

The MILITANT

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

VOL. II. — No. 15.

NEW YORK, N. Y., OCTOBER 1, 1929

PRICE 5 CENTS

The Drive for the WEEKLY

The announcement in the last issue of the final decision to launch the WEEKLY MILITANT on November 7th, 1929, the twelfth anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution, has aroused great enthusiasm in the ranks of the Opposition. Comrades throughout the country are awaiting the first issue of the WEEKLY and concentrating all efforts on insuring its continued publication. The New York branch of the Communist League is now at work to raise its share of the fund. Two of our most reliable branches, Chicago and Minneapolis, write to inform us that they will subscribe their part of the money required for the WEEKLY Points as far apart as Kansas City, Toronto, and Philadelphia are energetically engaged in the campaign. Many of the other branches are also taking up the question of the drive with enthusiasm.

Every day brings a new event that demonstrates the imperative need of a militant organ of the class struggle that is able to bring clarity of purpose and action into the labor and revolutionary movement. The bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor proceeds from one betrayal to another. It has just finished delivering the fighting carmen New Orleans bound hand and foot to the traction interests. It is trying to organize its trade unions against the Gastonia victims of the Southern reaction, instead of for them. The organized forces in the A. F. of L. that can challenge Messrs. Green and Woll are being weakened and devitalized by the senseless policy of the Communist Party. The MILITANT, from the very beginning, has fought against this line of leaving the reactionaries an open field in the A. F. of L. instead of fighting them inch by inch for the leadership of the organized workers. As a WEEKLY it will be able to increase this work manifold.

The other side of the picture—the situation in the Communist movement—shows the need of the WEEKLY even more keenly. The movement is in a severe crisis. The tremendous work of gathering the forces of American Communism in the past decade is being broken down by the irresponsible direction and policies of the Communist Party leadership. Expulsions, deep-going splits, confusion and corruption are the order of the day in the Party. The weakening of the Communist movement is a profound blow at the labor movement as a whole, since the Communists are its most active, its clearest and most militant section. The fight to revive the Communist movement on the foundations of Marx and Lenin which enabled it to grow so powerfully at one time is a fight in the interests of all the workers. The MILITANT, which has conducted this stubborn fight since its inception, will be enabled to multiply its efforts as a WEEKLY.

The MILITANT is the organ of the class conscious workers. It is they who must put their shoulders to the wheel and make it certain that the WEEKLY MILITANT is insured for the first period. We are confident that they will respond. *...If an average of Two HUNDRED comrades and friends will pledge an average of ONE DOLLAR A WEEK for the next period the WEEKLY MILITANT is guaranteed to appear regularly as the voice of the revolutionary workers in every struggle.* The small sacrifice involved in this is as nothing compared to the tremendous sacrifices being made today by our Russian comrades—disemployment, imprisonment, exile and banishment—for the cause of the proletariat. Those who can make a bigger pledge than ONE DOLLAR A WEEK should do so and make up for the workers who cannot be reached by us. Those who can make an outright donation should send it in immediately.

The MILITANT needs the support of every militant fighter. Our small and growing regiment of Bolshevism needs your help to increase its ammunition of struggle, to insure the WEEKLY MILITANT.

JOIN OUR CAMPAIGN FOR THE WEEKLY!
FILL OUT THIS BLANK

THE MILITANT
Box 120, Madison Square Station,
New York, N. Y.

Enclosed herewith a contribution for \$.....
for the WEEKLY MILITANT.

I pledge myself to make a regular contribution of \$..... every week towards the SUSTAINING FUND FOR THE WEEKLY MILITANT.

Name
Address
City State

Lynch Law in Gastonia

The savage mercenaries of North Carolina's mill barons have claimed their first blood sacrifice. With tremendous odds on their side, the lust-maddened "chivalrous gentlemen" of the South attacked a truck-load of textile workers and murdered a defenseless mother of five children, Ella May Wiggins. Previous to this bestial assault, three organizers of the National Textile Workers Union, Ben Wells, C. M. Lell and C. D. Saylor were dragged out of their lodgings by a lynching mob, driven to a lonely spot, and brutally beaten. Wells was so horribly attacked that his body was one mass of lacerations and bruises. On another occasion, a number of organizers, including their courageous leader, Hugo Oehler, were attacked by a wolfish mob. They succeeded in escaping miraculously with only a few blows struck. Right after the murder of Ella Wiggins, organizer Cleo Tessner was kidnapped at gunpoint, by the same gang; blackjacked, beaten with clubs and almost strung from a tree.

The Black Hundreds of North Carolina continue their horrors with impunity. Homes are raided and meeting places are dynamited. A reign of terror has been instituted. The very lives of every organizer and active union worker hang by a hair. It is courting death for any of them to walk the streets alone or unarmed, or to sleep in the same house for more than one night. The police and the other legal authorities, who are more often than not in direct cahoots with the bloodthirsty hoodlums, do nothing to prevent these outrages for the simple reason that they exist solely for the purpose of protecting the gorged profits of the mill lords from the demands of the workers for improved conditions.

The reactionary camorra of mill owners, gunmen, police courts, and the state power, are frenziedly set upon running the National Textile Workers Union out of North Carolina. They are in a cold sweat of fear at the prospect of an organized militant textile workers' union that will defeat the slaves from the arrogant encroachments of the bosses.

Their other purpose is to poison the atmosphere against the Gastonia strikers who are on trial for their lives. The mistrial declared in the Charlotte court

gives the prosecution, faithful servant of the mills, additional time to tighten its frame-up net, to terrorize the union fighters and prevent them from mobilizing the support of the workers everywhere. They know that it is only by this support that the Gastonia defendants have a chance for freedom. They know that if the defense is able to arouse a mass movement of the American workers, it will be powerful enough to break through the legal murder conspiracy against Fred Beal and his fellow-fighters on trial.

That is why the fighters in North Carolina must break down the reign of terror of the progromists. This will be accomplished, great though the odds may be, if the workers throughout the Carolina battlefields are set into motion. Not all the gunmen of the Loray mills will be able to withstand the resistance of a mass movement.

That is why every textile militant will have to defend himself and his union at all costs. Every worker has the right and duty to defend himself against the murderous attacks of the gunmen. Every drop of blood that is shed in the Carolina struggle will fall upon the head of the capitalist class, from the mill owners and the governor, down to the prosecutor and the police.

That is why every worker throughout the country must help forge a solid ring of defense around the victims of the Gastonia frame-up. The second trial is coming up again, and only the workers' united efforts can set them free. Capitalist courts are where labor fighters are legally killed and imprisoned. The labor movement is where they are freed. All who stand in the way of uniting every worker, every workers' organization, irrespective of political and economic opinions, into one mighty front for the defense, will be brushed aside. Away with sectarian frivolity! Fighters for our class are in danger of their lives. Workers, express your solidarity!

Have your organizations join in the protest movement. Send funds to the Defense to help them fight for Gastonia. Demand a united struggle. Labor united in one movement is all-powerful, and strong enough to break down even prison bars and to destroy the lynchers of the working class.

Chiang Kai-Shek's War Drive

Efforts of the Russian White Guards, working under the direction of the Chinese reactionaries, to provoke the Soviet Union into a war over the Chinese Eastern Railway, continue to be exerted along the Manchurian border. Every day brings additional information of raids conducted by White Guard and Chinese cavalry or other military detachments against Russian villages, which the Nanking and Mukden authorities either deny took place or blandly refuse to take responsibility for. Not satisfied with these crimes, the hangmen of the Chinese people continue with their vicious attacks upon Soviet citizens in China. Not only have dozens of these been imprisoned and held incommunicado under the most atrocious conditions, but many of them have been massacred on the streets.

The Chinese reactionaries hope that by these acts the Russians can be sufficiently infuriated to take such measures as would lead to war. In that case Chiang Kai-Shek would appeal to the League of Nations and the other signatories to the hypocritical Kellogg Pact (which the Soviet Union made the mistake of signing) to lend their imperialist armies to "repel the Soviet militarists" with the aim of military invasion of the Workers' Republic. The Chinese dictator wants to frustrate the endeavors of the Russian workers and peasants to arrive at a pacific settlement of the dispute. In order to maintain a deceptive basis for his delay in acting on the Soviet proposals, Chiang has permitted and inspired the provocative raids of the White Guards and the Chinese squadrons, knowing that the Red Army will defend itself and punish the invaders. In some instances the Red Army has already pursued the White Guards so effectively that many of them will never again engage in counter-revolutionary work.

The imperialists, because of a complex of reasons, would like to avoid a war in Manchuria at the present time. But they hope that the situation will develop to the point where the concrete proposal can be made for the "internationalization" of the disputed railway, i.e., for establishing a mobile imperialist fort against the Soviet Union. This is particularly the aim of Hoover and Stimson.

Confronted with these dangers, it is now more than ever necessary that a correct class policy be pursued in the Soviet Union, since only a mobilization of the workers and poor peasants will enable Russia to meet and conquer these perils to its existence. The Kulaks (rich peasants) are resuming their bitter resistance to

the proletarian dictatorship, as is reported to the Party Congress now in session, and are refusing to turn over their grain crops, committing arson and murder, in the hopes that the outbreak of war will change the relation of forces to their advantage. The Russian workers will be mobilized if their economic and political position is improved at the expense of the Kulaks, Nepmen and the Bureaucracy. But Stalin, with his policy of industrialization at the expense of the workers, cannot achieve this aim. The defense of the Soviet Union—the highest duty of every worker—demands the replacement of the Stalinist bureaucracy by the Bolshevik leadership it expelled from the Party and sent into exile.

MASS MEETING

The Crisis in the American Communist Movement

Expulsions and splits are taking place with greater frequency in the Communist Party of the United States. The membership and influence of the Party are on the decline. The Lovestone group, in power in the Party for four years, has now been expelled. Less than a year ago it expelled the supporters of the Russian Opposition, (Trotsky) who have now formed the Communist League of America (Opposition). The Communist movement in America is in a deep-going crisis. How has all this happened? What is the future of the Communist movement in the United States? What effect has this crisis on the American labor movement? Come and hear this explained at the mass meeting arranged at the

LABOR TEMPLE, 242 E. 14th St., (near 2nd Ave.)
on TUESDAY, OCTOBER 22nd, 1929,
7:30 p. m. sharp.

SPEAKERS:

JAMES P. CANNON MARTIN ABERN
MAX SHACHTMAN

Admission: 25 cents Bring your friends.
AUSPICES: New York Branch, Communist League of America (Opposition).

The T. U. U. L. Conference

The achievements of the Cleveland conference of the Trade Union Educational (now Unity) League lie chiefly in the emphasis put upon the millions of unorganized workers in this country and the need to unionize them, and the fact that rank and file workers were gathered together from various parts of the country—Negro and white, young and old—under one roof to discuss their problems and outline the necessary plans to cope with them. These achievements have already been related in the Left wing press, and even exaggerated all out of proportion to their real and soberly considered significance. However, since the Party press has failed signally to indicate the enormous shortcomings and outright blunders made at the conference, it becomes a duty to point them out so that Communist and Left wing movement does not proceed blindly into deeper quagmires.

THE DELEGATION AT CLEVELAND

It is first necessary to estimate the real strength of the movement represented in Cleveland. For this, one must first strip all the reports of their exaggeration, bombast, circus-tooting and playing-for-the-record. We then find that the promised mass support for this new "revolutionary" federation of labor that is to challenge the A. F. of L. all along the line failed to materialize. The most tautly stretched reports of the credentials committee give a maximum representation of 70,556 workers, of whom no less than 57,000 are credited to the new industrial unions. Divide the last figure by two and you will obtain a still very generous estimate of the new unions. Shop committee delegates (picked out of thin air in many cases) represented less than 2,000 workers, and local A. F. of L. unions about as many. Of the 690 delegates reported, a round half represented the new industrial unions, i. e., more hopes than substance, with one or two exceptions. 107 delegates represented the largely paper shop committees (ranging from 8 workers upwards). In one part of the report, T. U. E. L. groups get 126 delegates, and in another, they are given 33 more. Fraternal delegates, i. e., Party and Left wing auxiliaries, ran to 44, and the National Committee had another 40, representing themselves. Not a very solid mass to tackle the exceedingly "revolutionary" tasks set the conference. Even the first convention of the I. W. W. had more than twice that amount represented.

The conference was organized by the Party, and controlled, in the narrowest, most mechanical, factional spirit. Little else could be expected, particularly with such a steering committee as Weinstone, Stachel and Foster, who, together with another comrade, were appointed for the task of working under the direction of the Comintern Commission. Opponents of the present line of the Party chiefs were sedulously excluded from all participation, to the great detriment of the gathering and all of Stachel's crowing about the absence of the Communist Opposition from the conference will not conceal the harm done by factionally excluding from T. U. E. L. work such comrades as Swabeck, Skoglund, Hedlund, Coover, Votaw, Angelo, MacMillan and a dozen other recognized Left wing leaders in their localities.

This ruinous factional course has now been established as a sacred principle. "Our organization," said Foster at the conference, "must be ready to wage a merciless struggle not only against the employers but against social reformism and right tendencies in the T. U. E. L." By this Foster means the exclusive legalization of the line followed by the Communist Party at a given moment, (it changes every month), and persecution of all who differ with it. This is guaranteed to transform the new movement into a battlefield of Party factions, with the same tactics applied to political opponents as are used by Sigman and Lewis. We have already seen the removal of Swabeck, of Coover, the attempted removal of Voyzey from his union post, the removal of Weisbord, the coming removal of Zimmerman. The new movement will hit a reef in no time if it charts such a course.

A FORUM AGAINST THE OPPOSITION

The conference was made a forum from which the Opposition was maliciously attacked. In the Party fraction meeting, Weinstone reported that Muste opposes the new unions, and Cannon and Lovestone are only little grouplets of Muste. The R. I. L. U. letter repeated the same guff. It was unloaded in barrels from the platform. Even little Johnnie Williamson earned his day's wage by parroting what he was told in his article in *Labor Unity*, and strove for a raise by adding the original contribution that we are strike-breakers to boot.

THE MILITANT

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

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

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

Subscription rate: 1.00 per year. Foreign \$1.50

5c per copy

Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

Associate Editors:

Editor

Martin Abern

James P. Cannon

Max Shachtman

Maurice Spector

VOL. II

OCTOBER 1, 1929.

No. 15.

Entered as second-class mail matter November 28, 1928, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

The stifling mechanical control of the conference by the Party was manifest on all hands. The Party fraction was in the majority and off-handedly railroaded through any and all propositions. A "naive" non-Party metal worker from Chicago, who thought it would be proper to have chairmen elected from the floor, was guffawed out of court by Foster himself. Gitlow's resolutions on Gastonia and the Labor Party were never discussed, nor was his nomination to the National Committee. The steering committee yanked it off the floor and later brought in a number of motions disposing of the whole matter with a bang. Most of the time was taken up with reports, and very little for discussion from the floor. Members were nominated for the National Committee by the heads of the industrial groups without taking the trouble to get the consent of their respective delegations, as in the Marine workers' delegation. So raw were some of the methods—all so reminiscent of a good, factional Party convention!—that at the end of the first day, one seaman's delegate, Stuart MacDonald, jammed his hat on his head and threatened to go home.

The problem of organizing the unorganized was treated in a purely schematic, arbitrary and administrative manner. No realistic conception illuminated the reports or discussion. Instead, many stupidities were uttered and committed.

New unions are being formed in committee rooms without the masses every knowing a thing about it. Out of a clear sky, for example, we have the announcement of the "Metal Workers Industrial League, an organization affiliated with the T. U. U. L." (*Daily Worker*, 9-17-29). Or else, the utter insanity of this: "A construction section of the T. U. U. L. embracing a much larger field than the building trades was proposed by the conference, Rosen said, which included highways, workers on bridges, subways, etc. The situation is ripe for the organization of a new industrial union, he declared," (*Daily Worker*, 9-5-29). A new industrial union in the building trades is just that: utter insanity.

A serious review of the past activities of the new unions was entirely missing. There was no penetrating discussion of work, successes, and failures of the new unions now in existence. No attempt was made to probe the reasons for the present collapse of the Left wing Needle Trades Workers Union and the striking advance of the Right wing, and draw the imperatively necessary lessons. The rich lessons in strike strategy contained in the numerous recent defeats of the Left wing (particularly in the East) and the fallacious policy of the National Textile Workers Union which prevented it from getting a foothold in Marion and Elizabethton did not exist for the conference. It did not condemn either the vulgar collaborationist policies of the opportunist Needle Trades Union leaders on the one hand, or their sectarian standing aloof from the struggle of the workers led by the Right wing, in which they contented themselves with inane shouting: "Fake Stoppage" and "Fake Strike," until the workers in one craft after another had registered with the Right.

Is the reconstruction of the Right wing and the virtual crushing of the Left in the Needle trades not a commonplace by now? Is not the passivity and lack of vitality of the National Miners Union (on a national scale) another commonplace? These "trifles" found no word of comment at the conference. They were orphans lost in a storm of wind and fury.

A NEW FEDERATION OF LABOR

The main work of the conference was the establishment of a new federation of labor, but the reasons given for doing it now are not valid. The *Daily Worker* (9-4-29) motivates it by the fact of the "signs of the oncoming rising wave of revolutionary movement" and points to Lodz, the Buhr, the Czech land workers, the Rumanian coal miners, India, Peru, Colombia, etc., etc. Therefore . . . "a new national federating body". But what about 1926? There was the strike movement in Syria, the Italo-French crisis, the Rakosi trial, and three little affairs like the Chinese revolution, the British miners' and General Strikes and the revolution in Indonesia. Wasn't 1926 just as good an occasion for a T. U. U. L. and a "new line." That wave, really revolutionary, was missed because the Comintern was too sound asleep in bed, wedged in between its friends Chiang Kai-Shek and A. A. Purcell!

There is a motivation for the building of a new national trade union federation at this time, but it lies in the attempt to cover up the opportunist, Menshevik sins of the past few years which cannot be covered up. It is the result of non-revolutionary disappointment at the tiresomeness and lack of immediate success of work within the old unions dominated by black reaction, and a consequent hopelessness and lack of faith in the masses still following the Honorable Mr. Green.

"But," says Foster, "this does not mean that the work in the old trade unions will be abandoned . . . There are approximately 3,500,000 organized workers, the T. U. U. L. will never surrender these to the Green-Wool bureaucracy." (*Daily Worker*, 9-14-29). Like a sinner who goes to occasional confession, Foster is careful to bow religiously, at least once in a while, to this formula which has been made absolutely meaningless by the line of the T. U. U. L. and its conference. Johnstone expresses it most bluntly when he says that we will work in the A. F. of L. only for the purpose of tearing off as much support from it to the new center as possible. Such an approach means guaranteed, automatic elimination of any Left wing from the A. F. of L. How long, for example, could a Rosen be a Left winger in the A. F. of L. with his senseless program? Or the few that are still in the A. F. of L.? No, Foster knows better than anyone else just exactly

how little, if any, work will be done in the A. F. of L. with the present line of policy and state of mind of the Communists and Left wing.

Perhaps no better proof of this profound retrogression from Leninist teachings on working in the reactionary unions can be afforded than the following parallel of quotations:

"We cannot ask the workers to join the corrupt A. F. of L. Unions."

"I would cut off my right arm rather than join the A. F. of L."

"The A. F. of L. is a prop for this system (capitalism); we must knock out that prop."

"The 28,000 local unions of the A. F. of L. are 28,000 agencies of the capitalist class."

"The A. F. of L. has succeeded only in debauching the working class in the interests of the capitalist class. The new T. U. U. L. will succeed because it is the workers' federation of labor."

"It has been said that this convention was to form an organization rival to the A. F. of L. This is a mistake. We are here for the purpose of forming a labor organization."

The three quotations on the left side are, in order, Foster (*Daily Worker*, 9-2-29); Foster (same issue); editorial (*Daily Worker*, 9-3-29). The three on the right side are all from speeches of Bill Haywood! Is more of the same needed? It is available by the yard. The *One Big Union Bulletin* of Canada (8-29-29), prints parts of an article by Leslie Morris who wrote on the 10th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. that "all talk of capturing the apparatus of the reformists' unions is hopelessly wrong; that the reformist bureaucracies are an integral part of the bourgeois machinery of state", and comments: "Gee whiz! it's too bad it took the Plenum nine years to find this out. The O. B. U. told these masquerading revolutionists the same thing just nine years ago."

There we have precisely the type of "Leftism" that our Stalinists have imposed on the movement today. "Ascribing the most extravagant virtues to their utopian dual organizations . . . they looked upon the trade unions (A. F. of L.) as a sort of conspiracy carried out by the employers against the working class, as capitalistic organizations which, yielding no benefits to the workers and utterly incapable of evolving into genuine labor unions, had to be ruthlessly destroyed." Who wrote this once upon a time? Foster! Against whom? Against romantic "Left" revolutionaries and syndicalists! To whom does it apply today? To Foster!

The conference adopted a wrong attitude towards the progressives. By some queer twist of the mind, its directors concluded that in new unions, under Party control, there would be no need to worry about the progressives. But this is no truer than it is in the old unions. If the new unions are to become mass organizations, they will include reactionary workers and Communists, Catholics, Jews, Protestants and atheists, Republicans, Democrats and Socialists. Will it be necessary to have the proper approach to the progressive elements of these variegated strata of workers in order to safeguard the militant character of the unions? Of course. It will be necessary to work together with them, to draw them into leadership of the unions, to make united fronts with them against conservative and reactionary elements.

If the new unions are to be mass organizations, they will have enormous numbers of reactionaries and conservatives in their ranks for the simple reason that the overwhelming majority of the American workers are today still dominated by bourgeois ideology. Is it not true that many members of the National Textile Workers Union and the I. L. D. in the South are also members of the Ku Klux Klan and see no conflict between these organizations? (*Daily Worker*, 9-2-29, page 5). Will not such examples be multiplied a hundred times as the movement really begins to grow? The conference, however, obviously thought that its stereotyped denunciation of Muste ended the problem of a correct Left wing approach to the backward and the weakly developed progressive elements in the American working class.

THE "LEFTISTS" AS OPPORTUNISTS

Lack of space prevents us from more than mentioning the opportunist resolution adopted on the Labor Party, which calls for a "revolutionary" Labor Party organized so that no "reformist elements can sneak into its ranks"—a viewpoint distinctly reminiscent of Pepper and his Federated Farmer-Labor Party. Or of the resolution on imperialist war which asserts "the right of labor organizations to train their members in the use of arms, to organize special companies and to select their own instructors," which means—if such fantastic infantilism can mean anything at all in this country at the present time—the "right" of the reactionaries to organize black gangs of armed trade union hoodlums against the militant workers.

Scandalous as such a suggestion may sound nowadays we would nevertheless propose that the American Communists begin to read again and study the classic work of Lenin on the Infantile Disease of Left Radicalism. It will be a healthy antidote to the virulent policy that had its day at Cleveland. The present ultra-"Leftist" spree of the Party will cost the Communist and Left wing movement very dear and lose it the influence among the workers painfully gathered for years. There is no virtue whatsoever in this "Leftism" and the ease with which this cloak is draped around the shoulders of such confirmed opportunists in the Party as Stachel, Weinstone, Bedacht, Foster et al, is sufficient indication of how little it has in common with the genuine Bolshevik teachings of Lenin. Too much damage has already been done the movement to permit the continuation for another day of the disastrous policy that dominated Cleveland and prevented it from accomplishing its great tasks.—S.

CLEVELAND and Unorganized Labor

By James Young

(Note: The following observations on the Cleveland conference of the T. U. E. L. were written by one of the delegates who is at the same time one of the leading comrades in the Party. He uses the pseudonym of Young for obvious reasons.—Ed.)

The mobilization and organization of the unorganized, unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the basic industries of the United States is of major importance for the class struggle. The tactics to be employed in this task have again brought confusion in the revolutionary and labor movement. The present position of American imperialism, with its upward curve, with its unsolvable contradictions, and a radicalization process among the workers, compel us to clarify the situation.

In the revolutionary ranks, the Communist forces, the Right wing elements throughout the world and especially in the more important sections of the Comintern, have openly taken up arms for their opportunist line. In America, the Lovestone-Gitlow forces have joined hands with their brothers in Germany, Russia and France. The dislodging of this Right element in the world Party has put adrift the Centrist forces of Stalin, which mechanically adopt a "Left" position. But with their non-Marxist, non-Leninist position on socialism in one country, on the colonial revolutions, etc., the Centrists lead directly isolation and to the mechanical execution of our tasks.

Today, the three wings in the American Party, the Lovestone-Gitlow Right, the Foster-Bedacht-Stachel Center, and the supporters of the Communist Opposition, face the problem of organizing the unorganized, with the official Party press performing its customary service of beclouding the issue.

The question, "Shall we build new unions?" is not settled by a purely negative or positive answer. Over a year ago the question was on the agenda of the Party and the Opposition fought for a new line and for the new unions, as against the conservatism and rigidity of the present Rights and a good part of the Centrists who opposed the new line and fought the R.I.L.U. on this point. Foster was included in this list. However, when they were forced to concede to the formal position, they did so mechanically and established a few paper organizations.

The struggle for the unionization of the unorganized will not be successful until the militants adopt the correct tactic for combining their forces in the old unions with the work of establishing new unions in the basic industries, not as two separate tasks but as an interconnected whole. Our experiences thus far show that even from the "abstracted" point of view the new unions and their struggles, supplementary work in the old unions would have put many spokes in the strike-breaking work of the reactionary leaders and won the ranks to our side.

The New York Times quotes Muste in his Labor Day speech as gleeful that the Communists are building their own unions and their own center which will enable Muste and his kind to proceed with their mission without being labelled as or bothered by Communists. Muste is opposed to building new unions, but this does not at all mean that anyone who wants a united front is thereby opposed to new unions. Thus, the Lovestone forces opposed the building of new unions when they controlled the Party and the present Opposition fought for the establishment of new unions.

The R.I.L.U. letter to the Cleveland conference said: Muste is opposed to the new unions, and Lovestone and Cannon are of the same group of opportunists. Tactical questions and differing positions cannot be dismissed so easily. One must know the history of the Trotsky and Lovestone groups to see why their various tactics are formulated. The Communist League is for organizing the unorganized into new unions wherever necessary and its supporters were the first to fight for this line. The problem lies in the relation of the new unions to the forces we can utilize in the old unions.

The difference between the official Party and the Communist League is not a difference on new unions versus no new unions, but a difference on the estimation of the forces within the old and the new and their mutual relation. The mechanical "Left" position of the Party already confronts us with two dangers: first, the establishment of paper organizations in every industry, and secondly, the withdrawal of revolutionary forces at the wrong time from reactionary unions, thereby making the fakers a present of the masses.

The Stalinists are great strategists; In a revolutionary period in England, during and after the General Strike, after the "Lefts" in the General Council had outlived their usefulness, the Stalin forces fought for the continuation of the united front with the betrayers. A united front with Purcell and Co.—reserving our own independence and right of criticism—was essential up to a certain stage, but carried beyond this point, suicidal.

In America—when the drift to the Left, when the radicalization process is only on its first lap (it is not yet a revolutionary period despite the monstrous exaggerations of the Party)—the policy of the Stalinists is to carry out a crazy caricature of what they refused to accept in England when Trotsky called for the break with the reformists. In England we had a period of tense and pregnant class struggle, a stage of revolutionary upheaval; in this country we have yet to approach that period. In England, the "Lefts" showed the workers their true colors. In America the progressives have yet to be exposed. As the period of struggles approaches with increased speed, the progressives will rally greater masses, because editorial

denunciation and criticism from the outside, as the Party press is doing now, is not sufficient. Activity from within to separate the chaff from the wheat in the progressive movement through action is necessary.

Stalin and Lovovsky claim to continue Lenin's policy on trade union work, and Foster says: Intensify our work in the A. F. of L. To say this and at the same time to reject the united front, leads to the defeat of one's policy, to giving the fakers free rein in the unions. Deeds, not words, are required against Green and his loyal opposition.

These progressives have "stolen our thunder." With our old program they will be able to get many honest and sincere workers. The way to prove to the workers that these reformists cannot lead them is to put them in a position where they will be faced with the execution of their own words. United front action with the workers will prove that only the Communists and their sympathizers are ready and able to carry out a militant program.

Our emphasis be on the organizing of the unorganized in the basic industries, but at the same time we must have a policy that will enable us to intensify our work in the old unions in reality. This does not mean a verbal barrage, but actual work within the old unions to expose the Greens and the rest of the fakers and win large sections of the workers for the class struggle.

The proletarian sentiment at the Cleveland Convention was good, but not the direct representation, which was a blow to the exaggerations fed us for months. Worse than that was the fact that the discussion on the vital tactical questions indicated above was completely lacking. It has to be conducted now.

A Lovestone Paper Coming

As we go to press we are reliably informed that the Lovestone faction has finally made arrangements for the immediate publication of a sixteen page official monthly magazine. After many weeks of circulating secret mimeograph sheets, the Right wing has made its decision to issue an open organ. The Lovestoneites, who expelled us from the Party when we demanded a discussion of the vital issues in the Communist movement, will now be compelled to face these issues openly and reveal their viewpoint. We proposed that the discussion imperatively needed by the revolutionary movement, and violently prevented by the Stalinists in a bloc with the Thermidorian Right wing, should be held inside the Party. Now it will be held in spite of them in the open—a crushing blow to the blind, frightened bureaucrats who detest and fear all criticism and discussion, and thought to eliminate it with their pitiful mechanical methods. A three-sided discussion of the enormous errors of the Party regime for the past six years, through the WEEKLY MILITANT of the Communist Opposition, the daily paper of the Centrists, and the monthly of the Right wing, will end in a vitally needed clarification. We are confident of the ultimate victory of the Opposition in this discussion.

"Burglary Bolshevism"

To those faith-filled souls who thought that the outcries of the new Party leadership against the burglaries committed by Lovestone against Party offices, indicated any change of heart, or remorse at having burglarized our offices and homes, we recommend the following excerpt from an article entitled "Lovestone, my Former Leader" by William Abrams, in the *Freiheit* of September 1, 1929: "And it is to you, former comrades—again, not to those who ran after a Lore, a Salutsky and other pestilences—I come with the question: Don't you think that the same tactic that is applied against Cannon is criminal when applied to the Communist Party? Don't you think that breaking into the offices of the Central Committee and of Section One, the taking away of documents and lists from there, is an act that must be condemned?" This is the first open and quite cynical admission that the Party second-story men broke into the home of comrade Cannon and stole documents and funds of the Opposition. Worse than that, Abrams not only comes forward here to justify such burglaries, but also by some perverted quirk of the mind and of logic, to condemn just such burglaries when Lovestone commits them against the Party office.

Tragi-comic as it sounds, these are nevertheless the people who claim that they will purify the Communist movement of all petty-bourgeois corruption and Tammany Hall methods! We would like to recommend to the business management of the *Freiheit*, as one of the means of the financial improvement of the paper's condition, to take Abrams and his like bodily to the nearest butcher and sell them while the market is good for such commodities. The Abramses are worth their weight in tripe.

AT LAST! News of Bucharin. . .

The *Daily Worker* (September 13, 1929) has finally received permission from Stalin to publish the first official news of the removal of Bucharin from all his posts, in the form of a resolution of the 10th Plenum of the E.C.C.I. So far as the readers of the *Daily Worker* are concerned, this is the first "news" they have had on the matter. The *Militant*, however, printed the detailed information of the famous "Bucharin case" months ago, including a verbatim report of his negotiations with the capitulator Kamenev, the report of Bucharin's trial before the Control Commission, the secret resolution of Stalin's Political Bureau of the Russian Party to remove Bucharin (passed long ago), and the news of his actual removal. Moreover, months before even this was published, we printed articles by comrade Trotsky in which he exposed the program of the Right wing (Bucharin, Rykov, Tomsky), and foretold the course of the struggle between it and the Stalinist Center. And although

THE 5-YEAR PLAN How Stalin Builds Socialism

One of the most radically false steps yet taken by the Stalin-controlled Political Bureau of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has just been announced in a decision of its Central Committee. It deprives the Russian factory workers of one of the greatest achievements of the Bolshevik revolution: the rights of the worker in the shops and his control of their management. The American correspondents inspired (if not paid) by Stalin, like Walter Duranty of the *New York Times* and Boris Smolar of the *New York World*, sent the first news of the decision and reported it with proper glee. Smolar cables from Moscow:

"The actual boss in Soviet factories, henceforth, will be the director of each factory, and not, as has been the case, the 'triangle', consisting of a representative each of the Party, the labor union and the directorate. This became known today when the Central Committee of the Communist Party issued a long statement to workers explaining that such clipping of the rights of workers in factories was necessary to stimulate the initiative of factory administrators and to help the five-year industrialization plan. This revolutionary change had to be made because representatives of the Party and the labor unions constantly interfered with the management. Today's instructions therefore state clearly that no Party representative, labor union or other social organization has the right to change the orders of a director." (Our emphasis.)

The *Daily Worker* carefully refrains from mentioning this decision. But the *Freiheit*, which knows that Duranty's cables from Moscow are written in the Kremlin, rewrites his dispatch unblushingly as follows: "For this purpose (industrialization) all Soviet Union Communists must help to establish order and discipline in the factory. Members of the Communist Party, union representatives and shop committees are instructed not to interfere in questions of management." (September 9, 1929, Our emphasis.)

Exactly two years ago today (September 9, 1927) Stalin, in replying to one of the questions of a member of the first American trade union delegation to Russia, said proudly:

"It must be observed that the overwhelming majority of the factory and works managers in Russia are workmen, appointed by the Supreme Economic Council in agreement with the trade unions, and that not a single factory manager can remain at his post contrary to the will of the workers or the particular trade union. It must be observed also that in every factory and workshop there is a factory council, elected by the workers, which controls the activities of the management of the particular enterprise. Finally, it must be observed that in every industrial enterprise regular production conferences of workers are held in which all the workers employed in the given enterprise take part and at which the work of the manager of the enterprise is discussed and criticized; the plan of work in the factory administration is discussed, errors and defects are noted and rectified through the trade unions, through the Party and through the organs of the Soviet administration." (Report of Interview, page 36.)

The latest decision of the Party Central Committee abolishes every single one of these advantages, privileges and rights of the workers in the factory! Factory managers can remain at their posts now even if contrary to the will of the workers or the trade union. The factory council cannot control the activities of its management. Errors and defects in management can no longer be rectified through the trade unions and Party, since there are told not to "interfere", to keep hands off. The very instruction to the Communist Party, the trade unions and the shop committees "not to interfere"—who has the right to "interfere" if not these bodies?—is the acme of bureaucratic distortion of the conquests of the revolution.

Lenin did not oppose the "subjecting the will of thousands to the will of one" in industry. Nor do we. But he emphasized that "the more firmly we now have to advocate a merciless and firm rule and dictatorship of individuals for definite processes of work during certain periods of purely executive functions, the more diverse should be the forms and means of mass control in order to paralyze every possibility of distorting the Soviet rule, in order repeatedly and tirelessly to remove the wild grass of bureaucratism." (Soviets at Work, page 42. Our emphasis.) And this was written at the very beginning of the revolution, in 1918, with chaos and counter-revolution in the land. By his new decision, Stalin has removed a number of these "forms and means of mass control" that prevent the growth of bureaucratism.

Only two years ago, the Platform of the Russian Opposition pointed out, in its section on the position of the working class and the trade unions, that under the Stalin-Bucharin regime, the management in the factories strives ever more to establish its unlimited power, to hire and fire without control by the workers. Now this striving has become an established, a legally established fact. The new decision is characteristic of the so-called Five Year Industrialization Plan: it is an industrialization carried out at the gradual expense of workers' rights and workers' interests. It is Stalin's method of "building socialism in one country alone."

even the yellow socialist and the capitalist press published the news weeks and months ago, the *Daily Worker* still retained its gag. In this, as in all else, the Party members are always confronted with accomplished fact. When we tell the truth in time we are "slandering" the International. When the *Daily Worker* tells its half-truths long after the fact, it is Bolshevik self-criticism.

Once Again: On Brandler and Thalheimer

By L. D. TROTSKY

Dear Comrade:

I am very grateful to you for your detailed letter of June 3, 1929: it contains a lot of very important news for me which I hope to utilize in the future. Here, I wish to confine myself to examining the question of our attitude towards the German Right Opposition.

1. You admit that Brandler and Thalheimer did not understand the revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923, in China in 1925-1927, in England in 1926, and finally the Thermidorian character of the struggle against "Trotskyism" from 1923 to 1927. You admit all this. But thereby you recognize that Brandler-Thalheimer are not revolutionaries, for revolutionaries are determined and characterized by their attitude towards the fundamental problems of the world revolution. What can we Bolsheviks have in common, in politics, with non-revolutionaries, especially with individuals who, for the last 6-7 years, have been fighting our revolutionary decisions and slogans in the most trying moments?

2. Still you resent the fact that Brandler and Thalheimer are called Menshevik-liquidators. Certainly, if this is taken literally, it is false. But the tendency that put them in opposition to us is without a doubt a tendency of liquidators and Mensheviks. The Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung" criticizes me exactly like Thalheimer does. Like him, it sympathizes with Stalin against me, with Rykov and Bukharin against Stalin. But the "Arbeiter-Zeitung" does it openly, while Brandler and Thalheimer play a most pitiful game of hide and seek. In such a case, I prefer the "Arbeiter-Zeitung", that is, the enemy who shows himself openly.

3. Your letter contains deadly arguments against the Rights. In spite of that, you thought it necessary to add that "the situation in the German Communist Party would be better if they applied the so-called Right policy instead of the one practised at present."

Well, we have already seen to what a pass the German Party was brought under the leadership of Brandler. It brought the huge catastrophe at the end of 1923. This catastrophe forms the basis of all the subsequent jumps of German Communism towards the Right and towards the Left. It constitutes the political premise for the period of stabilization of European capitalism that followed. How then can we fail to see that as a political person Brandler finds himself on the other side of the barricades?

You know that I did not come to this annihilating conclusion at one stroke. I had rather hoped that Brandler would learn. In the Fall of 1923, he understood his lack of capacity. He himself told me repeatedly that he was unable to find himself again in a revolutionary situation. Yet, after he had missed the situation, he became exceedingly haughty. He began to accuse me of "pessimism". He looked upon 1924 with lots of "optimism". Then I understood that this man did not know how to distinguish the face of the revolution from its rear.

Had it been only a matter of an individual peculiarity the misfortune would have been only half as great. But now it has been raised to a system on which a faction is being built. What can we have in common with a faction of this kind?

5. By that I do not assume to any degree the defense of the policy of Maslov and others. In 1923, the verbose radicalism of Maslov was imbued with the same passivity as was Brandler's. Without understanding the A B C of the question, Maslov tried to ridicule my demand for the fixing of the date of the insurrection. At the Fifth Congress, he still regarded the revolution as progressing. In other words, in the essential questions he shared the errors of Brandler, serving them up with an ultra-Leftist sauce. But Maslov at least made an effort to learn until he slid down into the morass of the capitulators. Others of the old ultra-Lefts learned certain things. I by no means assume the responsibility for the line of "Volkswille" as a whole. Even now there are not a few remnants of the past, that is, of combinations of opportunist and ultra-Left tendencies. Nevertheless, these comrades have learned a great deal and a great number of them have proved that they are capable of learning still more. Brandler and Thalheimer, on the contrary, have taken a gigantic step backwards by raising their revolutionary blindness to a platform.

6. You see one of their merits in their struggle for democracy in the Party. I do not see this merit. Brandler and Thalheimer never raised their voices against the annihilation of the Left Opposition. They not only tolerated the Stalinist regime but they supported it. They swallowed the Thermidorian bait of "Trotskyism". When did they feel called upon to take up the struggle for Party democracy? Only when the apparatus began to crush them, when they became convinced that they would never get to power simply by serving the Stalinists. Can one really find it meritorious that the opportunists begin to cry out when the Centrists, dreading the criticism of the Left, demolish them? No one likes to be clubbed. There isn't any merit in that.

The Centrist methods of struggle against the Right are disgusting, and in the long run help the Right. But that does not by any means signify that a democratic regime in the Communist Party must assure citizenship to the opportunist tendency of Brandler.

Party democracy cannot be regarded as a thing in itself. We speak of democracy on a definite revolutionary basis which excludes Brandlerism.

7. You see the second merit of the Brandlerists in their struggle for immediate demands, in their striving to find contact with the masses, etc. But do we need such contact for itself, and not for revolutionary (and, what amounts to the same thing, in-

ternational) aims? If we take as a point of departure the mere contact with the masses, we must turn our eyes toward the Second International and Amsterdam. The German social democracy is much more imposing on this point than Brandler-Thalheimer.

Of course it can be said that this is an exaggeration: Brandler and Thalheimer are not the social democracy. Of course, they are not yet the social democracy, and naturally not the social democracy of today. But we must know how to look at facts in their development. The German social democracy did not begin with Herman Mueller. On the other hand, so far Brandler only desires to give the masses with him, but he has not got them. You yourself speak indignantly of the Brandlerists turning their backs to the international proletariat. They don't give a flag for the Russian revolution, or the Chinese revolution, or the rest of humanity.

They want to carry out their policies in Germany like Stalin wants to build socialism in Russia. Live and let live. But we know where that led to: to the 4th of August, 1914. Allow me to remind you once more that the young factions, particularly the opportunist Opposition factions, are more "congenial" than the old social-chauvinist Parties in the same way as a young pig is more congenial than an old hog.

8. However, those who imagine that Brandler can really lead the masses on to "the soil of reality" (that is, of national reformism), are seriously mistaken. No, on that soil Brandler has an invincible competitor. So long as the masses of the workers choose between Brandler and Wels, they will prefer the latter, and in their fashion they will be right: It is useless to recommence from the beginning what has already been done once.

9. It seems that you present as a merit of Brandler and Thalheimer their criticism of Thaelmann's First of May policy. At the same time you express the certitude that I cannot approve of this policy. I do not know if you have read my letter to the Sixth Congress entitled "What Now?" This letter contains a special chapter devoted to the perspectives of the Leftward march of the German working class, and also a direct and categorical warning against Thaelmann's hare-brained over-estimation of the movement towards the Left and against the danger of ultra-Leftist adventures that flow from it. I will speak of all this in greater detail in a pamphlet that I hope to publish next month. But, while criticizing the spirit of bureaucratic adventurism, I will draw a line of demarcation all the more clearly between my criticism and Brandler's. Opportunists always have a triumphant air when they criticize the spirit of revolutionary adventurism. But it is precisely they who prepare the ground for it: Brandler prepared the ground for Maslov like Maslov prepared the ground for Thaelmann, who combines all the errors of Brandler and Maslov and adds to them his own faults that result from bureaucratic stupidity and blustering ignorance.

10. You point to various groups of the Left Opposition and call them "sectarian". We must come to an understanding of the meaning of this term. There are among us elements who content themselves with criticizing the mistakes of the official party, without setting themselves any other tasks in a broader sense, without taking upon themselves practical revolutionary obligations, and make a distinction of the revolutionary Opposition, something like the Order of the Legion d'Honneur. There are also sectarian tendencies expressed in splitting every hair in four. This must be combated. And I am personally ready to fight against this until the last, if needs be against old friendships, personal relations, etc., etc.

However we must not have any illusions. The revolutionary Marxists are now again reduced (not for the first time and probably not for the last) to being an international propaganda society. Such a position, by its very essence, contains certain elements of sectarianism that can be overcome only by degrees. It seems that the fact that we are very few frightens you. Of course, it is unpleasant. Naturally, it would be better to have behind us organizations numbering millions. But how are we, the vanguard of the vanguard, to have such organizations the day after the world revolution has suffered catastrophic defeats brought on by the Menshevik leadership hiding under the false mask of Bolshevism? How? Yes, how?

We are passing through a period of tremendous reaction following upon the revolutionary years (1917-1923). We revolutionary Marxists find ourselves thrown back, at a new and higher stage of history, into the position of a small minority, persecuted almost like at the beginning of the imperialist war. As is shown by all history, beginning with the example of the First International, similar relapses are inevitable. Our advantage over our predecessors consists in the fact that the environment is now much more mature and that we ourselves are much more "mature", for we rest upon the shoulders of Marx, Lenin and many others. We will be able to utilize this advantage that we possess only if we know how to manifest the greatest ideological intransigence, fiercer yet than that of Lenin at the beginning of the imperialist war. There will still be characterless impressionists, like Radek, to abandon us. They will still talk of our "sectarianism". We must not be afraid of words. Twice already have we gone through all this. Such was the case during the reaction of 1907-1912 in Russia. It was the same during the war in Europe. The present reaction is deeper than the preceding ones. There will yet be isolated capitulations, desertions and even

direct betrayal. That is in the nature of the present period. So much the surer will be those selected. To be at present a "sectarian" of revolutionary Marxism in the eyes of philistines, of snivellers, of shallow minds, is the greatest honor for a real revolutionary. I repeat: we are today again nothing but an international propaganda society. I do not see in this any reason for pessimism, despite the fact that we have behind us the huge historic mountain of the October revolution, or, to speak more exactly, precisely because of that. I have no doubt that the new chapter of the proletarian revolution will begin its genealogy with our "sectarian" group.

11. In conclusion, a few words on the Brandler faction as a whole. You agree with me that Brandler and Thalheimer themselves are incorrigible. I am ready to admit with you that in any case their faction is better than its leaders. Many workers go to this faction, despairing of the policy of the official Party and unable at the same time to forget the luckless leadership of the ultra-Leftists after 1923: All that is true. A part of these workers, like a part of the ultra-Left workers, will pass over to the social democracy. Another part will come to us, if we do not spare the Right. Our task consists of explaining that the faction of Brandler is only a new door leading to the social democracy.

12. Do we need a platform of immediate demands? Yes. Do we need a correct tactic in the trade unions? Certainly. But we cannot speak of these questions except with those who have clearly and firmly decided for themselves why all this is needed. Just as I will not discuss the various tendencies in materialism with a man who makes the sign of the cross whenever he passes by a church, so I will not work out slogans and a tactic with Brandler who, in principle, calls the rear of the revolution its face (and vice versa). We must begin by intrenching ourselves in positions of principle, by occupying a correct position of departure, and afterwards expand our tactical lines. We are now in a period of the clarification of principles for ourselves and of pitiless delimitation from the opportunists and confusionists. It is only in this direction that the way to the great road of the revolution will be found.

Strong and intransigent greetings,
Constantinople, June 12, 1929.

Malkin's "Statement"

The Daily Worker of September 14th prints what purports to be a letter from comrade Maurice Malkin, at present a State prisoner in Comstock, New York, to the Party Secretariat. In this letter, comrade Malkin is alleged to sever his connection with the Opposition and appeal for reinstatement into the Party from which he was expelled.

Comrade Malkin was one of our first supporters in the Party. While under sentence in the Mineola furrier's trial for his activity on the picket line, he joined with the Russian and American Opposition and was forthwith expelled by the Party bureaucrats. The smug apparatus men who now hail him again as a stalwart fighter, are the same ones who slanderously denounced him as a "counter-revolutionist," a "Trotskyist gangster," and tried to organize mobs of hoodlums to beat him up in front of the New York Worker's Center. Because he was supporter of the Opposition, his defense was criminally neglected and even sabotaged by the Party leaders in control of the I.L.D. Even a protest meeting was called off by them at the last minute because Malkin insisted on his right to speak there.

The real reasons that animated the appearance of the letter are not contained in it. We know that they are not the ones written there. Comrade Malkin does not believe the infamous slander that we are "counter-revolutionists." He was not and cannot now be taken in by the hypocritical barrage laid down against comrade Trotsky for breaking through the Thermidorian conspiracy of silence on the viewpoint of the Opposition with his articles in the bourgeois press. Comrade Malkin was never a pupil of the school of Zinoviev, Kamenev, Safarov, Radek and Co.

How many times did comrade Malkin write us ridiculing the spurious arguments of the weak-kneed capitulators! How enthusiastically did he endorse the formation of our Communist League! With what scorn and contempt did he write about the cheap Stalinist maneuver which grafted the Foster branch on to the rotting Lovestone tree! No, the Malkin we know, who fought side by side with us from the beginning will never be at one with the Weinstones, Stachels, Fosters, Bedachts, Trachtenbergs, Minors and Engdahls. He knows the stifling atmosphere of the Centrist swamp.

Comrade Malkin was, and will be in the future, a stalwart fighter in the camp of the Opposition. The Stalinist ghouls, who have exerted their utmost cunning to play upon his sentiment, who have resorted to the most damnable tricks, to the most shameful pressure upon him and his family, will not succeed in dragging him into the mire of Stalinism. When the whole story of the dastardly role played by the Stalinists in the Malkin case—before and after his entry into prison—is told, and it will not be long delayed, it will redound to the credit of comrade Malkin and to the ineradicable shame of the Party.

To his fellow-workers in prison, and to comrade Malkin, we send again our warmest Opposition greeting. Speed the day when his release will enable him to return to the front ranks of our movement from which he was snatched!

PALESTINE - - Pogrom or Revolution?

By MAX SHACHTMAN

The reactionary Arab leaders have diverted the nationalist movement of the masses into Pan-Islamic and anti-Semitic channels and out of its natural current against British imperialism. Is not this clear from all that has happened? Here is an interview (New York Times, September 7, 1929) with Auni Abd-el-Hadi Sij, secretary of the Arab Executive, secretary to Feisal of Iraq at Versailles and co-signer of the treaty:

THE ARAB CONGRESS

"At our congress today we solemnly declared that we would not budge from our conviction that Palestine must again form a part of the *Arab Empire of our dreams*.' The Arab leader went on to say that the Arab Executive gave orders to the Arab population *not to shoot at British troops* even when these troops, blinded by London orders, were shooting at them. In the last outbreaks *the Arabs shot at Jews only*; those Englishmen reported killed, he said, were the victims of stray bullets. *'We are by no means anti-British.'*" (My emphasis. M. S.)

Furthermore, the Executive Committee of the Arab National Congress, in a message to the League of Nations, asked it to see that a parliamentary government, representative of the Arabian majority, was installed in the "Holy Land". Between these gentlemen and their Zionist contemporaries there is about the same difference as between the Polish nobility and the favoring Jews under czarism.

The cause of the street struggles is therefore not to be found in the dispute over the so-called Wailing Wall. Rather the latter is only a religious cloak for deep-going social conflict. Only the passionately blind or the wilfully deceptive fail to acknowledge this obvious fact now. Have not even the National Council of Palestine Jews, and Chief Rabbinate and the pious Agudheh Israel admitted, in their memorandum to the British High Commissioner, that the Wailing Wall is only incidental to the main struggle?

Is the Arab attack upon the Jews a pogrom? That the action of the Arabs had anti-Semitic features is quite clear, and is implicitly admitted even by the Communist Party Thesis (*Daily Worker*, September 3, 1929) when it says that "the action of the Arabs transformed itself rapidly (but from what? M. S.) into a national revolutionary uprising." That it was not a pogrom on the Jews, however, is eloquently evidenced by the fairly reliable figures of the *Literary Digest*, which reports that the first two weeks of the upheaval brought the following fatalities: Moslems killed, 870; Christians, 4; Jews, 175. That the main responsibility lies up British imperialism and its Zionist salesmen, and only in an entirely secondary sense upon the Arabs, is attested by no less an "unbiased" authority than the editor of the *American Hebrew*: "The arrogance of the so-called Zionist revolutionists is doubtless a causative factor behind the unhappy Moslem outbreaks against the Jews. The bravado with which they claim Jewish Palestine against the Arabs, the aggressive zeal with which they demand an exclusive Jewish nationhood in Palestine, the inflammatory political harangues with which they demonstrate their foolhardy assertiveness are in no little measure to blame for the ill-will and recurrent clashes between Moslem and Jew in the Holy Land." No, it is not a pogrom. It is an uprising of the down-trodden Arabian masses, seeking expression for their hatred of the British oppressor, but still strangled and retarded by their corrupt feudal and bourgeois leaders, sold out at every opportunity, and often dragged off into reactionary by-paths.

THE ROLE OF THE FORWARD

It is, therefore, the lowest kind of reactionary nationalism, jingoist incitement of backward sentiment, and contemptible insult to an "inferior race", when the "socialist" *Forward* writes in its leading editorial (August 31, 1929): "The main motive (so!) of the pogromists, the force that drove them to their bloody work, was 'Gold and women'. 'In the Jewish houses you will find herds of gold and lovely women.' That was the cry, that was the fire that excited the blood of the mob and drove it to carry out its diabolical work." The Southern Bourbon reaction always uses precisely the same "reasoning" when it proceeds to lynch Negroes. And every worker to whom the cause of Labor is dear, will condemn unmeasurably the scandalous lynching campaign of the *Forward* and its Zionist allies against the Communist Party, and its Jewish Organ, the *Freiheit*, in particular. The daily incitement of the *Forward* and the *Jewish Day*, aided, as in Chicago, by the American Legion, has resulted in hooligan attacks upon the *Freiheit* office in Chicago, intimidating newsstand dealers from selling the papers, pressing advertisers to withdraw their contracts, and breaking up Communist street meetings. These are the same despicable methods used by Burlison and Palmer against the socialist and the labor press during and after the war, and they have nothing in common with the working class. We protested against these actions when Stalinists sought to break up our Opposition meetings and tear up our press. We will fight with the party against the present methods of the yellow *Forward*.

THE ARAB LEADERS

Now, is the Arab uprising a national revolutionary movement, as the official Party press declares? No.

Pogrom or national revolution? The answer to this question, arising out of the recent events in Palestine, has brought confusion and sharp dissension into the labor and Communist movement in this and other countries. An understanding of the present situation is prerequisite for an answer.

The artificially-established country known today as Palestine has been inhabited by Arabs for more than twelve centuries. While under the domination of Turkey, the liberation of the country (together with other Arabian territory) was promised by British emissaries to the Emir of Mecca, Hussein, as soon as Turkey entered the world war on the side of the Central powers. In November 1915, the English pledged the Arabs title to their lands, retaining reservations on French claims to Syria. Hussein, relying upon the support of Britain, began his noted revolt in May 1916, and Britain signed the Sykes-Picot agreement on May 16, 1917 which agreed to support an eventual Arab national state in the interior of Syria. Hussein's son, the Emir Feisal, sweeping through Transjordan into Syria, took Damascus, and made it the capital of the Arab state.

The end of the World War saw the betrayal of the promises made by England to the Arabs and dissolved their Pan-Islamic dreams in the brutal realities of imperialist striving for power. Through the secret treaties, France was given Syria north of Palestine; and after driving Feisal out of Damascus occupied the whole country. England got the oil regions of Mosul and Palestine.

PALESTINE AND THE EMPIRE

With Cyprus and Egypt, Palestine forms the triangular protective collar of the jugular vein of British imperialism: the Suez Canal, the great route to India and China, the other end of the long Mediterranean gap guarded on the Atlantic by Gibraltar. Moreover, Palestine is of additional strategic importance for England. The pipe line for Mosul oil will terminate at the seaport of Haifa, and with it the railroad to Mesopotamia; Britain's imperial airways, of the commercial and military variety, have an important post in Palestine, over which lies the land route to India. To retain a stranglehold on Palestine by throttling any Arabian movement for independence has become a cardinal section in the British imperialist code.

Largely to this end, as well as for the purpose of distracting the sympathy of the Jews from the impending Bolshevik revolution, Lord Balfour issued his notorious declaration on November 2, 1917, which proclaimed England's intention to assure Jewry "a national homeland", that is, by their domination of the Zionist movement, to inject into Palestine a solid base for British imperialist support, and a source of friction with the Arabs, a bulwark against the nationalist wave. The reactionary-Utopian character of Zionism lent itself splendidly to this design. Misled by the glowing promises of the Zionist leaders, thousands of Jewish workers were brought to Palestine to serve as the instruments of British imperialism against the Arab natives and the reactionary aims of well fed Jewish magnates in establishing a state in Palestine dominated by the Jews—who to this day form only about one-seventh of the population—and serving the cause of the Union Jack.

The expropriation of the Arabian peasants began on a big scale. Their land was "bought" by Zionist speculators at incredibly low prices, usually paid to the rich Sheiks and Effendis, leaving the Arab fellahin without any source of livelihood. Together with thousands of Jewish workers, the Arabs were transformed into objects of almost limitless exploitation as agricultural workers and proletarians in the incipient industry of the country.

THE NATIONALIST MISLEADERS

The natural growth of Arab resentment against British imperialism and its Zionist trail-blazers, expressing itself in a movement for national liberation by the unshackling of England's fetters, was checked, perverted and emasculated by the Arabian feudal landlords, the religious caste and the budding bourgeoisie. From the Grand Mufti to the lower caste Sheiks, there is hardly one of the leaders of the Arabian nationalist movement who has not at one time or another been bought, or who could not be bought to serve British or French imperialism. And outside of this reactionary element, dominated largely by religious and Pan-Islamic notions, there is no substantial anti-imperialist movement except the Communist Party of Palestine. Today there is not even as advanced a movement in Palestine as was represented in China by the Kuo Min Tang.

It is this element that is today leading the Arabian nationalist movement, particularly in Palestine, and much to the detriment of the interests and aspirations of the Arab peasant. It wants the establishment of an Arab State in Palestine, if not throughout all the Arabic countries proper—an Arab State in agreement with the British, "if necessary", and even under their benevolent protectorate. Thence arises their sharp antagonism to the Zionists and their servile attitude towards the British master.

Therein lie the causes of the present struggle. To jockey for a better position in Palestine, to advance their desires for greater power, the Arab and Zionist bourgeoisie continue to set their respective peoples into conflict with each other. The Arab worker and peasant is depicted to the Jew as the source of all his difficulties. The Jew is pointed out to the Arab as the source of all evil.

Not every movement led by spokesmen of an oppressed nationality is a revolutionary movement. It is a lamentable fact that at the present time the Arab movement is directed by unconcealed reactionaries, with no substantial Left wing or revolutionary force to challenge their leadership, outside of the Communist Party of Palestine which has virtually no influence upon the recent events and which these same reactionaries helped to drive into illegality and imprisonment. The Arab leaders have curbed the genuine movement of the masses, they have stunted its growth and prevented the development of its natural course of struggle, they have repeatedly misled and devitalized it.

They are still the only spokesmen of the movement, and they speak for reactionary aims. They fight for an "Arab Empire". They have compromised with imperialism and are willing to do it again. They are against all Jews as Jews. They set up the reactionary demand for the "restriction of the Jewish immigration into Palestine".

They do not even pretend to a program one-tenth as advanced as that of the Kuo Min Tang three years ago. They promise the peasant no land and the worker no social improvement. They are vehement enemies not only of Bolshevism, but of the mildest kind of labor movement. In this respect, they far "excel" their Zionist competitors.

But all of this means to the Stalinist high priests of the "Third Period". They have their idiotic and empty formula, and feel compelled to make every event, occurring anywhere in the world, fit into the cherished blueprint. The confused and misdirected action of the Arabs is therefore touched with the magic wand of the "Third Period", and presto! it has become a "national revolutionary uprising against British imperialism." And endless as the Arabian deserts are the theses written to "prove" this contention. But who is leading this movement along national revolutionary lines? We are not told, because discretion is the better part of the New Line. Were an answer given, it would have to be: the Grand Mufti, the rabid Pan-Islamists, the Effendis, the feudal lords are the as yet unchallenged leaders of the movement that has been generated.

But, you say, thereby the contention falls to the ground? Yes, that is precisely why we have the astounding picture of three theses of the Political Committee and its Agit-Prop department (August 30th, September 3rd, and September 7th issues of *Daily Worker*) that do not say a word about these reactionary leaders of the Arab masses, much less condemn them. The September 3rd thesis has 9 slogans at its conclusion, without a single one of them implying the need of struggle against these elements who will never lead a national revolutionary movement or allow one to develop. The September 7th thesis says: "We must point out the distinction between the Jewish bourgeoisie and the exploited and misled Jewish working masses in Palestine." Excellent! But why is there not a whisper about the "distinction" between the Arab fellahin and their oppressive Effendis and Mukhtars? Are we perhaps to understand that the Grand Mufti has become the leader of an Arabian "Bloc of Four Classes" as was Chiang Kai-Shek before him? Has the green banner of Islam replaced the blue of the Kuo Min Tang? Are we to witness another period of exaggeration of the essence of the movement, of praises sung to the "national revolutionary anti-imperialist bourgeoisie" until they again decimate a whole generation of workers and peasants?

Behind all the "revolutionary" blabber of the Stalinists on the Palestine uprising is concealed an abysmally opportunist appraisal of the movement and its leaders.

THE FREIHEIT'S ZIG-ZAG

Does this mean that we have the same viewpoint as that of the *Freiheit* before it was condemned by the Party Political Bureau? By no means. The viewpoint of the *Freiheit* was quite indistinguishable from that of a Reformed rabbi with leanings towards the labor movement. "The Arabian attacks bear all the signs of the czarist pogroms," it said (August 26). "Protest against the British government which permits the pogroms upon innocent people!" (Ah, cold-hearted MacDonald, why don't you send some warships and troops to shoot down these confounded Arab pogromists!)

What happened was that when the incurable Menshevik Olgin, and the Zionist-trained Epstein, were scratched by a struggle, their thin coat of Bolshevik veneer was scraped off to reveal the Bundist underneath. The fact that the Olgins and Epsteins (there are many of them, all specialists in slaughtering Trotskyists, by the way) covered their scratches inside of an hour with some more varnish as soon as they found they were ordered to by the Political Committee, changes nothing about them. It merely made them throw away the speeches prepared for the Plaza Hall meeting, and rewrite them, using the same facts, but adding on new slogans furnished them by the Agit-Prop department. But you will never make a pig's ear out of a sow's ear, or a Bolshevik out of Olgin.

British imperialism, with the help of God and "comrade" MacDonald and Webb,—not to speak of the anointed Zionists—will suppress the present uprising, but since its causes remain, the situation will continue to cast up new and greater insurrections. But the Arabian masses will win their liberation only under the banner of Bolshevism.

Who Is Leading the Comintern To-day?

CONTINUED FROM LAST ISSUE

The native element of the Petrovskys, the Rafeses and the Guralskys is the bustle behind the scenes, gossip and combinations, diplomatic tricks around the Anglo-Russian Committee or the Kuo Min Tang, in brief, the intrigues around the revolution. The flexibility and adaptability of these people have a fatal limit: they are organically incapable, either of testing revolutionary initiative in action or of defending their views as a minority. And yet it is just two qualities, which complement each other, that make a real revolutionary. Without the ability to stand obstinately in the minority, it is impossible to gather a confident, firm and courageous revolutionary majority. On the other hand, a revolutionary majority, even when once conquered, by no means become a permanent and irrevocable patrimony. The proletarian revolution marches over great heights and depths, over beaten paths, through tunnels, and down steep declivities. There are still enough of these heights and depths for a decade. That is why the continual selection of revolutionaries, tempering them not only in the struggle of the masses against the enemy but also in the ideological struggle within the Party, testing them in the great events and at brusque turning-points, is of decisive importance for the Party. Goethe has said that once a thing is acquired, it must always be won again in order to possess it in reality.

During the first Party cleansing, Lenin recommended that ninety-nine percent of the former Mensheviks be thrown out. He had in mind Menshevism not so much as a conciliatory political line but rather the psychological type of adaptability seeking a protective coloration and ready to camouflage itself as Bolshevik—only so as not to swim against the stream. While Lenin recommended the pitiless cleansing of the Party from those who adapt themselves, after his death these elements began to play a great role in the Party, and in the International, a decisive role. Guralski crowned and uncrowned the leaders of the French, the German and other Parties; Petrovsky and Pepper directed the Anglo-Saxon world; Rafes taught the Chinese people revolutionary strategy; Borodin was the state counselor of the national revolution. All are variations of one and the same basic type: parasites of the revolution.

It is needless to say that the present "Left course" of Stalin has in no sense disquieted this public. On the contrary, all the Petrovskys joyously enter into this Left course today, and the Rafeses fight against the Night danger. In this Left-Centrist campaign, which is three-fourths inflated and purely formal, the adapters feel themselves like fish in the water, demonstrating cheaply—to themselves and to others—what remarkable revolutionaries they are. At the same time, they remain, more than ever before, true to themselves. If anything can kill the International, it is this course, this regime, this spirit, incarnate in the Petrovskys.

MARTINOV

One of the inspirers and determined educators of the International after Lenin is Martinov—a wholly symbolic figure in the history of the revolutionary movement. The most consistent, and consequently the most stupid, theoretician of Menshevism, Martinov remained patiently sheltered from the revolution and the civil war in a comfortable refuge, like a traveler shelters himself from bad weather. He ventured forth into the light of day only in the sixth year of the October. In 1923, Martinov suddenly unbosomed himself by publishing an article in the Moscow review, *Krasnaia Nov*. At a session of the Political Bureau, in the spring of 1923, I said in passing, half in jest, half in earnest, but at any rate as bearer of ill omen: "Watch out that Martinov doesn't worm his way into the Party." Lenin, his two hands around his mouth like a trumpet, "whispered" to me so that he was heard throughout the room: "Everyone knows very well that he is a block-head." I had no reason to contest this brief characterization made in a tone of absolute conviction. I merely observed that it is evidently impossible to build a large Party only out of intelligent people and that Martinov could belong to another category. Now the peasantry has taken a serious turn. Martinov has not only wormed his way into the Party, but he has become one of the principal inspirers of the International. He has been brought closer and he has been elevated, or rather, they have come closer to him and they have stooped to him—solely because of his struggle against "Trotskyism". In this respect, he had no need to begin his education anew. He continues to fight the "permanent revolution" just like in the past twenty years. Formerly, he spoke of my under-estimation of bourgeois liberalism and bourgeois democracy. He has not changed the cliché. He has only inserted the peasantry.

In the Menshevik journals of the period of the reaction, one could find not a few articles by Martinov designed to bring proof that "Trotskyism triumphed for the moment in October, November and December 1905" (*sic*) when the elements ran riot and extinguished all the torches of Menshevik reason. The high point of the revolution—October, November and December 1905—was designated by Martinov as its "Trotskyist" decline. For him the genuine high point began only with the Imperial Duma, with the bloc with the Cadets, and so forth, that is, with the beginning of the counter-revolution.

Having tarried in his refuge for the end of a new play, infinitely more terrible, of the "unfettered elements", the October revolution, the civil war, the revolution in Germany and Austro-Hungary, the Soviet overthrow in Hungary, the events in Italy, and so

By L. D. TROTSKY

forth and so on, Martinov came to the conclusion in 1923 that the time had come to relight the torch of reason in the Russian Communist Party. He began where he had left off in the period of the Stolypinist reaction. In *Krasnaia Nov*, he wrote:

"In 1905 L. Trotsky reasoned much more logically and consistently than the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks. But the defect in his reasoning was the Trotsky was 'too consistent'. The picture that he painted *in anticipation a very precise, charming idea of the Bolshevik dictatorship of the first three years of the October revolution, which as is well-known, ended by landing in a blind alley, after having detached the pro-*

10th Plenum of the Communist International

The Tenth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International will be recorded in history as the most fruitless and superficial world gathering of a revolutionary movement that ever assembled to solve the burning problems with which it is confronted and to diagnose the diseases corroding its vitals.

Characteristic of the gathering was the monotonous mediocrity of its spokesmen and their auditors. The sessions of the Communist International, once illuminated by the genius of Lenin and Trotsky, flanked by Zinoviev, Radek, Rakovsky, Bucharin and a host of others, were "graced" this time by such fourth-rate functionaries as Kuusinen and Manuilsky, the main political reporters, droning out their platitudinous wisdom to an audience of officials. The importance attributed to this Plenum can perhaps best be estimated by the fact that Stalin, the present leader of the International, its spokesman and theorist—save the mark!—did not even bother to attend a single session, much less to make an address.

Of the political reports, the less said the kinder one is to the reporters. Very few even of the Party members today pay much attention to what a Kuusinen or a Manuilsky have to say; even fewer read it. Manuilsky may repeat a hundred times that he considers "the capture of the majority of the working class to be a burning task of the political moment today confronting the mass Communist Parties of Europe", but everyone knows that there are no mass Communist Parties in Europe and that Manuilsky took four hours to fail to tell his inattentive audience how to remedy the defect.

As for the dry-as-dust professor, Kuusinen, with his ABC class lecture on economics, he reached the height of his directive genius in the Comintern at the 10th Plenum in a bloodless battle of quotations from Marx and Lenin with Varga. When he had no quotations left to fire, he simply stated: "I am not quite certain if a Red professor would not be able to ferret out some sentence in Marx' works as a proof that Marx had even taken the effect of the conveyor system into consideration." In the face of the sharp defeats of the Comintern in half a dozen countries, of its decline in every section, of the advancing strength of the social democracy internationally, of splits and degeneration in the International, we have this pitiful Punch-and-Judy battle of words occupying half the Plenum's time.

One gets the same impression of senility from the remarks of most of the speakers, chewing over again, like old men, the cud of infantile theories on the offensive, on social democracy, on fascism, on trade union work, for which better men than they were whipped by Lenin and Trotsky almost a decade ago.

At this Plenum the "Third Period"—probably because Bucharin was its co-parent with Stalin—did not occupy the center of the stage. That place of honor was reserved for the new theory of "social fascism", and it was mauled about by one speaker after another. Bear in mind that it has become one of the main-springs of Comintern policy today. It appears in every manifesto, every thesis, every article and news-story in the Party press. Yet, after all of its phases had been exhausted—even Bela Kun's theory of "the possibility, nay, even the necessity of the transformation of democracy into fascism"—it remained for Martinov to admit that although "the question of social fascism is now of tremendous and fundamental importance, yet no definition of social fascism has been given in the theses or in the main reports"! As to Kolarov, who probably had no other answer to Varga's contentions, it remained for this oyster to shed a pearl of truly classic luster: "As a matter of fact, bourgeois statistics have now entered into the period of their fascization, becoming transformed into fascist statistics. This is a fact which comrade Varga overlooks!" Had Kolarov produced nothing else in his career, he would achieve eternal fame by that alone.

The same wearying blabber in a vacuum featured the "struggle against the Rights and the Conciliators". Serra was denounced, Humbert-Droz and Ewert were denounced, Weisert was threatened. Bucharin was openly attacked. But only one of them was present and none spoke. The Right wing is not yet ready to play its full hand of cards. When it does, Manuilsky and Kuusinen may have a different song to sing.

But it is with Piatnitsky, head of the organization al section of the Comintern, that the greatest interest

letariat from the peasantry with the result that the Bolshevik Party was obliged to beat a great retreat." (*Krasnaia Nov*, Nr. 2, 1923, page 262. My emphasis).

Martinov relates here, in all frankness, what it was that reconciled him to the October: the great retreat of the N. E. P., rendered necessary by the retardation of the world revolution. Profoundly convinced that the first three years of the October revolution were nothing but the expression of the "historic error of Trotskyism", Martinov entered the Party and, without waiting for a moment, took the place of the heavy artillery in the struggle against the Opposition. This fact alone illustrates more eloquently than many theoretical discussions the profound evolution that has taken place in the upper circles of the Party leadership in these last years.

TO BE CONTINUED

lies. According to the theses of the International, the Communist Parties are now on the very verge of capturing the majority of the working class, and in many cases, of entering into acute revolutionary battle for power, in the streets, on barricades. A sober review of Piatnitsky's report shows in what position the sections of the International are today with regard to their organizational strength. Exaggerated though most of his figures still are, they nevertheless give shocking proof of the tremendous decline of the membership of the world Party. They are a striking refutation of all the sickeningly bombastic claims of the daily Party press. His report is worth reading. We give a small excerpt from it here, summarized and tabulated:

| PARTY | MEMBERSHIP IN | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1924 | 1925 | 1926 | 1927 | 1928 | 1929 |
| Czecho-Slovakia | 138,996 | 93,220 | 92,818 | 138,000 | 150,000 | 81,432* |
| Great Britain | | 5,000 | 10,730** | 9,000 | 5,556 | 3,500 |
| France | 68,191 | 83,326 | 65,230 | 56,010 | 52,526 | 46,000 |

* Tremendous drop reported by secretary since new Party crisis.

** In October, at the time of the great strikes.

These figures are typical, and that even they are highly colored is clear from Piatnitsky's report that the American Party has between 9 and 11 thousand members, when the real figure is closer to 3 or 4 thousand. And in every case, the perspective for the next future is an additional decline. The picture Piatnitsky gives of the trade union work of the various Parties, of the virtual liquidation of the shop nuclei, of the general passivity and indifference of the membership as a whole, is one of the blackest yet painted in our movement. Piatnitsky's only remedy is an appeal that new members must be recruited, that more work must be done, that all resources must be utilized, i.e., a commonplace; and yet no one else had any thing else to propose for this alarming loss of blood in the Comintern.

These generals who talked so loudly of the approaching revolution never looked back once to see that their armies are melting away or dying of political malnutrition. Not a moment was wasted on the really burning questions before the revolutionary movement; the Thermidor danger in the Soviet Union and the platform of the Opposition; the two class worker and peasant Parties sponsored by the Comintern which still exist in India, Japan and Mexico; the new situation and consequently the new problems of the Chinese revolution; the danger of corruption and decay of the Communist Parties; the destructive ultra-"Left" somersaults that are discrediting the movement in Europe and America and alienating the masses of the workers, and numerous other vital questions.

If there is such a thing as a Third Period in the International then surely it is the period of the ideological and organizational decline of the Parties. The echo of its hollow rattle is a warning sound to all conscientious Communists.

How Not to Build New Unions

The *Daily Worker* (9-17-29) carries a story from North Carolina which says in part: "Ten thousand leaflets calling for a one-day protest strike . . . have been issued. 'Every mill worker into the National Textile Workers Union,' and 'Every class conscious worker into the Communist Party,' are the slogans of the leaflet, which is signed by Hugo Oehler, southern organizer of the National Textile Workers Union, and Bill Dunne, organizer for the Communist Party."

We cannot think of a more harmful and incorrect act yet taken by the Party in the Gastonia fight than the issuance of this joint leaflet with those slogans. It is one thing for the Communist Party to urge workers to join the N. T. W. U. It is entirely senseless for the N. T. W. U. to sign its name jointly with the Communist Party urging workers to join the latter organization—particularly in the present situation in North Carolina. That is not the way to build the new unions. It is the way to "politicalize" them to a sectarian death, to "Communistize" them out of existence as a mass organization. "The whole of the Communist problem," said Lenin, "is to be able to convince the backward, to work in their midst, and not to set up a barrier between us and them, a barrier of artificial childishly 'Left' slogans." That is precisely what the leaflet does. It is incomprehensible how comrades like Oehler and Dunne can be got to endorse such ridiculousness. Neither Communists nor unionists will be made that way.

The Cult of the 'Third Period'

CONCLUDED FROM LAST ISSUE

So much for the first part of the manoeuvre to avoid responsibility. But the rank and file was beginning to get restive. The hammer-blows of the Opposition platform were beginning to sink in especially as the passage of events continued swiftly to vindicate its every important argument and criticism. Repression, deportation, expulsion, slander, and victimization were proving insufficient for the bureaucracy to maintain their grip on office. The grain crisis in Russia, the Chiang Kai Shek coup in China, the corpse of the Anglo-Russian committee, the consequent weakening of the international position of the Soviet Union (Arcos and Pekin raids) the exposures of degeneration and corruption in the party and state machines, were too flagrant to dispose of with mere abuse of the Opposition. The growing unrest had to be canalized. The old gag of "bolshévization" had lost its force. So resort was had first to "self criticism", which meant anything but criticism of the leadership, and secondly, a "new line" for a "new period".

At the Fifteenth Russian Party Congress (1927) and at the subsequent Ninth Plenum of the E. C. C. I. the outlines and the strategy of the "Third Period" began to emerge. The sophistic Bucharin suddenly discovered that the social-democratic leaders were merging with the state-apparatus and were traitors to the working class and that henceforth only a "united front" from below" was permissible. Hitherto communists had been under the impression that the social democratic leaders were traitors in 1914, 1927, 1919, 1923 and a number of intervening years and that they had been pretty well merged with the state apparatus all this time. Is Arthur Henderson more "merged" with the State and a bigger traitor today than when Lenin urged that the Communists support him as a rope does a man hanged, or when Henderson was in the first Labor Government? But the capitulations to Purcell, Hicks, and Cook, during the "second period" had to be explained away. Furthermore said Bucharin, the independent role of the communist parties must now be strengthened and the British and French Communist Parties, but yesterday enthusiasts for the Chiang Kai Sheks and the Cooks, were presented with the slogan of "Class Against Class" for use in forthcoming struggles. Apparently Bucharin-Stalin would have us believe the communist parties knew and practised nothing of their independent role during the active leadership of Lenin before the "class against class" slogan was launched.

The "Third Period" with which the "Right Danger" was tied up, blossomed out into full glory at the Sixth Congress. Bucharin and Stalin, Serra and Ercoli, Ewert and Thaelmann, Lovestone and Foster equally gave it their blessing. It was a meaningless and platitudinous substitute for the concrete Marxist analysis of the given class relations and world situation upon which communist strategy must base itself. The "Third Period" is defined as one of capitalist stabilization but of growing contradictions which leads to the danger of fresh wars for the shrinking world market, sharpens the danger of an attack on the Soviet Union, and brings with it a leftward movement of the working class and an intensification of the general crisis of capitalism. This definition adds exactly nothing to the fundamental and elementary communist conception of the epoch of imperialism as one of wars and revolutions and capitalist decline which was as true at the Third Congress in 1922 as at the Sixth in 1928. But because it is so general and vague, the definition of the "Third Period" unanimously endorsed by the Right and Center at the Congress, has also served as the argument of each of these factions against the other since the struggle in the Right-Center bloc began to assume sharper forms.

THE COMINTERN RIGHTS

The Right Wing in the Soviet Union bases itself socially on the state bureaucracy, and the upper crust of the labor aristocracy, and the new possessing classes. It worked out its real perspectives on the international situation and the stabilization in common with the centrist Stalin party apparatus, in the theory of socialism in one country, which is the revision of the international socialist character of the Russian revolution. It implies the stabilization of capitalism for decades, the attempted retreat to the theoretical positions of the party in 1905 (bourgeois revolution) The rights in the Comintern must formulate their outlook less bluntly than the social democracy which expresses its outright belief in the consolidation of capitalism as a progressive historical factor. The tradition of Marx and Lenin is still strong in the Communist masses, and this compels the Rights to proceed in round about ways. Their perspective includes the peaceful cohabitation of socialist and capitalist system, the formation of Workers and Peasants Parties, the kulak's growth into socialism, the orientation on Amsterdam, collaboration with the national colonial bourgeoisie. Brandler and Thalheimer have expressed agreement with the program of the Bucharin-Rykov Right in Russia, and so does the Right elsewhere.

The ultra-left zig-zag is represented by the Russian party bureaucracy which is centrist, that is, it swings between social democracy and communism, between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The strength of Stalin is in the party apparatus, which however, is more subject to the pressure of the party masses, with their revolutionary traditions of October. Jointly responsible for the opportunist theories and course of the past six years with the Rights, the fear of the influence of the Opposition among the industrial workers and the awakening of their revolutionary class con-

sciousness, has led the Center to advertise a "swing to the left" a move which is either shadow-boxing or a swing to the left of the Marxist line. The centrist staffs of the parties of the Comintern, subsidized appointees of Stalin, imitate their master closely or follow out instructions implicitly. The centrists seek to extricate themselves from the fruits of their past collaboration with the Rights unsuccessfully because they cannot follow a true Marxist policy without recognizing the monstrous errors committed in the fight against the Leninist Opposition. Hence the obverse side of Stalin's cooperation with Chiang Kai Shek is the Canton Putsch.

ULTRA-LEFT ADVENTURISM OF CENTRISTS

The centrists interpret their "Third Period" as an almost immediate revolutionary and war situation. The May Day events in Germany were hailed in extravagant terms as a proof of the rising tide of the revolutionary movement. The terms of the call of the Western European Bureau of the Comintern leave little doubt that the First of August was conceived as some sort of dress rehearsal for the insurrection. The Soviet Union is pictured as in danger of imminent attack. Fascism and social democracy are identified without regard for their specific political functions. The social democratic worker is characterized as the most reactionary element of the working class, and the unorganized worker as the most revolutionary. The leftward movement of the working class is monstrously exaggerated. The slogans of "united front from below" and "class against class" are used to liquidate the policy of the united front in general and in the trade union work in particular. All warnings are disregarded. No heed is paid to the results of the Saxony elections which registered losses for the communist party despite the May day events, to the apathy of the German workers in face of the proscription of the Red Front organization, to the fiasco of the "new line" in England where the party secured some paltry 50,000 votes, to communist impotence in the Ruhr struggle. The results of this ultra-left adventurism are seen clearly in the United States in the isolation of the party in the fight for Gastonia, in the debacle of the left wing furriers' strike which it was responsible for, in its failure to exercise any influence on the cloak makers stoppage, in the loss of its base in the needle trades in general, in the playing with the idea of a new socialist trades and labor alliance of dual unions, in its inability to manoeuvre in connection with the new progressive movement in the trade unions.

For the real Left in the Comintern, the Communist Opposition, the basic estimate of the epoch given by Lenin remains valid to day as it was several years ago when it began to fight the theory of national socialism. No real Marxist policy can be pursued until the program of the International is cleared of revisionist undergrowth. We recognize more than ever the force of Lenin's dictum that without revolutionary

theory there can be no revolutionary practise. The decline of the capitalist system, however, does not proceed in an unbroken curve. The defeats of the proletariat in 1923 helped the capitalists stabilize the system, and gave the social democracy a new lease of life though on a different basis than before 1914. We cannot disregard the fact that the defeats in China, Great Britain have not strengthened but weakened the proletariat. The contradictions of capitalism are again in the process of maturing and not explosion.

CLASS AGAINST CLASS

The leftward movement of the workers must not be exaggerated. There is such a movement but it still flows in reformist and parliamentary channels. In Europe it is a movement from the bourgeois parties to the social democracy and on a much smaller scale to the communist parties. In the United States it takes the comparatively primitive form of sporadic struggles in the worst paid industries, in a certain revival of progressivism in the trade unions, in scattered signs of labor party sentiment. Our policies must be adapted accordingly. The united front must be our guide to the winning of the masses, and unity must be our slogan in the trade unions even while we proceed legitimately to the organization of the unorganized. The slogan of "class against class" as issued by the Comintern looks terribly radical but is in reality a reversion to the Lasallean theory of the single reactionary mass outside the industrial workers. A class movement is not created by the use of so general a slogan but on the basis of the concrete needs and demands of the workers in their developing struggles linked up with the final goals. Not "class against class" but peace, land and bread was the slogan launched by the bolsheviks even in the directly revolutionary crisis of 1917. The period requires concrete programs of action, flowing not only from the revolutionary estimate of the international situation but expressing the specific characteristic and demands of the situation in each country. The senseless confusion of social democracy and fascism must be abandoned. The former play their main role as agents of the bourgeoisie in the peaceful parliamentary period and the fascists are their arm in the period of direct civil war, and different tactics must be applied in the approach to each. Millions of workers are still in the fold of the social democracy and their leaders have not yet been "unmasked" to them. The "united front from below" cannot be regarded as the exclusive legitimate form of the united front. It cannot be any less permissible now than in the days of Lenin to engage in united fronts from "above" as well as below, if that does not take the form of the Anglo-Russian Committee replacing the mobilization of the masses and the independence of the party, by mere combinations with the leaders. It is the Opposition that has been fighting all these years for the independent role of the Communist Party in England, in China and elsewhere. The idea of Workers and Peasants Parties and Blocs as a substitute for the party should be expunged from the program and strategy of the Comintern. MAURICE SPECTOR.

All's Well in the Party, Says the Daily Worker!

Outside of a few splits, another few score of expulsions, a series of defeats, a burglary or two, the latest information from the Party shows that it has reached—or is it about to reach—the Apex of Unity and enter into a period of uninterrupted growth. The following are a few of the choicer bits of news that seem to have been omitted from the Party press, probably for lack of space.

The Young Communist League has been given a strong dose of new functionaries, to replace those expelled and removed. The hungry Fosterite wolves, kept from the apparatus for years, are coming into their own. Gil Greenberg has been made District Organizer in New York, to replace the incompetent Pershing; theoretical weight has been added to the new D. O. by making Mates agit-prop director, after his removal from Pittsburgh, where his place is taken by Sam Herman. Morris Tomash is now D. O. in New Jersey, Jack Childs in Kansas, Piccoli in California, Pobersky in Chicago, Clem Forsen in St. Paul, Art Stein is saving the recalcitrant Seattle League for the new line. The peerless Frankfeld is now running the Detroit League.

The Right nevertheless continues to make headway. Lovestone's caucus circulars say that: The Boston District Bureau voted down Puro's proposal (on Aug. 24) to endorse the Address and the expulsions. A reorganization has taken place, Bail, the Party Organizer, has been removed, and his regeneration is hailed with glee in a Lovestone faction document. A few months ago another document covered the same Bail with yards of mud.

In the Anthracite district, the Bureau voted down Stachel's proposals, and removed the imported Organizer, Gorman, packed his grips and sent him home. The Bureau reversed the decision of the National secretariat to expel Frank Vrataric by a vote of 7 to 2. The Bureau was thereupon itself wiped out and a district secretariat of 3 takes its place.

The Seattle Y. C. L. Bureau refused to allow the National Committee representative (Stein) "to disrupt and wipe out the growing League organization" (writes Lovestone). Subsequently, the C. E. C. emissary, and specialist in unification, Jakira, "straightened out" the situation by reorganizing the whole district. Ditto for California.

At a meeting of the New York needle trades fraction, almost one hundred members voted against the reports of Foster, Stachel and Weinstone. In addition, Sascha Zimmerman, the Party leader in the Needle

trades, is to be expelled for supporting Lovestone. Removal from his position in the Union will "naturally" follow. (Here, as in so many cases, the *Volkzeitung* and the Jewish *Forward* carry the news long before it is announced in the Party press!).

Albert Weisbord, suspected of conciliationism, has been removed by the Party from the secretaryship of the National Textile Workers Union, and replaced by Eli Keller. These purely administrative, mechanical and factional methods are guaranteed to destroy the new unions before they are out of their swaddling clothes.

Bedacht and Stachel are still on a precarious perch in the Party. Lovestone reports that the Comintern has cabled for information on their part in the notorious Lovestone cablegram. The idea of Bedacht and Stachel being dumped out of the new leadership into which they ran at the last moment, is delightful to contemplate.

Dr. Moissaye J. Olgin, arch-Bolshevik of the very purest water, has finally been made secretary of the Jewish Bureau and editor of the *Freiheit*. That's what we call a real pogrom on the Jews.

Lovestone continues the publication of his faction documents, and raises a loud outcry about "the Trotskyites, whose platform of yesterday has been adopted by the Political Committee for today." Although we have been assured a thousand times that Trotskyism is wiped out, we are shown the spectacle of Lovestone accusing the Party of being Trotskyist today, and the Party officials accusing Lovestone of having united with the Trotskyites! However, neither accusation has an ounce of merit.

A Lovestone circular says: "It is also important to know that Pete Shapiro, an agent of Cannon in the Party, is being suggested for the Lenin School for his magnificent services—to Trotskyism." This is malicious stuff, sent out solely for the purpose of preventing Shapiro from getting his well-earned trip across. Everyone knows that Shapiro flees in panic from a Trotskyist approaching a mile off. His slight hesitation and doubts of the first couple of days after our expulsion have completely disappeared. He now believes with deep conviction that socialism can be completely constructed in one country alone or in one city, or one back yard alone—in fact, he believes anything and everything that he is told to believe. When one has faith (and a bit of discipline, too, eh?) one can even say of socialism what the Biblical Peter said of the church: "On this rock shall we build."

GOOD-BY PEPPER! Letters from the Argentine and from England

The Passing of an Adventurer

After considerable negotiations, delay and hesitation, the International Control Commission has decided to expel from the Communist Party John Pepper. The manner in which he was expelled and the accusations made against him are characteristic of his whole career in the revolutionary movement and of those who made him the "great" figure that he was in the American Party and in the Communist International.

Months ago, we told the story of how he excused himself for not coming back to Moscow upon decision of the Executive of the International by concocting a Munchhausen story of his attempted dash to the Kremlin via Mexico which was allegedly foiled by Hoover and Calles. Now our report is officially confirmed by the charges of the Control Commission. We are further enlightened by the charge that Pepper was supposed to have gone to Corea for the Comintern, never went, and presented a bill for expenses never incurred. It may puzzle the novice to think why Pepper should be confronted with his Corean escapade at this late date; for it is more than a year ago that he was sent there, and of all things, to straighten out a factional squabble. But all the charges dissolve in the face of his major unforgivable sin: his support of Bucharin. Had he come out for Stalin, all would be forgotten and concealed—of that there can be no doubt. Pepper's record for the last 15 years has been worse than it is today, but he was not only tolerated by Stalin and Bucharin and Zinoviev—each in his own day—but raised to the highest commanding positions. So that he shall not be lightly forgotten, we recapitulate some parts of the astounding career of Pepper:

Before the war, a pillar of the Hungarian yellow social democracy. During the war, a jingo of the blackest dye who served as paid war correspondent of Emperor Franz Joseph and toasted the imperial generals in their camp. After the war, war minister of the Karolyi government, during which time he imprisoned Bela Kun, threatened to mow down the Communists with machine guns, and denounced them as "Left counter-revolutionaries". On the eve of the Soviet revolution, he turned Bolshevik and became a Soviet commissar. A denouncer of Communists to the Viennese police during his exile there, and a manufacturer of fantastic anti-revolutionary theories. Then his re-appearance in Germany with Bela Kun as the light-minded organizer of the ill-fated "March action" of 1921.

Under the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky, he was virtually banished by the International to the United States to become a writer on the Hungarian Party paper, Uj Elore. On his arrival here he posed as the representative of the E.C.C.I. and for years took in the Party. Overnight he became the leader of the American Party, injecting an evilly poisonous stream into its blood, spinning theories out of his imagination which led the Party from adventure to debacle. He played with imaginary masses, toyed with millions on paper, organized and dispersed movements with a Napoleonic sweep of the hand. With the victory of the Foster-Cannon group in the Party at the 1923 Convention, he was virtually run out of this country too.

Back in Moscow, he became the loudest barker for the obscene show against Trotsky. No Plenum, no Congress, no meeting of any kind took place, but that Pepper disgraced it with his venomous denunciations of Trotsky and the Opposition as "counter-revolutionaries". None excelled him in villification. A Zinovievist of the wildest type, he fell into momentary bad grace with Stalin for failing to jump on the bandwagon soon enough. But he paid his way back into the apparatus by howling louder than the rest of the pack for Trotsky's blood. His last prominent act in the United States was when he acted as Party spokesman in a shameful speech made when we were expelled. His latter day activities are too recent and well known to require elaboration.

Now he has joined again in Lovestone's camp, and this is quite as it should be. But he will yet be heard of. He is made of vile stuff and he will end in a more remunerative and larger camp, where his peculiar "talents" can be utilized to the utmost. No one can regret his expulsion. Belated though it was, it is welcome. Regret lies only in the thought of how the international Communist movement had to bear Pepper for so many years as a leader, and of the many Peppers still in its ranks.

Adventurer of three continents, demagogue of the meanest type, careerist and charlatan, man without character or principle, self-seeker and alien element in the body of the working class, Pepper brought only chaos, corruption and poison into our movement. It would be strong by his expulsion were it not for the other Peppers of varying stripe, who rise automatically to fill his vacancy. We who fought Pepper from the day we came in contact with him bid him farewell. The revolutionary workers will meet with him again, but only on opposing sides of the battle.

C-A-B-A-R-E-T & DANCE
For the Benefit of the Weekly Militant
on SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1929, at 8 p. m.
at the
HUNGARIAN HALL, 323 East 79th Street
Excellent Musical Program—Dancing—Entertainment
Admission: 50 cents in advance, or 60 cents at door.
AUSPICES: Communist League of America (Opposition) New York Branch and the Proletar
(Hungarian Opposition)

Buenos Aires, Argentine.

Martin Abern,

Dear Comrade:

Yours of the 27th to hand and I thank you for much for the "Militant". A few days ago there arrived from New York a comrade who gave us a report about things in the States, but it wasn't up to much.

I should like to let you know about the state of affairs here, yet I am not sure how much you do know and how much you don't know. Anyhow, here goes.

Our trouble started about 2 years ago. Seven members of our E. C. began to work against the other five members; these seven had the support of the delegate of the Comintern and nothing would have mattered much had their fight been in a clean, manly way, as should be a fight between comrades, between Communists. Curiously enough, these seven were all of them of the "intelligentsia", of the middle class, and the other five were men from the working class.

No doubt about it, the majority of the E.C. did some dirty work. They suppressed some telegrams from the Comintern, destroyed some letters, sent lying telegrams to the Comintern, assaulted houses and libraries of the members of the Opposition, wrote a letter to the Chief of Police asking aid of the Police in order to take possession of the houses and libraries of the members who weren't approving their proceedings, arrested, of course with the help of the police, some of our comrades—among them Penelon, our best man, and in the opinion of many, the best man in South America.

Things went so far that we had to separate and form another Party, 18 months ago. Then came a delegation from the Comintern with a resolution of the C. I. which was so plainly in favor of our enemies that we wouldn't have anything to do with it. Then this delegation went away and now there is another here, but there is no sign of settlement.

Our terms are plain and simple. The Comintern must in some way punish 3 or 4 members of the old E.C. men who have shown themselves to be scoundrels or fools or agents of the bourgeoisie. If the Comintern is mad enough—or in other words, if Stalin is pig-headed enough—to sacrifice the whole Communist movement of South America in order to save 3 or 4 men who are not worth saving, then we can't help it. As we are, so we'll continue to be. In the meantime there is another Bolshevik Party against the official Party in Montevideo, Uruguay, and another division in the Communist Party in the Republic of Paraguay. Here there is a fight between the two parties on all sides—in the press, in the unions, in the Sports Federation, etc., etc. It is a pity—but what's to be done?

As regards the Russian Opposition it is only quite lately that the members of our Party have been able to learn some truth about it. We used to see something about it in the capitalist press and in the Russian "Pravda" and, of course, couldn't make head or tail of it. Lately, we've been reading "The Real Situation in Russia" and "Where is Russia Going" etc., (in Spanish), and it seems that the best men in the Party believe Trotsky to be right. Our E.C. has decided that in this question every member may think as he pleases, but it's best not to make public propaganda of it just now. It is understood, more or less, that in our present situation, waiting as we are to see which way the cat

will jump, it is better for us to say as little as possible, not to compromise ourselves too far, not to get Stalin's back up too much by proclaiming ourselves to be on the side of the Russian Opposition.

What will happen in the future—of course, we don't know. We are still waiting for the final word of the Comintern. It is rather a long time coming—but let it come whichever way it likes, I am sure we won't budge. We are ready to unite with the rank and file of the official Party; we had no disagreement with them, but with the 3 or 4 men of the E. C. who called in the police to arrest our comrades, we refuse to work with them again.

Speaking for myself, I don't care much if I never join an official Party of the Comintern—Comintern as it is just now. I believe in an International of Lenin, but don't care much for an International of Stalin. I respected the Communist International, but just now it seems to be more like a Jesuit International. So there you are.

Along with this I am sending our first proclamation and the first number of our journal "Adalante". You may be interested in it.

You may make whatever use you like of this letter. I am 62 years of age, born in England, brought up in St. Petersburg at the time of Alexander II, having known men like Kropotkin, William Morris, Tom Mann, Stepniak, Chernischevsky and others; a Socialist all my lifetime, 7 years now in the Communist Party. If you feel that way inclined, please write and let me know if there is anything I can do to help along the good cause. As said Danton, "The cause alone is great and shall not perish, but live forever!"

Wishing you the best of luck, I remain,

R. GUINNEY.

Helston, Cornwall, England.

Dear Comrade:

Enclosed find the right sum for what I owe for Militants . . . I find that propaganda in England is very expensive work. Some of the most intelligent workers, and of the unemployed, could not pay the price of a book or a newspaper if their lives depended on it. Everything has to be done at one's own expense.

The effect of the Militant in the Tyneside area has been excellent. In North Shields, which is the headquarters of my reading circle, the official Communist Party is broken up (though in the last letter I received there was not of a rumor that it was starting again). If this is true the members only number two or three, I think. The Militant readers are steadily on the side of the Opposition. With comradely greetings,
M. S.

(NOTE:—Confirmation of Comrade M. S.'s letter on the Party situation on the Tyneside, comes from the official organ of the British C. P., "Workers Life" of August 1, 1929: "A specially summoned joint meeting of the Tyneside District Party and the D. L. C. met on July 12 to consider a written statement on Party policy and leadership. The statement points to the serious decline in Party forces . . ." Tyneside is only a replica of the rest of the Party under the leadership of the British jumping-jacks of Stalin.—Editor.)

COMMUNIST LEAGUE ACTIVITIES

The fall period witnesses an impetus to the activities of the branches of the Communist League of America (Opposition) throughout the country. In summary, the branches are working to maintain and build a WEEKLY MILITANT, organizing study classes, getting new members, participating in the campaign to free the Gastonia frame-up victims, holding street meetings, working in the labor unions and generally developing a broader activity inside and outside the Communist League.

TORONTO, CANADA. The Toronto branch is getting on the job in earnest for the Militant; Comrade Maurice Quarter, Secretary, reports the branch is arranging an affair for its benefit. An educational program for the fall and winter period is being mapped out.

NEW HAVEN, CONN. Comrade S. Gendelman, Secretary, writes that after a quiet summer for the League in which the Party has been even more quiet, if not extinct, good working branch is being organized. Funds are being raised for The Militant.

PHILADELPHIA, PA. This branch although not very large at present, is alert in spreading the Militant, and is raising a special fund to ensure a Weekly Militant. Comrades Leon Goodman, Bernad Morgan, K. Whitten are the live wires here.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL. Joe Angelo writes that more can be expected from now on in Springfield and vicinity for the Opposition movement, and reports on prospective members.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. Subscriptions continue to come in for The Militant from Minneapolis. The Minneapolis League, very active in the labor unions, had a delegate at the recent Minnesota State Federation of Labor Convention. This Branch functions in every phase of the working class movement as a genuine revolutionary movement should.

CHICAGO, ILL. Chicago has been active on behalf of the Gastonia defendants, for the drive for the Weekly Militant and in the trade unions. Its

branch meeting was the best attended meeting to date, and new members were added. Among the active forces there are Arne Swabek, Albert Glotzer, both members of the National Committee of the Communist League. Helen P. Judd, John Mihelic, John Edwards, R. Booth, Mike Zalisko, Bob Garver, Bill Edwards, Rebecca Sacherow, and many others.

A class in the "History of the Communist International" with comrade Arne Swabek as instructor, has been organized by the Chicago branch.

KANSAS CITY, MO. The Kansas City comrades, writes comrade A. A. (Shorty) Buehler, are very well pleased with the Militant, and are raising a quota for its maintenance. Many workers are getting in touch with the Communist League through the book shop maintained there by comrade Buehler.

NEW YORK, N. Y. Street meetings continue to be held with great success by the New York Branch. New speakers, among them George Clarke, Joe Friedman, Sol Lankin, have been developed to aid the more experienced comrades. A mass meeting (see other columns) is being planned for October 22nd. At the recent open branch meeting of the New York Communist League, four new members were admitted, including two active seamen, a former member of the Communist Party of Germany and another active worker.

A study class in the Fundamentals of Communism, instructors, Max Shachtman and Martin Abern, is to begin in early October.

BOSTON, MASS. A number of subscriptions for The Militant have come in from Boston. Comrade Schlosberg informs the National Office that there is renewed and added stimulus and vigor among the members with the prospect of a Weekly Militant before them.

All signs point to a vigorous activity by the Communist League of America and its branches. Clarity of principle and the conviction to carry these principles into action animate the members throughout the country.