles of the Illinois miners for many years past and will continue to be, despite the childish attacks of the Stalin-Foster clique. Future events and pressure from below will prove that the present policy is incorrect.

Stalinists Retreat Partially

Under the blows of the Communist League (Opposition), the Stalin-Foster leadership has been forced to admit part of their mistakes and adopt a program of immediate demands, which should have been done before the strike. Yet, to adopt a program which reads, (Daily Worker 1-9-30) "that the miners must be imbued with the spirit of preparation for the coming general national movement of the miners, which will come next Fall." is not enough. Fishwick is afraid of the Indiana miners whose contract expires next April and that is why he is trying to prepare the minds of the miners of Illinois and Indiana against a militant struggle. The National Miners Union must make not only the Indiana strike but every strike an opportunity for launching demonstrations of national solidarity.

is in New Bedford. While in the South, the N. T. W. U. has many supporters, due to the semi-legal character of the work, the union does not function to any great extent. In most Southern towns it hardly functions at all. In New Bedford on the other hand, the work is carried on regularly, meetings are held and the union is a factor in the community. Although the United Textile Workers Union likewise has a strong branch in the city, the Left wing union fights it every inch of the way.

While the United Textile Workers Union membership in the main consists of the skilled workers, weavers, loom-fixers and spinners, the membership of the N. T. W. U. is composed mostly of the unskilled, such as warpers, spoolers, carders and speeder-tenders.

At present the two unions are divided on national lines—the highly skilled United Textile Workers being mostly English and French-Canadians while the members and supporters of the N. T. W. U. are in the main Portuguese and Polish.

If the present organization drive is to mean anything it must immediately break down the national barriers and have the English, French-Canadians, Portuguese and Polish workers unite in a common struggle. One of the greatest weaknesses of the 1928 strike from the point of view of the Left wing union, was the division on national lines. The inability of the N. T. W. U. to gain more than a score of supporters among the English and French-Canadian workers was one of the principal reasons why the Left wing was not more successful than it actually was. If the membership of the N. T. W. U. had been more varied in composition the sellout of the strike by the United Textile Workers Union in September 1928 may not have succeeded.

In brief: the present organization drive, which the N. T. W. U. says is leading up to a general strike, to be successful must be a broad movement, otherwise it will fail. All workers must participate and be given responsible positions. Let the Stalinist leadership forsake their factional game, which only discredits the Left wing and gives ammunition to Lovestone, and the New Bedford workers in 1930 will more than repeat their heroic struggle of two years ago. —FRANK BROMLEY

TROTSKY

The writings of L. D. Trotsky are the richest and most fruitful contributions being made to the labor and revolutionary movements today. There is not a problem that great Bolshevik touches which is not immediately illuminated in all its aspect. And the problems he deals with concern the most vital interests of the whole movement.

The international labor and Communist movements are in a critical situation. Never has the need for clarity been so urgent as it is today. Never has the need for straight Marxist thinking been so pressing. Nobody is doing more in this field than Trotsky.

The situation in the Soviet Union, the fountain-head of the revolutionary movement today, which offers so many complexities to the average observer, is made clear and understandable by Trotsky's writings. In fact, the course of events in the Soviet Union and the Russian Communist Party can be evaluated properly only by a reading of the works of the Russian Opposition which Trotsky speaks for and leads.

In the United States, Trotsky's writing appear regularly in the Militant. Just as the first writings of Lenin in this country became a mighty instrument for the molding of the revolutionary movement years ago, the writings of Trotsky now are playing the same role in the movement at a different stage.

Among the articles by Trotsky that have appeared in the Militant recently are: Disarmament and the United States of Europe. Syndicalism and Communism. The Austrian Crisis and Communism. Who is Leading the Communist International? What is Happening in China? Twelve years of the Russian Revolution. The Defense of the Soviet Union and the Opposition, Etc. Etc. No active worker can afford to be without these contributions which appear only in the Militant.

In 1930, the Militant plans to continue the publication of Trotsky's writing, which will include some of the most brilliant work he has yet done in the course of his years in the revolutionary movement. The best way to insure getting these copies of the Militant regularly, is to subscribe for a year. A yearly subscription is \$2.00 or \$1.00 for six months.

MILITANT

JUST RECEIVED!

NO. 7

THE BULLETIN
of the Russian Opposition

The new issue contains articles by L. D. Trotsky on the Twelfth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, Communism and Syndicalism, Syndicalism's Mistakes in Principle, the Austrian Crisis, China, etc., etc. Articles by Christian Rakovsky on Government Policy and the Party Regime, the Capitulators. Letters from Russian Oppositionists in Exile. An unpublished document of the Petersburg Party Committee on the eve of the uprising, concealed by Stalin. And many other important articles and documents.

ALL ARTICLES IN RUSSIAN
25c each 18c in bundles

Order From
THE MILITANT
25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.

DANCE

For the Benefit of the Weekly Militant
on SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1930 at 8 p. m.
at the

HUNGARIAN HALL, 323 East 79th Street
Excellent Musical Program—Dancing—Entertainment
Admission: 50 cents in advance or 60 cents at door
AUSPICES: Communist League of New York (Opposition)
English and Hungarian Branches

If the number on your wrapper is

30

then your subscription to the Militant has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

THE MILITANT, Vol. III, No. 5, February 1 1930. Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. Subscription rate: \$2.00 per year; foreign \$2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon, Max Shachtman, Maurice Stassen, Ann Swaback. Entered as second class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879. (Total No. 30)

The Indian Revolution at the Cross-roads

By Max Shachtman

The resolution adopted by the Indian National Congress last month on the initiative of Mahatma Ghandi, which gives formal approval to "complete Indian independence" from the British empire as the goal of the Congress, is of tremendous importance, not so much for itself but for the temper of the Indian masses which it mirrors. And what characterizes the present spirit of the latter is much less the lukewarm if sonorous phrases of the elements which dominated the Congress than the militant action of the workers in Bombay on Independence Day (1-26-30) particularly the mill workers who attempted to hoist the Red Flag not only in place of the Union Jack but also of the red-green-white flag of Indian nationalism.

To grasp the enormous significance of a genuine revolutionary movement in India, a land embracing some three hundred million people—a fifth of the world's population—its place in the mosaic of British imperialism must first be established.

A Keystone in the British Empire

Out of every ten people in the British Empire, black, brown, yellow and white, more than seven are in India alone. From the very first days of the conquest of India by Britain and the ousting of the Portuguese and other mercantile pirates, the country has been a source of almost inexhaustible loot for the Englishman. The British bourgeoisie still remembers with satisfaction and longing the days of the notorious East India Company, whose profits frequently mounted to 250 percent a year. The period of ruthless primitive accumulation for British industrial capitalism was greatly accelerated by the plundering of India and the impoverishment of its millions. As a source of markets and raw materials for Britain India has occupied an almost unrivalled position in the scheme of the Empire.

In more recent times, it has offered an immense field for capital investments. The British investment in India today is estimated at more than one billion pounds sterling, or a larger sum than that of all the other British dominions combined. In four post-war years alone, from 1919 to 1923, British capital exported to India increased 1800 percent, from 1,400,000 pounds to 25,300,000 pounds, and constituted a change in the capital exported by Britain to all parts of the world from six-tenths of one percent to fourteen and four-tenths percent of the total, or an increase in the Indian proportion of British capital exports of 2400 percent. India is not only a source for capital exports. One-tenth of general British exports go to India—more than any other single country in the world—and represents 70 percent of India's total imports.

India has even more than an economic-financial importance in the British Empire; it is of incalculable strategical value. It is not for nothing that priceless India has been the central objective of British Mediterranean and Oriental policy for virtually centuries. It is not for nothing that every European maritime power has sought enviously at one time or another for a route to India. The fabulous riches that spurred Columbus to cross the Atlantic exist today in an even more substantial and developed form. The Gibraltar guards not only Egypt but India, Malta and Cyprus are stations on the road to India and so is the Suez canal. A look at the map will further show that India forms the apex of a rough triangle, the basis of which is formed by a line drawn between South Africa and Australia; that India is a guardian towering over Afghanistan and Arabia, in which England is heavily interested; that India neighbors upon that second great Oriental field for imperialist buccaneering, China; that India forms an unrivalled basis for Asiatic and Pacific power for the country that dominates it.

Loss of India a Fatal Blow

The loss of India would be a fatal blow to the British Empire, compared to which the loss of even Ireland or being driven entirely out of China would take second place. That is why England prizes India as highly as a pauper would value the Koh-i-noor. Not a single political party or group in England, with the exception of the Communists has the slightest intention of ever granting India genuine freedom. The policy of England towards its possession has been stated with harsh frankness in the noted "steel frame" speech of Lloyd George in Commons (8-2-1922): "That Britain under no circumstances... has responsibility in India

is a cardinal principle, not merely of the present Government, but of any Government which will command the confidence of the people in this country... I can see no period when India can dispense with the guidance and the assistance of this small nucleus of the British Civil Service... They are the steel frame of the whole structure."

With no essential changes, this policy has been pursued in India by every British government, be it Tory, Liberal, Coalition—or Labor. In two words, therefore, to find the forces and interests making for a movement to liberate India, one must look anywhere but in the ranks of British imperialism. The latter will never voluntarily yield its domination. The driving forces of the Indian revolution are consequently centered in India itself, even more so now than a few years ago because of the weakening of the revolutionary proletarian movement in England—the only other reservoir of Indian freedom.

What elements in India constitute these driving forces? In the first place, they are not the big Indian bourgeoisie or the native princes. The latter exist largely on the sufferance of Britain and are more or less satisfied with their present status. Imperialism exerts no particularly harassing pressure upon them. The former is an avowedly counter-revolutionary force. Much as it would like a larger share in the unequal partnership it has established with its British master, it likes infinitely more the suppression of every mass movement that threatens its social and economic position in the slightest. There is no movement away from Britain that has not been opposed by the native big bourgeoisie and the Liberal Federation. They can be counted upon to act hand in hand with the British bourgeoisie in crushing any struggle of the masses for the improvement of their economic conditions, not to speak of their liberation from the imperialist yoke.

The Nationalist Bourgeoisie

The second factor in the Indian struggle is the petty bourgeoisie in its various sections: landlords, merchants, professionals, small manufacturers, civil service employees, students, intellectuals, etc., etc. Having no really broad basis, and no over-secure economic position, they must rely for their troops upon the millions of workers and peasants. They are for the development of a native industry, by bounties if possible (Swaraj Party), for protection, for the decreasing of the heavy burdens of taxation, for the abolition of the irksome color discrimination that exists in governmental institutions, for a more decisive voice in the management of India's affairs and destiny.

But the national petty bourgeoisie constantly vacillates between its troops—the workers and peasants—and the class interests to which it is inherently inclined, to the big bourgeoisie and to compromise with British imperialism. It has always been ready in the past to accept some form of dominion status, which will allow it greater freedom of action and a larger measure of influence in India, without allowing the movement of the masses to "get out of hand". It lives in respect for the might of the British master and fear of a developing movement of the workers and peasants. On more than one occasion it has already demonstrated that when the miserably impoverished masses really enter the path of struggle against imperialism the role of the petty bourgeoisie is to sap the vitality of the movement, to misdirect its energies, to curb and limit it, and if necessary to betray it into the hands of British imperialism.

The Indian national bourgeoisie cannot and will not lead a revolutionary struggle against imperialism. It cannot and will not solve any of the fundamental problems that now strangle the development of India. It cannot and will not free the workers and peasants from the British and Indian chains that fetter them. If anything, its role will be even more rather than less ignominious and treacherous than the deceptive, murderous role played by the Chinese national bourgeoisie in the revolution of 1925-27 and thereafter. It will lead the masses of workers and peasants only to the extent that the latter can be used as a club with which to extort from England certain concessions for the national bourgeoisie, as obedient troops who can be ordered to advance or retreat as the class in-

terests of the bourgeoisie dictate at the moment. But so far as the interests of the workers and peasants themselves are concerned, whether they are viewed from the angle of the struggle against British imperialism, or the native capitalists, users and landlords, the native bourgeoisie will lead them only to defeat and slaughter.

That the nationalist leaders, from Ghandi to Nehru, have apparently moved to the "Left" in the recent period, under the pressure of the masses, is just an indication of the fact that they will make every attempt to head the mass movement in order to behead it the moment it presents a serious danger to British imperial rule and their hoped-for class domination in the future.

To put a pennyworth of confidence in the capacity of the nationalist bourgeoisie and its leaders to conduct a genuine struggle against imperialism is to prepare and permit the strangulation of the Indian revolution in the same manner as the national bourgeoisie rode to power over the backs of the Chinese workers and peasants. The conclusion flows not only from the bitter experiences of the Chinese revolution, but from the recent past of the Indian movement itself.

Ghandi's Record

Will Ghandi, for example, who introduced the apparently "revolutionary" resolution at the Congress, lead or participate in a real struggle against British imperialism? His whole record proves the folly of such a belief. From the days when he organized an ambulance corps for service on the side of British imperialism in the Boer War, and his war record as a chauvinist servant of Britain, down to more recent times when he has defended propertied interests in every workers struggle or strike, Ghandi has played a reactionary role (not to speak of his semi-feudal "economic" theories or his spiritualistic and mystical confusionism).

Or do the actions of Ghandi and all the rest of the national bourgeoisie in the period after the war inspire any confidence that their real role is anything but the restraining and betrayal of the movement and interests of the masses? It is sufficient to recall the period between 1919 and 1922, when the liberation struggle reached a high point, with millions participating. The Empire was really in danger. Demonstrations, strikes and various other struggles swept the whole country. The visit of the Prince of Wales was the occasion for magnificent demonstrations of mass antagonism and resistance to British imperialism. The temper of the masses was approaching a high pitch. At Chauri Chaura and Bareilly, conflicts took place between the workers and poor peasants and the authorities.

The role of Ghandi and the Congress was to stab the movement in the back, nothing less. The struggle was officially called off at the notorious Bardoli meeting which adopted a resolution deploring "the inhuman conduct of the mob at Chauri Chaura in having brutally murdered constables and wantonly burned police (stations)" and demanding of the peasants that they recontinue the payment of taxes to the government and rent to the landlords! The contemptible middle class hoof of the hallowed Ghandis was revealed—as it always is and always will be—as soon as the storm of a mass movement of workers and peasants swept the country and threatened the existence of British imperialism and the "rights" of the landlords. The Bardoli resolution expressed in a classic manner the real role of the national bourgeoisie in the colonial struggle against imperialism: to stand by its foreign master, by the native landlord and business man against the masses of workers and peasants.

It is not the national bourgeoisie that will lead the Indian revolution. It will only mislead it. Its role will be no more glorious than the role of the Russian Kerenskys and the Chinese Chiang Kai-Sheks. The Indian revolution will not succeed as a "democratic revolution" carried on by a so-called "revolutionary democratic alliance." It will be successful only if it is led by the Indian proletariat, already quite numerous and enriched by many militant battles, supported by the mass of horribly pauperized tillers of the soil. It is quite true that there are gigantic difficulties in the way greater in many respects than those that confronted the Chinese workers and peasants. It is also true that the

course pursued by the revolutionary elements particularly by the Communist International, in the past few years, has not facilitated the success of the struggle—it has made it harder and introduced the most ridiculous and calamitous confusion into the situation.

At the Cross-Roads

But these difficulties are decreased at the present moment by the revolutionary situation that is developing at such a rapid pace. Under the concentrating pressure of such a situation, mistakes and shortcomings of the past can be swiftly rectified—or lead swiftly to catastrophe. A rectification is now an essential requirement that dare not be postponed, precisely because the Indian revolution now stands at the cross-roads: it can travel either the path of the 1927 debacle in China or the 1917 victory in Russia.

As for the workers and peasants, the shortcomings of the past, the mistakes of the present, the character of the coming revolution, the question of the Communist Party—all the problems of decisive consequence—a consideration of these points require and must be left to another article.

Φ

Stalinists Disrupt Minneapolis T. U. U. L. Conference

MINNEAPOLIS—Although the T.U.U.L. unfurled its banner at Cleveland several months ago with a call to the wide masses of workers for struggle on all fronts, the first district conference held in the northwest opened its one session today with expulsions of three well-known militant workers.

C. R. Hedlund presented credentials from the Railroad Council of Minneapolis, the only militant group of railroad workers in this city. His credential was not only turned down by the credential committee, but he was denounced in the conference as a "Trotskyist". Further than this the railroad workers' problems were not considered.

The same treatment was accorded Arnold Ronn of Superior who presented credentials from the Central Co-operative Exchange of that city.

Representing the women's section of the co-operatives, Helen Ronkenan, who came down from the Twin-Ports as a fraternal delegate, was also refused a seat.

The complexion of the conference was anything but reassuring to one at all familiar with the workers' movement in this section. Of the fifty men and women present, less than a half dozen represented any one except themselves. The Stalinist functionaries were there in force. The district had been carefully worked. The result was a party membership meeting—not a Trade Union convention. A long list of speeches by party bureaucrats, a still longer list of resolutions presented by the same people, together with the maneuvers both before and after the expulsions, give a fairly good picture of the meeting. If anything really constructive was accomplished it was not apparent to the writer. The great harm that would proceed from the narrow sectarian line given at the conference, in other circumstances, is minimized by the fact that the official party apparatus and its hangers-on have little contact with the workers movement here and still less authority.

Φ

\$81,000,000 CORPORATION REFUSES TO PAY 37 CENTS AN HOUR

CAMBRIDGE, Mass.—Rather than pay the extra 2 cents an hour provided by the state's minimum wage law, the wealthy Harvard University corporation has fired 20 scrubwomen without notice. The Harvard Scrub Women's Protective Aid Society, believed to have been started by students, is soliciting pennies to make up the Harvard budget so the women may not be jobless. They were getting 35 cents an hour, or \$10.50 a week.

Some of the discharged scrub women were reemployed as chambermaids for the dormitories at 32 cents an hour. Chambermaids do not come under the minimum wage provisions. Harvard investments, listed at \$81,000,000, have been swelled another \$5,000,000 by a recent donation.

N. Y. TELEPHONE GRABS \$14,000,000 MORE

NEW YORK—"To prevent confiscation of its property", the New York Telephone Co., Bell subsidiary, has announced a flat increase of \$1.25 a month in business rates and 50 cents for residence phones. The increase, to net \$14,000,000 for the already profitable company, was obtained through the courtesy of the federal courts.

The «Third Period» of the Comintern's Mistakes

Crises of Conjuncture and the Revolutionary Crisis in Capitalism

By L. D. Trotsky

At the Fifth Congress of the Confederation General du Travail Unitaire, A. Vassart made a lengthy speech against Chambelland*, which was later published as a pamphlet, with a foreword by Jean Brecot**. In his speech, Vassart attempts to defend the revolutionary perspective against the reformist perspective. In this respect, our sympathies are entirely on his side. But unfortunately he defends the revolutionary perspective with such arguments as can bring only advantages to the reformists. In his speech, there is included a series of fatal theoretical and factual mistakes. One may object: Are there so few mistaken speeches in the world? Vassart can still learn a great deal. I myself would be glad to think so. But it has been made difficult by the fact that the speech has been published in the form of a propaganda pamphlet. It is provided with a foreword by Jean Brecot who is at least a cousin to Monmousseau himself, and this gives the pamphlet a programmatic character. The fact that not only the author, but also the editor who prepared it for publication, did not perceive the enormous mistakes is witness to the sad state of the theoretical level of the present leaders of French Communism. Jean Brecot does not tire of smashing the Marxist Opposition. What he ought to do, as we shall soon demonstrate, is simply to sit down and study his A. B. C. S. Leadership of the labor movement is incompatible with ignorance, as Marx once said to Weitling.

At the congress, Chambelland expressed the superficial thought—based decisively on nothing but the reformist tendencies of the speaker—that capitalist stabilization will last for about another thirty-four years, that is, that even the new generation of the proletariat which is just coming forward cannot count upon the revolutionary seizure of power. Chambelland brought no serious arguments to substantiate his fantastic period of time. Whereas, the historical experience of the past two decades and the theoretical analysis of the present situation speak wholly against Chambelland's perspective.

But let us see how Vassart refutes him. He proves first of all that even before the war the capitalist system could not exist without convulsions. "From 1850 to 1910, an economic crisis took place approximately every 14 years (!?) bred by the capitalist system." (Page 14.) And further on: "If, before the war, the crisis took place every 14 years, we see a contradiction between this fact and the assertions of Chambelland who does not foresee a serious crisis before forty years." (Page 15).

It is not difficult to understand that with this sort of argument, Vassart, who confuses crises of conjuncture with the revolutionary crisis of capitalism as a whole, only strengthens the false position of Chambelland.

First of all, the establishment of the conjuncture cycle at 14 years is rather surprising. Where did Vassart get this figure? We hear it for the first time. And how is it that Jean Brecot, who instructs us so authoritatively, (almost as authoritatively as Monmousseau himself) did not notice such a crass mistake, especially in such a question that has such an immediate, such a vital significance for the trade union movement? Prior to the war, every trade unionist knew that crises or at least depressions recurred every seven or eight years. If we take the period of a century and a half, we find that one crisis was never separated from the other by more than eleven years. The average duration of the cycle was about eight and a half years, and furthermore, as was shown by the pre-war period, the conjuncture rhythm had a tendency not to slacken but to accelerate, which is bound up with the renewal of technical machinery. In the post-war years, the changes of con-

juncture had a disorderly character, which was expressed by the fact that the crises recurred more frequently than before the war. How does it happen that leading French trade unionists do not know such elementary facts? Especially how can one lead a strike movement without having in mind a realistic picture of the changes of economic conjuncture? Every serious Communist can and must put this question to the leaders of the C. G. T. U., primarily to Monmousseau—and that squarely.

That is how the matter stands from the point of view of the facts... It is no better from the methodological point of view. What does Vassart actually prove? That capitalist development is generally inconceivable without conjuncture contradictions; they existed before the war and will exist in the future. It is doubtful if even Chambelland would deny this commonplace. But from this there does not as yet flow any revolutionary perspective. On the contrary: if for the past century and a half the capitalist world passed through eighteen crises, then there is no basis for the conclusion that capitalism must fall with the nineteenth or twentieth. In actuality, conjuncture cycles in the life of capitalism play the same role as is played, for example, by the cycles of blood circulation in the life of an organism. From the periodicity of the crises, there flows just as little the conclusion of the inevitability of the revolution, as the inevitability of death—from a rhythmic pulse.

At the Third Congress of the Comintern (1921), the ultra-Leftists of the time (Bucharin, Zinoviev, Radek, Thaelmann, Thalheimer, Pepper, Bela Kun and others) calculated that capitalism would never again know an industrial revival because it had entered the final ("Third") period, which would develop on the basis of a permanent crisis until the very revolution. Around this question, a big ideological struggle took place at the Third Congress. My report was devoted to a considerable extent to proving the idea that in the epoch of imperialism the laws determining the change in industrial cycles remain in effect and that conjuncture vacillations will be characteristic of capitalism as long as it exists: the pulse ceases only with death. But from the state of the pulse, in conjunction with other symptoms, a doctor can determine whether he is dealing with a strong or weak organism, a healthy or a sick one. (Of course, I do not speak of doctors of the Monmousseau school.) Vassart however makes the attempt to prove the inevitability and proximity of the revolution on the basis of the fact that crises and booms take place every 14 years.

Vassart could easily have avoided these gross errors if he had at least made a study of the report and discussion at the Third Congress of the Comintern. But, unfortunately, the most important documents of the first four Congresses, when genuine Marxist ideology ruled the Comintern, are now prohibited literature. For the new generation of leaders, the history of Marxist thought begins with the Fifth Congress, particularly with the unfortunate Tenth Plenum of the E. C. C. I. The principal crime of the dull and blind bureaucratic apparatus consists in the mechanical interpretation of theoretical traditions.

Economic Conjuncture and Radicalization of the Masses

If Vassart does not know the mechanics of business cycles and does not understand the relationship between conjuncture crises and revolutionary crises of the capitalist system as a whole, then the dialectical interdependence of the economic conjuncture and the struggle of the working class is just as unclear to him. Vassart conceives this dependence just as mechanically as his opponent Chambelland, although their conclusions are directly contrary, and moreover erroneous to the same degree.

Chambelland says: "Radicalization of the masses is in a certain sense the barometer which makes it possible to evaluate the condition of capitalism in a given country. If capitalism is in a state of decline the masses are necessarily radicalized." (Page 23.) From this Chambelland draws the conclusion that because the strikes embrace only the periphery of the

workers, because metallurgical and chemical industries are affected only to a slight degree, capitalism is not as yet in decline. Before him there is still a forty years' period of development.

What does Vassart answer to this? Chambelland, according to him, "does not see the radicalization because he does not see the new methods of exploitation." (Page 30.) Vassart in every respect repeats the thought that if one recognizes the intensified exploitation and understands that it will develop further, "that in itself compels you to reply affirmatively to the question of the radicalization of the masses." (Page 31.)

When one reads these polemics, he gets the impression of two blind-folded men trying to catch each other. It is not true that a crisis always and under all circumstances radicalizes the masses. Example: Italy, Spain, the Balkans, etc. It is not true that the radicalism of the working class necessarily corresponds with the period of capitalism's decline. Example: Chartism in England, etc. Like Chambelland, Vassart also ignores the living history of the labor movement in the name of dead forms. Wrong also is Chambelland's conclusion itself: From the fact, that strikes have not as yet embraced the main mass of French workers, one must by no means deduce a denial of the beginning of radicalization; but what can and must be arrived at is a concrete evaluation of the extent, depth and intensity of this radicalization. Chambelland, evidently, agrees to believe in it only after the whole working class is engaged in an offensive. But such leaders who wish to start only when everything is ready, are not needed by the working class. One must be able to see the first, even though weak, symptoms of revival, while only in the economic sphere, adapt one's tactics to it and attentively follow the development of the process. Meantime one must not disregard, even for an hour, the general nature of our epoch, which has proved more than once and will yet prove, that between the first symptoms of revival and stormy upsurge which creates a revolutionary situation, not forty years but perhaps only a fifth or a tenth of that are required.

This matter stands no better with Vassart. He simply establishes a mechanical parallel between exploitation and radicalization. How can the radicalization of the masses be denied, Vassart says irritably, if exploitation grows from day to day? This is childish metaphysics, quite in the spirit of Bucharin. Radicalization must be proved not by deductions but by facts. The conclusion of Vassart can be turned into its opposite without difficulty. It is sufficient to put a question like this: How could the capitalists increase exploitation from day to day if they were confronted by the radicalization of the masses? It is precisely the absence of fighting spirit in the masses that permits an increase of exploitation. True, such reasoning without qualifications would also be one-sided, but still a lot nearer to life than Vassart's constructions.

The trouble is that the growth of exploitation does not under all circumstances raise the fighting spirit of the proletariat. Thus, with a declining conjuncture, with the growth of unemployment, particularly after lost battles, increased exploitation does not breed radicalization of the masses, but quite the contrary, the falling of spirit, dispersal and disintegration. We saw, that, for example, in the English coal mining industry right after the strike of 1926. We saw it on a still larger scale in Russia when the industrial crisis of 1907 fell with the wrecking of the 1905 revolution. If in the past two years the growth of exploitation in France brought about the evident growth of the strike movement, the ground for it was created by the rise in the economic conjuncture and not its decline.

False Revolutionaries Fear Economic Processes

But the ultra-Left opportunists leading the Comintern fear a rise in industry as economic "counter-revolution". Their radicalism leans on a weak reed. For the further rise of industry, business conjuncture would in the very first place have delivered a mortal blow to their stupid theo-

ries of the "third and last period". These people deduce revolutionary perspectives not from the real process of contradictions but from false schemas. And from this flow their fatal mistakes in tactics.

It may seem quite improbable that at the Congress of the C. G. T. U. in France the official orators tried above all to depict the affairs of French capitalism in the most piteous form. Loudly exaggerating the present swing of the strike movement, the French Stalinists at the same time gave such a characterization of French industry as would make strike struggles absolutely hopeless in the future. Among them was Vassart. Precisely because he, together with Monmousseau, does not distinguish between the crisis of capitalism and the conjuncture crisis, and figures this time together with Chambelland, that a conjuncture rise might further remove the revolution to a period of decades, Vassart is apprehensive of an industrial rise. On page 21-24 of his pamphlet, he proves that the present industrial revival in France is "artificial" and "momentary" (page 24). At the December national committee meeting, Richetat diligently painted the French textile industry as being in a state of crisis. If this is the case it means that the strike movement which so far served as the only indication of radicalization has no economic foundation under itself or is losing it rapidly. To say the least, by anticipation Vassart and Richetat give the representatives of capital a priceless argument against economic concessions to the workers and what is more important they give decisive arguments to the reformists against economic strikes, for it must be understood that from a perspective of chronic crisis one can by no means draw a perspective of increasing economic struggles.

Do not these sorry-syndicalists follow the economic press? But, they may say, the capitalist press deliberately parades its optimism. However, it is not a question of editorials here. From day to day, from month to month, the press publishes the market reports, the balances of the banks, commercial and industrial enterprises and railroads. Some of the totals involved have already been printed in No. 12 of *Verite**. The more recent figures are further proof of the rising tendency of French industry. The last economic weekly to reach me, *Le Temps* (October 9, 1929), carries for instance, a report of a general meeting of the stockholders of the metallurgical enterprises of the North and East of France. We do not know M. Quivelette's attitude to the philosophy of the "Third Period" and we admit that we are not very much interested. But nevertheless he can very well sum up profits and cut dividends. Quivelette sums up the total of the past year in the following phrase: "The condition of the domestic market has been exceptionally favorable." This formula, I hope, has nothing in common with platonic optimism because it is strengthened by forty franc dividends on stock instead of the twenty-five franc franc dividend the year before. We ask: Has or has not this fact an importance for the economic struggles in the metal industry? It would seem that it has. But unfortunately, behind the back of Quivelette we see the figures of Vassart and Brecot or that of Monmousseau himself, and we hear their voice: "Don't believe the words of this capitalist optimist who does not know that he is up to his ears in the third period!" Isn't it clear that if a worker makes the mistake of believing on this question, Monmousseau and not Quivelette, he will have to come to the conclusion that he has no ground under his feet for successful economic struggle, to say nothing of an offensive.

The Monmousseau school—if one may

*We can only welcome the fact that *La Verite* has introduced monthly economic reviews. The first article (No. 12) gives an excellent outline for the need of economic orientation for every Communist in the Party as well as in the trade union work. Particularly the Oppositionists must rely on this side of the matter: the establishment of a correct revolutionary perspective, based on a Marxist analysis of facts and figures, not only in opposition to the empty babblings of Cachin and Monmousseau, but also to the political fiction of some gentlemen who have wandered into the ranks of the Opposition by mistake.

*Spokesmen in the C. G. T. U. for the ruling regime in the French Communist Party.—Ed.

**Leader of the syndicalist minority group at the C. G. T. U. congress and one of the editors of *La Revolution Proletarienne*, organ of the Syndicalist League (Monatte Group).—Ed.

Throughout the World of Labor

The Developments in Germany

The German working class is now going through a far severer period of economic and moral depression than even the most pessimistic tables of statisticians can describe. It takes an insight into the conditions of the average proletarian family to establish this. Vegetable-butter (margarine is found everywhere at the workman's table instead of butter. The diet is entirely devoid of eggs. Only the most meager portions of meat find their way to the worker's stomach. Malt coffee has displaced bean coffee, and so on without end. In short, the working class diet consists in large measure of what was termed during the war and inflation periods *ersatz-lebensmittel* (substitute products).

Professor Kucinski, a bourgeois economist has figured out that the worker receives in wages only 85% of what he needs for a minimum standard of living! This at the same time that German industry increases its production by leaps and bounds. And yet the reformists, still backed by a

give such a title to an institution where people are taught to unlearn thinking, reading and writing—is afraid of an economic rise. It must be said plainly that for the French working class, which has renewed its composition at least twice—during the years of the war and after the war, having included in its ranks tremendous numbers of youth, women and foreigners—and is far from having fused this raw mass together in its melting pot—for the French working class, the further development of an industrial rise would have created an incomparable school, would have welded its strength, would have proved to the most backward sections their meaning and role in the capitalist mechanism, and would thereby have raised class consciousness as a whole to new heights. Two or three years, even one year, of a broad, successful economic struggle would give rebirth to the proletariat. After a properly utilized economic rise, a conjunctural crisis might give a serious impetus to a genuine political radicalization of the masses.

At the same time, it must not be forgotten that wars and revolutions in our epoch result not from conjunctural crises but from the contradictions between the development of the productive forces on the one hand and the bourgeois characteristic of national boundaries on the other carried to their climax. Imperialist war and the October revolution have succeeded in showing the strain of these contradictions. The new role of America has developed them further. The more serious a character the development of the productive forces has in one country or another, or in a series of countries, the faster a new rise in industry will find itself confronted with the basic contradiction of world industry and the sharper will be the reaction—economic, political, domestic and international. A serious industrial rise would be at all events, not a minus but a tremendous plus for French Communism, creating a mighty strike forerunner to a political offensive. Conclusion: there will be no lack of revolutionary situations. It is quite likely, however, that there will be a lack of ability to utilize them.

But is the further rising development of the French industrial conjuncture guaranteed? This we cannot dare to confirm. Here all sorts of possibilities remain open. At any rate, it does not depend on us. What does depend on us, and what we are obliged to do, is not to close our eyes to facts in the name of pitiful schema, but to take the course of economic development as it really is and to work out trade union tactics on the basis of real facts. We speak in the given case of tactics in distinction to strategy, which is determined, of course, not by conjunctural changes but by basic tendencies of development. But if tactics are subordinated to strategy then, on the other hand, strategy is realized only through tactics.

To the Comintern as well as the Profintern, tactics consist in periodic zig-zags, and strategy—in the mechanical sum of zig-zags. That is why the proletarian vanguard suffers defeat after defeat. Prinkipo. December 22, 1929

majority of the working class, shout: Accumulate! Accumulate! For them the way out of this working class misery lies in the accumulation of capital in Germany.

There are more than 3,000,000 unemployed in the Reich, more than half a million in Berlin alone. There is hardly a family in proletarian Berlin that hasn't its *stempelbruder*. Unemployment insurance, of which the "social" state, Germany, so proudly boasts as against the unsocial U.S., is hardly enough to keep its recipient alive. The result is that the unemployed fill the "welfare offices" and "aid societies" day after day and are forced to degrade themselves to virtual beggars. The moral effects can be imagined.

The coalition government of the Reich is very shaky. It has done its work. It has brought about the reduction in unemployment insurance and the arbitration clauses through *Wissel*; it has cast the burden of the taxes on the working class through *Hilferding*. Severing's anti-Communist "Law for the Protection of the Republic" complete the circuit. Finance capital is preparing the boot for its social democratic lackeys. It needs more "resolute" servants for its purpose in the period to come.

The entire German economic system of the immediate future will live in the shadow of the recent Wall Street crash. A German economic journal writes on this:

"It is probable that at least partially the economic cooperation of similarly constructed concerns of the countries involved will take place of the formerly customary loan grants, namely, those made to the large industrial states like Germany, for instance, which (economic cooperation) powerful American capitalist enterprises will finance." (*Zeitschrift d. Deutsch-Amerl. Wirtschaft*, Ver., December, 1929)...

The favorable German industrial conditions, to be made yet more favorable by the greater depression of the German working masses soon to follow, now attract all the capital that formerly went to the prosperity-promising American industry. This means an advanced internationalization of industrial capital and a firmer grip on the latter by world finance capital (Morgan and Co.). How this works out in Germany may be gathered from the growing dictatorial strength of Morgan's German representative, Hjalmar Schacht, the president of the Reichsbank. Herr Schacht is the man who tumbled Hilferding from his ministerial chair, because he was not far-reaching enough in his "reforms" and because, for reasons of political demagoguery, he didn't go in energetically for immediately carrying out these reforms. Schacht is also the leader in the movement for the "decommunalization" of Germany, i. e., for the abolition of communal expenditure. (An example of ringing success is Mr. Schacht's plans was shown recently in Berlin, where the city council voted a Christmas surplus for the unemployed, which the magistrate, under Schacht's direction immediately repudiated.

In German politics, the situation finds a mirror and barometer. The coalition government is nearing the end of its string. Its prospective collapse is on the order of the day. The national "Right" is in a deep crisis. Those elements backed by heavy industry, like the *Landbund* and *Stahlhelm*, are breaking way from the irreconcilable Rights around Hugenburg and Hitler and are going in for a policy of supporting the status quo of the republic, because "It is developing in a direction towards us". Even Hitler is willing to "listen to reason". His papers are full of praise for Schacht, and despite all their radicalism and sham "revolutionary socialism" they write that they are for such a payment of reparations as the "nation finds bearable."

The C. P. of Germany is thus facing a very serious but promising state of conditions. Its victory in the Berlin elections was a real one, all the more significant because the Party campaign program was altogether out of proportions to real affairs—to the "Left". It is no exaggeration to say that a considerable majority of the Berlin proletariat is behind the Party and places all its confidence in it. Whether the party will be able to hold this mass and increase it depends entirely upon how much sanity it will apply in its tactics in the trade unions and towards the increas-

ingly disillusioned workers who still follow the S. P. while discontent within the reformist organization is growing, while rebellion against the treacherous leadership is brewing.

As a whole, the party seems to have sobered a good deal lately. The calls to arms echo very faintly in the press today. In the trade unions as well as in the party itself, the stress is being laid on organizational work. But the ultra-Left tactic of "revolutionary" *kampfleitungen* (struggle leadership) and separate factory councils lists has not been given up and may still do it much harm. In many factories (e. g., Ullstein, Simiens) where the largest Communist nuclei exist, these nuclei have pitted themselves almost unanimously against the party tactic. In the question of "social fascism", the Communist workers have solved the problem in their own way. They explain to the S.P. workers in discussion that the word is applied only to the social democratic leaders, to the "comrade"-ministers, etc.

The campaign of terror which the authorities and the bourgeois press have been conducting for some time against the party and the militant sections of the class is taking on ever greater proportions. Falsification, slander and provocation fill the air. The revolutionary masses are increasingly aroused to counteract violently to this terror, and the party functionaries sweat blood to keep the people in check at demonstrations and public meetings. The party's effort to connect the active discontent of the unemployed with solidarity actions of the workers in the factories is to be applauded. But here too it will not do to restrict oneself to phrases alone.

On the occasion of initiating a formal "Stalin cult", the *Rote Fahne* has not overlooked any opportunities to make personal attacks upon comrade Trotsky. It is significant to note who the attackers are, and how they attack. Heinz Neumann, accused by the social democrats and the Brandlerites (without any refutation up-to-date) of being in close connection with the German police is the star—using the occasion of a review of Willi Munzenburg's latest book "Die Dritte Front". He pits Munzenburg's "collective" spirit against Trotsky's "gnawing egotism". This is just too ridiculous, even when we overlook the incongruity of the comparison. For, as you know, upon Munzenburg's head hang the following charges made by Herzog, the editor of *Das Forum*: breaking the foreign trade monopoly of the Soviet Union, speculating with goods sent to relieve the Russian famine in 1921, misappropriation of W. I. R. funds—all for personal purposes. As far as I know Munzenburg has not as yet made answer to these charges.

While Willi does a thriving business with his newspaper-concerns, and lives in princely luxury in his home at "In den Zelten," comrade Trotsky, the "egoist" lives the life of exile in backward Turkey, refused a visum by the rest of the planet. Perhaps Heinz Neumann will make us believe that this ban is due to nothing more than Trotsky's "gnawing egotism". The workers know better. They know that in Trotsky, the bourgeois world fears the personification of that "haunting specter" that is rocking the foundations of the capitalist system, of victorious Communism.

The Brandlerites have had considerable success lately—in a material way: they have finally begun to publish a daily which appears in Leipzig. In Berlin, their publications have to be sought for with a search-light.

How Brandler goes about in organizing his international faction may be seen from his article on the amalgamation of the three Czecho-Slovakian opportunist groups. Brandler was present on the scene of action. His role can only be imagined. He writes, among other things:

"Only when the united opposition applies the united front tactic wrongly will the confederation (amalgamation) be, not a step forward, but a retreat. But there is no occasion to assume this, despite (!) the false formula of 'class conscious parties' (referring to united front with the social democrats.—S. G. See last issue of *Militant*.—Ed.) in the unity resolution." (*Gegen den Strom*, No. 1, 1930.)

Brandler reprints Lovestone's articles on the International, which are only an echo of his own and Roy's articles. Where Roy writes: "It is unfortunate that the factional struggle in the C. P. S. U. lost such valuable revolutionaries as Trotsky for the movement", Lovestone, for his own purposes, substitutes Zinoviev for Trotsky, and Brandler adds a little note, remarking that after Lenin's death, Zinoviev never played an independent role in the International. A similar instance of "differences" is Roys "polemic" against Wolfe, in which he criticizes the latter's theory that the resolutions of the Sixth Congress were correct, but were revised at the Tenth Plenum. Here too, the theory is made to fit "national" purposes.

I visited a Brandler meeting recently. Brandler gave a pretty accurate appraisal of conditions in Germany, from which there was much to learn. When he was asked in the discussion part how the Communist Party and the International came to be in such a position of impotence at present, he simply answered that this condition is due to the failure of the revolution to arrive in the rest of Europe and to the increasing difficulties in the building up of socialism in Russia. Almost in the form of asides, he remarked that the failure of the revolution in Germany in 1923 was due to the threat of the Entente to come to the aid of bourgeois Germany (!) and further: "Even the skilled leadership of Marx and Engels was not able to hold together the First International, built on centralized direction. Its decomposition showed that it is necessary that the proletariat of each country work out its own problems in the struggle for power." Berlin, January 10, 1930.

—S. GORDON

Communist Injunctions. . . .

The 3rd period according to the 6th World Congress, represents a critical stage in the class struggle against capitalism... great industrial strikes, increasing unemployment, growing crisis, etc. etc.

In Canada, beginning with Aug. 1, 1929, the shades of the Third Period were more visible than ever before. The Party had openly challenged the Toronto police force on the issue of freedom of the streets, free speech and assembly. Unfortunately, the failure of the Party to mobilize the masses had doomed the struggle almost from the beginning as to its possible success in forcing reactionary powers in Toronto to withdraw their edict making the revolutionary movement semi-illegal.

But in spite of the buoyant boasting and revolutionary chatter of the Party leadership the membership and working class were soon to be treated to the spectacle of a form of the class struggle of the A. F. of L. fakers. On Oct. 9, Jack McDonald, secretary of the C. P. of Canada, R. E. Knowles, Jr., a petty bourgeois liberal and J. W. Gill, a social democrat and petty bourgeois storekeeper filled and filed an injunction against the Toronto police force, for trying to suppress the class struggle.

But fortunately for the powers that be, the bourgeoisie remains as class conscious in the Third Period as they had been in the previous periods and the injunction was squashed. It would seem that the police had taught the Party leadership a lesson in the A B C of Communism but no...

Another three months were hardly to elapse when Rev. A. E. Smith, secretary of the Canadian Labor Defense League and a Party leader, was to announce to a Convention of the Labor Circle, that at last the break in the fight for free speech had come. The police had prohibited the *Freiheit* Singing Society the use of a hall for a concert.

An application for injunction was once more filed against the police and again the courts of capitalism taught the party the same lesson they had taught them so short a while ago—the laws and constitution of a bourgeois state, are made to serve the interests of the capitalist class. Injunctions, even in the 3rd period, still remain a weapon in the hands of the capitalist class to suppress the workers and cannot be used as a substitute for the class struggle by the proletariat.

Toronto, January 21, 1930

—M. Q

On the Chinese Revolution

Trotsky's Reply to the Letter of the Chinese Opposition Group

Dear Comrades:

On December 20 I received your letter of November 15: it took 35 days from Shanghai to Constantinople. For my reply to reach you, at least as many days must be allowed. Nothing can be done about it: neither air mail nor radio are yet at the service of the Opposition's cause.

The most important thing in your letter is the announcement that you have published a platform of the Chinese Opposition. You should immediately translate it at least into a European language. The whole International Opposition must have the possibility of knowing this highly important document. I will await your platform with the greatest impatience.

In your letter, you pose two questions connected with the platform: the Constituent Assembly and the United States of Asia. The second question is entirely new; I must put off my reply until I can devote a special article to it. On the question of the Constituent Assembly, I will answer in a few words:

The Constituent Assembly in China

The political task of the Chinese Communist Party, weakened and driven into illegality, is to mobilize not only the workers but also the broad social layers of the city and the country against the bourgeois-military dictatorship. It is to this end that the simplest and most natural slogan under present conditions, the Constituent Assembly, must serve. A tireless agitation must be carried on under this slogan, in correlation with other slogans of the democratic revolution: the transfer of the land to the poor peasants, the eight-hour day, the independence of China, the right of self-determination for the people that constitute it.

The agitation must be supplemented by a propaganda that will make at least the most advanced sections of the proletariat understand that the road leading to the Constituent Assembly can only pass through the insurrection against the military usurpation and the seizure of power by the popular masses.

The government that will issue from the victorious revolution of the workers and peasants can be nothing but a government of the dictatorship of proletariat, leading behind it the majority of the exploited and oppressed people. But the difference must be clearly understood between the general revolutionary perspective which we must tirelessly develop in articles and in theoretical and propaganda speeches and the present political slogan under which we can, beginning today, mobilize the masses by actually opposing them to the regime of the military dictatorship. Such a central political slogan is the slogan of the Constituent Assembly.

This slogan is dealt with briefly in the draft of the platform of the Chinese Opposition, drawn up in Constantinople by some Chinese and foreign comrades. My young friend N., I know, has transmitted this draft to you. With all the greater impatience do I await your platform so as to be able to judge, documents in hand, if there are differences between you and comrade N. and if the separate existence of two groups is justified. Up to the time that I am able to become acquainted with the facts and documents, I am obliged to refrain from formulating any judgement on this important question.

Stalinist Impotence and Violence

You report that the Chinese Stalinists have fired on an Oppositionist in the streets of Canton. Monstrous as this act may be, I do not consider it impossible. In his "Testament," Lenin accused Stalin personally of having a tendency to abuse power, that is, of violence. Since then, this trait has developed monstrously in the apparatus of the Russian Communist Party and has been extended to the Communist International. Naturally, the dictatorship of the proletariat is inconceivable without the use of force, against certain parts of the proletariat itself as well. The workers' State, however, also requires that workers' democracy exercise the most vigilant control in order to know who, how and in whose name violence is employed. This question presents itself in an entirely different manner in the bourgeois countries where the revolutionary party constitutes only a small minority of the working class and where it is obliged to fight in order to gain the majority. Under such conditions, the use of violence against ideological opponents—who are not strike-breakers, or provocateurs or fascists attacking treacherously, but ide-

ological opponents, honest social democratic workers included—is an enormous crime and madness that must inevitably turn upon the revolutionary party itself. In the bitter struggle that Bolshevism conducted against the Narodniki and the Mensheviks for the 15 years that preceded the October revolution, there was never a question of employing methods of physical violence. As for individual terror, we Marxists rejected it even with regard to the czarist satraps. Nevertheless, in recent times the Communist parties or rather their apparatus people, have resorted more and more frequently to the disruption of meetings and to other methods of the mechanical suppression of adversaries, notably the Left Opposition. Many bureaucrats are sincerely convinced that this is what real Bolshevism consists of. They avenge themselves on other proletarian groups for their impotence towards the capitalist state, and thereby transform the bourgeois policy into an arbiter between us.

It is difficult to imagine the depravity engendered by this combination of impotence and violence. The youth becomes more and more accustomed to thinking that the fist is a surer weapon than argument. That is, a political cynicism is cultivated, which prepares individuals better than anything else for passing over into the fascist camp. An implacable struggle must be conducted against the brutal and disloyal methods of Stalinism, by denouncing them in the press and in meetings, and by cultivating among the workers a hatred and contempt for all these pseudo-revolutionists who, instead of appealing to the brain, take a crack at the skull.

As for the Tchen Du-Hsiu group, I am pretty well acquainted with the policy it followed in the years of the revolution: it was the policy of Stalin-Bucharin-Martinov, that is, in essence, a policy of Right Menshevism. Comrade N. wrote me, however, that Tchen Du-Hsiu, basing himself on the experience of the revolution, has come considerably closer to our position. It goes without saying that this can only be welcomed. In your letter, however, you categorically dispute this information of comrade N. You even contend that Tchen Du-Hsiu has not separated himself from the policy of Stalin, which presents a mixture of opportunism and adventurism. But here again, I have up to now read only one program-declaration of Tchen Du-Hsiu. I am therefore in no position to express myself on this question.

In other respects, I conceive a solidarity in principle in the Chinese question only on the basis of clear replies to the following questions:

So far as the first period of the revolution is concerned:

1. Did the leading role of the "national" Chinese bourgeoisie follow from the anti-imperialist character of the Chinese revolution (Stalin-Bucharin)?

2. Was the slogan of the "bloc of four classes"—the big bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry and the proletariat (Stalin-Bucharin)—correct, even for a single instant?

3. Were the entry of the Chinese Communist Party into the Kuo Min Tang and the admission of the latter into the Communist International (resolution of the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party) admissible?

Wages Decline

Wages are also in a bad way, the state department reports. Payroll totals fell off 4.3% in manufacturing though showing slight gains in other industries, chiefly department stores and mail order houses that profit by the orgy of Christmas spending on the part of the comfortable classes. But normal manufacturing was impaired by widespread shutdowns or layoffs.

"The volume of unemployment is con-

4. Was it admissible, in the interests of the Northern Campaign, to curb the agrarian revolution (telegraphic directives in the name of the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party)?

5. Was it admissible to renounce the slogan of Soviets, from the moment that the broad movement of workers and peasants developed, that is, in 1925-27 (Stalin-Bucharin)?

6. Was the Stalinist slogan of a "workers and peasants" party, that is, the old slogan of the Russian Narodniki, acceptable for China, even for an instant?

So far as the second period is concerned:

7. Was the resolution of the Communist International which said that the crushing of the workers and peasants movement by the Kuo Min Tang of the right and left signified a "transition of the revolution to a higher stage" (Stalin-Bucharin), correct?

8. Under these conditions, was the slogan of insurrection, issued by the Communist International, correct?

9. Was the tactic of guerilla warfare, recommended by Ho-Lun and Ye Tin, and approved by the C. I., at the moment of the political ebb-tide of the workers and peasants, correct?

10. Was the organization of the Canton uprising by the agents of the C. I. correct?

So far as the past in general is concerned:

11. Was the struggle of the C. I. in 1924-27 against the Opposition in the Chinese question a struggle of Leninism against Trotskyism or, on the contrary, a struggle of Menshevism against Bolshevism?

12. Was the struggle of the C. I. against the Opposition in 1927-28 a struggle of Bolshevism against "liquidationism" or, on the contrary, a struggle of adventurism against Bolshevism?

So far as the future is concerned:

13. Under the present conditions of victorious counter-revolution, is the mobilization of the Chinese masses under democratic slogans, notably that of the Constituent Assembly, necessary, as the Opposition believes, or is there any ground for being limited to the abstract propaganda of the slogan of Soviets, as the C. I. has decided?

14. Has the slogan of the "workers and peasants democratic dictatorship" still a revolutionary content, as the C. I. thinks, or is it necessary on the contrary to sweep away this masked formula of the Kuo Min Tang and to explain that the victory of the alliance of the workers and peasants can only end in China in the dictatorship of the proletariat?

15. Is the theory of socialism in one country applicable to China, or, on the contrary, can the Chinese revolution triumph and accomplish its tasks to the very end only as a chain of the world revolution?

These are, in my opinion, the principle questions to which the platform of the Chinese Opposition must necessarily give a reply. These questions have a great importance for the whole International. The epoch of reaction that China is now passing through must become, as it has always been in history, an epoch of theoretical preoccupation. What characterizes the young Chinese revolutionists at the present time is the passion to understand, to study, to embrace the question in its entirety. The idealless bureaucracy, the Chinese vanguard of the proletariat will produce from its ranks a pleiade of notable Marxists who will render service to the whole International.

With Opposition greetings,

L. D. TROTSKY

Prinkipo, December 22, 1929

Hoover Prosperity Invisible in State of Illinois

CHICAGO—Figures of the Illinois department of labor do not show much hope of Hoover prosperity coming to this important industrial state. There were almost two applicants for every job listed, the ratio being 181 jobseekers for every 100 available jobs. A year ago there were only 14 applicants. Both figures apply to November, the latest month officially available. In October 1929 the ratio was 147 applicants for every 100 jobs.

Wages Decline

Wages are also in a bad way, the state department reports. Payroll totals fell off 4.3% in manufacturing though showing slight gains in other industries, chiefly department stores and mail order houses that profit by the orgy of Christmas spending on the part of the comfortable classes. But normal manufacturing was impaired by widespread shutdowns or layoffs.

"The volume of unemployment is con-

siderable," the department asserts on the basis of its free employment service. Corn-husking machinery caused an unusually light demand for farm labor during the month. With road work also slacker the department says that "a large volume of common labor is idle, presenting a serious unemployment problem in practically every large city of the state."

The average weekly earnings of male workers in all Illinois industries were \$32.21 in November. Females earned \$18.94 a week on the average. In manufacturing the average was over a dollar lower, being \$31.14 for males and \$17.08 for female workers.

If a man were employed 50 weeks a year in Illinois this would give him \$1,610.50 at the average rate, which is far below even the government's minimum decency standard as worked out by the U. S. bureau of labor statistics.

Mummery in Labor Unions

Very few workers are conscious of the destructive influence of secret and ritualistic work in their union meetings. The altar, with its open bible in the center of the lodge room, the chaplain with his reading of the prayer at the opening and closing, the juggling of pass words, signs and counter-signs, creates a stifling and depressing atmosphere of solemn mummery in workers' meetings. This is especially true in the division and lodge rooms of the Railroad Brotherhoods, where ritualistic mummery is practiced under the influence and support of the official bureaucrats who figure that it is a harmless way to spend their time when together. The officials know that as long as they can induce and compel the workers to practice these useless ceremonies at their meetings, it will naturally help to keep their minds and attention away from more serious and important problems, such as organization, amalgamation, labor party instead of labor lobby, repeal of gag laws and lowering of official salaries, etc.

Bosses are Wiser

What would be thought of corporation officials if they would open their meetings with altar, prayer, ritual, pass word, grips, signs and countersigns as the workers do in the Railroad Brotherhoods and many other labor organizations? It would be thought that they were crazy, wouldn't it?

Our useless and overpaid craft officials are also anxious to keep so many gag laws in our labor constitutions as they can, so as to stifle every impulse towards change that may place their fat meal ticket in jeopardy. Section 84, page 73, of the constitution of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers is a typical example of the kind of gag laws that are considered most precious by the labor fakers. This law forbids every member and local union in the B. of L. E. from printing anything concerning the Brotherhood or its leadership. Think of such ignorance enforced on the workers. It is this gag law which now protects the B. of L. E. officials from the wrath of the membership. It is section 84 that protects the officials in their game of robbing the membership by levying five dollar monthly assessments on the members without being compelled to render a definite account of the proceeds.

Lengthy obligations, incorporated in the rituals, administered to applications for membership, also contain a lot of gag rules which are practically hidden from the rank and file.

Militant Twice Expelled

The writer of this article has on two different occasions seen these gag laws in practical operation by the B. of L. E. bureaucrats and their henchmen in the ranks. In 1919, Grand Chief Warren S. Stone used Section 84 in ordering me expelled from Division 369 of the B. of L. E. because I published two articles on amalgamation which he refused to publish in the B. of L. E. Journal. Ten years later, in 1929, I was again expelled by Stone's successor in office, Alvanley Johnston, aided by his tools in Division 369, for spreading literature pointing out the injustice of the five dollar special assessment without the rendition of a definite account to the membership as to where the proceeds of this special assessment are going and why we are paying it. This time the obligation was brought into play as I had not violated Section 84. The obligation not only forbids the printing of literature but also forbids the giving out of literature pertaining to the Brotherhood. Thus, gag rule in the B. of L. E. is complete.

A systematic and organized fight must be carried on by the militant section of the labor movement against these gag laws. Raise these questions at your local and union meetings and at conventions. Send in amendments to the constitution calling for the repeal of gag laws like Section 84 and the abolition of obligations and secret work. Obligations and gag laws are always used by useless and crooked officials to protect themselves against the intelligence of the masses while in office. They never operate against the official bureaucrats. The B. of L. E. situation shows this plainly.

Obligations, gag laws and secret mummery belong in the garbage can, not in workers' meetings.

—C. R. HEDLUND

YOUNG VANGUARD

- - A Section Devoted to Problems of the Working Class Youth - -

The Last Plenary Session of the Y. C. I.

Note: The author of this article is a member of the Young Communist League in New York, whose name cannot of course be revealed. At the time of our expulsion from the Party, he voted with the majority of the Party and League. Recently, he has written to us after a thorough study of the question, he has decided to support the Communist League (Opposition) working as much as possible inside the Y. C. L. and Party for our viewpoint. The course of comrade R. is only a sign of a steady movement inside the official Party in our direction.—Ed.

A most remarkable document, indicative of the trend of development in the Communist movement, and therefore deserving of the close study of every sincere Communist, is the theses adopted at the last enlarged Plenum of the Young Communist International (Daily Worker, 1-14 and 15-30). If the members of the Y. C. L. would give some deep thought to these theses many of them would see in the depths of the Communist stream much that they fail to see on the surface. It would enable them to begin the process of breaking through the thick shell of deception in which they have been steadily encased. They might then observe in the face of the Party, lines and features of a strange and peculiar nature—lines that run crooked, features that reveal sharp distortions.

The theses speak of "the unsatisfactory situation in the sections of the Y. C. I. which in some countries takes on a form of a crisis". The theses state that "there was to be observed during the past year an exceedingly dangerous lagging behind in the tempo of work of the Y. C. I. compared with the general tempo of revolutionary development". We are informed that there has been an average decrease of 20% in the number of members and factory nuclei in most countries and an even sharper decrease in some countries ("serious political and organizational crisis" in Czechoslovakia, England, Norway, Austria). We are made to understand that the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the Y. C. I. have suffered the fate of merely remaining decisions.

The Cause For The Situation — The Situation

What is the cause of this deplorable situation? "The main reason for the unsatisfactory situation in the Y. C. I. should be sought in the sectarian isolation and separation from the basic mass of the working class youth which dominates in the organizations of the Y. C. I." Can this be the reason? It must be plain to every intelligent Communist that what is stated here as a reason is no reason at all, but only the consequence of a wrong line. They have substituted the results of an ultra-Leftist policy for the cause. This is standing matters on their head. Why don't they explain the reason which has led to this sectarian isolation, and not tell us that there is an unsatisfactory situation and the reason for this is sectarian isolation?

The whole situation as described in the theses must lead every Communist to serious thought. And a series of questions must loom up in his mind:

How does it happen that the sections of the Y.C.I. reveal such a stubborn inability to adapt themselves to the "general tempo of revolutionary development"? Why is it that the sections are lagging behind, continue to lag behind and still lag behind? How does it come that this lagging behind has become such a universal phenomenon? Does this not lead one to believe that the roots reach deeper than is apparent to the eye? Is there not reason to believe that the cause of this crisis is not merely that there is no will, no determination on the part of the Leagues to accomplish their tasks in accordance with the necessities of the situation, but that there is something politically unsound at the bottom of the structure? The theses tell us that we lag behind. But what does it propose? It says: we must not lag behind. It tells us that the situation is unsatisfactory. What must be done? More of this kind of work and more of that kind of work must be done!

How does it happen that the Y. C. L.s

show such a sterility that they cannot create the forces to conquer their shortcomings and assure their growth?

What kind of a situation have we reached when leaders of the Leagues must be threatened like two-year olds to carry out their Communist duties? "The enlarged Plenum of the E. C. makes it mandatory for all Leagues to create in the immediate future strong working factory nuclei in the large enterprises employing many young workers. The failure to carry this out must bring with it a change in the composition of the leading organs of the League". Does this not resemble the last, strained efforts of people who feel helpless before a hopeless situation? And should this not put a spur to every Communist to start thinking seriously, and to stop shouting in chorus: "Trotskyist renegades"?

Confusion on Right and Left Danger

The theses speak of the Right danger. Then they go on to say: "Along with this danger there is also the so-called 'Left danger', namely: a tendency towards petty bourgeois radicalism leading to the divorce of the leadership from the masses and the mass organizations, its transformation into narrow groups of 'Left' phrasemongers." Then it goes on to say that this danger is either not seen or underestimated, "that they do not want to or are unable to carry on the struggle against it". Why is this so? Why cannot the Left danger be seen and fought against? The answer is: for the same reason that Lovestone saw the Right danger in "Trotskyism". He himself was the most typical and consistent representative of the Right danger in America. The enlarged Plenum looks into the

The Disruption of the Canadian Youth League

It is now one year since the first group of young Communist League Members in Canada challenged the arbitrary methods of forcing decisions down the throats of the membership. Since that time the leadership following out with servile obedience instructions from the Young Communist International, have plunged the league from one crisis into another till today the Canadian League is fighting for its very existence. The Y. C. L. membership continues to shrink; its influence wanes with dangerous rapidity; the Young Worker as a bi-weekly comes out at rarer intervals than when it was supposed to be published once a month. It is time the members of the Y. C. L. began seriously considering the reasons for the failure and degeneration of the League in Canada and also the Young Communist International.

Responsibilities With Y. C. I.

Basically responsible for this condition, of course has been the failure of the leadership of the Young Communist International and the Comintern on an international scale which undermined the revolutionary movement throughout the world, and contributed to the revival and growth of the socialist Reformism. Until the first fight inside the Y. C. L. about six months previous to our expulsion, a more homogeneous organization could have hardly been imagined or found in the Y. C. I. The progress of the League was good. We were able to strengthen the National Executive, organize sport units and form a National Workers Sports Association, increase the membership, and take on more activity in the trade unions and on the cultural field.

In spite of these redeeming features, the ideological level of the membership remained very low. Factional fights were practically unknown, and so far as political differences there hardly seemed to be any. The expulsion of comrade Spector on the issue of "Trotskyism" came like a bolt from the blue. The opposition squabbles of the American Party had been always regarded with disdain and cynicism. The fight inside the Comintern, the Anglo-Russian Committee, the Chinese Revolution, the differences inside the Russian Party, didn't directly bother anybody and were never discussed.

The issue inside the Y. C. L. had arisen from the insistence of the Toronto membership to criticize the N. E. C., and, while it led to the expulsion of 77 active members, had been confined solely to Toronto. There

mirror and cannot see who is reflected there.

Many comrades will see in the theses the virtue of fearless self-criticism. But this in itself can lead us nowhere. Self-criticism which is not subordinated to Leninist political analysis is meaningless. It would be like the doctor who has the "courage" to inform you that you are suffering from a curable disease without telling you how to take measures to remedy it. The theses have the "courage" to inform us of an unsatisfactory condition in the Y. C. I., but they can give no political analysis for the basis of this situation, and can only propose artificial measures for the elimination of this situation.

What stage of political paralysis and stagnation has been reached in the Y. C. I. can be clearly seen from the methods by which the leaders hope to uncover the cause of the crisis. They are going to make an investigation in the Czechoslovakian, British, Norwegian and Austrian Leagues! Doesn't this show complete political impotence? Not to be able to analyze the political factors which are the cause of the unsatisfactory situation but to make an investigation as if trying to detect some technical irregularity! Yes, they have arrived at a blind alley, and do not know how to retrace their steps. The seeds of the struggle against "Trotskyism" have ripened into a pernicious plant.

It is plain. The poisonous opportunist course of the last six years could result in nothing but political demoralization. The road of bureaucracy, forgery and falsification, mockery of self-criticism, elimination of inner-party democracy, expulsion and exile of the Leninist vanguard could lead only to confusion, bankruptcy and disintegration. No number of revolutionary phrases about the brave young Communists can help. The brave young Communists can find a solution only beneath the banner of the Bolshevik-Leninists. Along this path they will find their way, even if at the present moment its direction is not yet clear to them. The course of events is bound to illuminate the road.—R.

had been no political principle at stake. The ideological reign of terror and provocations to which the expelled were treated, had, unfortunately, been a lesson only to the Toronto membership.

The Hypocrisy of the Stalinists

In the narrow development of the Canadian League, it is not at all surprising that the leadership was so easily able to force the bogeyman of "Trotskyism" down the throats of the membership. Instead of trying to raise the political consciousness of the rank and file, who were crying for discussion, the leadership demanded under threat of expulsion machine-like obedience. Those who protested were expelled. The leadership, playing on the ignorance of the League was able to defeat and deaden the fighting spirit of the membership. For the Smiths and the Bucks to come out now and blame the League and Party rank and file for passivity and disinterestedness in the fate of movement is sheer hypocrisy. They themselves are responsible. The League and Party membership repeatedly demanded discussion on the issues that were splitting the world Communist movement.

The cutting off of the Opposition has not strengthened the Y. C. L., as the leadership promised it would. On the contrary it has drained and continues to drain blood. It has opened up the organization to the attack of Police Chief Draper, which has ended in a miserable fiasco for the League and Party. Today the Party is not even able to organize an election campaign in Toronto, units don't meet, complete demoralization exists. The League has false policies due to the wrong estimation of the world situation. The Workers Sports of Canada has been completely wrecked due to the ridiculous irresponsible tactics.

In the trade unions the influence of the Y. C. L. has completely disappeared because of the adventurous Leftism of the leadership. The Socialist Youth Organizations, which had repeatedly met with failure in trying to organize the youth, has since our expulsion been successful in forming an Arbeiter Ring Club and a National Workers Alliance. In the Palestine affair, many former League sympathizers marched together with the Zionists and are today coming more under their influence. The main activity of the once leading Toronto League has been reduced to monthly social gatherings.

The answer to the question of what now is to be done is therefore more than ur-

The Curse of Mining Accidents

TAYLORVILLE, Ill.—Since the strike of December 9, after the underground wage slaves had been driven back to work by the united and unscrupulous forces of the Farrington-Fishwick gang, the Peabody Coal Co. officials, the tin soldiers of Governor Emmerson, the sheriffs and gunmen and the whole of the yellow press, two deaths by electrocution in the mines, several semi-serious and almost fatal accidents in which miners had their spinal columns fractured, have occurred.

Speed-up Causes Accidents

Let us see what is the cause of all this slaughter of the miners underground. The answer that any experienced miner will give is: the speed-up system, the arrogant handling of the men by the infernal officials and their lickspittles of the Peabody system, in conjunction with the Fishwick-Haywood officials of the company controlled union, the United Mine Workers.

The union double-crossers and the Peabody Simon Legrees know that thousands of miners are tramping the streets in search of work, and that those at work, who get only a scanty wage, fear to open their mouth to protest against the inhuman and brutal conditions and handling of the miners, for that would mean the loss of their jobs which is equivalent to a death sentence to many of them, as well as for their wives and children. If it is not direct death it is at least a slow death by starvation, since the jails and poorhouses are already overcrowded.

Now let us see the additional causes for accidents. In my experience, I have come in contact with men who have passed their examination before the Board of the State of Illinois, appointed by the Governor that did not know the rudiments of third grade arithmetic. Some of them had no or little practical experience in the mines. But they had a pull with the bosses who know that this ilk of numbskulls make good slave drivers. They generally pass the examination (we have some that can't even read or write) and then are turned loose to look after the miners' safety. Such violation of even the state mining laws and misconduct of coal company officials is general and rampant all over the Peabody system.

U. M. W. Officials Delinquent

The officials of the U. M. W. generally stand idly by and apparently don't care how many violations of the mining laws the coal companies commit, or how many deaths and accidents occur. They only watch the check-off system. So long as they can draw their fat salaries and hug and squeeze the fat lady, Miss Cellaneous Expenses, they are deaf and dumb to anything pertaining to the welfare of the hands that feed them.

The National Miners Union intends and strives to do away with this disgraceful and deplorable condition. But it has a tremendous front aligned against it, running from the officialdom of the old union to the state soldiers.

So the miners continue to be plucked and degraded with the aid of the invisible whips, Hunger and Starvation. The miners must wake up to the fact that the U.M.W.A. officials only want their dues and assessments to spend, as they are doing now, for court proceedings where they fight for the remnants of the loot that remains in the U. M. W. The U. M. W. treasury is virtually depleted, even the sick and death benefit fund is almost gone. The miners have nothing left to lose now, except bad mining conditions, but they have a new world to gain. A united battle by them, with the spirit of the old days of 1894 to 1898, when it was necessary to organize miners secretly, will win the miners their victory.

—FRITZ BODE, Sr.

gent. It is not yet too late to save the Y.C.L. if the rank and file begin immediate agitation for—

1. Reinstatement of all the expelled with full rights and positions held prior to the expulsion.

2. Down the arbitrary methods of the suppression of league discussion.

3. The full discussion of the platform of the Russian Opposition.

M QUARTER

The New Industrial Unions

The Mass Organizations of the Workers or Narrow Party Sects?

By Arne Swaback

The new industrial unions organized under Communist Party leadership, have in the short period of their existence in several instances succeeded in inspiring workers to militancy; they have thrown fear into the hearts of the exploiters. But they also have shown serious failures caused by basically wrong policies.

The efforts to organize new unions in the unorganized industries remain as necessary and as correct as ever. But since the new line of the "third period" these efforts have become caricatures of what they should be, mainly through the basically wrong conception of "revolutionary unions", from which so many other mistakes flow. If this were merely a matter of grandiloquent phraseology with which this period is "enriching" itself, it might possibly be ignored. But unfortunately it has become an actual conception. The results of this can only be that the splendid opportunities available for organization become entirely neglected; the working masses, growing more ready for struggle, become alienated from these unions and the unions themselves will come to occupy a position of narrow sects, isolating the Left wing from the working masses.

Revolutionizing the Unions

Unions become revolutionary in revolutionary periods, and in general, when, having a mass basis, they reflect the degree of development of the workers. When separated in exclusive crafts of skill trades they naturally lag behind this development; but even the most backward ones can in such periods be pushed forward, though they usually remain several steps behind the working class. It is the duty of Communists to help and to guide this process of revolutionizing the unions. It will certainly require the most persistent, devoted activities and struggle of the revolutionists to organize new unions in the unorganized industries, but the false conception of "revolutionary unions" in the United States at the present degree of development of the working class, when even a revolutionary party does not yet exist as a mass factor, if continued, completely annihilates the necessary mass basis of the unions. This is what is happening now, made yet worse by extremely adventurist, Leftist enterprises, maneuvering without any regard for responsibility to the working class.

As a natural consequence of this essentially wrong conception, the Party appears in the role of exercising complete mechanical control over these unions. It prevents the development of a leadership coming from out of the ranks of the workers—a leadership which could stand on its own feet and gain the confidence of the membership. Selection of leadership thus becomes arbitrary, based exclusively upon the prerequisite of ability merely to accept orders and such leaders usually have the least experience. Independent views, in general conformity with the Left wing program of the unions, are not even tolerated. Communists and Left wingers who disagree with Party bureaucrats are arbitrarily removed from office and barred from participation in the work. These digressions are quite inevitable when mechanical control becomes substituted for the correct method of establishing Communist influence. Mechanical control has nothing in common with Communist leadership and the results cannot be without effect upon the union membership who see in it only a repetition of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy. It destroys the confidence of the workers in the unions, narrows its leadership basis and separates the Party ever more from many valuable experienced elements. This in turn becomes one of the important reasons for many mistakes in policy.

The Third C. I. Congress on Trade Unions

The correct relationship of the Communist Party toward the unions could not be more explicitly stated than in the theses of the Third Congress of the Communist International, then still under the leadership of comrades Lenin and Trotsky:

"To increase the union of the Party with the masses means above all a closer alliance with the workers' organizations. The task does not at all consist in mechanically and outwardly subjecting the unions to the Party and thereby denying them the autonomy required by the very nature of their work, but in the revolutionary, Communist elements within the unions

giving them that direction which answers the general interests of the proletariat in its struggle for the conquest of power." (Emphasis in original.)

And further, under the heading "The Tasks of Our Parties":

"The real test of the strength of every Communist Party is the actual influence it has on the workers in the labor unions. The Party must learn how to influence the unions without attempting to keep them in leading strings. Only the Communist fraction of the union is subject to the control of the party, not the labor union as a whole. If the Communist fractions persevere, if their activity is devoted and intelligent, the party will reach a position where its advice will be accepted gladly and readily by the unions."

The establishment of the "revolutionary trade union center", the T. U. U. L. could have become an important factor in strengthening Left wing influence. The organization of a center for Left wing activity and groups is not only correct but a pressing necessity. Its basic conception, however leads it in the opposite direction. The conception of a center in the sense of a new federation at the present time, naturally means a head on clash with the old unions for the control of the workers, coming long before the Left wing has succeeded in establishing and extending its influence.

New Unions Everywhere?

From that follows competition for building of unions all along the line also in organized or partly organized industries. The fight of the Left wing becomes one not against the reactionary leadership of the existing unions but against the unions as such, and certainly it can appear in no other way to the workers. Where some Left wing elements are still within the old unions they split off—as the whole policy is a split policy—and completely withdraw all Left wing activities from the A. F. of L. and kindred unions. It is a split policy, not applied when it is necessitated by developments, but resulting in the "revolutionary center" getting the small fraction outside isolated from the mass section of organized workers while the reactionary bureaucrats, who are an integral part of the capitalist structure are enabled to solidify their influence over these masses.

One of the most recent examples of this development is the creation of a couple of small unions in New York with big pretensions to an industrial form and affiliated to the T. U. U. L., appearing as split off sections: the new Subway Workers Union and the new Building Service Union. Their course will be one of so many of its small split-off predecessors. They will lead a sectarian existence until they disappear, unless they grow sufficiently conservative to again become part of the organizations from which they split. In industries where the existing unions are more firmly established the result will just be much more fatal because such policy has nothing in common with the conquest of the majority of the working class by the Communists.

Of the new industrial unions none has escaped suffering under these wrong conceptions and wrong policies. The Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union is but a fraction of the once powerful Left wing influence among these workers. The National Textile Workers union is now facing a decline in the South despite the favorable objective conditions. In both instances may be noted the failures of the Left—which means the Communist Party—to attempt to develop united front actions with the workers in A. F. of L. unions. It might be objected that reactionaries oppose it, that they betray the workers or lead them in fake strikes, etc. These are not valid objections. The workers in both industries suffer intolerable conditions, they have been engaged in struggles which would give the Left wing the opportunity through efforts for united action to broaden their contact with the masses, better expose the betrayers, turn the demands of the struggles into more genuine accord with the interests of the workers and give them more political and revolutionary content. The growth of the National Miners Union has certainly suffered from the mechanical maneuvers. The recent experience of

wrong policies preceding and during the Illinois strike is already making its effects felt more deeply.

Every mistake made strengthens the position of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy. But these mistakes are typical of the Centrist leadership as directed throughout the International by the Stalin regime. They zig-zag from Right to Left, from unity with the betrayers of the British general strike to extreme leftists chatterings, which in reality isolate and weaken the Left wing in the labor movement. It should be remembered that at the time we introduced the correct conception in to the Communist Party of organizing the unorganized industries, Foster joined with the Lovestone group in opposition. Ever since then the Centrist Party leadership has been feeding and strengthening the Right wing Lovestone group by giving it apparent justification for much of their criticism.

The Responsibility of the Right Wing

The Right wing in turn carries heavy responsibility for the present Leftist rantings and irresponsible mechanical maneuvering with workers interests. When in control of the Party, it proved itself master of such maneuvering. It consistently opposed the conception of organization of the unorganized into new unions. Now it is trying to take up our criticisms as a cover for the introduction of its own tendency toward social reformism into the labor movement.

The present epoch is the epoch of capitalist decay and proletarian revolution. It is now further accentuated by the present advancing industrial depression. If it teaches Communists anything in winning through the unions an influence over the majority of the working class, it teaches that the new industrial unions must have a mass basis and that the policies must be shaped so as to accomplish this. One necessary part of this is the correct coordination of the Left wing within the unions with the Left wing and opposition movements within the A. F. of L. There can be no disputing the necessity of taking up in earnest the work of building a revolutionary ideology and understanding within the existing mass organizations and giving it organized expression. We must also accept the duty of organizing workers into these mass organizations where they exist and stop the senseless split off of small sections.

The advancing period of depression poses many serious questions to the Communist movement; but especially does it pose the one of correctly applying the united front policy in such a manner as to bring the largest sections of both the old unions and the new unions into united struggle for their class interests. Once that is learned, a big step will have been taken toward extending Communist influence among the American workers.

Where to Buy The Militant

LOS ANGELES, Calif.: Belmont News Co., 101 East 5th St.; Western News Stand, Box 604, Arcade Station.
SAN FRANCISCO, Calif. McDonald's 65 Sixth St.
WASHINGTON, D. C. Gale's Book Shop 300 Tenth St. N. W.
PITTSBURG, Pa.: P & A News Co., 220 Federal St., N. S.
CHICAGO, ILL.: Cheshinsky's Book Store, 2720 W. Division St.; Horsley's Book Store, 1623 W. Madison St.; and on various newsstands.
SPRINGFIELD, ILL.: Joe Angelo, 431 No. We.ley St.
BOSTON, Mass.: Shapiro's, 7 Beach St. near Washington.; Andelman's, 291 Tremont St., Newsstand, 38 Causeway St.
DETROIT, MICH.: Aldas Book Shop, 1713-24th St.; and on various newsstands.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.: Engelson News Co., 234-2nd Ave. So.
KANSAS CITY, MO.: Buehler's Book Store, 220 West 12th St.
ST. LOUIS, MO.: Foster's Book Store, 410 Washington Ave.
PHILADELPHIA, Pa.: Newsstands at 5th & Market; 11th & Market; 13th & Market; Market between 19th; 9th & Locust; Warwick's News Depot, 262 So. 11th St.
BUTTE, Mont.: International News, 121 So. Arizona.
SEATTLE, WASH.: Raymer's Old Book Store, 905 Third Ave.
TACOMA, Wash.: Raymer's 1317 Pacific St. St.
TORONTO, ONT., CANADA: On various newsstands.
NEW YORK, N. Y.: On various newsstands in New York and Brooklyn; Biederman Bookstore, 2d Ave and 12th St.; Rand Bookstore, 7 East 15th St.; The Militant, 25 Third Ave

Cleveland Labor News

By John Foley

CLEVELAND—The garment workers strike has been settled with a weak compromise, accepting the 42-hour week as against the 44-hour week they were working. They struck for the 40-hour week and as fine a display of solidarity of workers as ever existed was manifested in this struggle. The union shops came out to the man, and about 700 from the non-union shops are still trying to get recognition from the American Plan Shops, this city being the national headquarters of the American Plan Association.

As a spectator at the Garment Workers Union convention a couple of months back at the Public Auditorium, listening to resolutions calling for Bronze Convention Badges being turned into Gold Badges for spineless officers, I don't think that the American Plan Association will have much trouble defeating this jellyfish of the old International Ladies Garment Workers Union that once affiliated with the International Federation of Trade Unions of Amsterdam-Second International fame. But I don't think it makes much difference whether they are sold by International Ladies Garment Workers Union or driven by the American Plan Association.

In regards to the trial of 11 demonstrators arrested in the City Council on December 2nd the case was nolleed on account of capitalist hoodlums trying to get rid of the city manager in Cleveland. At the last two meetings of City Council, they turned this dignified, august sanctuary of priests into a bedlam, according to the daily murder sheets, into scenes similar to the French Revolution. The judge admonished the group of laughing Communists and said he had a sense of humor and would not allow them to martyr themselves in his court.

I wonder if the bourgeois judges think that breaking into jail is martyrdom. Their rotten system of starvation and eviction is the cause and jail is the only home the worker has got under capitalist production.

I had the American Civil Liberties Union defend me, the other ten the I. L. D. Because I employed the American Civil Liberties Union the I. L. D. sent me a letter that my bond would be withdrawn the next day! It seems that the worker that went my bond had more spirit of solidarity in the workers movement than the secretary of the I. L. D. in District 6 and refused to withdraw it. I suppose he will be disciplined for this breach of Stalinist Communism.

I travelled the slave market today looking over the situation. I find in Cleveland about one hundred unemployed for every single job that shows up.

On January 17, 1930, at three p. m. we held a meeting on Public Square. It was very cold but a couple of hundred unemployed stood in the cold to listen to speakers. One wobbly whom the workers have respect for, has been co-operating with the International Brotherhood Welfare Association, the Communist Leaguers, the Anarchists, the emergency program of the Industrial Workers of the World and the official Industrial Workers of the World members all responded to the call of organizing the unemployed and unorganized workers. I spoke at the first meeting and explained that these organizations represented flows of social forces in society and they all called for the class war, and we could all fight the common enemy together, use the movement for recruiting grounds for members, as no organization has a monopoly on unemployed and misery, and use the movement also as a training ground for dynamic rebels.

But of course, you know we have the remnants of Lovestoneism and Amerism and the hero-worshippers yet in Cleveland, although we have a new district organizer, Anthony Simba, and a Trade Union Unity League secretary, Douglas. They may or may not be responsible, but due to mechanical control and suppression of unemployed expression. All these elements mentioned above withdrew their cooperation. The burlesque tactics of artists and bourgeois-trained youth looking for careers and ego expression hung the crepe on the movement as far as real spirit is concerned. We have had the finest type of fighting spirit, the most dynamic individuals of past class battles all working together here. When these fellow-workers start organizational work, the comrades of Stalin fame become so jealous that they try to lightning-rod and smother the work