

The

MILITANT

Semi-Monthly Organ of the
Communist League of America
(Opposition)

VOL. II. — No. 17.

NEW YORK, N. Y. NOVEMBER 1, 1929

PRICE 5 CENTS

12 YEARS OF RED RUSSIA!

THE greatest achievement of the proletariat of the world is the victory of the Bolshevik Revolution and the Soviet Republic established by the Russian workers in November 1917. With a spirit of solidarity, firmness and self-sacrifice that history has never before known, the Russian working class has maintained itself in power for twelve years, and its 12th anniversary this Seventh of November will be celebrated by every militant worker in the world. Twelve years—in which the surrounded fortress of the world revolution has successively overcome one "insurmountable" obstacle after another, beaten back the armies of the most powerful imperialist countries, defeated the subsidized adventurers who tore the country with the ravages of civil war, triumphed over such catastrophes of nature as the famine and the drought, reorganized its economic life, and made possible the rebirth and growth of the international movement of the revolutionary working class that was temporarily destroyed by the treason of the socialist leaders during the World

The seizure and maintenance of power by the Russian workers remain the most powerful answer to the lying spokesmen of the capitalist class who teach the workers that capitalism is a permanent system of society and that the workers can never hope to rule their own destinies. The victory of the Bolsheviks in the face of all the dismal croakings and warnings of their enemies, is a living refutation of the predictions of defeat made by the socialists of all varieties, an answer to those who deceive the workers into thinking that capitalism will "evolve peacefully" into the cooperative movement commonwealth through the application of petty reforms.

While the Russian working class, in spite of all the difficulties and mistakes, continues to march forward, and is today more firmly entrenched power than in the beginning of the revolution, the balance sheet of the socialist record shows a big deficit for the working class. In Germany, the socialist-coalition ministry has become the official agency for reborn German imperialism. In England, the MacDonald government has not brought the British worker a single step closer to socialism or lifted an ounce of the imperialist burden from the backs of England's colonial slaves. In Austria, the "Left" socialists, who scorned the "barbaric Asiatic" methods of Bolshevism and promised the workers a socialist republic by the "reasonable"

method of voting capitalism out of existence, are paralyzed before the threat of an increasingly arrogant and determined Fascist movement.

Where the social democracy has universally failed, the Russian workers, under Bolshevik leadership, have succeeded in establishing the first Workers' State.

But the Russian victory only opened a new epoch of revolution and did not end it. The workers of the Soviet Union will be able to establish socialism and complete victory ONLY with the aid of the victory of the workers in other countries. The Soviet power cannot always exist in a hostile capitalist environment. It can hold out for a long time, as it has, but its really great progress will come only when the workers of more highly developed countries come to its aid. Those who, like Bucharin and Stalin, teach the workers otherwise are deceiving them.

The victory of the Russian proletariat, has not proceeded in a straight upward direction. It is still confronted with many enemies. Its most powerful foe is world imperialism, which rightly sees in the Soviet power its mortal enemy. Imperialism threatens the workers' republic not only with armed intervention from the outside, but even more with the capitalist elements inside Russia that work persistently to undermine the proletarian state. These elements are the Kulak (rich peasant), the private capitalist and the

corrupted sections of the Soviet bureaucracy, linked by a thousand invisible bonds to their foreign allies. These are the elements that express themselves politically through the Right wing of the Russian Communist Party, the faction of Bucharin-Tomsky, Rykov-Kalinin and their supporters.

The Right wing, in close bond with the vacillating Centrist faction of Stalin, has carried on a six years' struggle against the Bolshevik Opposition led by Trotsky which represents the interests of the proletarian elements in the country. It is the Bloc of the Center and the Right that invented the slogans and theories for that period of reaction and back-sliding in the Soviet Union. It was the pressure of the classes alien to the proletariat that delivered systematic, heavy blows to the workers' power by attacking the Opposition. Each blow against the Opposition and the movement for which it stood marked another forward step of the forces of capitalism.

But they all underestimated the tremendous resources for revolutionary resistance still possessed by the Russian proletariat. The hounding imprisonment and exile of the Opposition, did not settle the question at all. The stubborn resistance of the Opposition to the encroachments of the forces hostile to the workers, found an echo in the Russian proletariat.

The workers, passive for years under the lulling influence of Stalin and Bucharin, are again awakening and assuming the offensive. The present struggle—demanded for years by the Opposition—against the Kulak and the Right wing for concentration upon heavy industry and for the industrialization of agriculture, is a victory for the Leninist Opposition. It is carried on with slogans and arguments which the workers forced Stalin to borrow from the Opposition.

It is true that Stalin seeks to restrain this struggle, to prevent its transformation from a bureaucratic, apparatus fight into a movement of the masses. It is true that in borrowing bits from the Opposition, he continues to distort and water down its essential ideas in theory and application. That is because he represents the Centrist bureaucracy. For a consistent line, the victory of the Opposition is required.

The Russian workers will attain that victory too. They still possess enormous powers of resistance. They remain the inspiration of labor.

Class Justice and Revenge in the South

The seven Gastonia strike leaders, Beal, Miller, Harrison, McGinnis, Hendrix, Carter and McLaughlin, have been convicted and sentenced in Charlotte, N. C. to such terms as signify for most of them their whole future life in a Southern prison. At virtually the same time, a Cabarrus county jury set free four mill boss thugs who were charged with kidnapping and flogging the three union militants, Wells, Saylor and Lell. In Gastonia, the grand jury refused even to find a true bill against the men charged with the cold-blooded murder of Ella May Wiggins. At Marion, the legalized thugs of the mill owners, led by sheriff Adkins, are still at large, despite their massacre of six textile workers and the wounding of many more.

The young capitalist class of the South has shown itself not one whit different from its brother of the North. The decisions of the various courts have given legal approval to the murder, the shooting, the kidnapping, the flogging and the armed raiding of the workers. It has been made plain that even the most ruthless acts of violence against them can be committed without fear of punishment. It has also been made clear that every worker, Communist or not, who dares to fight for the improvement of his conditions, is subject to the frame-up, to a vicious sentence of imprisonment, and even the electric chair.

The farcical trial of the Gastonia workers was conducted by the darling of the liberals, the much-praised "exemplary" Judge Barnhill. We pointed out that the "fairness" of Barnhill was only a cloak under which he was preparing to repeat the cruel game of Judge Landis in the trial of the I. W. I. We warned especially against the illusions fostered by Norman Thomas when he wrote: "Hats off to Judge Barnhill for his remarkable fairness thus far to the Gastonia defendants. At least North Carolina is to be spared the disgrace of a Webster Thayer." It was this remarkably fair judge who ruled: "If he is a Communist, he should

not demand to be tried as a loyal citizen of the U. S."

The seven men were framed up! Not a scintilla of evidence was produced during the whole trial to show that a single one of them had shot at Aderholt. The whole trial proved that these men were convicted solely because they were fighting for the workers and against the bosses, that the witnesses against them were already fixed, and that the predominantly farmers' jury would be true to its role.

We had no expectations of a "fair trial" and the release of the men from either Barnhill or his court. The only hope for the men was the formation of a mass movement throughout the country sufficiently broad and strong to prevent their being railroaded to the penitentiary. The mill bosses and their courts and juries were determined before the trial starts to convict the defendants. Only such a movement could have saved them. Such a movement was not organized to its full possibilities, and we say plainly that the responsibility rests not only upon the leaders of the official American labor movement, from whom nothing but sabotage could be expected, but in large part upon the sectarian policy of the present leaders of the Communist Party, who deliberately rejected the offers of aid of other groups of workers, and organized the movement on so narrow a basis that it could not express the widespread sentiment of the working masses in favor of the defendants.

It is not yet too late. The mill owners and their government are still subject to working class pressure. Our obligation to the men in prison is now greater than ever before. They must be set free. The warm, militant spirit of labor solidarity can force open the prison doors even now. This solidarity must be organized immediately, upon the widest foundation. The united front of labor must be established in reality and not on paper. Every working man, every labor organization—Unite to free the prisoners!

Next Number of the Paper Is the First Issue of the WEEKLY MILITANT

IN the face of tremendous difficulties, in spite of the Stalinists and the Right wing, who whistle songs in the dark about our "disintegration", we are achieving our goal. The next issue of the *Militant* will be the first issue of the *WEEKLY MILITANT*! The loyal group of pioneer fighters in the ranks of the Communist League have made it possible to transform the paper from a semi-monthly to a Weekly exactly one year after the first issue of the *Militant* was published. That is our answer to the bureaucrats who keep up their courage by announcing our "death" every two months.

We regret that the technical work involved in establishing suitable headquarters and making proper arrangement for the printing of the *Weekly Militant* will make it impossible to get out the first issue on the stipulated date of November 7th. But we have estimated definitely that it will be off the press on or about November 15th, 1929, and we appeal to all comrades to make the necessary arrangement for the widest possible distribution.

est possible distribution.

We have made the grade through the staunch spirit of our comrades and sympathizers. But the Weekly must not only be begun but also maintained. That is the big job before us. Our only source of support is the group of workers throughout the country who sympathize with our cause. Many of them have not yet been reached and they have not responded. It is the workers who must maintain the Weekly and guarantee its regular publication. It is they who can make it a weapon of struggle against the deceivers and betrayers of labor, for the regeneration and rebuilding of the revolutionary movement, for the victory of the proletariat.

The *WEEKLY MILITANT* will be able to analyze and report every event of importance to the working class. Besides the general political articles of a high standard which will be maintained, the *WEEKLY* will survey the field of the daily class struggle in the United States and report the outstanding happenings

of the week accurately. In addition to this, we have arranged to obtain regular articles and information from some of the best writers in the international movement and a standing section of the paper will be devoted to informing our readers of the important occurrences in world politics and labor.

We can publish the *Militant* regularly and improve it with each issue only with YOUR aid. We are raising a Sustaining Fund that will guarantee the appearance of the paper every week. Such a fund will establish a firm foundation under our feet. If you can give an outright donation of money, send it in immediately. If you can make a pledge to send in a sum of money each week or each month towards the Sustaining Fund, no matter how large or small the pledge may be, let us know right away. Send all funds and inquiries to

THE MILITANT
P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Sta.,
New York, N. Y.

The A. F. of L. Convention

By Maurice Spector

Of organized opposition there was an almost complete absence at this year's convention of the American Federation of Labor in Toronto. Neither the Left Wing nor the so-called Muste progressive group were in evidence. The internationally notorious hierarchy of "business unionism" reigned supreme and unchallenged from the floor. Yet the old hard-boiled arrogance of which Gompers was the incarnation, seemed noticeably shaken on occasion. As much as it would like to, the bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. can as little as Mussolini succeed in putting a stop to the class struggle. Fighting exploitation bravely and desperately, the awakening of the South at Gastonia, Marion and Elizabethton, became by virtue of their role the sort of opposition that could not easily be ignored, proclaiming more forcefully than a hundred resolutions, the bankruptcy of the bureaucrats.

This bankruptcy is becoming so flagrant and obvious that it begins to make the wiser heads of the American bourgeoisie feel uncomfortable. The Scripps-Howard press carried so pointed and well-informed an editorial attack on the A. F. of L. failure to function as a labor organization, that it made the officialdom wince, stinging that would-be statesman Green into public recrimination. The attitude of the liberal press is understandable. It regards "moderate" trade unionism as a safety-valve, a bulwark against revolutionary movement, a pillar of capitalist society. If the A. F. of L. ceases even to perform the duties of "moderate" trade unionism, and merely duplicates the activity of the National Civic Federation, or say, the American Legion, the Left Wing is given a clear field in which to proceed with the militant organization and leadership of the working class. The activities of the Communists in Passaic, New Bedford, and more recently in Gastonia have made a considerable impression on the more far-sighted circles of the possessing classes.

The liberal view was echoed on the floor of the convention by the "old-war horse" Furuseth and by Fitzpatrick of the Vaudeville Actors. Furuseth taunted the officialdom with having become soft and comfortable and made a veiled attack particularly on J. L. Lewis, for the latter's cowardly attitude in the 1919 strike when he refused to fight the federal injunction on the ground that "we cannot fight our government". In the interests of "the sound A. F. of L. philosophy" Fitzpatrick called for an injection of some of the spirit manifested by "the fanatical Communists who are willing to suffer, bleed and die for their unsound philosophy". He was also of the opinion that "our mission is not to found banks and life insurance companies, but to be the refuge of the desperate workers who have no other place to turn."

Under the lash of the Southern events, the bureaucracy had to conduct the necessary manoeuvres to save its face. The convention resolved to raise funds immediately from the international unions and to call a conference within thirty days to map out an organizing campaign into the southern states. Past experience teaches us to accept these gusty resolutions of the machine with a good deal of salt. Similar gestures were made in 1927 in connection with the Pittsburgh coal conference, and at divers times in connection with organizing campaigns in the automobile industry. Green and Company are not over-joyed at the militancy of the Southern workers. In the very midst of discussing the southern situation, Green raised his voice to warn them that "they must not lightly go on strike" expecting the A. F. of L. to pour millions in to help them.

The labor bureaucrats have no stomach for the class struggle. Their ideal is to "sell the trade union movement" (their phrase!) to the boss peacefully, as one businessman to another. Their hearts are in class-collaboration, in "union-management cooperation" in banks and in life insurance companies. They are seriously concerned not about fighting the injunction but in the graft of jurisdictional struggles. Their own security and salaries are first charges on the organization. Militant wage struggles or struggles for unionization disturb the even tenor of their lives and are as far as possible to be avoided. It is with real relief that they welcomed the turn in the needle trades situation that temporarily gives the Rights the upper hand and Schlesinger-Dubinsky were congratulated for having "wiped out the vestiges of Communism" among

the fur workers and garment workers. Incidentally it was broadly hinted that negotiations are under way for the admission of Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Sidney Hillman would fit in nowadays and could even teach the others a few tricks of his own about the scientific exploitation of the worker.

The bureaucrats were right in their element listening to Sir Henry Thornton of the Canadian National Railway deliver a eulogy of union-management cooperation of the B. and O. Plan. Sir Henry, whose salary has just been boosted to \$90,000 a year, had little difficulty in proving that "cooperation" was very satisfactory—for employers. It brought greater efficiency and higher production, of that there could be no doubt. He discreetly omitted to add that it brought no corresponding increases in pay, no improvement of conditions, or greater regularity of employment. As a matter of fact, just about the time Thornton was dilating on cooperation, more men were being laid off in the Canadian National Railway yards.

Fresh from his "good-will" conversations with Hoover, "fellow-workman" Ramsay MacDonald was another guest to the convention and treated it to a goodly modicum of his swollen and meaningless pacifist verbiage. He was hailed with delight. The A. F. of L. bureaucracy never fails to take its cue from the State Department. Momentarily, American imperialism finds it most advantageous to advance its interests under the guise of the Kellogg Pact, naval disarmament conferences, etc. Meanwhile the antagonism between British and American capital for the shrinking world market is growing and maturing the condition for another world war. In these circumstances, the organization of the working class for resistance to the war danger by exposing its roots in capitalism and imperialism, should be a major task of the trade union movement. Instead, Green and his fellow-bureaucrats play the pseudo-pacifist game of the American Government as they played its war game in the past and will assuredly re-enact the part of the "patriot" Gompers in the future. When Bodenheimer, commander of the American Legion fulfilled his share of the division of labor by appealing for support of greater preparedness, a bigger navy and universal conscription, Green gently chided him for being out of step which does not mean that he himself is not prepared to be as openly imperialist as Bodenhamer when the amenities next require it, say at the Plattsburg manoeuvres.

Comrade Rakovsky's Appeal - - Stalin's Reply

The capitulation of Radek, Preobrazhensky and Smilga has just provoked a decisive reply. Comrades Rakovsky, Kassior and Okudjava have written and circulated an appeal to the Opposition. It is a rather extensive document. It begins with an analysis of the situation in the present period and is then devoted, for the most part, to a severe and unreserved denunciation of the capitulators, Radek and Co.

The appeal has been the object of a profound discussion in the circles of the deported; it has played an important role in the consolidation of the forces of the Opposition. In spite of the difficulties that the Stalinist régime puts in the way of communication between the deported Oppositionists, it is already known that by August 20th more than a half a hundred of the colonies now made up of the "Siberians" have rallied to the appeal of Rakovsky. Among the first adhesions is cited that of Muralov.

Those of our comrades who are at present in the Tcheliabinsky solitary—there are over a hundred of them—declared themselves, with Sosnovsky at their head, unanimously in solidarity with the signatories to the appeal. On the other hand, a draft of a declaration by I. N. Smirnov who takes over, by mitigating them, certain portions of the shameful letter of Radek has been approved by only four colonies of the deported.

I. N. Smirnov has been unsteady for some time now. Gentle and conciliatory by temperament, he constantly strives to create buffer groups in the hope of avoiding any break. In the present situation his efforts are condemned to live in vain. Those who are in touch with him say that he gives the impression of a man bewildered.

The response made to Rakovsky's appeal shows that the repression, aggravated as it has become recently, will not succeed in shattering the Opposition. The press is even obliged to acknowledge tacitly that in spite of some loud capitulations, the Opposition is growing stronger. Thus was announced a few days ago the expulsion in Odessa of 23 members of the Party for "Trotskyism."

Do not allow yourself to be impressed by the clamor that is being made about the capitulations. If there are some who go away, the greater part remain loyal and they frequently receive the reinforcement of newcomers.—N. B. Moscow, September 1929.

Sooner after the receipt of this letter from Moscow, we were informed of the following subsequent developments:

The Stalinist repression did not delay very long. Rakovsky, who was at Saratov, was at first imprisoned and then shipped to Siberia, at Barnaoul, where other Oppositionists had preceded him. Barnaoul is located on the left bank of the Obi river, about 300 miles or so south of Tomsk.

Christian Rakovsky has again found, under the Stalinist régime, the life that was his before the Russian

No. A. F. of L. convention would be complete without jurisdictional squabbles of mutual charges of corruption. The feature this year was the set-to between Lewis and Fishwick of the Illinois district. Each accused the other of corruption. Fishwick sent a wire to the convention proposing that both Lewis' and his own books be submitted to an audit, to be followed by the resignation of whichever's books were discovered not to be straight. Fishwick could have made this confident offer less from any exuberant consciousness of his own integrity as from an overpowering certitude of Lewis' corruption. Needless to say, Fishwick's telegram was ignored.

The reactionary character of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy was well demonstrated in its advocacy of old-age pensions. Not that the adoption of this decision was in itself a backward step; on the contrary. But the fact that so elementary a reform of labor conditions, which exists in one manner or other in numerous countries, could be advocated only after so much sharp controversy and then hailed as a "revolutionary forward step" of the A. F. of L. leadership, speaks eloquently of the deep-seated nature of this leadership's backwardness.

There have been worse conventions of the A. F. of L. than this. It met under the sign of a growing mood of struggle among the workers, which had inevitably to be reflected in the temper of the convention. But the reflection of this mood in Toronto was a perverted one, a distortion, a caricature. Whole oceans separate the speeches of Green on the textile situation in the South and the sharp reality of the struggles there. When the bureaucrats take "one step forward" it is quite certain that the workers have already taken two or three or ten such steps, so that Green and Wolls continue to remain behind the spirit and actions of the workers, always pulling them backward. The failure or refusal to understand this role of the trade union bureaucracy will nurture the baseless illusions about their "regeneration" which have become current in certain "progressive" circles.

The sectarian policy of the Communists and Left Wing on the one hand, and the timidity of the new progressive movement resulted in a total absence of a single voice at the convention that could speak out in condemnation of the destruction wrought by the present leadership in the labor movement, of the ruination of its strongest unions, of the enormous set-backs in numerical strength and influence precisely in this period. It was open season for the bureaucrats of all shades, with no competition present. The work that has thus far been neglected by the Left wing must be begun in earnest.

revolution. Born in 1873, he is to be found successively, beginning with 1890, in all the countries of Europe and everywhere the story is ended in the same way; by expulsion. No country wants to have anything to do with this dangerous agitator. Both Rumania and Bulgaria demand the province where he was born, the Dobrudja, but neither wants Rakovsky. Even as Soviet ambassador to Paris, he was judged undesirable. Briand sent him back to Moscow, and a little while later Stalin deported him to Astrachan, then to Saratov and now to Barnaoul, after a short time in prison.

At the beginning of the war, when one of the French pillars of Stalinism today, Marcel Cachin, charged by the French government with a mission, brought money to Mussolini (who had been driven from *Avanti!*) so that he might found the jingoist *Popolo d'Italia*, Rakovsky wrote to Charles Dumas:

"We are and we remain partisans of the good old tactic of the class struggle and we repudiate with all our strength that of class collaboration. We Rumanian socialists wish to remain with revolutionary socialism which was, yesterday, the source of our strength, and we wish to continue in the future the struggle against the war and against opportunism."

Hounded under the Rumanian boyars, the French bourgeoisie, or the Stalinist bureaucracy, the life of Christian Rakovsky is an example of fidelity to socialism.

Our Russian Organ

The first three numbers of the BULLETIN OF THE OPPOSITION, published in the Russian language, have arrived in the United States. They contain the most important documents and writings of the leaders of the Russian Opposition, L. D. Trotsky, Rakovsky, Sosnovsky and many others, in addition to contributions by the Opposition leaders in various countries. Russian readers will want to get this important publication (40 pages). Many of the articles will not appear in the English language, in the *Militant*, for a while yet, and Russian readers therefore have an opportunity to become thoroughly acquainted with the program and writings of the leader of the Opposition, Leon Trotsky and others of the Leninist-Bolsheviks.

The third number (October issue) contains a lengthy brochure by L. D. Trotsky, entitled, THE DEFENSE OF THE SOVIET REPUBLIC AND THE OPPOSITION.

The magazine can be purchased through the MILITANT, Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y. at 25 cents per copy, bundle rates at 18 cents and subscriptions at \$2.00 per year.

MINNEAPOLIS MEETING

The Minneapolis Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) will hold a mass meeting in celebration of the 12th Year of the Anniversary of the Russian Bolshevik Revolution on Thursday November 7th, 1929 at the Labor Lyceum Hall No. 2. All workers are cordially invited.

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

Address all mail to: P. O. Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

Publisher address: 332 E. 18th Street, New York, N.Y.

Subscription rate: 1.00 per year. Foreign \$1.50
5c per copy Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Martin Abern, James P. Cannon, Max Shachtman,
Maurice Spector, Arne Swaback.

VOL. II NOVEMBER 1, 1929 No. 17.

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

What MacDonald 'Accomplished' Here

By Max Shachtman

"A tremendous contribution to the peace of the world." "A titanic blow for peace." "One of the greatest forward steps toward naval limitations that has been taken." "A practical step toward world peace, a long step toward sanity." There are the lyrical extravaganzas with which the American capitalist press greeted the visit of Ramsay MacDonald to Hoover. The reality of imperialist politics is far more prosaic than all this wordy blabber. The MacDonald-Hoover negotiations were not a step toward world peace, or toward world disarmament. They were one of the many preliminary peace-time skirmishes in which each side tried to make the best of its position in preparation for the war between the United and England which is already traced out for the future.

The alleged aims of the conversations were: The reduction of non-capital ships and the achievement of parity by 1936. Neither navy is to undertake the building of new units for the next seven years. The British fleet is to be conceded a certain small cruiser superiority for "policing and trade route protection" purposes which give it no actual combat superiority. Heavy reductions are to be made in both destroyer and submarine fleets, the United States to permit about 200,000 tons of destroyers to become obsolescent by 1936 and Britain about 75,000 bringing them down to virtual parity. A similar decimation is to take place for submarines.

This marks the second big naval defeat of Great Britain. The first was at the 1922 Washington conference where the U. S. broke up the Anglo-Japanese alliance and forced capital ship parity upon England. In that field, the U. S. now has built, under construction, or authorized, 525,850 tons, while England has 556,350 tons. The big disparity between the two competing powers lay for seven years in the cruiser category. At the Washington conference, Britain maintained that it required a minimum of 600,000 tons, and no agreement could be arrived at.

At the Geneva conference in 1927, the American delegate, Gibson, proposed a maximum of 250,000-300,000 tons, which failed to find the agreement of the First Lord of the Admiralty, Bridgeman, who insisted upon a minimum of 450,000 tons, and a total amount of 70 cruisers. On this point the conference collapsed, but American pressure increased and even forced, subsequently, the repudiation of the Anglo-French agreement (as it did the Anglo-Japanese in 1922) by the Conservative government. Under MacDonald, the British demand has finally been scaled down to 339,000 tons, and instead of 70 cruisers, 50 are now "required". This brings about a virtual parity with the U. S. in spite of its 35 cruisers, since "we" have a number of 10,000 ton cruisers equipped with 8-inch guns that have a firing range of thrice the power of the 6-inch guns mounted on most British cruisers.

The United States has achieved a temporary victory over the British lion and the picture presented at the Spithead review in July 1914 of the British fleet as the mightiest in the world can now be relegated to a museum with many other of Britannia's glories. For the time being, England has been forced to submit to the iron arrogance of the United States, MacDonald came to the brooks of Rapidan not as a magnanimous bearer of peace but as a representative of the once most powerful empire in the world that cannot stand the furious pace its bloated American cousin can set, and comes to beg for a respite. It is not the peace-loving English social democrat who has won the belligerent American imperialists to the cause of brotherly love. It is the financial domination of Wall Street that has forced the once haughty naval power down to parity on the seas.

The center of world economic power has shifted in the last decade from Europe (specifically, England) to the United States. The U. S. despite the resistance with which it is met and will be met in the future in an even broader and more belligerent degree, is attempting to put the European capitalist countries on an ever smaller ration in world economy. Its direct, even if unwilling, agent in Europe is Great Britain. It is no accident that the first Labor government, also under MacDonald, put through the Dawes Plan in Germany. England has become the European collection agent for Washington and Wall Street. An examination of the disposition of German reparations under the Young-Morgan Plan will indicate this. The creditors of Germany receive their payments directly as follows: England, about 1-5 of the total; France, about 1-2; Italy, about 1-10; the United States about 1-30; and the rest is divided among Belgium, the British Dominions, etc. But, one of the German payments received by France, Italy, Belgium and other lands, a third or more must be paid immediately by each of them to the U. S. Approximately the same amount must be paid also to England. England, in turn must pay such an enormous sum to the United States that the final disposition of the German payments is approximately as follows: France, 1-5; Belgium, Italy, the Dominions, etc., 1-6 and the United States, about 2-3. England is left to hold the sack, with virtually nothing!

Or, regard it from another angle. Sir Leo Chiozza Money, the British bourgeois economist, points out: "We have agreed to pay to the U. S. for two generations, about 38 million pounds a year. This sum we are to collect yearly for 60 years, as to £18,000,000 from Germany and roundly as to £20,000,000 from France, Italy, Greece, Jugo-Slavia, Portugal and Rumania. That is to say, we collect money in Europe and pay it over to America, the income almost exactly equalling ours... Agreements... condemn this generation

and the next and the one which succeeds it to pay tribute to the U. S. not our own tribute, but tribute painfully collected by Britain in Europe from nations large and small. Shall we set out the effect of the agreements for the year of 1980, fifty-one years hence, when the names who are now tempted to squabble will long have been forgotten? Here they are:

"Agreement by Britain to the U. S.	£38,300,000
"Agreements to pay to Britain:	
By France	£14,000,000
By Italy	4,500,000
By Rumania	700,000
By Jugo-Slavia	600,000
By Portugal	400,000
By Greece	400,000
By Germany	18,000,000
	£38,600,000"

The extent of the financial domination of the United States is graphically depicted by these telling figures. They explain the reason for the unusually bitter fight made by Snowden at the Hague conference and his victory over France, which resulted in an increase of Britain's share of the unconditional German annuities from \$14,292,000 to \$22,867,200. It also becomes clear why, when the New York Federal Reserve Bank raises its discount rate from 5 percent to 6 percent on August 8, the Bank of England must, a few days later, raise its rate from 5 1-2 percent to 6 1-2 percent, the highest in eight years, in an attempt to coax back some of its fugitive gold from Wall Street and prevent a curtailment of credit even though it aggravates the unemployment situation in such badly-hit British industries as coal, steel and cotton.

These dynamics facts, and not the pacific cooings of MacDonald, are the motivating force in England's retreat to parity with the United States. MacDonald knows these painful realities just as well as Baldwin did when he was forced to throw the Anglo-French alliance overboard. He also knows that the retention of England's 50 cruisers is not for the "peaceful" purpose of war, and they are fit for nothing else. All the

mysterious technical "explanations" of naval "experts" and sundry pacifists cannot conceal that.

It has been proved that cruisers, as well as battleships, as a defensive protector of trade vessels and routes are a gigantic fraud. Britain's scores of dreadnaughts plus its 50 cruisers would provide convoys for about three dozen escorts—in case of a war with Japan, let us say—for such routes as Auckland to Panama, Sydney to Wellington, Honolulu to Panama, Hong-kong to Honolulu, Colombo to Aden, Hong-kong to Singapore, for the coastal traffic of East Africa, India, Burma, China, Australia and the intricate systems of the East Indian Archipelago. For adequate protection, literally hundreds upon hundreds of cruisers would be needed. Raiders could make mince-meat out of trading vessels. It would take a force of ten ships, going at 15 knots, twenty-nine weeks for one search of the Indian Ocean alone. A Japanese fleet of 30 modern cruisers, intent upon crippling Pacific and Indian trade, would require a fleet of hundreds of cruisers to force them to remain at their bases.

It is plain that cruisers are meant exclusively for active naval engagements of an offensive character, which have nothing at all to do with the high-sounding purpose of the peaceful protection of trade.

In other words, although—or precisely because—the U. S. is trying to put the European powers on an ever diminishing ration, the latter are driven to ever more desperate resistance, an ever louder clamor for a larger share in world economy, which leads steadily to a sharpening of the antagonisms that make for war. Even in the face of American financial domination, England must carry on a struggle, underneath all the gracious gestures of MacDonald, to retain as much military, naval and political power as possible in store for the coming clash that will decide the supremacy of the world to the accompaniment of 16-in naval guns, aerial bombs and trench fire.

The attitude of France, Italy and Japan and their special role in this struggle, already manifest and sure to come out more openly when the projected Five-Power conference takes place next January, either in London or Geneva, are of special significance. But an analysis of these factors must be reserved for another article.

Three Conferences for Defense of Gastonia

The trial of the seven Gastonia militants has undoubtedly aroused the sympathy of broad sections of the American working class, and one of the best opportunities is at hand to mobilize and organize the sentiment of hundreds of thousands of workers to form a ring of defense around the victims of the frame-up. The official Communist Party, however, has almost totally neglected to approach these sympathetic workers and to draw them into a united front against the jailors. Instead it has followed the narrowest kind of a sectarian policy which has deliberately alienated some of the best elements in the labor movement.

The spurious ultra-"Leftist" policy of the Party has rarely shown its bankruptcy so pitifully as at two of the conferences for relief and defense called in New York, outwardly, as a result of our criticism, as united front conferences, but in actuality as jealously guarded gatherings of a clan. At the first of these, the Youth Conference held on October 13, the only sign of activity displayed by the young Stalinists was their rejection of the credentials presented by Comrades George Clarke and Joe Friedman of the Youth Group of the Communist League, and by Hank Stone, of the Postal Clerks. Harry Yaris, caucus master of ceremonies, explained that the first two could not be seated by informing the delegates that the Communist League was not a "bona-fide organization"! Our comrades, in reply, pointed out that this was the classic argument of the fakers in the unions against Legt wing and progressive organizations, and that the imperative problem of the moment was now to organize an all-inclusive front of those willing to work for the release of the frame-up victims. Apparently, this was of secondary importance to the conference directors, and after a few "brilliant" remarks by a few other young neo-Bolsheviks, the conference voted to refuse our comrades admission. All who voted thus were bound by discipline as members of the Young Communist League, while every single delegate to the conference who was not under this discipline, voted to seat our comrades. That was the sum and substance of the achievements of the conference. Yaris made no report of the past work of the committee, but contented himself with an agitational speech on the need for defending the prisoners. No plans for future work were outlined. The important thing was already accomplished—the unseating of the hated Trotskyists, even though it was done at the cost of driving away every non-Party sympathizer with the defense.

The regular "mass united-front Gastonia conference" held about a week later under Party control was even worse. Nominations for chairman, secretary and committees were made openly by slate. No "outside" nominations were even considered by the chairman or put to vote! Such a notoriously bourgeois institution as an agenda was not presented to the delegates. At least 90% of the delegates were Party members, and the conference itself was composed of about 20 delegates, and this in the strongest district of the city. For three solid hours, the conference was listen to bally-hoo speeches from Robe

swore that the case was not a frame-up, Otto Hall, Eli Keller, Harriet Silverman and similar lights. Throughout the conference, literally not a single delegate spoke from the floor—not one! There being no agenda, nothing could be discussed. A few minutes after midnight, the usual resolution was rushed through before the report of the credentials committee had been presented. All through the evening, the leading thinkers of the Party, Overgaard, Jakira, Weinstein, Wagenknecht and Bloomfield continually conferred in the hall and corridors on what to do with comrades S. M. Rose and James Russell, delegates from the Communist League. The upshot of these conferences was that the credentials committee report, brought in just before the motion to adjourn, recommended that all delegates be seated, although not a single name of a delegate or of an organization was read off! No committee was elected to carry on the work in the future, no plans or proposed, nothing accomplished except the collection of a few dollars. The "mass united front" was a mass meeting, a small, insignificant mass meeting, splendidly controlled, captured and attended almost exclusively by the Party members. That is the sort of victories achieved by the irresponsible faction-mongers of the Party at Gastonia's expense.

In Minneapolis, these is a totally different picture. There the Party and the I. L. D. have virtually disappeared since the expulsion of the best comrades for their support to the Opposition. Despite the numerous urgings of the local Communist League branch, the Party and the I. L. D. have failed to take a single step in the Gastonia defense rather than work together with our comrades. The disgraceful neglect by the Party has finally been overcome by a group of active militants in the labor movement who have sent out a call for a Unity Conference for Gastonia Defense held Tuesday, October 29, at Labor Headquarters. The provisional committee is composed of such well-known workers in the Minneapolis labor movement as: John Brinda, member Upholsterers Union No. 61; I. G. Scott, member of Operative Plasterers' Union No. 65; M. Christenson, member of Electrical Workers Union No. 292; Guy W. Alexander, Fin-Secy. Electrical Workers Union No. 292; David S. Hingsley, member of B. of L. F. & E. Local 704; J. G. Evans, member of B. of L. E. Local 494; Ed. W. Lawrence, member of Electrical Workers Union No. 292; A. S. Sturtevant, member of B. of L. F. & E. Local 704; I. Hoberman, secy Cap-makers Union Local 12; Chas. Pederson, member Electrical Workers Union No. 292; Carl Skoglund, member Railroad Carriers Union Local 299; O. Carlson, organizer, A. C. W. A.; Oscar Coover, member Electrical Workers Union No. 292; C. A. Green, member of B. of L. E. Local 474; Leo Gisslen, secretary of Socialist Party; C. R. Hedlund, Locomotive Engineer; W. R. Hopkins, member of B. of L. E. Local 474; Henry Kook, member of Electrical Workers Union No. 292; A. Roseland, Carpenters Union No. 7. The composition of the committee ensures broad, unified efforts in the Twin Cities.

Who Is Leading the Comintern To-day?

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

THE "RALLIES"

As can be seen, the general spirit of the changes that have taken place in the leadership of the International appears in full light in the procession of its responsible figures. The International is led by the Martinovs, by the conformers of every description. The French have the political expression "rallié" which means one who has become reconciled. The need for such a term was born out of the frequency of political revolution. If the republican had to accustom themselves the Empire, the royalists and the Bonapartists, in their turn, had to get used to the Republic. They did not do this right away, but only after convincing themselves of the stability of the republican regime. They are not the republicans who fought for the Republic, but those who charitably accepted positions and stipends from it. They are the ones who are called "ralliés". But one must not think that this type is peculiar only to the bourgeois revolution. The basis of ralliement is not the revolution, but its victory and the State created by this victory.

It goes without saying that true fighters, especially in other countries, belonging not only to the younger generation but in a certain measure also to the older generation, have rallied and are rallying to the October revolution. But the present regime in the International does not permit them to rise to the level of independent directors not to speak of revolutionary leaders. It removes, sweeps away, deforms and tramples under foot all that is independent, ideologically firm and inflexible. It needs conformers. And it finds them without much difficulty, groups them together and arms them.

Among the "ralliés", two nuances can be distinguished, running from the politically dull but honest elements, devoid of perspicacity and initiative, up to the most arrant careerists. But even the best of these "ralliés" (as psychology suggests and experience proves) demonstrate towards new revolutions the same qualities that they showed before and even on the eve of the October: lack of foresight, want of creative initiative and real revolutionary courage. The Kolarovs, the Peppers, the Kuusinsens, the Valetskys, the Martinovs, the Petrovskys, the Lozovskys and the other heroes who overslept, who missed or destroyed one, two, three and even more revolutions, are undoubtedly saying to themselves: "Let a new revolution come our way and this time we will prove ourselves." It is like the unlucky hunter who swears after every miss that he will take better aim at the next bird. Remembering their faults and uneasy at the idea that they have not been forgotten, these post-revolutionary revolutionists are always ready, on a sign from above, to prove their fearlessness to the four corners of the earth. That is why missed revolutionary situations alternate with no less tragic revolutionary adventures.

The best than can be done to all the varieties of Martinovs, Kuusinsens and Peppers is to keep them beyond cannon range of the institutions where the destinies of the revolution are decided.

* * *

One can object that all the figures I have enumerated above are only of second order and that the "real" leadership is concentrated in the Political Bureau of the Russian Communist Party. But that is an illusion. Under Lenin, the immediate leadership of the affairs of the International was confided to Zinoviev, Radek and Bucharin. In the solution of questions of ever so little importance there took part Lenin and the author of these lines. Needless to say that in all the important questions of the International, the key was in the hands of Lenin. Not one of the present members of the Political Bureau, with the exception of Bucharin, took the slightest part in the leadership of the International, and naturally that was not by mere chance. The nature of this work presupposes not only a certain theoretical and political level, but also the direct knowledge of the internal life of the Western countries and the possession of languages permitting one to follow the foreign press continually. In the present Political Bureau, no one possesses even these formal qualifications, with the exception of Bucharin, who, while Lenin lived, was only a candidate to the Political Bureau.

BUCHARIN.

The "Testament" of Lenin, at first glance, gives Bucharin a somewhat contradictory characterization. On the one hand, he is spoken of as one of the "most valuable and outstanding theoreticians of the Party", on the other hand it is pointed out that "it is very doubtful if his theoretical conceptions can be taken as Marxist conceptions, for there is something scholastic in them (he has never wholly understood the dialectic)". How can a non-dialectician and a scholastic be the theoretician of a Marxist Party? I will not dwell upon the fact that the "Testament", written for the Party with a definite aim, is permeated with the desire to "balance off"—it was that to a certain extent—the characteristics of each militant leading the Party: Lenin carefully withholds any too marked praise just as he softens too harsh a judgment. Still, this has reference only to the form of the "Testament" and not to its essence, and it does not explain how the Marxist works of a writer who has not mastered the dialectic can be "valuable". Nevertheless, the characterization given by Lenin, despite its seeming contradiction meant to sweeten the pill a little, is not contradictory in essence and is entirely correct.

The dialectic does not do away with formal logic, just as the synthesis does not do away with analysis, but is, on the contrary, supported by it. Bucharin's mode of thought is formally-logical and from

By L. D. Trotsky

to the other abstractly-analytical. His best pages relate to the domain of formally-logical analysis. Wherever Bucharin's thought moves along the furrows already drawn by the dialectic blade of Marx and Lenin, it can give valuable *partial* results, even if it is almost accompanied by an after-taste of scholasticism. But where Bucharin penetrates independently into a new sphere, where he is obliged to combine elements borrowed from different fields,—economy and politics, sociology and ideology, in general, basis and superstructure,—he manifests a completely irresponsible and untenable arbitrariness, pulling generalizations out of the clouds and juggling with ideas as if they were balls. If one took the pains to assemble and classify chronologically all the "theories" that Bucharin has served up to the International since 1919, and especially since 1923, he would have a picture recalling the Night of Walpurgis where the lean shades of Marxism shiver in the winds of scholasticism.

The Sixth Congress of the International brought the contradictions of the leading apparatus to their apex, and therefore to absurdity. Outwardly, the leadership seemed to belong to Bucharin: he made the report, indicated the strategical line, proposed and put through the Program—no trifle, that—opened and closed the Congress by drawing its balance. His domination seemed complete. And in the meanwhile everyone knows that the real influence of Bucharin upon the Congress was next to nothing. The interminable babblings of Bucharin were like bubbles thrown up by a drowning man. In the meantime, without regard to the spirit of the reports, nay even counter to this spirit, a regrouping went on among the delegates and their factional organization was consolidated. This monstrous duplicity disclosed what a secondary, subordinate and decorative role is played after all by "ideology" under the bureaucratic regime of the apparatus. But, now that there is no longer any reason to speak of the leadership of Bucharin, inasmuch as the main point of the Sixth Congress was to liquidate him, there remains Stalin. But here we fall from one paradox into another: for he who is called today, with some reason, the leader of the International, did not even show up at the Congress, and in his later speeches disposed of the questions of the Program and the strategy of the International with a few meaningless phrases. And that again is no accident.

STALIN

There is no need at all to dwell upon the grossly empirical character of Stalin's policy. With more or less belatedness, it is only the passive reflection of the subterranean social clash. The strength of apparatus Centrism for a certain period and under certain conditions, lies in an empirical adaptation. But that is precisely where its Achilles heel is.

Those who do not know it, find it difficult to imagine the primitive niveau of the scientific knowledge and the theoretical resources of Stalin. When Lenin was alive, it never occurred to any of us to draw Stalin into discussions of theoretical problems or strategical questions of the International. The most he ever had to do was to vote sometimes on this or that question whenever the differences of opinion among the Russian leaders of the International necessitated a formal vote of the Political Bureau. In any case, up to 1924 it is impossible to find a single article, a single speech of Stalin dedicated to international problems. But this "quality"—the fact that he was not bound personally by any ideological obligation or tradition to the fundamental theoretical and international questions—rendered him only the better fit to lead the policy of retreat while, in the country, the classes crushed by the October revolution began to rise again by exerting pressure upon the Party. Stalin became necessary when the October film began to be wound backwards. "Every social epoch," said Marx, invoking the words of Helvetius, "demands its great men; when they do not exist, it invents them." (*Class Struggles in France*). Well, Stalin is the great man "invented" by the period of the reaction against October.

It is known that Marxism does not at all "deny" the personal factor in history; on the contrary, better than any other doctrine, it is capable of elucidating the historical function of an outstanding personality. But the fetishism of the personal factor is entirely alien to Marxism. The role of a personality is always explained by the objective conditions contained in class relationships. There have been historical periods in which, according to the expression of an intelligent enemy, Ustrialov, "to save the country", an outstanding mediocrity and nothing more proved necessary. In his *Eighteenth Brumaire*, Marx showed, according to his own words, "how the class struggle created the circumstances and the conditions that permitted a mediocre and vulgar personage to play the role of a hero." Marx had in mind Napoleon III. The social subsoil of the latter was formed by the small peasant proprietors, under the mutual neutrality of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Essential elements of such a situation exist among us also. Everything is in the mutual relation of forces and in the tendencies of further evolution. We are still fighting for these tendencies. But in the meanwhile it is incontestable that the further we go the more the Stalinist regime appears as the preparation of Bonapartism.

Confronted with questions of principle and meagerness of thoughts have always accompanied Stalin. In 1925, his Party paper, *Saria Vostoka*, did him a bad

turn, by publishing his letter of January 24, 1911. The bloc of Lenin with Plechanov for the struggle against the liquidators and the conciliators, Stalin calls in this letter a "foreign tempest in a glass of water"—neither more nor less—and then continues:

"In general, the workers are beginning to look upon the foreign groups with disdain; let them get into a rage to their heart's content; we, however, think that he who really has the interests of the movement at heart, work—the rest then passes on. My opinion is that the result will be best."

Thus, in 1911, Stalin disdainfully left it to Lenin to "get into a rage" in his struggle against liquidationism. As for the group that Lenin formed ideologically, Stalin called it contemptuously "a foreign tempest in a glass of water". What disgusting hypocrisy is Stalin's retrospective intransigence today towards the old ideological struggle!

But it is not only a matter of 1911. In the Spring of 1917, the semi-Defender of the Fatherland, Stalin, was in agreement in principle that the Party should unite with the Defender of the Fatherland, Tseretelli. In the minutes, concealed up to now, of the Party Conference in May 1917, we read:

"Order of business: Tseretelli's proposal for unity.

"Stalin: We must accept. We must define our proposal to realize to unity. A unification is possible on the basis of Zimmerwald-Kienthal."

To the fears expressed by certain delegates of the Conference, Stalin replied:

"Differences should neither be anticipated nor warned against. Without differences there is no Party life. Once inside the Party we will liquidate the little differences."

The differences with Tseretelli appeared to Stalin as "petty differences", just as six years earlier the theoretical struggle of Lenin against liquidationism seemed to him "a tempest in a glass of water." In this cynical contempt for political principles and in this conciliatory empiricism lies the whole basis: of the future alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek, of the collaboration with Purcell, of the theory of socialism in one country, of the dually-composed workers' and peasants' Parties, of the unity with the Martinovs, the Peppers and the Petrovskys for the struggle against the Bolsheviks-Leninists.

Let us quote another letter of Stalin, written on August 7, 1923, on the situation in Germany:

"Should we, the Communists, (in the present stage) strive to take over power without the social democrats, are we mature enough for that? That, in my opinion, is the question. In taking power, we had in Russia such reserves as a) peace, b) the land of the peasants, c) the support of the great majority of the working class, d) the sympathy of the peasantry. The German Communists at this moment have nothing of the sort (?). Of course, they have the Soviet nation as their neighbor, which we did not have, but what can we offer them at the present moment? If today in Germany the power, so to speak, falls, and the Communists seize hold of it, they will fail with a crash. (!) That in the 'best' case. And in the worst, they will be torn to pieces and thrown back. The whole thing is not that Brandler wants to educate the masses, it is that the bourgeoisie and the Right social democrats will surely transform the lessons—the demonstration—into a general battle (at this moment all the chances are on their side) and crush them. Of course, the Fascists are not asleep, but it is to our interest that they attack first: that will rally the whole working class around the Communists (Germany is not Bulgaria). Besides, according to all information, the Fascists are weak in Germany. In my opinion, the Germans must be held back and not spurred on."

To this amazing document, which we must refrain from analyzing here, it must simply be added that in the Spring of 1917, before the arrival of Lenin in Russia, Stalin did not pose the question of the conquest of power in a more revolutionary manner than he did in 1923 with regard to Germany. Is it not evident that Stalin is therefore the most qualified person to brandish the thunderbolts over Brandler and the Right wing in general?

As to the theoretical level of Stalin, finally, it is enough to recall that, in seeking to explain why Marx and Engels rejected the reactionary idea of socialism in one country, he declared that in the epoch of Marx and Engels "there could be no question of the law of unequal development in the capitalist countries". There could be no question of it! That is what was written on September 15, 1925!

What would be said of a mathematician who came to maintain that Lagrange, Hauss or Lobatchevsky could not yet know of logarithms? With Stalin this is no isolated case. If the hashed eclecticism of his speeches and his articles are examined, one will perceive that they consist almost solely of this kind of pearls and diamonds of almost virginal ignorance.

TO BE CONTINUED

ONCE AGAIN—PALESTINE!

Just a few days after the publication of the "thesis" of the recent Party Plenum, there arrived Inprecorr Vol. 9, No. 54, containing a statement by the C. P. of Palestine on the recent events. The U. S. Party thesis denounces the viewpoint of the *Militant* as counter-revolutionary. Unfortunately for the local Stalinites the statement of the Palestine C. P. is entirely identical with our view and opposite to that of the *Daily Worker* and *Freiheit*.

The Coming Dress Strike

A Talk with the Left-wing Needle Trades Union Members

The New York joint board of the Needle Trade Workers Industrial Union Left wing) has finally adopted an official position on the dressmakers' strike now being planned by the leaders of the Right wing union, the I. L. G. W. U. The essence of this decision has been known for some time among the Left wing workers, but it has aroused no enthusiasm among them. And the passive and even antagonistic reaction of the workers is a healthy sign for the Left wing, because the decision that has been made by the officials of the Left wing union, directed by the Party specialists, is certain to deal the N.T.W.I.U. one of the heaviest blows it has yet suffered!

At the membership meeting of the dressmakers in the Left wing union, held in Webster Hall on October 17, 1929, the recommendations of the joint board were adopted, including the following, which forms the essential kernel of the whole question: "2) Should the Schlesinger coterie with the leaders of its dress bosses' association call the dressmakers to a stoppage, the said call should be entirely ignored." (*Morning Freiheit*, 10-18-1929.) Since this decision is qualified in absolutely no respect, it means in plain English: When the Right wing union calls its strike of the dressmakers in New York, the workers in the Left wing union are instructed to remain at work in the shops while the rest of the dressmakers are striking and picketing. Or in still plainer English, the Left wing is instructed by Zimmerman-Wortis-Gold-Foster-and-Weinstone to scab!

Can the decision adopted have any other significance or result? Absolutely none. The whole needle trades market knows to a man that the Right wing bureaucrats are unmistakably moving forward in their dressmakers' organization drive (and this too because of the grievous past blunders of the Left wing). It is known that when Schlesinger, Dubinsky and Co. get ready to call their stoppage or strike, their appeal will be followed, for one reason and another, by the bulk of the dressmakers, as was the case in the recent cloakmakers' strike. If the senseless policy of the Left wing is carried through in practice, it will mean that while the majority of the shops are being struck, the Left wing workers will be compelled to work on scab garments. The Left wing's "peculiar" tactic will not only be misunderstood by the needle trades workers in general, but it will certainly discredit and set back the Left wing movement for a long time.

Why did the Stalinist adventurers force this insane decision upon the Left wing union? Is this really a "radical" policy or is it opportunism gone mad? If it is the former, how does it happen that such congenial opportunists in the Left wing as Zimmerman, Rose Wortis, Gold and Boruchovitch are its staunchest protagonists? Will its application advance the interests of the Left wing and the workers in general, or will it be a crushing blow to them?

This is the fourth change of policy by the Stalinists in less than a year, and each has led the Left wing to a worse position. The first was in the dressmakers' strike of about a year ago led by the same Zimmerman and Wortis. It was so scandalously conducted, and the settlement so indistinguishably similar to any ever made by Sigman or Schlesinger, that both the leadership and the settlement had to be semi-officially condemned in the organ of the T.U.E.L., *Labor Unity*, by Philip Aronberg. The second was the policy in the recent cloakmakers' strike called by the Right wing. After weeks of vacillation, the Party and the Left wing union hit upon the unique idea of calling the workers to join the "fake stoppage" by quitting work and coming to the Left wing halls. Naturally, no one came to the Left wing halls, but at least the stigma of working during a strike was avoided by the N.T.W.I.U. The third attempt to retrieve the ground the Left wing was steadily losing in the needle trades, was the poorly organized, ill-prepared, badly-conducted adventure—it can hardly be called a strike—in the fur industry, which was lost before it began and was officially called off a few weeks later with an acknowledgment by Gold of total failure.

All of this irresolution, this squirming effort to avoid adopting the proposals made in the *Militant*, has not left the Left wing unscarred. On the contrary, for the first time in years, the Right wing union, the leaders and policies of which were the most discredited in the American labor movement, is virtual master of the New York field and the Left wing is being reduced ever more to an undecisive factor in the industry. Now, the latest decision with regard to the coming dressmakers' strike presents us with an act of mad desperation to recoup losses by paying for the openly opportunist sins of the past with counterfeit "radicalism." That such an overnight reversal of position is not infrequent, and particularly in the needle trades Left wing dominated by Zimmerman, Wortis and their kin, is attested by no less an authority (nowadays, alas!) than Earl Browder: "When a reaction against the disastrous results of opportunism sets in, it gives rise to wild adventures, 'leftist' policies, splitting tendencies, etc. The opportunist who has 'reformed' (but who has failed to grasp the essentials of Leninism) is almost sure to become the 'putschist', the ultra-left advocate. Finding that 'being practical' was a failure, he decides to 'be revolutionary' without being practical. The result is sectarianism." (Earl Browder, *The Workers Monthly*, August 1925, page 469.) It is no accident that Browder spoke in that article of precisely the present leaders of the needle trades Left wing, Zimmerman, Gold, et al. But Browder could never have conceived at that time (1925) that Zimmerman, Wortis and Co., would go so far in their opportunist sectarianism as to adopt their present decision, or that he, Browder, as one of the leaders of the Party, would endorse that decision!

There was an occasion in the Party when one of its leaders was only partly guilty of the monstrous blunder for which the entire Party leadership is now responsible. That was during the 1925 strike of 150,000 anthracite miners, when Ben Gitlow developed his "famous" thesis that: "The anthracite coal strike is a conspiracy between the officials and the coal operators. It will benefit only the coal interests. The strike will not benefit the miners out on strike. It will cause untold hardships to the workers in the eastern states that depend upon anthracite coal. . . . The miners will remain out on strike for many months. They will probably go back to work without any material advantages gained. The check-off will be won by Lewis. The strike is a John L. Lewis strike, a strike led by the policy of class collaboration. It is cooperation between the officials of the union and the owners of the mines for mutual self-interest. It does not in the least help the workers or attempt to solve their intolerable conditions." (Ben Gitlow, *The Workers Monthly*, Nov. 1925, page 17.)

At that time, such a hue and cry was raised against this reactionary sectarianism by Party leaders like Cannon, Foster, Dunne and others, that not even Gitlow's faction, which was then leading the Party, could defend his position and it was finally repudiated and condemned. Substitute Schlesinger for Lewis, dressmakers for miners, dress bosses for coal operators, and you have exactly the same arguments made by Messrs. Foster-Zimmerman-Gold today as were made in 1925 by Gitlow. But not even Gitlow ventured to go so far as to call upon the Left wing miners to stay at work; he advocated the intervention of the then Progressive Miners Committee "in an effort to make the anthracite strike a real struggle in the interests of the workers." Gitlow developed logically to his present position as one of the leaders of the Right wing inside and outside the Party. Again, it is no accident that the present policy—like so many others—of the Party and the Left wing, so "revolutionary" at first sight, should prove in actuality to be only a further application of Gitlow's Right wing thesis of 1925. The difference is that today, unlike 1925, there is no responsible Party leader to raise his voice in condemnation of the policy just adopted for the dressmakers.

We speak primarily to the Left wing workers: Do not be swayed by demagogic appeals to sentiment. Schlesinger is no better and no worse than John L. Lewis, and the Party's condemnation of Gitlow's policy in 1925 must be repeated by the Left wing workers in a rejection of the Gitlowist policy that has been adopted now for the dressmakers, which will bring discredit and defeat to our movement. The new path to which the irresponsible Stalinists have just jumped will not lead to the eradication of Right wing influence in the industry, but to its consolidation. That is the path of the Schlesingers, the one they trod during the last dressmakers' strike. It cannot be ours. Ours must be the one that leads to the struggle side by side with even the most conservative worker, even though for the moment he is deceived by Schlesinger and follows his leadership. In the struggle, the Right wing workers can be won away from the misleaders of the Right wing, but not if you stay in the shops while they are striking.

The severe defeats of the Left wing in the cloakmakers' and furriers' strikes should be signposts of warning. The Left wing can make headway, and regain the strength and influence it enjoyed in 1926 and 1927, if it knows how to approach the Right wing worker, how to work for a united front against the bosses. The Left wing must take the initiative in the united front. It must challenge Schlesinger and Co. openly to unite the divided ranks of the workers. It must work for joint action, joint committees in the shops. The Schlesingers and Dubinskys will expose themselves sufficiently in their actions during the struggle, but only if the Left wing shows its readiness to work side by side with the Right wing worker. The present attitude of the N.T.W.I.U. gives the Right wing hypocrites every opportunity to strengthen their grip upon the workers. The cheap "Leftism" of the Lovestoneite, Zimmerman, and the Stalinite, Foster, must be rejected by the Left wing workers before too much damage has been done.

A Cowardly Paper

We will yet have occasion to return to the first, and other, numbers of the *Revolutionary Age*, the official organ of the Right wing (Lovestone group). Here only a word:

What strikes the reader is the political cowardice of the paper and its editors. We said some time ago that Lovestone is organizing his faction first on the basis of petty matters, and only after it has been mobilized, will he unfurl his banner, will he develop in full his platform. The first issue of the paper bears this out entirely. Lovestone and his faction are an integral part of the International Right wing. It is no secret that he supports the Bucharin faction in Russia as

well as he does its Brandlerite brother in Germany. But not a word of that in the *R. A.* The first page contains a "statement" which says nothing at all about its position on the burning issues of the Russian revolution's greatest crisis, about the struggle between three tendencies in the Comintern. Lovestone's article on Russia is a cowardly mass of meaningless platitudes, in which he dares not come out boldly for the Russian Right wing, except through the furtive expedient of calling the Five Year Plan "Rykov's" plan. He does not "endorse" the Right wing groups in the International; he only gives highly-colored favorable news about the Brandler, Jilek-Hais, Huber, Flyg and Roy factions. That is how Lovestone is "preparing the followers" for deeper swamps. The *Revolutionary Age*, to borrow a term from Browder, is an organ of cowardly opportunists.

Wicks at Large Again

An unsigned editorial by H. M. Wicks in the *Daily Worker* (10-26-1929) strains itself to the utmost to explain away the recent defections of George Bessadovsky and Paul Marion in France. In the course of the short editorial, we find a minimum of two wopping lies, not to mention seventeen smaller ones, including one slander of the *Militant*.

1. Wicks speaks of "one George Bessadovsky, who was dismissed from a subordinate post at the French embassy" (of the Soviet Union), and who gets together with counter-revolutionary thieves and blackguards "with the kind permission of Monsieur Briand." This "one, George Bessadovsky" was *not* dismissed, and did *not* hold a subordinate post in the Russian embassy. He ran off of his own accord, and his post was that of Acting Ambassador of the Workers' Republic in the absence of Valerian Dovgalevsky. As for his friendship with Briand, there is an interesting story to tell. After Comrade Trotsky was deported to Turkey, he applied to various European countries for asylum. One of the secretaries of the French Communist Party, Bouthonnier, ran to the Soviet embassy and pleaded frantically with Dovgalevsky and Bessadovsky to see Briand and influence him to prevent Trotsky from coming to France. A couple of days later, the Soviet representatives were visited for the same purpose by Marcel Cachin, who trembled and groaned that if Trotsky were to enter France "he would ruin the Communist Party." As is known, Comrade Briand accommodated Comrades Bessadovsky and Cachin and the French Communist Party was saved. But while he is at it, will Wicks explain to us how it can happen that an out-and-out counter-revolutionist could have remained in such a high Soviet post for so long a time, while the Bolshevik fighter, Rakovsky, who was his superior at one time, is today in exile at Barnaoul?

2. "Recently, in the world capitalist press, another pimple burst in the form of flamboyant 'exposures' by a hitherto unknown soldier of counter-revolution, Paul Marion, a petty-bourgeois intellectual, who sought a career in Communism. Being an intellectual he was taught to need an education, and at what better place to learn than in Moscow, where, however, after working in a minor position a while, he was sent back to France with the testimonial to the French C. P. that he was a cheap careerist and an enemy of the working class." Lots of lies here! Marion was *not* unknown; he was indeed no less a celebrity than the head of the agit-prop department of the French Communist Party. He was *not* sent to Moscow for an education, but as one of Stalin's educators of the Communists of the world. He was *not* sent back to France with that testimonial, for if he had been, how could an enemy of the working class remain in the ranks of the C. P. for 30 minutes? Marion left the C. P. of his own accord to join the social democrats, where so many of the pillars of Stalinism have recently landed. What Wicks "forgets" to tell us is that Marion, as head of the department of agitation and propaganda, was the author of most of the manifestoes, theses, platforms, proclamations, directives, road-maps and phillipics in the campaign against "Trotskyism". He was the lad who taught the French Party membership how "counter-revolutionary" Trotsky and the Opposition were, and how *Bolshevized* he, Marion, was (just as Bro. Wicks does today). For it was the Wickses, Marions, Bessadovskys, Lovestone's and Peppers of the world who expelled and slandered the Opposition.

That's why Wicks should be a bit more reserved in condemning Marion and Bessadovsky. After all, Wicks, who knows what the Third Period can do? A few years ago, you thought it necessary to line up the Gary Chamber of Commerce and American Legion against the Communists. And does not the good priest teach us that God alone knows what the morrow may bring? So why make it harder for yourself to climb over the garden wall, like Bessadovsky, into the comforting arms of the bourgeoisie and its Law?

"LET NOT THY FIRST PAGE KNOW WHAT THE SECOND PAGE SAYETH"

"The capitalist Scripps-Howard newspaper syndicate openly rebukes the A. F. of L. for not doing more to head-off and suppress the workers' strike movements, because it has not succeeded in stopping the 'industrial warfare in the South'—that is, stopping the workers' fight for better conditions." (*Daily Worker*, October 25, 1929, PAGE ONE).

"The (Scripps-Howard press) criticism was that the A. F. of L. was too cautious, reactionary and cowardly to do anything for the workers, that it was an organization of labor aristocracy, and all aristocracy is rotten." (*Daily Worker*, October 25, 1929, PAGE TWO).

Well, which is it? Is it too reactionary or not reactionary enough? The first two pages of the *Daily Worker* ought to get together and straighten out the line.

Next Steps in the Textile Field

Two new factors have made it imperative for the Left wing in the textile industry to adjust its policy more radically to meet the different situation that is being created in the Southern textile field. The first is the vicious sentences passed upon the victims of the Gastonia frame-up, the failure to indict anyone for the outrageous murder of Ella May Wiggins, and the similar failure to act against the lynch mob that attacked and beat up the union organizers Lell, Saylor and Wells. The second is the decision of the A. F. of L. convention in Toronto "adopted with a crusading fervor" to begin organizational work among the Southern textile mill slaves.

It would be futile to under-estimate the effect of these two developments upon the situation in the South. Only by evaluating it soberly will the Left wing be enabled to make further progress in spite of the enormous obstacles.

The court decisions will have a two-fold result. The Southern workers, the bulk of whom are entering the active field of class struggle for the first time and are, for that and other reasons, still weighted down by deep-seated illusions about our class society, will be jolted loose from some of these illusions by the crude class character of the court decisions. It will become clear to them that workers are sent away virtually for life because they were devoted fighters for labor, while the paid gangsters of the capitalists are set free when they "violate the law" by murdering and beating these labor fighters. For many of them it will be the first lesson in the capitalist class nature of the American government, its officials, and even its highly-praised judicial institutions. But, on the other hand, the decisions will undoubtedly have the effect of increasing the terror against the workers, and especially against those militants who stand out as the most active fighters for the union. The arrogance and brutality of the bosses and their armed agents will grow as never before. The courts have given them a free hand—and what are courts for if not for that—to beat, maim and murder any worker whose activity displeases the mill owners.

The bosses will undoubtedly succeed in intimidating many of the workers. But their success will be in inverse proportion to the success of the National Textile Workers Union in organizing a sufficiently broad movement in the South to form a protecting ring around every worker that can resist the disciples of Judge Lynch. The N. T. W. U. has an enormous advantage in this respect, since no matter how sharp is the threat of the lynching terror, the frightful exploitation of the mill slaves is still sharper and will find expression in strikes of the most desperate kind.

But broad movements do not arise from good wishes alone. Nor is it sufficient for them to exist only in the fabulous reports of inspired Party reporters. The policy of distortion and easily-revealed exaggeration practised by the *Daily Worker* and *Labor Unity* is wrong from any viewpoint, one of which is that reports of non-existing strength are guaranteed to lead to despair and disappointments in the future. The struggle for broad trade union organization requires not only militancy and persistence, but essentially a proper approach and policy of conduct. This has not yet been worked out by the Left Wing, although its urgency, advocated by us for many months, becomes more apparent every day.

The decision of the A. F. of L. convention will bring this problem to a focal point. It is entirely true that the A. F. of L. is not "going South" for the purpose of organizing the workers into a strong trade union movement to fight the bosses for better conditions. That is not the function of the A. F. of L. leadership, and their record speaks more eloquently of that than a mile of promises. The Gomperses, Greens and Wolls participate in struggle only to head them off into harmless channels, to stamp out every spark of militancy. They did that in the 1919 steel strike, in a dozen coal strikes, in previous textile strikes (Passaic) and a thousand other of lesser importance. In recent years, they have promised organization drives in the automobile industry, in the packinghouses, in the mine fields and elsewhere, but nothing materialized. The task of organizing the unorganized millions in this country falls upon the shoulders of the Left wing and progressive forces inside and outside the A. F. of L. Green and Co. will not do it, and the wreck and ruin of a dozen once powerful unions including the miners' union, the most powerful of them all, are a conclusive answer to those who think otherwise.

In other words, Green enters the South after the Left wing, and because of the Left wing, and only in order to wipe out the Left wing and its union which has drawn to itself the rising spirit of rebellion among the Southern workers. Green will do organizing work in the South only so long as the Left wing and its union are still a force to be reckoned with there. Then he will quit, because if the bosses prefer an A. F. of L. union to a Left wing union, they also prefer no union at all to the A. F. of L.

Against the N. T. W. U., Green will have not only the big financial resources and apparatus of the A. F. of L. but the tacit tolerance of the employers. And while it may be solacing to some to repeat over and over again that the Southern workers are completely disillusioned about the A. F. of L. and its traitorous leaders, the unfortunate fact remains that this is very far indeed from the truth. The A. F. of L. can become a tremendous force among the workers to be reckoned with, and which cannot be met with the ridiculous slogan (which we notice has now become an official, stand-

ing headline on the first page of *Labor Unity*) of "Fight the A. F. of L. and the Muste Reformists!"

What is required is multiplied work of organization by the Left wing in the South. In many, if not in most of the situations, the workers will follow the National Textile Workers Union essentially because it shows greater initiative and readiness to fight than the United Textile Workers Union, because it gets there first. What the Southern workers need and want is a labor union that will lead them in a fight against their frightful conditions of work. That is why any tendency to slacken down or decrease the forces of the N. T. W. U. in the South at the present time would prove disastrous for the future. On the contrary, the organizing forces and support must be greatly increased and the prestige already gained by the left wing union followed up.

In addition to that, however, the Left wing now needs more than ever before the policy of the united front.

The Left Wing and the Workmen's Circle

The National Conference of the Left wing and progressive branches and minorities in the Workmen's Circle, the Jewish labor fraternal order, held in New York City on October 11, 12 and 13, decided "unanimously" to call upon all of its supporters to withdraw from the Workmen's Circle and to join, in groups and individually, the Independent Workmen's Circle. The decision to split was, of course, initiated by the present leaders of the Communist Party, and it marks the temporary conclusion of the long, bitter struggle of Communist and Left wing workers to gain dominant influence and control of this big fraternal order. Unfortunately, it also marks another blunder of the Stalinist Party leadership. And finally, it marks a victory for comrade Costrell, who advocated the policy of splitting for many years, who was firmly turned down by the Party for just as many years. He can now feel consoled at the thought that his despised and bespattered ideas have finally been canonized by the new Party leadership.

The Workmen's Circle, an organization of some 75,000 members, predominantly Jewish workers, has been constantly under the control of a crude Right wing-Socialist Party clique. Under the guidance of the Communist Party, it was the policy of the Left wing and the progressives up to now to carry on their work and agitation inside the organization in spite of the difficulties, expulsions and persecution to which they were subjected. A few years ago, when scores of Left wing members and branches were being expelled and their rights violated by the Right wing, an "Alliance of Left Wing W. C. Branches" was formed; about 70 branches which refused to quit the "Alliance" were "dissolved" by the Right wing. But the Left wing carried on such a capable campaign that the re-entry of these "dissolved" members into the Workmen's Circle was successfully negotiated and the work continued.

Now, virtually out of the clear blue, comes the new policy of the Party to quit the W. C., singly and collectively and without a moment's hesitation. The best way in which to judge the correctness of this breath-taking reversal of position is to examine the six main reasons given in the Manifesto of the Left wing conference (*Morning Freiheit*, 10-14-1929.) Since a new policy is being adopted by the Left wing, it is under an obligation to show that a new situation has developed in the Circle. Or else, it should honestly admit to the workers that the Communists were entirely wrong and have been misleading them in these last years by insisting that every progressive worker remain in the W. C. and help to liberate the tens of thousands of workers in it from the baneful, reactionary influence of the Weinbergs and Baskins. But let us test the validity of the reasons:

1. The Workmen's Circle, says the Manifesto, "is under the black hand of the yellow *Forward*." But that is not new. It has been under that deadening hand for years, in 1920 and 1925 as well as in 1929.

2. "The W. C. is no longer a workingmen's circle. It is a business men's circle . . . In the W. C. there is not one class, but two classes—the working class and the bourgeoisie." Quite true. There has been and is a small element of petty shopkeepers, real estate sharks and merchants in the Circle who were and are the main support of the reactionary officials. But they did not come in yesterday. They have been there for years. To justify its new policy, the Party must prove that the social composition of the Circle has changed radically in the most recent period. But no such proof can be brought forward. The Circle is still predominantly working class in its composition.

3. The W. C. (the manifesto should say, The officialdom of the W. C.) has not supported the workers in a single struggle in the last few years, but the bosses and the union bureaucrats especially in the needle trades. But that, admittedly, holds true for "the last few years." A split for this reason was therefore just as imperative in 1926 as in 1929. The complaint that Baskin and Co. tax the membership for support to the I.L.G.W.U. led by Sigman and Schlesinger is equally invalid as a reason for withdrawal, for the Left wing has, quite justifiably, taxed the membership of branches under its control for the support of Left wing unions and institutions. Will a Communist leave the reactionary Carpenters' Union if Hutcheson imposes a membership tax for, let us say, the support of the American Legion? No, he will stay with the workers and fight against such measures

Our previous criticisms have resulted in a certain amount of polite acknowledgement of the need for this tactic, but it has largely remained on paper. It must be applied in reality. It will serve to mobilize the broadest sections of the Southern textile workers for a concerted struggle, to dispel any taint of sectarian partisan aims of the N. T. W. U., and to reveal the Green and McMahoos in their true fight. The present narrow policy of the Left wing will have exactly an opposite result, and involve a set-back for it of long duration. The Left wing must take the initiative in proposing joint action.

That the labor fakers will reject it is not of decisive importance in the long run. The masses of the workers, even the inexperienced slaves of the South will understand the fight for unity conducted by the Left wing. They will welcome it and regard the N. T. W. U. as the ever-ready champion of the united struggle for their interests. Such a course can only strengthen and increase the ranks of the Left wing union, set larger groups of workers into motion, and increase in them the distrust and contempt that the class conscious workers already have for the professional agents of capitalism in the labor movement.

and such a leadership.

4. The W. C. has joined openly with counter-revolution in the United States by endorsing the Socialist Party and donating money to it. Can the authors of the Manifesto recall a single convention of the Workmen's Circle in the last ten years in which these endorsements and donations were not given? The only thing that is new is that the Right wing will now have an absolutely free hand to endorse and donate to the socialists without there being the tiniest voice of Left wing protest in the organization or a single branch to balance off this support to the politically bankrupt S.P. by moral and financial support to the Communist movement.

5. The W. C. has not supported any of the big strikes of recent times, particularly those led by the Left wing. This "news" is at least three years old. And it is only partly true. The reactionary officialdom did not support these strikes. But the Left wing and progressive branches and members did support them. This "reason" is a condemnation of the W. C. leaders, and a good reason for continuing to fight them for the control of the membership and the organization. As a reason for withdrawing from the organization, however, it is worthy of people who have lost their heads or never had any.

6. The W. C. supports the counter-revolution in Russia. A "splendid reason" for withdrawing—but just as good in 1922, because the Toronto convention of that year adopted a position which the Left wing has since then correctly labelled support to the Russian counter-revolutionary Mensheviks.

The fact is that the Party can show nothing new in the situation to warrant a new policy, except its own impatience, its desperation, its straining at quick—and quickly dissipated—results, its new narrow, sectarian line, its capitulation before difficulties.

The new policy becomes only more dangerous and fruitless in view of the present status of the Left wing movement among the Jewish workers in this country, which makes it imperative for the Left wing to intrench itself even more deeply in the mass organizations of the workers. Two or three years ago, when the Left wing movement—especially in the unions—was swiftly gaining strength among the Jewish workers, there may have been some faint justification for this policy. But precisely now, when the Left wing has been weakened in the Jewish field by the series of mistakes by the Party, when it is plain to the naked eye that it has lost ground heavily both in the needle trades and in the Workmen's Circle, the adoption of the new policy is sheer folly, which will only net the Left wing a series of disappointments. The Left wing will succeed in drawing a maximum of 2000-2500 members out of the W. C., add them to the approximately 7000 members of the Independent, and leave tens of thousands of workers in the Workmen's Circle to be misled, mis-educated and mulcted by Baskin, Weinberg and Co. who are as happy as larks that the Left wing is leaving them an uncontested field.

This is quite clear. It is involuntarily substantiated by Melech Epstein, who writes about the W. C. bureaucrats with such violently and fearlessly radical phrases that an ordinary, timid soul would never suspect that he absorbed his Bolshevism, before coming to the *Freiheit* a little while ago, from the ultra-pious atmosphere of the Zionist *Jewish Zeit*: "Without the Left wingers and progressives, the black forces will lose the last bit of restraint that they felt upon themselves. With all their insolent attitude towards their political opponents in the order, the *Forward* and S.P. politicians nevertheless had to conceal their deeds from time to time . . . Now the policy will become as naked as Adam. The dictatorship of the *Forward* will become still tighter and stifling. The dance will become still wilder." (*Morning Freiheit*, 10-16-1929.) In other words, the withdrawal of the Left wing will result in the surrender of the remaining tens of thousands of workers to the insolence, the stifling dictatorship, the will dance of the *Forward* and its kindred.

There is still an urgent need for the unification of the two Circles, and for the development and strengthening of the Left wing within the united organization until it has won the support of the decisive sections of the working class membership. Splits which give such small results as 3 or 4 percent of the membership to the Left wing and the balance to the Right wing are indefensible. There is nothing revolutionary in a policy that yields such results.

A Party Plenum of Cliques

The Mechanics of the Coming Struggle within the Party

The Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, the first one to be held since the last "open address" of the Comintern, has only two accomplishments to its credit. The first is the adoption of a thesis on the present situation in the country and the tasks of the Party, which is a classic of confusionism, word-mongering, false evaluations and stark ignorance of many fundamentals of Marxism, and is at least twice as long as it should be. The second is the growing manifestations of collapse in the patched-together "leadership" imposed upon the "now unified" party by arbitrary Stalinist decree. There is very little to say about the thesis since its only future is its inevitable reversal or repudiation some six months from now. The second product of the Plenum, however, is of first-rate consequence, since it contains all the essentials of an inevitable factional struggle in the very near future, which will be even less principled and more destructive than those of the past.

The very nature of the present amalgam of leadership in the Party is a guarantee of its brief duration, since it was not established as a result of a struggle between principled viewpoints in which the correct view issued forth victoriously. It was thrown together hastily out of the rag-tag and bobtail of all factions, having nothing at all in common except their readiness to rubber-stamp enthusiastically any policy and decision of the dominant faction in the Russian Communist Party. If this were not enough to insure the speedy disintegration of this leadership, the lack is more than made up for by the ruinous inner-Party regime and the policies being carried out today in the general class struggle. It has ceased to be news that the Party is losing heavily in membership and in influence among the workers (the coming elections in New York City will only be another demonstration of the latter).

A year ago, upon the expulsion of the Opposition from the Party by the joint forces of Foster and Lovestone, we were quite safe in predicting that the great "unification" achieved in the Party against Trotskyism was the sheerest illusion and would fall to pieces at the first blow. The same prediction held true in the similarly great "unification" achieved by the Foster group and the remnants of the Lovestone-Pepper faction after the expulsion of the latter's leaders. The failure to reinstate the expelled Opposition which alone has fought for a Marxist policy in the class struggle, against sectarian opportunism, and for a democratic inner-Party regime, continues to leave the newly-concocted leadership floundering in ever seaview seas with fatal reefs just ahead.

It is important to analyze the contending factors inside the Party today and the mechanism of the impending factional struggle which will become "official" Party property in a relatively short time.

1. The Plenum officially transferred the leadership of the Party (the Political Committee) to the former Foster group by replacing the expelled Lovestonites with William F. Dunne, C. A. Hathaway and that granite monument to brilliance Harrison George. But this is an achievement without a victory. The Foster group is an army without a general. The Fosterites who have thirsted for four years to replace the Lovestonites in power, find that their Caesar refuses the crown not only thrice but every day in the week. Foster is being cajoled and urged by this faction colleagues to "assert his leadership" in the Party, but he steadfastly declines to take all the responsibility of that office. Foster is too shrewd for that. He knows that the Party is due for pretty stormy weather, for painfully regular decline, not the least reason for which is the pseudo-Left policy. He goes along with this policy, and is even to be found at the head of the parade some times, but his heart is not in it. Foster's every instinct and inclination has always been in the other direction, i. e., to the Right. Even when it appears most certain that Foster has closed all his doors, one may be just as sure that he has left himself an open window for a necessary future right-about face. He is biding his time for new Communist winds from Moscow, or winds of a different kind in the United States. . .

2. Nevertheless, the formal transference of Party power to the old Foster faction, gives another set of leaders the opportunity for a revival of their tenuous political life. That is the thin layer of former Lovestonites still clustering furtively around Bedacht and Stachel. These two unfortunates sniffed the Moscow wind tardily. The solitary difference between them and Lovestone-Gitlow-Wolfe was that the latter refused to sign a document acknowledging that they were corrupt, petty-bourgeois, speculating, lying, Tammany Hall politicians, whereas Bedacht and Stachel readily agreed to say all that and more if necessary. But all this was done on the promise that the decision meant a victory for neither the Lovestone nor the Foster factions, and that the Party would not be turned over to the minority (Foster). But that is precisely what has happened, and it is far from being to the liking of Bedacht and his old cronies of the Lovestone group who "stayed loyal to the Comintern".

In these dog days, when a mild inquiry is denounced as a factional conspiracy, all that is left to these poor comrades is to look helplessly at each other, plan little intrigues and bemoan the glories of their past. And little intrigues there are a-plenty. At the Plenum, three of the former Lovestonites, including Jakira and Benjamin (of Philadelphia) laid down a barrage

against the nomination of Dunne for the Political Committee, ostensibly for good Party reasons. It is no one's secret that they were put up to this bit of stage play by Bedacht and Stachel who are vainly trying to stem the tide that swept the old minority into Party control.

This feeble struggle that has such potentialities for the future is manifest elsewhere. The triumvirate that is running the I. L. D., Engdahl, Jakira and Codkind, are pulling strings to keep George Maurer down in the field and out of the national office, where he was first placed as a Fosterite balance against the repentant (but not entirely trustworthy!) Lovestonites. On the other hand, a spike has been put into Stachel by shifting John Williamson from the T. U. U. L. into the position of Stachel's assistant in the Party organization department, (where Williamson hopes to settle up a few old scores with Stachel from the old days of the Y. W. L.). Furthermore, now that Weinstone is to become American representative on the E. C. C. I the struggle for his position as New York district organizer has been opened up. Bedacht is working for that notorious incompetent Amter to become N. Y. District Organizer; the old Foster wheelhorses, who never forget a friend or forgive a foe, are planning to occupy that strategic post through Charlie Krumbain, who is not only a good proletarian but has a newly-framed diploma from the Lenin School. Stachel is being shipped to Detroit to plague the auto workers and mend his factional fences. And more may be expected.

3. Weinstone is waiting for the future. He has got out from under the slow wrecking of the once powerful New York organization by accepting the post of American representative across. That gives him the double advantage of not being in on the crash and of staging a well-timed comeback when a savior is required. He has gathered around him a meager ring of New York functionaries to form the nucleus for a coming faction (Weinstone's factions have always been a spectacle!) Weinstone reckons: Right now things are too unstable. I will go off to Moscow where my somewhat tarnished reputation can be refurbished. It is certain that Bedacht and Stachel are too discredited to offer any serious competition for leadership. It is equally certain that Foster, even if he should take over the leadership, will soon hit a blind alley, since he has no Bittelman and only a very dubious Browder; his own theoretical qualifications are below contempt. Then, when chaos and lassitude have set in in the Party, I will make my entry again. After all, why should not the mantle of leadership rest snugly on my broad shoulders and the scepter of power be wielded by my hand and brain? It is true there is that annoying matter of Judge Panken, and the cooperatives, and a few other trifles. But they will be forgotten. . .

This far more fantastic. It is merely Weinstone's method of thinking. He is not the only one who has Napoleonic dreams. There are many others who muse over this corrupting, unprincipled struggle for leadership, among them those from whom better could be expected.

4. There remain the Weisbords and the Browders. The former has already been put to the sword by Bedacht and Stachel, formally for certain heresies, and in actuality because he claims (by the way, with justice) that Bedacht and Stachel are just as guilty of every crime with which Lovestone is charged as Lovestone is himself. Weisbord has a deep ineradicable conviction, that if the American Party must have a leader, there are few if any so well fitted for that imposing task as he is.

As for Browder, he has the unique distinction of having been wrong on almost every single important disputed political question in Party history. This does not prevent him from having delusions of grandeur. He is no longer satisfied, as he was years ago, to play the role of Foster's secretary of state. He has managed to get himself placed on the secretariat, together with Minor and Bedacht. Right now, the secretariat plays only a lesser role, but it has possibilities. Didn't Stalin succeed in making the Russian Pol-bureau a tail of the secretariat at one time? Browder reckons like Weinstone: What little competition these is can overcome with judicious activity. There is not even a Bittelman left to fear (by the way, where is Bittelman now?) In the meantime, I will not offend anyone and try to live at peace with all, for allies can come from the strangest quarters. And when the hour strikes. . .

That is the blueprint of the coming factional fight in the Party. There may, in fact there will undoubtedly, be some changes in the personalities, but in essence it is there. It may be objected: What will do the Comintern representative do? Where are the differences in principle? The former is not so much of a factor in this connection. He has only a formal standing with the present Party leaders, because they know him for what he has done in the last seven or eight years—a minor functionary in the apparatus of the C. I.

As for principles, that is another matter. The essence of the coming fight will be the absence of principles. No one dares to advance any differences of principles, for that involves a deviation to one side or another of the current line of the C. I. and the thought of the fatal consequences of such a bold step makes your average bureaucrat shudder. Not only must everyone shout in chorus for every comma in every

C. I. decision, but they must even refrain from "interpreting" these decisions, for that again will lead to deviating in one direction or another. The memory of Lovestone's ghastly fate is too fresh in the minds of all.

That is why the only thing left for this heterogeneous and absolutely incompatible collection of leaders is a struggle of cliques, devoid of principle and pregnant with further corruption of the movement. If there is any doubt of the clique character of the coming fight, read Frankfeld's letter reprinted in the first issue of Lovestone's paper. The principle "basis" for the purely clique struggle will be erected according to need. You will yet hear of Bedacht's and Stachel's role in the various Lovestone intrigues.

But the Party ranks, the membership? It is dwindling rapidly, but that is where the source of regeneration is to be found. For the moment it is in a barracks. The Communist Opposition must help it to break out of the stifling atmosphere and into the open struggle against corruption and opportunism.

Nadir Khan, Liberator of Afghanistan, Will Convoke a National Assembly

He will Give the People Voting Right.—National Assembly Will Decide Form of Government.—Nadir Khan and Amanullah Renounce Kingship.—A Republic Possible?—Nadir Khan Renowned as Idealist and Liberator.

PEOPLE OF AFGHANISTAN DANCE IN THE STREETS WITH JOY AT THEIR LIBERATION

PESHWAR, India, Oct. 10.—The population of Kabul, the principal city of Arghanistan, is simply dancing with joy at their liberation from the tyrannical King Habibullah, or Bacha Sakao, who was set upon the throne of Afghanistan a few years ago with the aid of agents of England.

King Habibullah fled in an airplane, but all his officials who did not flee with him, have been arrested. Nadir Khan, commander of the revolutionary forces, is now being awaited in the city.

It is now expected that Nadir Khan will call together the leaders of all the tribes to a national assembly which will give voting rights to the entire people, so that they can themselves determine their government.

It appears that the former King Amanullah will not be called back to Afghanistan. Nadir Khan also declares that he does not want to become a King. Whether he has in mind proposing a republican form of government to the national assembly is as yet unknown.

Nadir Khan, the leader of the uprising against King Habibullah, is very much beloved by the entire people. His name is now borne on everyone's lips as the hero and liberator of the country.

In the days when Amanullah was King, Nadir Khan was his diplomatic representative in Paris. He is pictured by the Afghanistan Consulate in Paris as an interesting personality, courageous and ready to sacrifice himself, for his ideals.

* * *

The reader may well rub his eyes in astonished disbelief that the stupidly reactionary nonsense printed above should appear in the columns of the Militant. We hasten to assure him that it is copied, word for word, from the first headline to the last sentence, from the front page of the Jewish *Morning Freiheit*, (October 11, 1929) official organ of the Communist Party of the U. S., which was recently spanked, de-chauvinized, de-nationalized, purged, re-organized and Bolshevized by the Central Committee of the Party.

"The Liberator of Afghanistan . . . Renowned as Idealist . . . population dancing with joy . . . commander of the revolutionary forces . . . rights to the entire people to determine their government . . . beloved by the entire people . . . and liberator!" Who is it? It is a Nadir Khan, the Lenin-Simon Bolivar-Debs-Chiang Kai-Shek-Kemal Pasha-Herbert Hoover of Afghanistan rolled into one, the darling of the *Freiheit*!

The *Freiheit* news-writer who wrote that story, and the Bolshevized editor who let it pass—to this day—without a word, have simply made a horrible mistake. They have wandered into the Communist movement purely by accident. They have a couple of splendid, good-paying jobs waiting for them on a Hearst newspaper or in the press department of the Chinese embassy at Washington.

The Real Situation in Russia

"THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA" by L. D. Trotsky, containing the PLATFORM OF THE OPPOSITION and the FALSIFICATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION, a book of 350 pages, can be purchased through the *Militant*, in either ENGLISH or JEWISH at \$2.00 per copy. No work is more important for an understanding of the situation in the Soviet Union, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the Communist International and the causes of the crisis in the Communist movement internationally and in each country. Comrade Trotsky also presents in this work, first given to the XVth Party Congress of the Soviet Union, the solutions to the problems facing the Soviet Union and the Communist International. Make money orders payable to THE MILITANT.

A DEBATE IN WASHINGTON

All workers are invited to the debate at the Washington (D. C.) Open Forum, 808 Eye Street, N. W., between Edward J. Irvine, who will defend the viewpoint of the Russian Opposition and Maurice Holld, who will represent the viewpoint of the Stalinist faction. The debate will take place on Sunday, November 24, 1909, at 3 p. m. Discussion will follow.



LETTERS FROM THE MILITANTS



THE LEWIS-FARRINGTON FIGHT

Springfield, Ill.

The Militant:

The crisis of the Illinois miners has deepened twofold since my letter to you. The reason for this is that many mines have opened up in the last month but since the conveyor system is being introduced into the mines only less than 40% of the miners are being employed—the rest must starve and those that are working under the conveyor system are beginning to show signs of revolt. Take for instance the mine at Cora, near Springfield, where formerly over 500 miners were employed; today, under the conveyor system, only 133 miners are employed and more coal is being produced and this in turn is having a social effect upon the miners. And what is being done at Cora is being done generally in every mine that is opening up this year.

Another reason for the deepening of the crisis is the continuation of the squabble of the Fishwick vs. the Lewis machine over the spoils of what is left of the U.M.W.A. in Illinois. At the Rock Island convention of the Illinois Federation of Labor, Frank Farrington was one of the principal speakers and from there we first heard that Farrington had again entered the U.M.W.A. through the back door, so Farrington says, "to save the Illinois miners from destruction by Lewis." The important thing about Farrington's comeback into the U.M.W.A. is that Fishwick in an editorial in the *Illinois Miner* says:

"After the resignation, or rather the assassination, of Former President Frank Farrington through one of the blackest conspiracies ever entered into by a so-called labor leader (i.e., Lewis) and an employer of labor." Lewis has caused the removal of the international board member Madden from Illinois, the Franklin County district board member Fox and is also demanding the removal of the Peoria district board member and the head of the district legal department. Many articles are being published by Lewis against the Fishwick machine showing corruption in Illinois and Fishwick is publishing many articles against Lewis showing that Lewis is a Leonardo Blowhardo Machiavelli.

This week, Fishwick did away with the provisional sub-district that Lewis appointed for the Franklin County. Fishwick added the local unions that formerly belonged to the Franklin County sub-district to other sub-districts that are under his control—thus taking the first organizational move against Lewis since the fight began. Then Lewis wrote to the coal operators telling them that he is the boss in Illinois; and Fishwick has done the same. The head of Fishwick's legal department starts court action against Lewis for \$250,000 damage suit for slander. Lewis demands that Fishwick call upon the head of the legal department to withdraw the suit and remove the attorney involved or else Lewis would oust the whole district machine. Fishwick says, go ahead and shoot, and has the removed international board member bring another \$250,000 slander and damage suit against Lewis. The final break between these arch-fakers is near at hand.

I suppose that by this time you have heard the reason why John J. Watt, the national president of the National Miners Union was kept away from the T.U.U.L. convention at Cleveland. In my last letter, I believe I wrote that Watt had resigned from the Party. Presto! Watt is not a member of the C.P. and therefore . . .

Since Watt became president of the National Miners Union, he has been continually fighting the Party bureaucracy. Watt's contention has been that the miners should have something to say with regards to what the program for the miners should be—that is, when the miners' problems are discussed and a program is to be outlined, the miners' fraction of the Party should be called in; that the Party give its general political line and together with the help of the miners' fraction a program for the miners be made. And Foster, while fighting to get control of the Party from Lovestone, supported Watt, who was fighting the Lovestone agents in the National Miners Union: the Tooheys, the Myerscoughs, etc. But now, since a different situation exists in the Party, Watt must go—even be removed from the presidency of the N.M.U. because he is no longer a member of the Party. Watt's reason for resigning from the Party was because he could no longer carry out bureaucratically made policies. And I believe Watt is sincere in trying to build the N.M.U. He is working night and day at present in Illinois trying to build the new miners' union. While Watt is trying to do this, the official paid agents of the Party are running around every corner and howling that Watt is that kind of a crook and that he is to be removed and that Freeman Thompson will be made president of the N.M.U.

I have been active in the miners' struggle during the last month. Several weeks ago I went to Benld to attend the Illinois N.M.U. Conference—mostly Party members present. I had just received my bundle of *Militants* and I distributed them there. A Chicago comrade reported on the T.U.U.L. convention and I had to take issue with him because he said that the miners must now make the center of their fight in Illinois against the I.W.W., the S.L.P., S.P., etc. In reply, I said that the center of our fight should be against the operators and the Lewis-Fishwick machines and that regardless of one's color or political affiliations he must have a right to join the N.M.U. In the afternoon a mass meeting was held at which about two thousand miners attended to hear Watt, Slinger and Thompson.

Last Sunday in Springfield we held a large mass meeting at which about two thousand miners attended. Watt

and myself were the speakers. The Stalinites tried every way possible to prevent me from acting as chairman of the mass meeting, but this time they failed utterly. We had miners from many surrounding mining towns attending our mass meeting. Now Watt and I are arranging for mass meetings in Taylorville and Nokomis. I have written to both Toohey and Corbishley demanding that they send me some dues-books and dues-stamps to sign up new members into the National Miners Union. Not even a word have I received from either of them in reply. Miners are coming into my home and wanting to sign up into the new miners' union and all I can do is to take their names and address and tell them to come to our next meeting and that I will sign them up as soon as I can get cards and dues-stamps.

In conclusion, the introduction of the conveyor system, the intensified exploitation of those that are working, and unemployment are forcing the miners to fight. The miners, whether they want to or not, are being dressed up for a fight. The Lewis-Fishwick squabble over the remains of the U.M.W.A. is adding fuel to the struggle. Of course the rank and file to the Lewis or Fishwick fakers means nothing. They will first try to settle their differences in the capitalist courts or through the coal operators. Being dressed up with a National Miners Union card is not enough. The N.M.U. must get on the job with a program and immediate demands for the present situation in Illinois. The Communist Party must wake up and show the miners how to fight. Just imagine: here is a struggle that has been raging for the last year—involving over 65,000 miners—yet the first news that the *Daily Worker* carries about the struggle is a column in the issue of October 8th, and the *Coal Digger* in its last issue of September 15th does not say a word about the situation in Illinois.

The Fishwick machine in Illinois no longer recognizes John L. Lewis as the international president, already refers to Lewis as the ex-president of the U.M.W.A. There is a split in Illinois. There is Fishwick's union and the Lewis union and the rank and file union of the N.M.U. The Communist Party must snap out of its narrow, myopic policy and give real leadership to the coming struggle.

The Party unit in Springfield is dead, not even holding any meetings since my expulsion. I feel confident that in the near future we will be able to organize a unit of the Communist League here.

JOSEPH ANGELO.

PURGING THE CANADIAN SPORTSMEN

Toronto, Canada.

The Militant,

I enclose a letter sent some time ago to all Y.C.L.

COMMUNIST LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

The Communist League of America (Opposition) is steadily and systematically broadening its work into the general field of class struggle. Recognizing as a major task, an organized theoretical struggle against the revisionism of Marx and Lenin's teachings by the false disciple, Stalin, in the Comintern and the respective Communist Parties, the Communist League knows that mass work directed by correct Communist policy must supplement to the other in order to bring the Communist movement again to a correct line in theory and practice.

The branches of the Communist League are active among the coal miners (Southern Illinois, under the leadership of Joe Angelo); the clothing workers in Minneapolis where a Left wing in the A. C. W. is being built through the Communist League, here also the League is active in all fields; the building trades (in Minneapolis, Chicago, New York, St. Louis); railroad men (in Minnesota); and in numerous other trades and industries. The Communist League is recruiting members regularly from trade unions and unorganized workers in numerous trades and industries, such as machinists, steel workers, building trades, auto industry, upholsterers, needle trades and others. The Communist League has a few hundred members, but they are active, thinking, determined fighters, prepared to fight over a long period for a regenerated revolutionary Communist movement, now being systematically destroyed by Stalin and his clique throughout the world. Clarity of principles and tactics and mass work are the rock upon which the Communist League endeavors to build.

The League, despite the sabotage of the official Communist party and the I. L. D. of a broad united front movement for the framed-up Gastonia defendants, leads in a demand for a genuine united front and works for the Gastonia victims (Minneapolis, Chicago, St. Louis, New York, New Haven, etc. The League (Boston, Minneapolis) is resisting the narrow policy of the Communist party in the Independent Workmen's Circle. Despite the usual tactic of expulsion by the party bureaucrats, the Toronto comrades are working for a broad workers' sport movement.

November 7th, Soviet Anniversary, meeting are already arranged in Minneapolis, St. Louis and other points. Mass meetings have been held recently in New York and Boston on the crisis in the Communist movement and on the recent uprising in Palestine. Entertainments for the benefits of the MILITANT were held the past month in Chicago and New York. Other cities are organizing similar affairs.

All the branches are active to raise their quotas for

and C.P. units in Canada by the former's national sport director, George Andrew, which I just received from a Finnish comrade. It says in part: "At present two Trotskyist renegades, Joe Silver and Maurice Quarter, hold important executive positions in the N. E.C. of the Workers Sports Alliance . . . We are faced with two immediate tasks, first to prepare to exterminate the influence of Trotskyism in the W.S.A. and build the W.S.A. as a militant, class-conscious, sports movement. Secondly, to further (?) unify the loose and weak Workers Sports Movement in Canada."

Today, after the Workers Sports was purged of the Trotskyist "renegades" and a complete C.P. and Y.C.L. fraction appointed in the National Executive, this body has gone entirely out of existence and the secretary has quit the city. Fine unity they achieved, very fine.

About the charge that we tried to destroy the organization: In 1927, comrade Silver and I took the leading role in the organization of the conference which followed with the formation of three branches in Toronto. In the same year, as secretary and chairman of the national sports department of the Young Communist League, we advised the Y.C.L. units in the organization of branches in Montreal and other places. We were responsible for the organization of factory leagues and both of us drew up the reports to the Red Sports International and Y.C.I. on the sports questions.

In 1928, we organized the national conference which was successful in setting up a provisional national executive. In spite of the efforts of the Y.C.L. to remove us, we remained as the national heads of the organization till the last convention. The proof of the position we held in the organization was that all the non-Party members supported us till the end, and at first even the Party and Y.C.L. members refused to vote against us until threatened with disciplinary measures.

In July, the Stalinist faction took over complete control of the organization. Today, not even the shadow of the national executive remains. Not a bad job, what?

MAURICE QUARTER.

FROM AN AMERICAN IN BERLIN

Berlin, Germany.

The Militant,

I've received the parcel of *Militants* you sent in good order. Thank you very much. As ever, the *Militant* is full of life, full of vigor, the one positive pole in the sad state of affairs into which the American Communist movement has fallen. Good luck to the Opposition in rallying the confused ranks of the Party membership under the Leninist banner. The mutual unmasking of the Right and the Center leadership certainly offers favorable ground.

S. GORDON.

the forthcoming WEEKLY MILITANT. Outstanding among these are Chicago, Minneapolis, New York, Philadelphia, Toronto in raising larger quotas. Richmond, Boston, Youngstown, Pittsburg and other cities are doing their bit AND THE WEEKLY MILITANT THEREFORE WILL BE. The National Office is completing the technical arrangements for its issuance.

A subscription drive (for renewals and new subscriptions) is being organized in which Minneapolis and Kansas City have just made a good start.

Suspension of O. Carlson from the Communist League

The National Committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) has suspended O. Carlson from the Communist League for a period of three months. His suspension as an alternate member of the National Committee of the Communist League is also in effect.

O. Carlson is suspended for failure to accept the discipline and carry out the decisions of the Communist League in the strike of the clothing workers in Minneapolis. He is an organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. The possibilities exist for the development of a left wing movement against the reactionary Hillman machine. The Communist League, at the moment of the outbreak of a strike among the unorganized clothing workers, in the Excell shops and others, laid out a policy and program of activity for the strike in agreement with Carlson. This policy, if fully carried out, would have aided in the broadening of the strike among other clothing workers, for winning greater gains for the workers on strike, and laid the basis for the development of a strong Left Wing in the A. C. W. against the class-collaboration policy of the Hillman machine, under the leadership of Genis and Kaminsky in Minneapolis. Carlson failed to carry out the decisions of the Communist League.

National Committee

Communist League of America (Opposition)

ST. LOUIS MEETING

The local branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) will celebrate the 12th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution at a mass meeting in Druid's Hall, 9th & Market, St. Louis, Mo. Elmer MacMillan and other well-known militants will speak. AM workers are invited to attend.

* * *

The Communist League branch in St. Louis has just sent in 11 subs to the MILITANT with an earnest pledge that this is only a small beginning which they intend to increase steadily in the future.