

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Vol. III, No. 26,

Telephone: DRYdock 1656 NEW YORK, N. Y. Saturday, July 12, 1936

PRICE 5 CENTS

Mooney-Billings Stay Jailed

Appellate Court Turns Down Foster, Minor, Amter and Raymond

APPEAL TO OUR READERS

Last week the Militant was compelled to omit publishing its regular number. Lack of funds made it impossible. The income of the Militant has been sharply affected by the intense unemployment and by the summer period which usually cuts down activities. The decrease in our income—never very high—has been a serious blow to the activities of the organization and to the Militant in particular.

The difficulties with the Militant are all the more harmful now, at a time when the Marxist truths it has been hammering home, against the greatest obstacles, have taken deep roots in the Communist and class conscious movement in this country. The living evidence of this is contained in the numerous statements of adherence to the Opposition made by rank and file and leading comrades of the Communist Party, which cannot forever be kept in a state of injurious ignorance by the prevailing regime of organized falsification.

The Opposition is growing, and the Militant must keep pace with it. Up to now, the financial support for the paper has been received largely from the members of the Communist League (Opposition) and their most direct sympathizers. The maintenance of the Weekly Militant by this small group has entailed some pretty heavy burdens in many cases.

It is imperative to maintain the Weekly! It is necessary to distribute this "burden"—one which we gladly assume as our elementary right and duty in the workers movement—to broader sections of our readers. The existence and maintenance of a revolutionary labor journal is a precarious affair under the best of circumstances. At present, under multiplied difficulties, only the greatest sacrifices and solidarity can accomplish the task.

The National Committee of the Communist League (Opposition) decided to make an intensive drive for a \$2,000,000 fund to maintain the Militant as a Weekly. A certain response has already been given. But it is far from sufficient. Much more money, forwarded at greater speed, is needed IMMEDIATELY!

The urgency of this appeal cannot be exaggerated. Money is needed NOW for the next issue, and the one thereafter. Upon the rapidity and generosity in the response to this appeal, depend the forthcoming numbers of the Militant.

Answer with your contribution right away. Every reader can and must help. Send all moneys to

THE MILITANT
23 Third Ave. Rm. 4, New York N.Y.

The Supreme Court of California last week refused to recommend the release of Warren K. Billings, working class fighter who is serving a life sentence in the most notorious anti-labor frame-up that American history redolent with these crimes of capitalism has known for decades. Because Billings has been in prison before for his labor activities, the "governor cannot act on a pardon" until the Supreme Court makes a "favorable" recommendation.

A few days later, the Advisory Pardon Board of California handed in a recommendation to Governor Young against the pardon of Tom Mooney, the comrade of Billings, who was convicted together with the latter, allegedly for having thrown the bomb at the San Francisco Preparedness Day Parade in 1917, but in actuality, because his activities among the workers were a thorn in the side of the open shop magnates who have made "Sunny California" a hell for the workers.

In New York, at about the same time, the highest state Court of Appeals refused to act against the outrageous decision of the lower court in convicting and sentencing the leaders of the Communist Party, William Z. Foster, Robert Minor, I. Amter and H. Raymond who are serving terms for leading the unemployment demonstration in Union Square on March 6th.

The frame-up against Mooney and Billings is one of the most dastardly monstrosities of American capitalist class justice. In the 13 years of their imprisonment, exhaustive investigation has proved to the hilt that they were tried in the

most prejudiced atmosphere and convicted on the basis of corrupted, perjured evidence, bought and paid for by the manufacturing and industrial interests of the State. One by one, the witnesses against the two militants were exposed as prostitutes, pimps, gamblers, drug addicts, forgers and similar types. The frame-up was so manifest that a commission appointed at one time by President Wilson revealed it publicly in all its criminal detail. Ev-

ery development since then has only served to confirm Mooney's and Billings' innocence of every crime but that of having antagonized the California boss class.

Class conscious workers have pointed out for years that Mooney and Billings will be released only after a vigorous campaign of the workers to compel the jailors to open the prison doors. Liberal and socialist "friends" of the prisoners have, instead, sought to obtain their release by cringing before their jailors, by back-door dickering, by appeals to capitalist politicians. The false hopes raised in this manner have been shattered a dozen times, and once more today by the recent decisions.

Justice in capitalist courts is not meant for workers. We emphasize what we have constantly repeated: Mooney and Billings will be freed only by the mass pressure of the working class. Mooney was saved from hanging by the protest of labor. Labor can obtain his and Billings' freedom only by the same method. This holds true for the New York Communists, whose continued imprisonment is a blot on the working class movement and a burning indictment of capitalist class "justice".

The fight for the release of our class war prisoners is the fight of every worker of the whole labor movement. There is still time for the building of a broad, powerful mass movement of defense. The Left wing must initiate it and imbue it with spirit and determination. A united battle will defeat the jailors.

LOVESTONE'S SYMBOL

Gandhi, says Lovestone, is the 'symbol of the revolutionary upsurge in India'. Gandhi's closest lieutenant is Pandit Vallabhi Patel, president of the all-India National Congress. On July 6th the New York Times reported a speech of Patel's to the rich Parsee merchants of Bombay. And this is what this Lovestoneite "symbol of revolutionary upsurge" said:

"It has been suggested that the Parsees might lose all their wealth under swaraj, but instead of being millionaires as at present, you would all become multi-millionaires under swaraj."

Apparently imperialism abrogates the class struggle in the eyes of the Bucharins, Stalins, Roys and Lovestones but not in the eyes of the Chiang Kai Sheks, Patels and the good Parsees of Bombay.

CAPITALIST MURDER ON THE STREETS!

Three revolutionary workers murdered in one week. That is the toll taken by police savagery and reactionary labor thugs in New York City and Chicago.

In Chicago, Herzl Weizenberg, a member of the T.U.U.L., was set upon by gangsters of the Painters' Union bureaucracy because he was engaged in distributing leaflets for the Left wing group. The brutal scum of society, paid employees of the reactionary labor traitors, attacked comrade Weizenberg with brass knuckles, black jacks and lead pipes and left him in such a condition that he died a few hours later in the hospital.

In New York City, at a street meeting in Harlem of the Communist Party, the police came to the aid of the black chauvinists of the Garvey movement who had started to break up the Communist meeting. Wielding their clubs in a rabid frenzy, the blows fell thickest upon Alfred Levy, an unemployed member of the Party. The injuries he received at the hands of the police proved fatal.

Forty-eight hours had barely passed when the police claimed another victim. This time it was the Mexican worker Gonzalo Gonzales, also a member of the Communist Party who was shot down in cold blood by a policeman in Harlem for marching through the streets with a small group of workers on their way to an indoor meeting. Comrade Gonzales died an hour later.

The New York militants responded to this outburst of barbaric police fury by an impressive funeral parade of more than five thousand workers, a united march of hundreds of Negro workers together with their white brothers, a symbol of the coming day of the revolutionary labor unity which the capitalist class seeks so des-

perately to hamper and destroy. The splendid march of the workers is only a beginning. A real struggle must now be begun—against police brutality, against the murder of the workers, and for the freedom of speech and assembly of workers.

Police Savagery

Why are the police so savage in their attacks on workers' meetings? There are thousands of gangsters engaged in the most nefarious work, openly, every day, in the city. Thirty thousand speak-easies run with cynical disregard for capitalist law. Corruption, bribery, speculation run rampant throughout the official administration. And the police are silent and inert as the tomb. But the activities of the labor movement, particularly of its revolutionary section, immediately arouse the uniformed thugs to mad activity; because the property, the wealth, the right to exploit and crush, the power of the boss class is endangered; because the threat rises of a working class aroused out of its lethargy and inspired to militant struggle. That is the function of the police: the suppression of the militancy of labor and the preservation of capitalist class power.

The awakening of thousands of workers under the influence of the economic crisis has impelled the police to more brutal activity. The working class must be kept in its place—the place of the underdog! The offensive against it must be sharpened on every front. Therefore, the most violent measures against the vanguard, the most militant section of the working class, the Communists. Break up their meetings! Raid their halls! Shoot down their fighters!

The attack on the whole working class is always started against its most conscious section. The capitalists and the

value to the workers of the Communist movement, and its dangers to their class rule. They know that the Communists alone—not the bosses' agents in the trade unions or the middle class socialist party—seek to mobilize the workers for struggle against their misery. They hate the Communist Party and fear its potential strength—not because of the blundering and harum-scarum policies and leadership of the Party, but in spite of them.

Workers Stirred

The attack on the Communists is first blood drawn from the whole working class. The whole working class must therefore unite against this attack. It must present an iron front to the murderers of workers on the street. The workers have been profoundly stirred by these slaughters. The workers must actively resist the disruption of labor meetings.

The Communist Party must strike back at the police thugs and their masters with the weapon of the united front—the organized power of labor. We do not speak here of the paltry frauds, the hollow, self-deceptive "united fronts" that have been practiced recently by the official Party. We urge instead a genuine united movement of all the progressive workers and their organizations to batter down the police terror, to fight militantly for that which is being taken from labor so violently: free speech, free assembly and free press.

Such a movement and such slogans can make powerful reply to the blue-coated murderers and their capitalist employers. The creation of such a movement will proceed from the elimination of the Party's official phrase-mongering, meaningless to the masses of workers and incapable of setting them in motion.

The Crisis in the Communist Movement

New Party Forces Continue to Join the Communist Opposition

JERRY HILL FOR THE OPPOSITION

Jerry Hill is a young Negro worker who was elected an alternate member of the National Executive Committee at the last convention of the Young Communist League. He joined the Y.C.L. in 1925 and did Negro work in Jacksonville and Springfield in 1927-28. Comrade Hill was elected a delegate to the Fifth National Convention of the Y. C. L. held in New York City in 1929. He is working at present in Springfield.

I agree with and endorse "Back to Lenin" the manifesto of the Communist League of America (Opposition) which points out correctly the crisis in the Comintern and the American Party.

The Comintern has revised the fundamental principles of Leninism, especially on the question of Building Socialism in One Country. Leninism is internationalism and the theory of "socialism in one country" is impossible in an epoch of world economy. The Chinese Revolution, the British General Strike and the United Front tactic failed because of the wrong policies of the Right-Centrist leadership in the Comintern.

The present objective situation in America—the Wall Street crash—the Atlanta situation—the white terror in the form of lynching Negroes in Sherman, Honey Grove and Bryan, Texas; all offers the Party a great opportunity to organize the workers. But due to incorrect policies and lame and impotent leadership the Party is not only losing ground daily but also it has utterly failed to organize and defend the working class. This condition is especially shown in the Southern Illinois district. Although thousands of coal miners are unemployed and tenant farmers being driven from their homes, practically no work is being carried on, especially among the Negroes living in Southern Illinois. Thousands of Negroes live in Springfield, Peoria, East St. Louis and Rockford yet no effort at all is being made to carry on work among them. The Party must begin to carry work in this so-called "great Abe Lincoln" state upon such burning issues as; Jim-crowism, barring Negroes from mines, factories, unions, theatres and municipal bathing pools. The Party must also fight against the white chauvinism that exists among the Party members as for instance at West Frankfort during the last National Miners Union strike.

The "self-determination for Negroes" theory* of the Party is incorrect because the American Negro is part and parcel of the American working class and not a colonially oppressed people. This theory in America leads away from class consciousness to race consciousness and ultimately into the swamp of white chauvinism.

The Young Communist League in general reflects the failures and mistakes of the Party and further shows the bankruptcy of the Stalinist leadership.

The International Opposition, under the leadership of comrade Leon Trotsky adheres to the fundamental principles of Leninism and the Left Opposition is the true bearer of the International Proletarian Revolution. The unity of the Comintern and the American Party on the line of Leninism is the need of the hour. Therefore, I, as member of the Young Communist League, demand that the first step in this direction must be the reinstatement into the Party of the Left Opposition and comrade Leon Trotsky under whose leadership the Red Army was organized and the October Revolution made victorious and who is today the foremost teacher of World Communism.

—JERRY HILL

* The question of the slogan referred to by comrade Hill was left by the national conference of the Communist League to the discussion and elaboration by the organization.—Eds.

The 7th Convention of the Party - a Debacle

The seventh convention of the C. P. U. S. A. will take its place as one of the most lamentable in the history of American Communism. The current economic crisis constitutes a more powerful indictment of American capitalism and its tinsel "prosperity", than the arguments of a thousand theses. The lash of hunger curves about the bodies of millions of unemployed. In their conference rooms the financiers weave schemes for the reduction of the workers' existence levels. Yet in this crisis the Party claiming to be the revolutionary vanguard reveals a shallowness of political thought, a pettiness of spirit and impotence in action that bring malicious satisfaction to every enemy of our movement. In speaking of the Party, we draw a sharp line of distinction between the membership and the bureaucracy. Where criticism on all but secondary issues is stigmatized immediately as Right or Left "opportunism" and invites expulsion, the bulk of the rank and file still prefer silence. The convention was a formality—the theses had already been drafted and adopted in Moscow.

The New Zig-Zag of Centrism

In substance these theses illustrate all the characteristic features of centrism. Who does not remember Molotov's formulation of the period at the Tenth Plenum as "we have entered with both feet into the realm of revolutionary events". Regardless of time or space, the "third period" strategy of the imminent revolutionary crisis was uniformly applied to all countries. When Stalin's ultra-Left caricature of collectivization and the Five Year Plan brought the Soviet Union to the brink of disaster, the bureaucrat, sounded a panicky retreat and unloaded responsibility for the "excesses" on the ranks. In the Comintern, Stalin's agent, Remmele blamed the membership for the extravagances of the theory of "social fascism".

Accordingly, the Party statement on the convention condemns as "Leftist" those who do not recognize the cyclical character of the economic crisis. The *Daily Worker* wakes up to the fact that the struggle for social insurance is one of the foremost Party tasks in connection with the unemployment situation. But eclectic substitution for Marxist analysis still prevails. In the same breath, the theses state that "a revolutionary upsurge grips the masses". In the United States? Where, how, when? Only in the lurid headlines of the *Daily Worker* nonchalantly lying that "thousands of miners have gone out in a mass strike against unemployment". How can a really correct line of political action result from such confusion and self-contradiction.

The Rank and File of Newark Speaks Out

The Worker-Communists in the ranks of the official Party are moving towards the Left Opposition in spite of all the abuse, slander, and suppression practised by the blind Party bureaucracy! This is manifest from the statements of adhesion to our platform which have been appearing in the last few issues of the *Militant*, and which we expect to continue for some time. The "liquidated Trotskyists" are on the march and nothing can prevent the victory of their ideas. In addition to the statements of support reproduced in other parts of this issue, we are glad to print the following letter from a young rebel in Newark, N.J. It is indicative of the process of development that is taking place inside the Party:

Dear Comrades of the Communist League:

Newark, N. J.

Since the split in the Communist Party and the expulsion of the comrades of the Communist League (Opposition) I have tried to get the real facts of what caused the split. I did not know much about Communism at that time as I only joined the Young Communist League a month before the split. But since then, after reading between the lines, I seem to

consider M. Olgin's report of the convention. Olgin is one of the present ideological Party leasers and editor of the most widely circulated Party organ. In an article in the *Freiheit* (July 3rd) he calls for a militant alliance between white and black workers "...to lead to a democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants" (our emphasis)—and this not for China or India but for the greatest imperialist power on earth. In other words, the coming revolution in America is not to be proletarian and socialist but bourgeois and democratic. Either the man knows what he is talking about or he is an imbecile. In either case he should be expelled from a Bolshevik-Leninist party.

Bureaucracy versus Bolshevism

This convention in the United States was a pocket edition of the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Both were simply rallies of the Centrist faction. While Stalin indulged his coarse witticisms amid the Bonapartist adulation of his apparatus pretorian guard, hundreds of Left Oppositionists were being arrested and rushed into solitary confinement and concentration camps in Siberia. Similarly in the U. S. we can record the biggest wave of adherents to our opposition movement since its formation after the Sixth Congress. The bureaucrats cannot stifle the Bolsheviks. Fresh cadres are maturing. We will continue our struggle for the Comintern against both Right and Centrists misleaders.

We shall yet have occasion to recur to the plenum of the Lovestone faction which met about the same time. It is the Lovestones in the Comintern who are jointly responsible with Stalin for the Menshevik corruption of the program and policies of the Communist International. Good elements though there are in the ranks of the group, the Lovestone leadership is the same old self-styled "Marxian trunk". Albert Weisbord criticized the Lovestone misrepresentations of the position of Trotsky on the international questions, the failure to protest the deportation, and the assassination of Blumkin. In answer, B.D. Wolfe came across with the same old fallaciousities about Trotsky's alleged "sectarianism", "conditional defence of the U.S.S.R.", "advocacy of Thermidor" (sic!) Lovestone has persuaded the group to "broaden out". He is prepared to admit all tendencies—"even Trotskyites"—under the hegemony of the "Marxian trunk," of course. The gap between Lovestone and Bolshevism widens.

The names of the 25 elected to the Central Committee of the Party are being (Continued on Page 8)

I agree with your line much more than I do with the present Y.C.L. and C.L. line. You seem to think that you have no sympathetic workers in the Party and League. But let me tell you that here in Newark, N.J., the question of the Opposition is discussed very often among Party and League members, but not at meetings. I often try to bring this question up at Young Communist League meetings, but every time I am threatened with expulsion. I am not the only one, there are a few other League members who try to get the real facts of the split, but they are also threatened. They even went so far as suspending one League comrade for a month. Some of our League members received the *Militant*. They read it with great enthusiasm. Right around the corner of the Communist Party headquarters a newsstand used to sell the *Militant*. But no more, since they were threatened that they would get their stand broke up. I wish you would do something about this if you can.

If you would only do some work here I am sure that you could win both the Party and the League and establish a Communist League branch right here in this city. Do not make my name public yet

—X.Y.

FORMER N. M. U. HEAD FOR LEFT GROUP

The letter of comrade Watt brings to the Opposition one of the best fighters among the American miners. In the Communist movement for many years, he was a leader in the Left wing fight against John L. Lewis. He was the first president of the National Miners Union. His opposition to the bureaucratic, mechanical tactics of the Stalinists was sufficient to cause his arbitrary removal from the union and expulsion from the Party.

Springfield, Ill.

I attended a very good meeting here in Springfield which was addressed by comrade Max Shachtman, Tuesday, May 24th, in which he explained the program of the Left Opposition, his meeting with comrade Trotsky and the preliminary Congress of the Left Opposition in Paris. Comrade Shachtman also dealt very effectively with the glaring errors of the Stalinite group in the various trade union and new union movements, dealing separately with their manoeuvres, wrong policies, idiotic schemes and phrase mongering in the Needle trades, textile and mining unions.

To me it was a treat, for not only has it been sometime since I have heard officially of the happenings in the other industries of this country, but also his lecture on the world conditions was clear and free from the exaggerations so commonly used by the Stalinite press, which only serve as their purpose the further muddling of the worker.

Comrade Shachtman was honored (?) by having in his meeting a few Party members, who by their exhibitions of ignorance on fundamental questions facing the Party and the new unions, their Stalinite traits of exaggerations, vilification and slander, made it easy for Shachtman to show to the honest workers in attendance the hypocrisy and sham that has destroyed the Communist Party in the mining fields of Illinois and how impossible it is for the Party under such leadership ever again to lead the workers. One glimpse at the Stalinists present, at their scowling faces, their inexperience in the economic or political phases of the struggle, and the traps they made for themselves and fell into when comrade Shachtman gave them the privilege of asking questions and permitting them to answer, was enough to show to the audience why there is no miners union of the National Miners Union in Illinois, much less any Party branches.

The meeting was significant in several respects. The audience was composed of workers, some coming from many miles to hear the message of the Opposition. We were deeply interested in the program and the also had one colored comrade present who rest of the audience was made up of real progressive elements in the labor movement. It showed the possibilities of again recruiting the progressives and again taking the lead in the struggles now going on. It showed that the workers are interested in the cause of the Opposition, for those workers sat some three hours, very attentive to comrade Shachtman and I predict that from this meeting will develop a strong group for the Opposition, and that the Opposition will be heard from in the coal fields of Illinois.

Personally, it also proved one thing to me, and that was that I have remained too quiet under the lying statements that have been broadcast by the Stalin group in regards to my activities connected with the National Miners Union. I have decided now that I shall issue a statement dealing in detail with my experiences with these Stalinites from the time I got into the movement. This will be illuminating and instructive especially to the mine workers and the Communists and other progressives who have felt the iron heel of these bankrupt "third period", phrase mongering bureaucrats.

—JOHN J. WATT

Aftermath of Needle Trades Convention

3. Tactics and Slogans for the Left Wing Struggle

By JAMES P. CANNON

It is high time to restate the fundamental tactics of Bolshevism on the trade union question and organize the struggle against their revision. The future of the Left wing in the American labor movement—and the future of the Communist Party—hinges on this issue. The decision of the convention of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union against the formation of a Left wing inside the old unions of the industry strengthens the grip of the reactionary leaders on these unions and thus strengthens the grip of the bosses on the workers. The nucleus of the Communist Opposition which is taking shape in the union, has for its first and most insistent duty the organization of a struggle to change this decision. Life itself will smash the decision, but the Communist militants must hasten the process in order that the least possible harm for the Left wing movement will result.

The building of the new industrial union and the organization of a fighting Left wing in the old unions are not contradictory tasks. They are two sides of the same task and are indissolubly bound together. The slogans and methods for the conduct of this two-sided struggle require explanation and discussion. This is all the more necessary since the convention failed to give a proper lead, and the document issued by the Lovestoneites at the convention is a typical product of opportunist straddling and half measures.

The policy adopted at the convention of the industrial union deals a double blow against the Left wing movement in the needle trades. On the one hand it forcibly tears away the more advanced and revolutionary elements from organizational contact with the masses of workers in the old unions. On the other hand it brings about a split in the ranks of the Left wing. In both of these consequences the policy runs counter to the basic line of Bolshevik tactics.

In the Amalgamated, which has a firm grip on the men's clothing section of the industry and where membership in the union is tied up with the question of a job, the new policy encounters insuperable difficulties from the start; and these difficulties will accumulate if any serious effort is made to enforce the policy. It will soon be demonstrated there that the workers who are willing to sacrifice their living in order to justify the stupidity of the Party are few. In the Cap and Millinery Union the new policy has already hit the rocks. The attempt to enforce the decision of the convention has split the Left wing of the New York blockers' local of this union in the middle.

The developments in the blockers' local are very instructive and they are symptomatic of what is to follow on a broader scale. In this local of 1,500 workers, constituting about fifty per cent of the workers in the trade in New York, the bloc of the Left wing and progressive forces has constituted a strong minority. The instructions to join the new Industrial Union have met with a categorical refusal on the part of all the Left wing and progressive elements except a handful of Party members. Let the Communist workers take heed of this situation in the blockers' local, it is a warning of what will happen everywhere.

Can a Left Wing Be Organized in the Old Unions

Is it possible under the present conditions to organize a strong Left wing in the old unions of the needle trades? Now more than ever. The program which the Party leadership forced on the Industrial Union convention, in arguing against it cites the destruction of standards won in years of struggle and the failure of the Right wing officialdom to defend the interests of the workers at any point. The answer is: just because this is so, just because the conditions of the workers grow more and more intolerable and the treachery of the Right wing bureaucrats becomes more clearly manifest, the soil becomes more favorable for the organization and rapid development of a broad Left wing movement within the old unions. The bureaucrats are powerless to prevent it. The only real obstacle is the policy of the Party which has been imposed on the present Left wing forces in the industry. And—so loudly do all the circumstances cry out for such an organized movement in the old unions not even the Party can hold it back for long. If not with the official Party then without it for the time being, the Left wing must and will be organized.

The nucleus of needle trades Communists now crystallizing under our banner have the duty to take the lead in this struggle and show the way, regardless of the decisions of the Party bureaucrats to the contrary.

The Program of Demands

The first and most important step in this direction is the formulation of a concrete program of economic demands and a vigorous agitation for them within the old unions. This is the Achilles heel of the Right wing regime and there is nothing they can do to prevent a sympathetic response to such an agitation in the ranks of the membership. The more they join hands with the bosses against the workers, the more they collaborate with them in robbing the workers of their standards the more do they create the conditions for a movement of revolt against them on the basis of our economic demands.

Every attempt on the part of the Right wing fakery to throttle this agitation will strengthen the position of the Left wing for the advocacy of another powerful slogan, the slogan of democracy in the unions. In view of the narrow, bureaucratic and arbitrary practices which have been smuggled into the administration of the new industrial union itself, it may be thought that this slogan is out of date. Nothing could be false than such an assumption. Those who hold it reckon without the workers and their deep-rooted impulse for self-governing organizations, one of the truest impulses of the advanced elements of the class. Not for nothing has been the long schooling of the needle trades workers in trade union organization; not in vain the historic struggles of the Left wing for this slogan of the rank and file. The sentiment for trade union democracy, developed and strengthened in these long struggles, is not dead. Given a sensible policy and leadership, this sentiment will reassert itself and be a source of power for the new Left wing struggle in the old unions.

Does the policy of re-opening the fight in the old unions imply any reconciliation with the traitorous and bribed officials of these unions, as the soft-headed experts of the "third period" say? Just the opposite. It means the elevation of Left wing fight from phrase-mongering futility into action which will animate the Left wing movement with a new vitality. We do not speak in favor of a tip-toe activity in the old unions by grace of the fakery, but an open, militant and ruthless war to exterminate them and all their influence. This

First Henri Barbusse - Is Michael Gold Next?

A number of weeks ago, we printed the correspondence of comrade Pierre Naville, of Paris, on the fate of Henri Barbusse, intellectual valet of the Stalinist regime, and his literary journal of pseudo-Communist confusionism, *Monde*. We announced then that the sale of *Monde* had been prohibited in the Soviet Union (for three months now) and that the bureaucracy of the Party was getting ready to unload Barbusse. We asked then why a journal which is prohibited in the Soviet Union is recommended as good revolutionary literature to the members of the French Communist Party in particular and the workers in general.

A reply of sorts has finally appeared in the French edition of the *International Press Correspondence* (No. 46, page 544), addressed to Barbusse by the so-called "International Bureau of Revolutionary Literature" which says:

"In a period of sharpened struggle, you, comrade, edit and publish under your name a journal by which there is emptied into the masses who have confidence in you the opportunist doctrine of the calumniators and enemies of the U.S.S.R. This journal which has no proletarian line, spreads ideological confusion in the masses, extremely detrimental in the present period... Are you with us in our struggle or against us? The only reply to our question will be the radical change of the line of the paper edited by you, or the withdrawal of your name from it. An evasive reply cannot be given in the present period."

All well and good—particularly if we bear in mind that the belated critics of Citizen Barbusse are precisely the same

means to expose and denounce them before the workers on the basis of every concrete act of betrayal which they commit from day to day. It means to explain theoretically and practically their role as agents of the bosses and to imbue the workers with a deathless hatred for them. The constitution of a new Left wing movement within the old unions, uniting its struggle with that of the militants in the new industrial union, means to enter on another stage in the fight to cleanse the needle trades movement of the reactionary labor lieutenants of the employing class.

The Tactics of the United Front

The fourth important phase of Left wing strategy is the revival of the tactics of the united front and the slogan of trade union unity. The slogan of unity has power to move the masses. It corresponds to the necessities of their struggle and to their own inmost convictions, born of tragic experience in splits and defeats. The Left wing must raise again the slogan of unity in the new union and in the old ones. It must explain to the workers over and over again that it is the Right wing reactionaries who bring division and split into the labor movement and that it is the Left wing which fights for unity. The Left wing must prove this in its daily policy because words alone are not enough; it is deeds which convince. The Left wing in the needle trades took shape, grew and became consolidated in battle under the slogan of unity. The abandonment of the slogan has been accompanied by a weakened organization and a dwindling influence. The revival of the slogan now is necessary to turn the helm and change the course toward new victories for the Left wing and for the masses of the workers.

A general phrase about unity means nothing. What is required is a precise formulation for the concrete circumstances. The Party's talk about unity is good for nothing because it goes hand in hand with a policy of split. The workers are not as dumb as the bureaucrats think and they are not so easily fooled by words which are contradicted by deeds. The slogan put forth by the Lovestoneite faction—a typical production of opportunist generality and evasion—is no better. This shoddy crew, trying to capitalize the sentiment for unity in the old unions and fearing to offend the sectarian patriotism of the members of the new union, has issued the slogan: "Fight for one industrial union in the industry!" What does that mean? Like all the slogans of the opportunists it means anything you like. As to how it is to be realized, how it is to be put concretely in

people who lauded him to the skies, started his paper *Monde*, and set it up as the model for all other "proletarian literary" journals to follow.

As is well known, the American prototype of *Monde* is the *New Masses*, under the ideological aegis of Michael Gold, Walt Carmon, Earl Browder and other prominent proletarian poets. The *New Masses* continues to publish advertisements for *Monde*, which—we repeat—has been prohibited in the U.S.S.R. The same *New Masses* fearfully rejects advertisements for the *Militant* or for any of comrade Trotsky's books. Like *Monde*, columns are open to every confusionist and dilletante hanging on to the fringes of the revolutionary movement, but not to the Left wing of that movement. They fear to anger the Stalinist commissars whose literary footmen they are, and the millionaire banker, Otto H. Kahn, patron of "proletarian art" and of Citizen Gold, the pallid devourer of Trotsky and Oppositionists.

M. Barbusse played the same role for a while. The Stalinists have now rid themselves of that embarrassing baggage. Were Gold one-tenth the sage in politics he imagines himself, he ought to be able to read handwriting when it is written on the wall.

Remember the days of "prosperity" when labor banking, was all the rage among the "constructive statesmen of labor?" Yet another "labor bank" has had to close its doors—this time the largest of its kind in the country (the Botheholds of Railway Clerks National Bank) as a result of the \$1,000,000 kiting operations.

the new union and in the old unions—this is left to guess work and interpretation.

The Slogan of Unity

The Opposition Communists in the needle trades cannot trifle with double-meaning slogans. Their aim is to clarify the issues, not to attract the workers with catch-words. They are duty bound to act in the spirit of Lenin, who said: "Argue about tactics but give clear slogans!" Therefore they must formulate the slogan of unity with such precision that there can be no misunderstanding about it. The Stalinists propose to achieve "unity" by having the 175,000 workers in the Right wing unions withdraw from them individually and join the six or seven thousand members in the new industrial union. This is absurd. The Lovestoneites formulate the slogan so that it can be interpreted one way when they are under the attacks of the Stalinists in the new union and the opposite way when they are under the attack of the officials in the old unions. This is misleading; this is playing with issues according to the time-honored practice of these unprincipled opportunists.

In our opinion the slogan of unity should be formulated as follows: "Unite the old unions with the new industrial union into a single organization for the entire industry!" The slogan, thus formulated, should be raised in direct connection with the other slogans mentioned above regarding the fight for economic demands, trade union democracy and the elimination of the Right wing leaders. It should be issued by the new industrial union and by the organized Left wing in the old unions in precisely the same way and would be the most important means of uniting their struggles into one, along the front of the entire industry. The two sections of the Left wing, working in different fields of organization, would thereby be bound together into a single ideological force. From this organizational coordination of the joint struggle would follow,

On this basis both sections of the Left wing would bound forward in the confidence of the workers, and each section—the new union in the sphere of the unorganized and the organized Left wing in the old unions—would expand its organization. There is no contradiction in such a perspective. The two lines of activity supplement and strengthen each other. The existence of the new union as a growing force would constitute a standing threat to the bureaucrats of the Right wing unions against mass expulsions. In fear of the new union they will be compelled to hesitate and temporize with a Left wing in their own organizations, and allow it a certain room for development. On the other hand, a desperate fear of the movement within the Right wing unions, driving the officials to mass expulsions and splits again would bring new forces to swell the ranks of the industrial union, not handfuls of Communists as will be the case under the present policy but masses of workers who would impart to the new union the character of a mass organization.

The Question of "Reforming" the Old Unions

Against our proposals and perspective there remains a question of last resort for the Stalinist tacticians: "Is it possible to reform the old unions and transform them into genuine organs of the class struggle?" The Stalinists have answered this question in the negative and thereby disposed of it as far as they are concerned. As for us this schematic formulation has no meaning. We do not advise the Left wing workers to waste their time in speculation as to the possibilities of a "legal" conquest of the apparatus of the old unions. Experience in the needle trades struggle has already provided a certain answer on this point. When we speak of a conquest of the old unions we do not think in terms of the offices, the buildings and the banks. We think of the 175,000 workers in these unions and we say they can and they will be won for the revolutionary banner. When we proclaim the slogan of uniting the old unions with the new industrial union in a single organization we do not promise that this unity will be legally confirmed by the reactionary leaders with a voluntary abdication. But our slogan of unity is nevertheless a sincere one and it is put forward with confidence that it will be realized. With a correct policy and a competent leadership the Left wing will win over the masses and unite them—if not all, then the great majority—into one union. Let the reactionaries think of the unions in terms of contracts with the bosses, offices, buildings and banks. Let us think of the unions in terms of the workers within them. This conception will guide us toward the slogan and tactics of victory.



THE REVOLUTION IN INDIA

By L. D. TROTSKY

India is the classic colonial country as England is the classic metropolis. All the viciousness of the ruling classes, every form of oppression that capitalism has applied against the backward peoples of the East is most completely and frightfully summed up in the history of the gigantic colony on which the British imperialists have settled themselves like leeches to drink its blood for the past century and a half. The English bourgeoisie has diligently fostered every remnant of barbarism, every institution of the Middle Ages which could be of service in the oppression of man by man. It forced its feudal agents to adapt themselves to colonial capitalist exploitation to become its links, its organs, its convoys to the masses. The British imperialists boast of their railroads, their canals and industrial enterprises in India in which they have invested close to four billion gold dollars. Apologists for imperialism triumphantly compare present day India with what it was prior to colonial occupation. But who can doubt for a moment that a gifted nation of 320,000,000 people would develop immeasurably quicker and more successfully were it freed from the burden of systematic and organized plunder? It is enough to recall the four billion gold dollars which represent the British investment in India to imagine what England extracts from India in the course of only some five or six years. Allowing India carefully weighed doses of technique and culture, exactly enough to facilitate the exploitation of the riches of the country, the Shylock of the Thames could not however prevent the ideas of economic and national independence and freedom from penetrating more and more widely into the masses.

Just as in the older bourgeois countries, the various racial stocks that exist in India can only be fused into a nation by means of a binding political revolution. But in contradistinction to the older countries, this revolution in India is a colonial revolution directed against foreign oppressors. Besides this, it is the revolution of a historically belated nation in which the relations of feudal serfdom, caste divisions and even slavery exist alongside of the class antagonisms of the bourgeoisie and proletariat which have grown greatly in the last period.

Social Antagonisms in India

The colonial character of the Indian revolution against one of the most powerful oppressors masks to a certain extent the internal social antagonisms of the country, particularly to the eyes of those to whom such masking is advantageous. In reality the necessity of throwing off the system of imperialist oppression which, with all its roots intertwined with the old Indian exploitation, demands the greatest revolutionary effort on the part of the Indian masses and by that itself assures a gigantic swing of the class struggle. British imperialism will not abandon its positions voluntarily; while dropping its tail before America, it will direct the remains of its energy and its resources against insurgent India.

What an instructive historical lesson it is that the Indian revolution, even in its present stage, when it has not yet broken loose from the treacherous leadership of the national bourgeoisie, is being crushed by the "socialist" government of MacDonald. The bloody repressions of these scoundrels of the Second International who promise to introduce socialism peacefully in their own home countries represent so far that small deposit which British imperialism brings in today on its future accounting in India. The sweet social democratic deliberations about reconciling the interests of bourgeois England with democratic India are a necessary supplement to the bloody repressions of MacDonald, who is of course ready, between executions, for the thousand and first commission of reconciliation.

The British bourgeoisie understands too

well that the loss of India would not only mean the crash of its sufficiently rotted world power but also a social collapse in its own metropolis. It is a struggle of life and death. All forces will be set in motion. This means that the revolution will have to mobilize irresistible energy. The many-millioned mass has already begun to stir. They showed their half-blind force to such an extent that the national bourgeoisie was compelled to come out of its passivity and master the movement in order to break the edge of the revolutionary sword. Ghandi's passive resistance is the tactical knot that combines the naive and self-denying blindness of the disunited and petty bourgeois masses with the treacherous manoeuvres of the liberal bourgeoisie. The fact that the chairman of the Indian Legislative Assembly that is, the official organ of the machinations with imperialism, gave up his post to head the movement for the boycott of English goods, is of a deeply symbolic character. "We will prove to you," say the national bourgeoisie to the gentlemen on the Thames, "that we are indispensable for you, that without us you will not calm the masses; but for this we will present you with our own bill."

The Jailing of Gandhi

By way of reply, MacDonald puts Ghandi in jail. It is possible that the lackey goes further than the master intends, being conscientious beyond reason in order to justify his faith. It is possible that the Conservatives, serious and experienced imperialists, would not at the present stage go so far with repressions. But on the other hand the national leaders of the passive opposition are themselves in need of repression as support for their considerably shaken reputations. MacDonald does them this service. While shooting down workers and peasants, he arrests Ghandi with an abundance of forewarning such as the Russian provisional government used to arrest the Kornilovs and Denikens.

If India is a component element in the internal rule of the British bourgeoisie, then on the other hand, the imperialist rule of British capital over India is a component element of the internal order of India. The question cannot at all be reduced to one of the mere expulsion of some tens of thousands of foreign exploiters. They cannot be separated from the internal oppressors and the harder the internal oppressors and the harder the pressure of the masses will become the less will the latter want to separate. Just as in Russia the liquidation of Czarism together with its indebtedness to world finance capital became possible only because to the peasantry the abolition of the monarchy grew out of the abolition of the land-owning magnates, to the same degree also in India the struggle with imperialist oppressions grows out of the countless masses of the oppressed and semi-pauperized peasantry, out of the necessity of liquidating the feudal landlords, their agents and intermediaries, the "chinovniks" and sharks.

The Indian peasant wants a "just" distribution of land. That is the basis of democratism. And this is at the same time the social basis of the democratic revolution as a whole.

At the first stages of their struggle the ignorant, inexperienced and disunited peasantry which, in single villages, opposes the individual representatives of the hated regime, always resorts to passive resistance. It does not pay rent, does not pay taxes, it escapes to the woods, or deserts from military service, etc. The Tolstoyan formulae of passive resistance were in a sense the first stages of the revolutionary awakening of the peasant masses. Ghandi does the same in regards to the masses of the Indian people. The more "sincere" he is personally, the more useful he is for the owners as an instrument for the disciplining of the masses. The support of the bourgeoisie for peaceful resistance to imperialism is only a preliminary condition for its bloody resistance to the revolutionary masses.

From passive forms of struggle, the peasantry has more than once in history passed over to the severest and bloodiest wars against their direct enemies: the land owners, the authorities and the loan sharks. The middle Ages were full of such peasant wars in Europe; but they are also full of merciless suppression of peasant wars. Passive resistance of the peasantry as well as its bloody uprisings can be turned into a revolution only under the leadership of the urban class which thus becomes the leader of the revolutionary nation and after the victory—the bearers of the revolutionary power. In the present epoch such a class can be only the proletariat, even in the Orient.

It is true that the Indian proletariat occupies a smaller numerical place in the composition of the population than even the Russian proletariat on the eve of 1905 and 1917. This comparatively small size of the proletariat was the main argument of all the phillistines, all the Martinovs, all the Mensheviks against the perspective of the permanent revolution. They considered fantastic the very thought that the Russian proletariat, thrusting the bourgeoisie aside, would take hold of the agrarian revolution of the peasantry, would give it a bold swing, and rise on its wave to the revolutionary dictatorship. Therefore they considered realistic the hope that the liberal bourgeoisie, leaning on the masses of the city and village, would complete the democratic revolution. But it turned out that their social statistics of the population are far from measuring the economic or the political role of single classes. The October revolution, by experience has proved this once and for all and very convincingly.

The «Only» Missing Condition

If today the Indian proletariat is numerically weaker than the Russian this in itself does not at all pre-determine the smaller swing of its revolutionary possibilities, just as the numerical weakness of the Russian proletariat compared to the American and English was no hindrance to the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. On the contrary all those social peculiarities which made possible and unavoidable the October revolution are present in India in a still sharper form. In this country of poor peasants, the hegemony of the city has no less a clear character than in czarist Russia. The concentration of industrial, commercial and banking power in the hands of the big bourgeoisie, primarily the foreign bourgeoisie, on the one hand; a swift growth of a sharply defined proletariat, on the other, exclude the possibility of an independent role of the petty bourgeoisie of the city and to an extent, the intellectual and transform by this the political mechanics of the revolution into a struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie for the leadership of the peasant masses. So far there is "only" one condition missing: a Bolshevik Party. And that is where the problem lies now.

We were witnesses to the way the leadership of Stalin and Bucharin carried out the Menshevik conception of the democratic revolution in China. Armed with a powerful apparatus, this leadership had the possibility of applying the Menshevik formulae in deeds and by that alone was compelled to carry them to a conclusion. In order best to secure the leading role of the bourgeoisie in the bourgeois revolution (this is the basic idea of Russian Menshevism) the Stalinist bureaucracy transformed the young Communist Party of China into a subordinate section of the national-bourgeois party. In connection with that, according to the terms officially arrived at between Stalin and Chiang Kai-Shek (through the intermediary of the present People's Commissar of Education, Bubnov), the Communists had no right to occupy more than one-third of the posts within the Kuo Min Tang. The part of the proletariat this way entered the revolution as an official captive of the bourgeoisie with the blessings of the C.I. The result is known: the Stalinist bureaucracy slew the Chinese revolution. History has never known a political crime equal in extent to this one.

For India, just as for all countries of

the Orient in general, Stalin advanced in 1924 simultaneously with the reactionary idea of socialism in one country, the no less reactionary idea of "dual composition worker and peasant parties". This was another formula for the same rejection of independent policy and of an independent party of the proletariat. The unfortunate Roy has ever since that time become the apostle of the super-class and supra-class "peoples" or "democratic" party. The history of Marxism, the development of the nineteenth century, the experience of the three Russian revolutions—everything, everything passed for these gentlemen without leaving a trace. They have not yet understood that the "worker-peasant party" is conceivable only in the form of a Kuomintang, that is in the form of a bourgeois party leading behind itself the workers and peasants in order later on to betray and crush them. History has not yet invented another type of a supra-class, or intra-class party. After all, not in vain was Roy the agent of Stalin in China, the prophet of the struggle against "Trotskyism", the executor of the Martinovist "bloc of four classes", in order to become the ritualistic scape-goat for the crimes of the Stalinist bureaucracy after the inevitable defeat of the Chinese revolution. Six years passed in India in weakening and demoralizing experiments with the realization of the Stalinist prescription for the two-class worker-peasant parties. The results are at hand: impotent, provincial "worker-peasant parties", which waver, limp along or simply melt away and are reduced to nothing precisely at a moment when they are supposed to act, that is, at a moment of revolutionary tide. But there is no proletarian party. It must still be created in the fire of events and at that it will be first necessary to remove the garbage piled up by the leading bureaucracy. Such is the situation! Beginning with 1924, the leadership of the Comintern has done everything that could be done to render impotent the Indian proletariat, to weaken the will of the vanguard, and to clip its wings.

While Roy and the other Stalinist pupils were wasting precious years in order to elaborate a democratic program for a supra-class party, the national bourgeoisie utilized this dawdling to the maximum in order to seize the trade unions. If not politically, then in the trade unions, the Kuo Min Tang has been accomplished in India, true, with the difference that the creators have in the meantime become frightened by their own handiwork, and have jumped aside heaping slander on the "executors".

Centrism's «Left» Jump

This time the Centrists jumped, as is known, to the "Left", but matters will not improve by this. The official position of the Comintern in the questions of the Indian revolution is such a tangled ball of yarn which is apparently intended especially to derail the proletarian vanguard and bring it to despair. At any rate, half of it goes on because the leadership strives constantly and willfully to conceal its mistakes of yesterday. The second half of the tangle must be credited to the hapless nature of Centrism.

We have in mind at present not the program of the Comintern which ascribes to the colonial bourgeoisie a revolutionary role, completely approving the constructions of Brandler and Roy who still continue to wear the Martinov-Stalin cloak. We also do not speak of the innumerable editions of the Stalinist "Questions of Leninism" where, in all the languages of the world, the discourse on the dual composition worker and peasant parties continues. No. We limit ourselves to the present, to today's latest posing of the question which is in conformity with the Third Period mistakes of the Comintern in the Orient.

The central slogan of the Stalinists for India, as well as for China, still remains the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants. Nobody knows, nobody explains because nobody understands what this formula signifies at present, in the year 1930, after the experience of the past fifteen years. In what way is the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants supposed to be distinguished from the dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang which massacred the workers and peasants?

Its TASKS and its DANGERS

Manuilskys and Kuusinen will perhaps answer that they now talk about the dictatorship of three classes (workers peasants and the city petty bourgeoisie) and not four as it was in China where Stalin had so happily attracted to the bloc his ally, Chiang Kai-Shek.

If so, we reply, then make an effort to explain to us why you reject the national bourgeoisie in India, that is that ally for the rejection of whom in China you expelled Bolsheviks from the Communist Party and then imprisoned them? China is a semi-colonial country. In China, there is no powerful caste of feudal lords and feudal agents. But India is a classical colonial country with a mighty heritage of the feudal caste regime. If the revolutionary role of the Chinese bourgeoisie was deduced by Stalin and Martinov from the presence in China of foreign oppression and feudal remnants, then for India each of these reasons should hold with doubled force. This means that the Indian bourgeoisie, according to the exact basis of the program of the Comintern, has immeasurably more rights to demand its inclusion in the Stalinist bloc than the Chinese bourgeoisie with its unforgettable Chiang Kai-Shek and the "true" Wang Chin Wei. And if this is not so in spite of the oppression of British imperialism and the whole heritage of the Middle Ages, the Indian bourgeoisie is capable only of a counter-revolutionary and not a revolutionary role—then condemn mercilessly your treacherous policy in China and correct immediately your program in which this policy has left cowardly but sinister traces!

Who Will Lead the «Bloc»

But this does not exhaust the question. If in India you construct a bloc without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie, then who will lead it? The Manuilskys and Kuusinen will perhaps answer with their characteristically gentle ardor: "The proletariat, of course!" Good, we answer, it is quite complimentary. But if the Indian revolution will develop on a basis of a union of workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie; if this union will be directed not only against imperialism, feudalism, but also against the national bourgeoisie which is bound up with them in all basic questions; if at the head of this union will stand the proletariat, if this union comes to victory only by sweeping away the enemies through armed uprising and in this way raises the proletariat to the role of the real all-national leader—then the question arises: in whose hands will the power be after the victory if not in the hands of the proletariat? What is the significance in such a case of the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants in distinction to the dictatorship of the proletariat leading the peasantry? In other words: in what way will the hypothetical dictatorship of the workers and peasants be distinguished in its type from the actual dictatorship which the October revolution established?

There is no reply to this question. There can be no reply to it. By this course of historical development the "democratic dictatorship" has become not only an empty fiction but a treacherous trap for the proletariat. That slogan is correct which admits the possibility of two diametrically opposed explanations: in the sense of the dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang and in the sense of the October dictatorship! There can be nothing in between these two. In China, the Stalinists explained the democratic dictatorship twice, at first as a dictatorship of the Kuo Min Tang of the Right, and afterwards of the Left. But how do they explain it in India? They are silent. They are compelled to keep silent for fear of opening the eyes of their supporters to their crimes. This conspiracy of silence is actually a conspiracy against the Indian revolution. And all the present extremely Left or ultra-Left noise does not improve the situation one iota for the victories of the revolution are not secured by noise and clatter but by political clarity.

But what has been said does not yet unwind the tangled yarn. No. Here is precisely where new threads are twisted in. Giving the revolution an abstract character and permitting it to be the dictatorship of the proletar-

iat only after some sort of a mystical or mystifying "democratic dictatorship" is established, our strategists at the same time reject the central political slogan of every revolutionary democratic movement, which is precisely the slogan of the Constituent Assembly. Why? On what basis? It is absolutely incomprehensible. The democratic revolution signifies equality to the peasant—above all equality in the distribution of land. On this is based the equality of rights. The Constituent Assembly, where the representatives of the whole people formally draw the balance with the past and the classes actually draw the balance with each other, is the natural and inevitable combination of the democratic tasks of the revolution not only in the consciousness of the awakening masses of the peasantry but also in the consciousness of the working class itself. We have spoken of this more fully with regard to China and we do not see here the necessity of repetition. Let us only add that the provincial multifariousness of India, the variegated governmental forms, and their no less variegated bond with the feudal caste relations, saturates the slogan of the Constituent Assembly in India with a particularly deep revolutionary democratic content.

The theoretician of the Indian revolution in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union at present is Safarov, who with the price of a happy capitulation transferred his injurious activities to the camp of Centrism. In a programmatic article in the *Bolshevik* about the forces and tasks of the revolution in India, Safarov carefully circles around the question of the Constituent Assembly just like an experienced

rat circles around a piece of cheese on a hook. This sociologist does not by any means want to fall into the Trotskyist trap a second time. Disposing of the problem without much ceremony he counterposes to the Constituent Assembly such a perspective:

"The development of a new revolutionary ascent on the basis (!) of struggle for the proletarian hegemony leads to the conclusion (whom? how? why?—Ed.) that the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in India can be achieved only in the Soviet form." (*Bolshevik*, 1930, No. 5, page 100).

Amazing lines! Martinov multiplied by Safarov. Martinov we know and about Safarov Lenin said, not without tenderness: "Safarchik will go Leftist, Safarchik will pull boners." The above-mentioned Safarovist perspective does not invalidate this characterization. Safarov has gone considerably Leftist and it must be admitted that he did not upset the second half of Lenin's formula. To begin with, the question of the revolutionary ascent of the masses of the people develops "on the basis" of the struggle of the Communists for proletarian hegemony. The whole process is turned on its head. We think that the proletarian vanguard enters or is preparing to enter or should enter a struggle for hegemony on the basis of a new revolutionary ascent. The perspective of struggle, according to Safarov, is the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Here, for the sake of Leftism, the word "democratic" is shaken off. But it is not said frankly what kind of a dual composition dictatorship this: a Kuo Min Tang or an October type. But for that we are

assured on his word of honor that this dictatorship can be accomplished "only in the Soviet form". It sounds very noble. Why the slogan of the Constituent Assembly? Safarov is ready to agree only with the Soviet "form".

The essence of epigonism—its contemptible and sinister essence—lies in the fact that from the actual processes of the past and its lessons it abstracts only the bare form and converts it into a fetish. This is what has happened to the Soviets. Without saying anything about the class character of the dictatorship—a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat, like the Kuo Min Tang, or a dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, like the October?—Safarov lulls somebody and primarily himself, by the Soviet form of the dictatorship. As if the Soviets cannot be a weapon for deceiving the workers and peasants! What else were the Menshevik-Social Revolutionary Soviets of 1917? Nothing but, a weapon for the support of the power of the bourgeoisie and the preparation of its dictatorship. What were the social democratic Soviets in Germany and in Austria in 1918-1919? Organs for saving the bourgeoisie and for deceiving the workers. With the further development of the revolutionary movement in India, with the greater swing of mass struggles and with the weakness of the Communist Party—and the latter is inevitable with a Safarovist muddle prevailing in its mind—the Indian national bourgeoisie itself may create workers and peasants Soviets in order to direct them just as it now directs the trade unions, in order thus to slaughter the revolution as the German social democracy, by getting at the head of the Soviets slaughtered it. The treacherous character of the slogan of the democratic dictatorship lies in the fact that it does not close tightly to the enemies, once and for all, such a possibility.

The Apotheosis of Confusion

The Indian Communist Party, the creation of which was held back for six years—and what years!—is now deprived, in the circumstances of revolutionary democratic ascent, of one of the most important weapons for mobilizing the masses, precisely the slogan of the democratic Constituent Assembly. Instead of that, the young Party which has not yet taken its first steps is inflicted with the abstract slogan of Soviets as a form of abstract dictatorship, that is, a dictatorship of nobody knows what class. It is truly an apotheosis of confusion! And all this is accompanied as usual with disgusting coloring and sugaring of an as yet difficult and not in the least sweet situation.

The official press, particularly this same Safarov depicts the situation as if bourgeois nationalism in India is already a corpse, as if Communism has either gotten or is getting at the head of the proletariat, which, in its turn, is already almost leading the peasantry behind it. The leaders and their sociologists, in the most conscienceless manner, proclaim the desired as the existing. To put it more correctly, they proclaim that which might have been with a correct policy for the past six years, for what has actually developed as a result of the false policy. But when the inconsistency of the inventions and realities are revealed, the ones to be blamed will be the Indian Communists, as bad exponents of the general inconsistency which is advanced as a general line.

The vanguard of the Indian proletariat is as yet at the threshold of its great tasks and there is a long road ahead. A series of defeats will be the reckoning not only for the general backwardness of the proletariat and the peasantry but also for the sins of the leadership. The chief task at present is a clear Marxist conception of the moving forces of the revolution, and a correct perspective, a far-sighted policy which rejects stereotyped, bureaucratic prescriptions, but which, in the accomplishment of great revolutionary tasks, carefully adjusts itself to the actual stages of the political awakening and the revolutionary growth of the working class. May 30, 1930.

Some Stalinist Activities in Czecho-Slovakia

The struggle of the Centrists against the Left Opposition Communists develops its own objective logic. Where there is default of principled policy, there precarious maneuvers arise, where revolutionary integrity is throttled, bureaucratic slander flourishes. Where the capacity to think is bankrupt, crude violence is the substitute. The Stalinists in Russian do not hold back from the abuse of revolutionary justice against the Opposition proletarians and likewise they do not hesitate in Western Europe to make a united front with the police against Opposition worker-Communists. The facts are strong enough in themselves to make every commentary superfluous. We draw the attention of the workers to the following facts.

The Soviet Diplomats and the Police

A delegation of Communist workers made a demand upon the representatives of the Soviet Union in Prague, Arosew, for an explanation of the shooting of Blumkin. He thereupon alleged that he would make a direct inquiry of Moscow. After several futile interventions this successful Communist declared in the course of a debate on being driven into a tight corner by a worker, that the shooting of a Communist did not come within his diplomatic "jurisdiction". The comrades, on leaving the building, were surrounded by secret service men, detained and subjected to a severe cross-examination: the above-mentioned worker was then arrested. The bold Arosew had displayed his finished diplomatic "art" having arrived at a secret understanding with the bourgeois police for the handing over his Party comrade to them.

A "Communist" as State Attorney

Some time ago, two worker-Communists, members of the Opposition who had a long revolutionary past behind them, were hailed before the bourgeois court on the charge of having distributed illegal leaflets of the Opposition. As they belonged to the Red Aid, a comrade demanded that they supply a lawyer for their defense. The latter, a certain Dr. Ertoschek, refused to assume the duties of defense counsel as soon as he learned that it was a "counter-revolutionary Trotskyist" who was up on charges. Apart from the formal aspect of the affair, that is, that he was an official of the Red Aid who was supposed to defend every worker against the persecutions of class justice, the following is noteworthy: These

were two Communists who had been hailed up for their revolutionary consciousness and activity, for their struggle against imperialism, and for the revolutionary defense of the Soviet Union (the leaflet they distributed left no doubt on that score). But still they were at the same time Oppositionists and therefore this would-be Communist Attorney, who is a leading member of the League of the Rights of Man, the Anti-Imperialist League, the Anti-Fascist League, etc., simply refused to take up the defense and stood by passively while these workers were being condemned to jail. A sorry picture indeed!

How the Workers Think

The bureaucrats have also not hesitated to exploit the confidence of the workers and their belief in the authority of the Comintern and the Russian workers' state. Under these colors they have often enough tried to rouse a pogrom sentiment against the Opposition. But the deeper one penetrates into the Party ranks, the more evident it becomes that the rank and file of the workers have a strong aversion to beating up their fellow workers. In Zizkov, one of the working class quarters of Prague, our comrades arranged a discussion evening on the lessons of the Canton insurrection. A Party official who learned of this meeting, thought that the best method of carrying it on would be by smashing in Opposition workers' heads. He demanded at one Party meeting that energetic measures be taken to break up our meeting. But the workers have their own opinion and were guided by their own instinct. Not a single man among them signified his assent to the proposal of the bureaucrats. Prague, June 17, 1930. —JAN



PUBLIC WARNING!

We note with alarm that Stalin's first public unleashing of Karl Radek (*Imprecorr*, No. 23, page 505), for the purpose of throwing a stink-bomb at the Opposition's standpoint in India, is immediately accompanied by a deviation! In the very second paragraph of his article, Citizen Radek speaks of "the so-called third period". What does he mean "so-called" third period? We demand that he be compelled to issue a new statement of error, and that forthwith. Why should he be any more privileged than Kameney?

Lessons of the Chinese Revolution

The Constituent Assembly and Soviets

By ARNE SWABECK

The epoch-making events in India today compel even the "theoretical" pigmies in the Stalinized Comintern, to cast an occasional glance at the historic lessons of the Chinese revolution of 1925-27. Unfortunately they continue to sink into the quagmire of their own confusion.

For the working masses who may not be able to follow the rapid changes of leadership in this "third period" we volunteer the information that Earl R. Browder is the latest Stalinist appointee to the position of superficial political director and "theoretician" in America. In 1927 he spent several months in China during the height of revolution and beginning of its defeat. Upon his return Browder wrote the pamphlet "Civil War in Nationalist China". In its foreword he promised an extensive work on the "more fundamental aspects of the Chinese revolution". We venture to predict that Browder will not keep his promise for fear of exposing the whole house of cards built up of the Stalinist policies.

Browder—Professional Confusionist

On the Chinese lessons and the standpoint of the Left Communist Opposition Browder says in the *Daily Worker* (6-6-30), in an article entitled "Opportunists and India":

"On China, where the revolution is in a much higher stage of development than India, Trotsky also issues the slogan of Constituent Assembly, putting it up against the slogan of 'Soviets' as organs of power of the democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants."

And further:

"The Trotskyites cover up their own surrender to the bourgeoisie in India and China with 'very left' phrases about the dictatorship of the proletariat, violent opposition to the slogan 'democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants' and then practically replace both with the open bourgeois slogan of 'Constituent Assembly'."

(Could opportunist confusion be more "eloquently" put?)

Browder goes on to explain that in a period when the bourgeoisie is historically a revolutionary class overthrowing feudalism, the Constituent Assembly is a revolutionary measure. But today the bourgeoisie as a class, as well as its organ, the Constituent Assembly, is reactionary standing in the way of the completion of the "bourgeois democratic revolution". Proceeding from this he draws the conclusion that the Left Opposition has united with the Right wing, and he then repeats all the cheap calumnies always held in stock for the Left Opposition hoping thereby to prevent the revolutionists from engaging in an objective study of the Chinese lessons.

Browder, in these passages quoted, commits one "little" error. He completely confuses the question of the essential character of the Chinese revolution with the question of a slogan to be applied at a certain stage of its development. To make our case clear let us recall a few important factors in the Chinese developments.

Browders' Confessions

In his pamphlet, "Civil War in Nationalist China", Browder tells of reports of Chinese trade union and peasant union leaders on March 16, 1927: "The countryside is in terror, the Kuomintang (revolutionary army) has turned against the people. At Kanchow, the second division has assassinated the secretary of the General Trade Union and occupied the union offices; the leaders are all in hiding and communication with the city is cut off." This is one side of the picture showing the so-called Right wing of the Kuomintang in its actual role, later repeated precisely by the so-called Left wing. For the other side of the picture Browder reports that during the northern expedition (from Canton to Shanghai), when the nationalist armies captured half of China, all the military victories were accomplished by the revolutionary masses who even overthrew and drove out the military rulers before the nationalist armies arrived. There were 2,300,000 trade union members and 10,000,000 members of the peasants union, several hundred thousand of them under arms, pledged to the revolution.

What do we find in these reports? In the first half of the picture those upon whom Stalin and Browder had pinned their hopes as liberators of the working class, and harbingers of the proletarian revolu-

tion and supported by the Stalin policies the Kuomintang, first its "Right" wing and later its "Left" wing, were already then beginning to show themselves in their true role as the hangmen and butchers of the Chinese revolutionary workers and peasants. In the second half of the picture we note the wide mass ferment, the mounting revolutionary wave of workers, peasants and soldiers; the ruling classes collapsing and power slipping out of their hands with a systematic struggle for power begun by the workers—the conditions for organization of Soviets as organs of power. But what in this situation was the policy of Stalin and Browder?

Stalin for Hankow

As late as the E.C.C.I. plenum, May 18, 1927, the Stalin policy still held to the theory of the Chinese revolution as based upon four classes (bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, workers and peasants). The plenum decided that the organizing center of the revolution must be the Hankow government of the Kuomintang, the hangmen of the Chinese workers. It hog-tied the Chinese Communist Party in subordination and political subjection to the Kuomintang. We quote from the resolution adopted:

"The E.C.C.I. regards as incorrect the view which underestimates the Hankow government and which in fact denies its great revolutionary role. The Hankow government and the leaders of the Left Kuomintang by their class composition represents not only the peasants, workers and artisans, but also a section of the middle bourgeoisie. Therefore the Hankow government being the government of the Left wing Kuomintang, it not yet the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, but is on the road to it and will inevitably, in the course of the victorious class struggle of the proletariat and in discarding bourgeois camp followers, develop in the direction of such a dictatorship. (!!)"

"The E.C.C.I. calls the particular attention of the Communist Party of China to the fact that more than at any other time is it now necessary to maintain the closest contact between the revolutionary government and the masses of the people. Only if such close contact is maintained—and obtained primarily through the Kuomintang—only by maintaining a determined course toward the masses, will it be possible more and more to strengthen the authority of the revolutionary government and its role as the organizing centre of the revolution. (!!)" (1927—Emphasis ours—A.S.)

Trotsky, speaking for the Left Opposition view at that plenum, demanded

the striking out of these paragraphs and all references of support to the Hankow government and the Kuomintang; to openly fight this center of counter-revolution and to proceed to organize Soviets as the revolution.

Whom did history, that is the actual revolutionary experiences, prove correct? The policies of Stalin, Eucharin and the Menshevik, Martinov, who had fought Bolshevism for twenty years? No! Their policy of strengthening the enemy led to disastrous defeat. The Hankow government established the organized bourgeois counter-revolution and drowned the workers and peasants in blood. Only after the turn downward, with the disarming, defeat and slaughtering of the workers and peasants, did Stalin propose the organization of Soviets. But then—too late.

It could lead then only to miscarriages and blunders culminating in the Canton insurrection—to adventurism as a product of opportunism. Yet even the Canton insurrection holds valuable lessons forged in the fire of revolution. It became a curtain raiser for the third Chinese revolution. Despite all its weaknesses and mistakes it indicated definitely this next stage. The shortlived Canton Soviet, not elected but merely appointed from above, proceeded to confiscate feudal lands, establish workers control of industry, nationalize big industry and banks and confiscate bourgeois dwellings and all property for the benefit of the laborers. Automatically it led to the proletarian dictatorship.

Browder in his present *Daily Worker* article, either in blissful ignorance, or else in a deliberate attempt to obscure all these historical experiences, proceeds to outline the tasks of the Indian and Chinese revolutions as follows:

The Bourgeois Democratic Revolution

"Revolution in India and China today has as its first task the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution, that is, to carry out in India and China those measures which were the characteristic feature of the transition from feudalism to capitalism—national independence, distribution of the land among the peasants, breaking the power of the feudal elements, establishment of certain popular rights of organization and individual liberties." (So, this is the task!.) He adds that it cannot be carried out by the bourgeoisie but only the workers and peasants can carry out the bourgeois democratic revolution.

This is the crux of the problem. Here we see that Browder like Stalin, still holds to a policy which could only spell another defeat for the Chinese workers and peasants.

Independent Workmen's Circle on the Coast

Comrades:

For the last several months I have read your weekly steady. I am a member of the Independent Workmen's Circle, refusing to join the International Workers Order—believing that we can do plenty of work in the ranks of the Independent. The Stalinists as you call them began calling me and my comrades names like renegades, traitors, Lovestoneites. It opened up my eyes. I began looking for the truth—who are these renegades and traitors, Lovestoneites and Trotskyites. I went over to the stand to buy a *Revolutionary Age* when I also noticed the *Militant*. I bought a copy—compared it with the *Revolutionary Age* and remained a steady reader of your paper.

Coming down to brass tacks the situation stands this way: The I. W. C. branches are hopelessly split. Branches which have been always Left, branches (5 of them) that have given money and energy towards the Communist movement are now split in half. They hoped to take away full branches, but instead they only got about 250 out of 500 members. They kicked us out of the Co-operative Centre which we have built and kept up. They refused to take our donation for the *Frehelt* when we were in. By the way on an

income of \$2,400 they have had an expense of \$1,000. They also made Olgin a "proletarian" suit of clothes which amounts to \$90 which was charged to the expenses of the *Frehelt*.

The Cooperative Restaurant existing for over a year has been brought to a dangerous condition by the same Stalinite leadership. It is about to fail utterly and miserably. The Cooperative Bakery fired the day shift and only works two men at night—in a city of nearly 100,000 Jews. The newly opened barber shop lost in its honeymoon months—\$30 the first month and \$50 the second month. The whole Cooperative movement including the Center is on the verge of failure and closing up entirely.

The Imperial Valley strike for which six of our best fighters were sentenced to one half year at San Quentin and Folsom was nothing but a fiasco, it never materialized; a bunch of inexperienced boys were sent down there, with no experience in union work—and how to conduct it.

In my branch of the Independent Workmen's Circle I am pushing the *Militant* all I can, and hope to organize a fraction here of the Communist League.

Yours for a clean Bolshevik policy,
Los Angeles, Calif. RO—EIN

Lenin on the "Democratic Dictatorship"

It was precisely on the problem of the bourgeois democratic revolution that Lenin, upon his return to Russia in April 1917, took such decisive issue with the views of the Pravda fraction, and Stalin as the editor of the *Pravda*. The Pravda fraction, through its spokesman Kamenev, demanded the completion of the bourgeois democratic revolution—that is the carrying out of the measure listed by Browder—Lenin replied that the bourgeois democratic revolution could find its solution in the proletarian revolution. Referring to those "old Bolsheviks" who more than once have played a sorry role in the history of our Party when they repeated a formula, once acquired, without thinking, instead of studying the peculiarities of new living realities" he added:

"He who now speaks of 'revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry' only, is behind the times, is therefore in practice on the side of the petty bourgeoisie and against the proletarian class struggle; such a one should be placed in the archive of Bolshevik pre-revolutionary antiques (it may be called the archive of 'old Bolsheviks')." (Lenin, Letters on Tactics, Vol. 20 part 1.)

The bourgeois democratic revolution took place in China in 1911 and was completed in so far as a bourgeois democratic revolution in China could be completed, sufficient to prove that its problems could not be solved under the leadership of the bourgeoisie. The second revolution in China proved that the solution of these problems could be found only in the proletarian dictatorship. It further proved that it could not remain in the state of the bourgeois democratic revolution but would have to become transformed in the permanent revolution to find its final solution on the world arena. In 1927 the proletarian dictatorship in China was raised by history up to the first point on the order of the day. Its realization was sabotaged by the Stalin policy. The organization of Soviets was rejected by Stalin who chose the bourgeois leadership of the Kuomintang. The revolution, with the decisive sections of the masses of workers and peasants in revolutionary ferment, therefore took the road of the only other alternative—the establishment of the bourgeois counter-revolution which still rules today.

A "Revolutionary Upsurge" Here and in China

Browder now speaks glibly, in the seventh Party convention thesis, about the "revolutionary upsurge of the working masses of the United States" while demanding the bourgeois democratic revolution for China, Adventurist phraseology on an opportunist basis. He is now riding the peak of this "revolutionary upsurge in the United States" which may soon collapse because it rests on nothing but paper.

The actual revolutionary upsurge of the Chinese masses in 1927 Browder failed to recognize and understand correctly therefore he is now trying to turn its history backward.

Did the democratic revolution in Russia solve its problems—that is, the measures listed by Browder. No. These problems were solved by the dual power, by the rising proletarian revolution based upon the Soviets and culminating in the proletarian dictatorship. We repeat—from history these pigny theoreticians have learned nothing.

The problems of the Chinese workers and peasantry, including the measures listed by Browder, which will rise more in the coming third Chinese revolution can find their solution only in the proletarian dictatorship. Since today, under the established rule of the bourgeois counter-revolution, it cannot be expected that the Communist Party can arrive at the seizure of power in one jump—the slogan of the Constituent, or National Assembly becomes a correct slogan to mobilize the masses.

It was after the establishment of the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia that the Bolsheviks demanded the speediest convening of the Constituent Assembly. This as well as its final dissolution proved a correct tactic. And as Trotsky now points out: "The millions of the toiling masses (of China) can come to the dictatorship of the proletariat only on the basis of their own political experience and the National Assembly would be a conservative step on this road."

A Review and Criticism

The Communists in the South

By HUGO OEHLER

The T.U.U.L. drive in the South, starting in 1929 at the very inception of the "new turn" in the Communist Party has not yet been analyzed. Our articles on the South have dealt with tasks and later with shortcomings and "self criticism" but none have followed this to a logical conclusion and explained the basic causes of these shortcomings. With the majority of the American workers unorganized, the building of new unions is on the order of the day but this is not separate and apart from our work in reactionary unions to unite the broadest forces possible against the labor fakery, reformists and sectarians. Such a correct relationship of these forces to expose the reactionaries existed in several of our past campaigns as exemplified by Passaic and the Colorado coal strikes, both cases isolating the A.F.L. fakery and gaining trade union support. In the first case the gain was nationally for the Communist leadership and in the second case mainly in Colorado and Wyoming by Communist forces for the I.W.W. leadership.

Only by the correct disposition of our forces in the reactionary trade unions and the new unions will it be possible for us to defeat the treacherous bureaucrats and build our influence in the labor movement. Let us review the Gastonia struggle and the southern campaign to find the causes of our mistakes.

In the economic development of capitalist society ever so often culminating points are reached when the psychological reaction of the workers to those changes making for greater oppression one form or the other are transformed into class ideology of a rudimentary nature. This change due to the material transformation can be accelerated and definite organizational results obtained providing the vanguard of the workers, the Communist Party is able to apply tactics and strategy based on a Marxian program for the concrete situation to crystallize the developing ideology to an organized class consciousness.

The stage of economic transformation in the West when the I.W.W. continued the traditions of the Western Federation, where the vanguard applied tactics with considerable success giving them a crystallizing of this changing ideology and an organizational base. The transformation in the South in the last several years is similar to the change in the West in the period spoken of, except (to our advantage) we are in a different stage of historical development. In the West at that period the vanguard was able to organize a considerable base but up to the present the vanguard has yet to accomplish this first task in the South.

A review of our activity in the South will throw light upon our success and failure that we may not repeat these blunders again. To begin with we must point out that our Southern campaign up to the present can register the following positive points:

1. We have brought for the first time in this section, the class issue into the struggle to advancing the workers' conditions.
2. Through our Gastonia Campaign (only considering the Southern end of the campaign) we have agitational though not organizationally, gained the wide support of American-born workers and cropper farmers to our broad struggle in spite of the rabid anti-Red campaign of the bosses.
3. We have proven agitational to a wide section of the Negro masses, Southern and Northern, that the Communists are the leaders in the struggle of the Negro masses.
4. To a fair degree we consolidated the unity of black and white workers at each step of the struggle and were consequently considered by these workers as the "best fighters" and known to the bosses and their henchman as the "worse enemies".

Since revolutionists don't need self-praise (nor the present official Party campaign of mechanical self-criticism) we will deal with the problem of how the class struggle could have been brought into the

In the beginning of our Southern work, before our forces were sent South the condition of the Gastonia area was in a state of tension without important open class conflicts. This period was a culminating point in the transformation of the new industrial South, dominating old forms of control and changing the "hill people" into machine automatons on a large scale.

Especially in the Textile section of the Southern industries was there a critical stage. A steady Southward shift of the cotton spinning section and an acute international textile crisis, accelerated competition between the North and the South. On the other hand modern mills with machines of enormous output had to be kept moving if the rate of profit was to be kept up. These contradictory forces resulted in intensifying the stretch-out system, in wage reductions, worse company town conditions and general lowering of the standard of living with wide-spread unemployment, pellagra and chain gang victims. Men, women and children of American born stock were being driven into open revolt and organization against these conditions.

In this period when the Party should have sent forces South the Cannon-Foster group was fighting to correct the official American Party leadership, who had been given leadership on a platter by the Stalin-Bucharin regime. The Pepper-Lovestone group considered that this industrialization was to create a reservoir of reaction and that no work could be carried on now. The R.I.L.U. was the first to clamor for the new line that was soon to follow in the international movement but instead of a correction of the Right mistakes in relation to our trade union work and the United Front tactics a mechanical swing to the Left was taken.

After months of fooling away time comrade Beal was sent South in February 1929 inadequately supported one way or the other. In fact from that period up until the October 13th conference and today the decisive voting majority at the Center of the Communist Party did not know what it was all about and was often a brake instead of a help. The mechanical shift at the top in these hectic days for the Lovestonites was no remedy, because such is never a remedy for anything except bureaucratic consolidation. Beal's glowing reports of what really could be done in the South and the A.F.L. activity opened the eyes of more forces at the Center, some to reality but most of them to the possibilities of dashing spectacular "victories".

More forces were sent South and the pivot point of activity was properly selected as Gastonia, the cotton spinning center with the Loray Mill as the pace setter. This pre-strike stake with the intense activity of a small force was entirely new to

Southern conditions, but several comrades with Beal did excellent work under the circumstances.

The leading committee was committed to a "rolling-wave theory" which in practice relied too much on the spontaneity of the masses and spectacular dramatization and not sufficiently on preliminary organizational activity.

The A.F.L. had already started their second drive since the war in the Southern textile field and were "coming in and taking over revolts of the workers" in Elizabethton, Greenville, Lexington, Ware Shoals Marion, etc., trying to get any kind of agreement with the bosses, selling out and leaving if it became too hot as they did in Ware Shoals and other places. The driving force of this campaign were the Mustekites who as a new development at this stage stood in between the reactionaries and the best progressives who in the immediate past had supported the Left wing led by the Communists.

Our mechanical interpretation of the policy of building new unions and the rejection of the United Front policy as a swing away from the Right blunders of the past in the united front action put a taboo on all kinds of united fronts, if not in words then in deeds.

This resulted in our refusal to utilize throughout the country all possible forces, so badly needed in that concrete situation, against a powerful enemy that was concentrating all forces against us.

In the Loray Mill, where the National Textile Workers Union was concentrating its forces the company had increased the stretch-out and systematically, department by department was reducing the workers' wages. Five thousand workers was the full time capacity of the mill. Before the union was ready for the counter-attack the Manville Jencks owners of Loray started discharging union members.

This precipitated the strike and over 2,500 quit work. This was inopportune for the union, for a little more time would have found them better situated. Mass picketing followed. A great number of these workers were in a strike for the first time and were new trade union recruits which meant that more emphasis should have been put on preliminary organization work.

This premature forceful break could have been overcome by the tried and tested tactic so well used in the Lawrence 1912 strike and many times since. The tactic of going from department to department at the inception of the strike in an organized planned manner—Strike!—Strike! and pulling switches, etc. This was not done. The failure at the start to close the mill pre-determined the tempo of the positive force and choked the fighting spirit of the workers on strike making a breach with those in the plant and enabling the bosses to play these two forces against each other to our disadvantage. Naturally, workers in the nearby mills did not gain the necessary inspiration from the strike, especially considering the training of these workers in any kind of class struggles.

(To Be Continued)

India

Browder vs. Luhani

Leadership among the Stalinist section of the Communist movement has become a very specialized function. In the motley collection that serves as the American "leadership", the specific function of Earl Browder is to "expose the counter-revolutionary renegades". That his "anti-Trotskyist" endeavors are limited structurally to abominable and deliberate falsehoods and politically to a vulgar admixture of Lester Wardism and a handful of Marxist platitudes is simply traceable to the natural character of the man. The trouble, however, is that he is permitted to inflict his sorry leadership upon the Communist Party.

Latterly, Browder has been firing his paltry weapons at the Opposition for advocating the slogan of the Constituent Assembly in India (and China) as a democratic slogan to arouse and coordinate the struggles of the masses and lead them to the victory of the proletarian power over the imperialist and nationalist bourgeoisie. In the *Daily Worker* (June 18, 1930), he writes:

"The Trotskyites cover up their own surrender to the bourgeoisie in India and China with 'very Left' phrases about the 'dictatorship of the proletariat', violent opposition to the slogan 'democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants', and then practically replace both with the open bourgeois slogan of 'Constituent Assembly.'" (Our emphasis).

Browder's remarks on "surrender to the bourgeoisie in India and China" are of course instructive, and do not come from any mateur. Let us anticipate any criticism from readers on that score by reminding them that he banqueted with General L. Ti-Sin, the butcher of the Canton proletariat, AFTER this bourgeois Kuo Min Tang militarist had decapitated scores of Canton's best revolutionary fighters. He speaks with authority about "surrender to the bourgeoisie", for did he not bring back from China an official letter from the Kuo Min Tang expressing its most cordial thanks for the services Browder had rendered it in China.

But so far as the "Constituent Assembly" slogan is concerned, it is hard to say whether Browder is ignorant or base, for surely he must know the policy of the so-called Communist Party of India, advocated, so far as we know up until a short time ago. It is stated by no less an authority than G. A. Luhani, the Stalinist who replaced Roy and was the Indian "specialist" and spokesman at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. On the very eve of that Congress, Luhani wrote:

"Finally, the Communist Party of India, as the Party of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat has put forward the slogan of the convocation of a Constituent Assembly for determining the constitution of India...In putting forward the slogan, the Communist Party of India declares:

"...The demand should be the convocation by the National Congress of a Constituent Assembly which will be the supreme organ of the people's power and as such settle the question as regards the form of government, relation to Britain, etc. The entire people must participate in the election of the Constituent Assembly. Committees for the election of the Constituent Assembly should be set up all over the country. Representatives of all the political parties, workers and peasants organizations and all other democratic bodies will sit on these committees. The election campaign must be carried on throughout the country over a period of at least a year. The largest possible section of the population should be drawn into the campaign through mass meetings, demonstrations, strikes, etc." (International Press Correspondence, Vol. 8, No. 6, Page 133).

The quotations speak for themselves and they speak facts. But we cannot say as much for Browder.

If the number on your wrapper is

51

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

Open Letter to the C. P. on the Elections

June 28, 1930

To the District Committee of Dist. 2, Communist Party of the U. S. A.:

The deep-going economic crisis, the growing army of the unemployed millions, the renewed attacks on the living standards of the workers, prompts the capitalist exploiters of this country to initiate a ruthless drive against the Communist movement as the spear-head and most militant section of the entire American labor movement. The activity of the Fish Committee to "investigate Communist plotting" foreshadows a stage of wholesale persecution of the Communists, of jailings and deportations of revolutionaries. At such a crucial time the Left (Communist) Opposition deems it more imperative than ever that the enemies of the working class—the capitalists and their social democratic and labor bureaucrat lackeys—should be confronted by united Communist ranks.

Regardless of the fact that the present factional and Centrist Party regime falsely and stupidly slanders us as "counter-revolutionaries" and "renegades" and wages a campaign of hooliganism against us, we will never permit them to separate us from the Communist Party and the Communist

International. As adherents of the principles of Marx and Lenin—undiluted by either opportunism or adventurism—it is our duty at one and the same time to criticize and correct the official Party line in its deviations from Bolshevism, and also to demonstrate our closest solidarity with the Party in the fulfillment of its tasks in the every day class struggle.

In view of these considerations and of the objective political and economic situation in the country, we herewith offer our cooperation in the forthcoming election campaign of the Party to secure signatures to place Communist candidates on the ballot, to supply qualified speakers for the election meetings of the Party and to carry on whatever other election work is assigned to us.

Awaiting your acceptance of our offer,

With Communist greetings,

The New York Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition)

In our next number there will appear a full report and critical evaluation of the Unemployment convention held July 4th in Chicago. Do not miss this number.

Solidarity on the Streets**New York Demonstrates for India**

The British consulate was the scene of a militant demonstration of 1,500 workers who attempted to address the mass from the front. Following the mass meeting in Battery Park the march of the workers on Whitehall Street began. Shouting revolutionary slogans and singing revolutionary battle songs, the procession advanced to the vicinity of the consulate. It was here that Mulrooney's police thugs swept in with their accustomed brutality. A worker who attempted to address the mass from the steps of the building was arrested by the police and pulled down.

This was the signal for a concerted onslaught of the police on the demonstrators. The workers fought back bravely until the police re-inforcement arrived in the shape of an emergency wagon with sirens shrieking, prepared to hurl tear bombs. Four comrades were arrested, Rollins, Manusky, L. B. Cohen and one other. Several workers were terribly man-handled and one Beatrice Blosser was knocked unconscious.

The demonstration was called by the New York district of the Communist Party and all workers organizations were invited to participate. The Communist League (Opposition) in New York immediately signified its decision to take part. We wrote a letter to the International Labor Defense notifying them of our intention and asking whether legal aid and defense would be extended to any comrades of the Opposition who would be arrested in the course of the demonstration. We received no reply from the I.L.D. which still leaves the question open whether the I.L.D. is an organization for the defense of the revolutionary movement at large or only the auxiliary for the defense of the adherents of the Stalin faction which momentarily controls the Party machinery.

Immediately we arrived at the demonstration we unfurled the banner of the Communist League which bore slogans denouncing British Imperialism and manifesting solidarity with the Indian Revolution. It was here that the functionaries of the Stalin group struck an ally note that threatened to disrupt the mass meeting before the demonstration could get under way. A series of physical attacks began on our comrades who carried the placards bearing our slogans and Militants. Among the rank and file Party comrades there was a noticeable current to resist this breach by their officials of the united front of the demonstration. But the officials went around agitating for a pogrom and comrades Berne and George Clarke were set upon by the functionaries tools, certain half-underworld types that have bored their way into the Communist Party under the present regime. Finally our placard was destroyed, but our comrades held their ground staunchly and would not be eliminated.

While the Daily Worker maintains silence regarding our presence at the demonstration, the Freiheit, and the Uj Eloré both shamefully surpass themselves.

The Freiheit is the Party organ whose editor is the old Menshevik, Olgin, Abe Cahan's old crony and a former strong believer in the Sisson documents that "Lenin and Trotsky were German spies". This Freiheit came out with the unspeakable statement that the "Left renegades were in a united front with the detectives to break up the meeting, etc., etc." It would be tragic if it were not so ridiculous that no worker in his senses reads this without shrugging his shoulders and feeling

The 7th Party Convention

(Continued from Page 2)

kept secret from the membership until they have received the approval of Stalin. Balam, Enckel and Wicks, the last of the Lovestone Mohicans in the Party leadership were dropped from the C.E.C. Ella Reeves Bloor takes the place of Anna Damon as the dowager. The Party secretariat—God save the mark!—is composed of Browder, Hathaway and Bedacht. However, Bittelman is on his way home from conquests in the Indian revolution and Bedacht will be transferred to Moscow. Alexander will now prepare to wield the sceptre while Browder and Hathaway run messages.

But the very last word in the Party will be with the Bolshevik-Leninists.

—M.S.P.

ashamed that what was once a Communist paper should have sunk to the degraded spiritual level of the yellow Forward.

We repeat—such factional tactics will not deter us. As Communists we continue to participate in every class struggle demonstration of the Party against capitalism and imperialism, without abandoning our Marxist right and duty to work for the clarification of principles, the correction of political blunders, and a Bolshevik Party regime.

—Sp.

«CLARIFICATION»

If ever one is looking for clarification on certain important questions and he wants to become muddled, he has but one thing to do. He can ask a member of the Communist Party to explain to him. A very striking incident occurred a few days ago, when another comrade and myself were walking through a park where many members of the Communist Party and of the Left wing unions hold unofficial meetings. One of them appoints himself speaker and chairman and answers any questions that his comrades may put to him.

When I joined the group, the self-appointed speaker was explaining to another the position and purpose of an industrial union. After he had exhausted all the stories he knew about his comrades in Russia about his shopmates, and had omitted to answer the question, he asked for other questions. I very naively asked him what the dispute was between Trotsky and Stalin and wherein they differed in principle. The question was taken up.

After speaking about a half hour to explain why he thought he ought to answer that question saying that in spite of the fact that Trotskyism is a dead issue he considers it his duty to explain to a young worker the truth and to keep her from going astray; he wasted another half hour telling me about Emma Goldman. Finally he came to Trotsky. He began from the end, he said to come to the beginning.

"Now this Trotsky, who sells himself to the capitalist class, who writes for their press, who betrays the working class, has been expelled from the Communist Party because he is a traitor." Here many of the other members of the Communist Party objected. That is not the way to explain a question, they all said. This is a very significant fact for us.

The comrade started again. I said that I would not listen to any scandal stories but I wanted to know the difference in principle. The comrade was in a loophole and again started to tell me all the black stories he knew about comrade Trotsky. Finally I was given the chance to explain the question myself.

After a short talk I noticed that quite a number of the Party members were in full sympathy with me. Many of them agree that it was not a question of personal grievances that put comrade Trotsky out. Many of them objected to the way the Communist League of America (Opposition) had been treated in the last demonstration. Some agreed that it was wrong for League members to be expelled because of their views. This all is very significant to us because it shows that we are growing in influence. Those that agreed with us that it was a question of principle and that principally comrade Trotsky is correct said that the only reason that they did not join us was that they had to keep the unity of the Party. That, to them, counts above everything else. However, we are breaking through the thick wall set up by the Party bureaucracy.

—REVA CRAINE

THE FOSTER FACTION

Lack of principle, characterlessness, intellectual and political cowardice on the part of the Foster-Bittelman group of "leaders", so clearly and so disgustingly revealed in the whole pre-convention and "anti-Trotsky" campaign, are the manifestations and the result of their contradictory and impossible position.

—FROM THE PLATFORM OF THE COMMUNIST OPPOSITION ADOPTED (CHICAGO) MAY 30 1929

A Stalino-Fascist Attack**Cleveland Workers Reply to Hooliganism**

CLEVELAND—

Following a fascist attack by the Stalinist clique on the public meeting arranged by the Communist League to hear Max Shachtman speak on the Left Opposition and his recent visit to Europe, local police swooped down on the meeting and arrested eleven workers, including comrades John Brahtin and L. Bryar, the owner of the meeting place, a couple of Party members, and a half dozen others who came to the hall. The "broad and non-partisan" International Labor Defense proceeded to bail out everyone but the two comrades of the Opposition.

The meeting was scheduled for the Painters Hall, but when the committee and the audience of 100 workers gathered there, the hall was closed and the caretaker nowhere in sight. His failure to appear was greeted by the assembled C. P. members with knowing grins. It was impossible to get a new hall immediately, and the Stalinists were overjoyed, until the Hindu owner of a restaurant, sympathetic towards the Party offered to rent his place as a makeshift. The committee in charge accepted the offer and announced the change of place on the street. The assembled workers then proceeded to march through the city to the restaurant, located two doors from the official Party's district office.

After some 70 workers had entered the restaurant and taken seats, a gang of some 20 Party members came down from the Party office, up the stairs leading to the restaurant, and attempted to break through the guard at the door. They were composed largely of the same people who had come down armed with blackjacks and knives a year before to break up the meeting organized to hear comrade J.P. Cannon. In spite of their fascist record, the door committee offered to let 10 of their number come in free of charge in order to take the floor and speak for the Stalinist standpoint.

The hoodlums refused to accept this proposal and started to create a violent disturbance. The door was nevertheless held, until the gang suddenly pulled out their weapons of Stalinist enlightenment—blackjacks, clubs, iron bars, brass knuckles, knives—and began wielding them murderously against the Opposition comrades at the door. Our comrade, Joseph Keller was badly cut around the head, his lip was laid open and he was kicked repeatedly in the stomach. Despite their superior numbers, however, these fascists who disgrace the name of Communism were repulsed by the Opposition comrades who were aided by many of the workers in the hall, including members of the I.W.W., who were incensed at the outrageously anti-working class tactics of the Stalinists.

A squad of police and detectives appeared immediately, and were directed to

The Opposition in Brazil

Our comrades of the Communist Opposition in Brazil just issued the first number of their paper, A Lucta de Classe (The Class Struggle). As has already been pointed out, the Left Opposition in Brazil is rallied around the "Lenin Communist Group", which has strong working class support in Rio De Janeiro and Sao Paulo, the largest industrial city in the country.

We enthusiastically greet the appearance of this paper which strengthens the Left Opposition on American soil. There now exist in the Americas four journals of the Left Opposition, around which the workers are being organized in spite of the difficulties that confront them: The Militant, in the United States, the Bulletin of the Communist Opposition, in Mexico, La Verdad in the Argentine, and A Lucta de Classe in Brazil.

The journal of our Brazilian comrades will probably, appear semi-monthly. It is printed in four pages of large format. In the first number we find an editorial on "Our Objectives", articles on May Day, on the new policy of the Communist Party, Trade Union notes, an extensive labor chronicle of Sao Paulo, Lenin's Testament, and an extract from Trotsky on the "Radicalization of the Masses".

The Opposition is on the march! Against the Right wing and Centrism and for the preservation and strengthening of revolutionary Marxism!

the hall by one of the Stalinists, Cullen name, who has probably been taught by the district organizer, Bimba that even cooperation with the police is permissible in the struggle against the "counter-revolutionary Trotskyists". The meeting, of course, was then broken up.

The Opposition comrades immediately proceeded to the Public Square and announced a meeting for the coming evening to protest against the shameful knife-work of the Stalinists. The next evening, the Opposition comrades arrived to find both Public Square "stumps" occupied by Stalinists, who were apparently in frenzied fear of having the workers listen to the Opposition's point of view. We nevertheless set up a park bench at the other end of the Square and comrade Boich had just begun speaking when the same hooligans appeared once more and began to boo and shout like madmen. They attempted to rush the platform, but meeting with better resistance than they expected, they had to give up. Again the cops arrived, and our bold Stalinists fled precipitately in four directions. We remained and continued our meeting, with the Party opening up immediately on the other "stump". Comrade John Foley, the chairman, introduced comrade Shachtman who spoke at length on the events of the night before and then delivered his lecture. Almost a thousand workers packed the square, and the loudness with which the radical workers of Cleveland denounced the fascist attack of the Stalinists was enough to make the latter's ears tingle. The Party speaker, one I. O. Ford, who was delivering himself of a despicable attack upon the Opposition as "counter-revolutionists" and "enemies of the workers", was properly exposed by comrade Boich as having been a private detective, i. e., a stool pigeon, just a little while ago, before he joined the Party and became so ardent a supporter of Stalinism.

The quick and authentic reaction of the Cleveland workers to Stalinist gangsterism was one of the severest blows the latter has yet suffered. These contemptible tactics imported into the labor movement from the army of Mussolini, Lewis, Sigman and their ilk, only serve to disgrace and discredit the whole Communist movement, to expose the political weakness of Stalinism, and alienate the best sections of the working class. The rank and file workers in the Party have no stomach for them—wherever they are practised, it is only under threats of discipline from the bureaucrats who stay discreetly at home.

Let the Party members and the militant workers in general reflect seriously on this: What is it that the Stalinist bureaucracy fears so desperately in the platform of the Opposition that it attempts by the basest methods of fascism to prevent its being heard? These methods will not do. Many cities have already shown that Cleveland has just shown it again. The standpoint of the Opposition is making its way to the workers. It has only become stronger and better consolidated in Cleveland after the hooliganism of the Stalinists was used against it.

—M.

AFTER THE CLEVELAND RIOT

(The author of the following letter was one of the Opposition comrades brutally attacked by the Stalinist pogromists at the Cleveland mass meeting for comrade Max Shachtman.)

Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Comrades:

Although still in pain, I am determined to rush whatever little help I can toward sustaining our fighter, the Militant. Comrade Michael Miklovich paid his debt in renewing his sub for the Militant, while he decided to donate two dollars towards the Sustaining Fund. He offered said amount to me in order to help me pay the doctor's bill, but I advised him to help our paper since I am still in a position to pay the doctor's bill. Tell Max that I finally had to go to the doctor to have my wounds examined, and they were accordingly treated, and now I feel much better. I don't think you would believe what a terror the Stalinists organized against us. Max could tell you what a beating the Stalinists administered to my body, but my enthusiasm for our cause would surpass—any time—all the beatings of the terrorists in Stalin's camp. They got theirs and they have learned a lesson for future discussions. Enclosed you will find money order.

—JOSEPH