

THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

VOL. IV, No. 4 (Whole No. 63)

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 15, 1931

PRICE 5 CENTS

United Front on Unemployed

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

Mooney's Betrayal by the Labor Bureaucrats

Two men have been in the prisons of California for some fifteen years now, as innocent of the crime for which they were convicted as any man who walks the streets. Their names are known to the working class in every part of the world. Around them, at various times, have been created movements of thousands, of hundreds of thousands and more, who have marched the streets, who have raised their voices in militant protest at their imprisonment, who have demanded in unmistakable language that the two be released immediately. Their names have become a banner of working class struggle. For "Mooney and Billings" have for more than a decade symbolized the crime of American capitalism against our class, the abyss of bourgeois class justice.

This has been known to every progressive-minded worker in the country: Mooney and Billings alone are a sufficient revelation of the cynical hypocrisy of all those who prate of "justice" for "rich as well as poor" under capitalism. Mooney and Billings were sent to prison and have been kept there only because of their activity in the labor movement and in spite of the fact that not one year has passed since their trial without new evidence being piled up to prove their guiltlessness and the fact that the whole case was a vile frame-up of the master class.

The Treachery of the Bureaucrats

But what has not been so widely known about the case is a feature of it which exceeds all others in shamelessness, duplicity and crime against labor: the treachery of the American labor leadership. The revolutionary vanguard has known of this black page in working class annals; others have felt it indistinctly but without much proof at hand; the bulk of the workers has not realized it at all. Yet the facts are there as large and real as life: from the very beginning of the historic case, the overwhelming majority of the American labor leaders have worked hand in hand with the capitalists and the capitalist politicians, not only to keep Mooney and Billings in prison, but to put them there in the first place.

Rarely has DeLeon's classic phrase, "the labor lieutenants of the capitalist class", been invested with more eloquent significance than by the whole record of the Gompers and Green school of labor chieftains in the Mooney-Billings case. The defense of the latter, at every stage of the struggle, has been confined to a small section of devoted, courageous militant workers who encountered the direct sabotage of the labor bureaucracy at every turn. How many have known of this great betrayal! Very few, we have said. And this ignorance has been caused not only by the conspiracy of the labor leaders, but to a certain extent by so many of those false "liberal friends" of the prisoners, who feared to "antagonize influential authorities". But this recedes into the background in the face of the revelations finally made in full by Tom Mooney himself and by his Defense Committee in a pamphlet just made public under the title: "Labor Leaders Betray Tom Mooney".

The Agents of the Frame-Up

It takes your breath away, this document does! As relentlessly as the judicial bloodhounds of California capital ran down Mooney and Billings, so does Mooney implacably pursue the record of misdeeds of the reactionary bureaucracy which American capital has foisted upon the labor movement. With fact heaped upon document, and document upon fact, he erects a crushing tombstone to any claims the labor skates may make to defending the interests of the working man. He marshals and parades them before our view: Paul Scharrenberg, of the California State Federation of Labor; P. H. Carthy, czar of the building trades; A. W. Brouillet, who was

(Continued on page 2)

Unity of action by the working masses in the struggle for the unemployed millions requires first of all united action of the workers vanguard. The National Committee of the Communist League (the Left Opposition) is in favor of such a unity of action. As a means of bringing it about we submit to you the following analysis of the problem and a concrete program of action. We ask your serious consideration, and that of all Party members and class conscious workers, to this appeal for a common struggle.

Unemployment is increasing and with it increases the inability of the capitalist system to provide the workers with the means of existence. The number of workers who search in vain for a job mounts ever higher. This is a problem of great proportions for the American working class movement, and particularly of its revolutionary section,—the Communists.

The crisis still continues in its downward sweep. As yet there is no change in this course. Even the bourgeois economic experts are extremely cautious in their predictions. But they have with brutal frankness demanded a further reduction in the general cost of production, which means essentially further wage cuts. The capitalist owners of industry, utilize the unemployment situation to play the unemployed against the employed. They see in the situation an opportunity to force downward the standard of living of the workers in order to increase their own profits. From the standpoint of the proletariat the organization of a militant movement of resistance, uniting the widest masses of workers, stands first on the agenda.

It is not only America's involvement in world economy that has produced the present crisis. It grows, the same as any former crisis, with deadly precision out of the capitalist system of production itself. This must not be forgotten. Ever so often crisis recurs when the production cycle reaches the saturation point and the market is glutted. This is a fundamental contradiction of capitalism. In recent years rationalization and speed-up of the workers has rapidly increased the productive capacity. This only made the contradiction more acute. The result has been a great excess of means of production on the one hand, and an excess of laborers without employment and without means of existence on the other.

To present this as the final crisis of American capitalism would be false. It is still the world dominant power within a declining capitalist imperialism. It is preparing now by all possible means to climb out of its economic difficulties upon the backs of the workers of America and abroad. But so much more, in order to maintain its existence, does it need an industrial reserve army—the unemployed. This army will hence be with us as a permanent phenomenon; millions of workers condemned to remain without work and without means of existence.

There will be more crises of capitalist production. They have already become world wide in character. The ranks of the unemployed are augmented everywhere, except in Russia where capitalist unemployment has disappeared.

Within the capitalist world the contradictions are thus growing and multiplying; the class struggle will increase in intensity. *There can be no solution to the unemployment problem under capitalism. The solution can be found only in the socialist revolution, and finally only on a world scale.*

In its ruthless efforts to find a way out American capitalism has embarked upon its savage campaign of slashing wages and crushing any workers' resistance. Its main fire is concentrated on the Communist vanguard. In the serious matter of correct Communist policy for the unemployment problem this outstanding feature of the moment must be given first recognition. Secondly, we must recognize the present defensive character of the general working class movement. There is not a "widespread workers radicalization", nor a "revolutionary upsurge of the American masses" at the present time. To proceed from such a fictitious analysis can lead only to fundamentally false conclusions and isolation of the Communist forces. But the situation is full of promising potentialities for a rise of the labor movement, for its entering into more active resistance and struggle for its needs. By means of a correct policy the Communist forces can connect up with this main stream they can help to prepare effectively for this new rise and give it to a positive direction.

The endeavor to keep the unemployment movement within the narrow bounds of the Trade Union Unity League is wrong. This policy hems in the movement instead of broadening it. It is false to center the unemployment program, and the activities and demonstrations, around the deceptive opportunist petition campaign to Congress. And it is doubly false to represent the Social Insurance bill as a panacea for unemployment. Such departures from Marxism only create reformist illusions. A militant struggle for real and immediate relief is indispensable, and this requires the closest unity of employed and unemployed. The slogan of "hunger marches", at a time when this unity is far from established, may tend to separate the unemployed from the employed and thus to narrow the struggle.

The net result of these errors is a situation in which the demonstrations become demonstrations only of the small Communist vanguard as an easy target for policemen's clubs while the main body of the working masses stands aside as passive bystanders. We must follow the opposite road, we must first of all endeavor to unite the working masses, with the Communist vanguard in the lead, in the struggle for the unemployed. In this struggle, those at work, suffering under the ravages and degradations of the capitalist offensive, must have their place side by side with the unemployed. Given such direction, no policemen's clubs can beat back the movement.

Our principle object is and remains the proletarian revolution. Our agitation and tactics must naturally vary to correspond with the objective developments, with the rhythms of the ebbs and flows, the upward and the downward curves of the working class movement. In each spe-

(Continued on page 3)

False Steps in the New York Dressmakers' Strike Preparations

The decision made by the leadership of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union to drop the economic demands in the New York dressmakers' strike, which we announced in our last issue, has been completely confirmed, and not only the fact of the change, but also the bad results which it would inevitably entail. A strike based on a struggle to improve the rotten working and wage conditions of the dressmakers would undoubtedly arouse a considerable section of the workers to follow the strike call of the union. As it is now, the announcement that it would be what amounts to a simple strike for union recognition has had the effect of a cold shower on the needle trades workers as a whole, and has served to set back the whole strike movement. Two very clear manifestations indicate this: the triumph with which the Right wing liquidators of the Lovestone camp have greeted the change in policy as a vindication of their opportunist policy, and secondly, the spiritlessness and feyness of the workers who have thus far rallied to the Industrial Union for the strike.

Unwilling or not able to meet this situation with the adoption of a correct policy of mobilizing the workers, and especially of drawing into the struggle those workers still following the Right wing union, the Industrial Union leadership is now planning to take another, even falser step, which is fathered by desperation and mothered by an inherent opportunism. At the last meeting of the Trade Union Unity Council, and in the Union strike committees themselves, the old, reactionary and discredited policy of "pulling committees" for the strike is being put for adoption. In the best of cases, these pulling committees as a substitute for the response of the workers, is a sign of lack of belief in the workers themselves; in the worst case, it is a sign of the weakness of the response which the opportunists seek to make up for by coercing the majority.

Should the Left wing adopt this proposal it would undoubtedly have disastrous effects. It is the policy which the old leadership of the needle trades Left wing—Zimmerman, Wortis, Gold and Co.—made notorious. It is only a few months ago

that Johnstone and his colleagues conducted a violent sham battle against this and similar methods and labelled them the acme of Lovestoneite opportunism. Now, made desperate by the poor results of their course, they are resorting to the very same steps. When the great majority of the dressmakers remain unmoved as yet by the strike call—and that is the case now—the "pulling committees" can only result in alienating and antagonizing the workers against the Left wing movement. The proposal must be rejected forthwith by the rank and file Left wingers. The plan we proposed in our last issue, for making the struggle a real strike for the economic conditions of the workers, or failing that, to transform the strike committees into organization committees to prepare a sound basis for a struggle in the near future, must be adopted. It is not yet too late. The Johnstones, Sazers and Hyman are taking the road that ends in the discredit and weakening of the Left wing. The ranks of the movement must take the union off this road and on to the highway of victory.

On the Illinois Miners

(The Militant publishes the following letter from comrade Gerry Allard of Illinois as a discussion article because it cannot agree with some of the statements expressed in it. We refer especially to the ambiguous remarks on working within the United Mine Workers of America, which, in its "reorganized" Fishwick section in Illinois, has become the dominant factor, embracing thousands of miners in the district in whose ranks the Left wing is obligated to work so as not to remain isolated from the masses and leave them at the mercies of the bureaucrats. The present attitude of the official Communist Party leadership means to transform into a fetish the empty shell of the Left wing union, Mine, Oil and Smelter Workers Industrial Union, which has no foothold at all in Illinois. With the remarks comrade Allard makes concerning Howat we are quite in agreement, except where he imputes to comrade Angelo the opinion that the Left wing movement must be built around Howat. The article by Angelo contained no such statement; on the contrary, it pointed out the need of the Left wing rank and file movement being built regardless of the attitude adopted by "leaders", past and present, of the miners who, consciously or not, have made themselves the instruments of the Fishwicks and Farringtons. With regard to comrade Allard, however, it should be remembered that firmness in principle should not be confined to a criticism of the Left reformists of the Howat caliber in one particular field or industry. Such firmness must be manifested especially in the fundamental questions that have divided the revolutionary movement in recent years the very questions which are of such decisive consequence to every tactical and momentary issue that arises for our movement. Comrade Allard himself has not always manifested this firmness, particularly at the time of his capitulation from the Opposition. We are gratified to note, however, that his recent position is being developed in ever closer harmony to that of our movement.—Ed.)

ON ANGELO'S ARTICLE

The situation in the coal mining industry in recent months has steadily become worse. As in all basic industries, in searching for a clear policy to meet the deplorable situation, the Illinois district holds the limelight with various important events in the last year. The National Miners Union, the Fishwick-Lewis fight, the rank and file movement, occasional glimpses of the I. W. W.—all these present to the coal miners factors of tremendous importance in the way of education. The arena presents various political groups in practical struggles, where workers may deduce their various aims, tactics, policies, etc., as well as reveal the soundness or weakness, the good and bad points. As a whole, it gives one a real sizing-up of the various tendencies, from the reformist to the ultra-Leftist revolutionist, in action.

To the militant workers, the reactionary Fishwick and Lewis groups which control the remnants of the U. M. W. of A., are proved traitors, agents of the bosses and the first lieutenants of capital in stifling real working class action. There cannot under any circumstances be any excuse for the colossal betrayals of these fakers through hard years of struggle on the part of the rank and file.

Comrade Angelo, in his recent article on the Illinois situation apologizes in an open way for Howat. Although Howat's record has many high spots of sacrifice and courage in facing the enemies of the coal miners, yet his record is spotted with numerous political confusions, weaknesses and discouragement in facing various tendencies on political issues. The actions of Howat in the last four years prove beyond much doubt his weakening, yes, and even opportunistic motives. Howat to my knowledge has proved beyond a doubt his disqualification to become a national leader of the coal miners. He does not possess the makings of a general in the class struggle. Would I be permitted to ask comrade Angelo these questions?

On Howat

1. Was Howat elected by bona fide rank and file delegates at the Springfield "reorganization" convention, or was he elected by Fishwick and Farrington?
2. Do you agree with Howat's statement to John L. Lewis' executive board wherein he promises not to embarrass the administration if it permits him to return to the U. M. W. of A.?
3. Has Howat ever voiced publicly his opposition to a stolen agreement between the miners and operators which is today

imposing the rottenest conditions ever imagined by a so-called 100 percent organized district?

4. Has Howat ever publicly denounced Fishwick, Nesbit, Walker and the gunman district board of the "reorganized" movement?

Comrade Angelo and the militant labor movement waste their time if they focus their destiny on the actions of an individual. Instead of making Howat "the tail end", there is a danger of making the principles of our movement the tail end of Howat. This is absolutely in contradiction to Leninism, on which the Opposition is firmly based. Comrade Angelo greatly exaggerates the so-called "respect and confidence of the rank and file". In Southern Illinois, Howat is placed by the rank and file in the same category with Lewis, Fishwick, et al.

The "educational groups" referred to in comrade Angelo's article receive a high consideration. Whether these "educational groups" are so organized as to legalize themselves in the face of the U. M. W. of A. constitution, I do not know. However, the outline of Angelo's plan of work is inadequate. Not to neglect the rank and file miners in the U. M. W. of A. is an important thing. But to rely solely on boring from within the U. M. W. of A. is just as bad as neglecting the miners in these reformist organizations and isolating ourselves in sectarian "dual" unions.

The main point of our struggle must be to win over the majority of the coal miners to our cause. To rely mainly on capturing the degenerated, corrupted, dying U. M. W. of A. is futile. The numerical inferiority of the U. M. W. of A. from a national standpoint places us in a position where other steps must be taken. If we can organize the masses of unorganized miners into the U. M. W. of A. we can organize the masses of unorganized miners into the U. M. W. of A. we can organize real industrial unions. Why ultimately take over the U. M. W. of A. and hinder our prestige and retard progress?

The absence of a real functioning Communist party in Illinois coal fields, after years of great influence and energetic work, presents a calamity to the revolutionary movement. The best example of the weakness of our party is the fact that in Franklin County, the largest coal producing section, Freeman Thompson, president of the M. O. S. W. I. U., polled only 24 votes running for Senator on the C. P. ticket. True, the results of capitalist vote-counters are not our barometers for gauging the degree of class-consciousness, nevertheless, the complete collapse of the party apparatus and the non-functioning of a single union local is a clear-out example of weakness in a county where over 400 party members once belonged and a year ago, some 5,000 members were enlisted into the National Miners Union.

These facts must not be received sarcastically by the militant workers. It means a weakening of our fight in the face of severe complications in the capitalist machinery. Thousands of miners are hungry, millions of workers starve. Capitalism faces serious opposition on a world-wide scale. We must redouble our efforts, we must drive the message home, we must put our party on the right track.

Christopher, Ill. —GERRY ALLARD.

PARIS COMMUNE

Hold Open

Saturday, March 21, 1931

FOR THE PARIS COMMUNE

CELEBRATION

organized by the

New York Branch, Communist

League of America (Opposition)

The Weisman Case

From the Organizer, the weekly bulletin of the New York Party district, we learn the following in the section devoted to the Control Commission decision: "That comrade Weisman acted in a most bureaucratic manner in general; that specifically he, just before his leaving [as self-appointed delegate to the Profintern Congress.—ed.], set up a secretariat without consulting the leading union committee, and also has kept himself aloof from the membership of the union [the Food Workers Industrial Union]; and that his personal conduct as to indulgence in alcoholics . . . (etc.) has injured the prestige of the party and the union in the eyes of the workers." In addition, the District Control Commission "investigated also rumors about financial irregularities and about personal conduct" and found that "comrade Weisman went to the R. I. L. U. Congress with the knowledge and permission of the party, but that he pursued various maneuvers [so!] towards this end; that the finances of the union have been handled in a most irresponsible manner due to which the union finds itself in a bad financial condition." The final decision on Weisman, it continues, severely censures him, removes him from all posts and committees, and prohibits his holding office for a year.

Insignificant an individual though Weisman is and has been, the case is nevertheless not without instructive features. It is an almost classic instance of the internal régime of the party and the organizations it controls, and the disastrous consequences of this régime. How would it be possible, given a normal functioning of the party and the Left wing union, for an individual under party and union control to manipulate finances in a shady manner, that he retain a post while conducting himself in a manner that destroys the prestige of the party, to act generally in a bureaucratic manner, virtually to appoint himself the representative of the workers to international congresses, etc., etc., and yet retain his post as leader of the union, as Weisman did? The answer is simply this: with a normal functioning, this situation would be impossible, or at the very least, most improbable. It has happened, does happen and will happen precisely because there is an abnormal, bureaucratic, irresponsible régime

(Continued on page 7)

Mooney's Betrayal

(Continued from page 1)

finally run out of the leadership of the Frisco Labor Council for his treachery; the camarilla of the Teamsters' Unions: Michael Casey, James Wilson, William Conboy, Walter Dryer and Co.; and from them to the national hierarchy, the Greens and Wolls, he takes us in the final step.

"They are scabs at heart," H. L. Mencken wrote to Mooney once; and the latter adds: "They are scabs in action." Mooney's jailers, those who framed him, received the constant support of these labor leaders; Mooney's defenders received their constant fire. The sentiment of the mass of American labor was deliberately ignored by labor fakerdom, and all activities in the defendants' behalf undermined, because Mooney and Billings had been "trouble-makers", "agitators" and "Reds" in the trade unions—and a thorn in the side of the businessmen. "Why, if you let his kind go about", John O'Connell, secretary of the Frisco Labor Council and chum of the Chamber of Commerce president, declared at one time, "no one would be safe . . . there is only one thing to do—to put him away for life—where he can't do any harm." This has been the attitude of nine out of ten of the A. F. of L. leaders, from O'Connell up to Green!

That is why Mooney is a hundred times right when he says in his letter to his fellow-prisoner, Billings: "Our struggle for freedom is inextricably bound up with the whole question of the future of the American workers. Our victory will be a guarantee that they too must win if there is a leadership capable of strengthening the A. F. of L., and not keeping it stagnant or weakening it. Out of the present leadership, which is thoroughly corrupted, no fundamental progress can be expected . . . These lieutenants of capital masquerading as labor leaders should be exposed; they are the worst enemies of a real organized labor movement. It is our duty to help expose their culpability. They are our worst foes. They are the foes of all militant workers."

A hundred times right: For the battle to liberate Mooney and Billings is not, as their liberal "friends" believe, a fight to vindicate "American justice", but a class struggle against "American justice" and its beneficiaries, the capitalist class and its labor agents. Each one of the latter run out of the labor movement means another bar wrenched, out of the sockets of the prisoners' cells; every new fortification of the Left wing in the working class is another stone crushed in the walls of the penitentiary.

The latest declaration of Mooney, following upon the recent Supreme Court decision, is an invaluable document. It was tardy in publication, because what it says held true from the very beginning, and its expression would surely have advanced the cause of the frame-up victims to greater success than it has hitherto attained. But it is not too late. The workers' movement in this country has also been tardy, in letting two of its best sons rot in prison for fifteen years without compelling their release. But that also is not irremediable, it is not yet too late to act.

With this new turn in its struggle as a point of new departure, to which added weight is being given daily by new arrests of militant workers, new imprisonments, the burning need of the moment is a broad, national defense movement to free all the class war prisoners, a movement that must break down the treacherous barriers of the labor bureaucracy, that must reach into every labor organization, to the workers in every city and town, until it has gathered such power and momentum that it can break through the walls that hold our class war fighters. The initiative and spirit must necessarily be furnished principally by the Left wing and Communist forces. They are under command and obligation. With intelligent boldness, a power can be created in the labor movement reaching beyond the confines of the struggle for the class war prisoners, and accomplishing successes of gigantic dimensions.

The International Labor Defense, which remains the only militant workers' defense organization on a national and international scale, must set about its task immediately. It can and will be done, but the prerequisite for success is to throw overboard the disastrously sectarian chart by which the ship of the Left wing is now being steered. That in turn is the task of the more conscious and farsighted militants. They must proceed to solve this task so that Mooney, Billings, McNamara, the Centralia boys, the dozens upon dozens of Communists and their prisoners of our class are liberated. Our aid is pledged in advance.—M. S.

OFF THE PRESS!

Trotsky Pamphlets

WORLD UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE FIVE YEAR PLAN	
Introduction by Arne Swabeck	10c.
(7c in bundles)	
THE SPANISH REVOLUTION	10c.
(7c in bundles)	
COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM (The Trade Union Question)	
Introduction by James P. Cannon	15c.
(10c in bundles)	

Order from
THE MILITANT

84 East 10th Street

New York, N. Y.

Recent Lessons in Strike Strategy

A serious study of recent events in the European labor and revolutionary movement would afford many valuable lessons. To bring some of these events out in their momentous importance should be well worth while. Add to them a few home experiences and we may approach the moot question of problems of strike strategy.

What is a correct strike strategy? Ask the theoreticians of the Stalin school and you will receive the most complex and detailed descriptions of the mechanics of conducting strikes. While this is necessary it does not really begin to touch the problem of strategy. Yet reams upon reams have been written in this manner in the official Communist International press, the sum total of which, considering its object, is hardly worth a brass farthing.

We are unquestionably moving toward a period of rising working class and revolutionary activities in the United States. With it yet greater problems will call for solution. It will be a test of the correctness of our theory and only that will stand up which is based upon the experience of life. Hence it is well to proceed to a close examination of these events mentioned in an endeavor to learn from them.

Recent Strikes in England

The declining British capitalist imperialism is now conducting an offensive against the working class all along the line. At the moment of this writing 250,000 weavers in the Burnley, Lancashire and Yorkshire districts are on the streets through an employers' lockout. An equal number of spinners are affected and practically idle. The weavers refused to accept the "famous" American stretch-out system of handling eight looms per operative instead of four as formerly prevailed. The lockout began January 19th.

In the railroad industry the employers demand a 10 percent wage cut. In the building industry as well as in the boot and shoe industry similarly wage cuts are demanded by the bosses. On July first, the legal maximum workday of seven hours in the mining fields is supposed to go into effect. But with the experience of recent events in these fields the coal miners may look forward with little probability of its becoming a reality. That is, unless they can pull themselves together better than before.

Coal Miners in Struggle

Some 140,000 South Wales miners have just returned to work after a strike to enforce the seven and a half hour workday act. The operators were willing to concede recognition of this act only on the basis of a demanded 6 percent wage cut. The miners terminated their strike on the promise of arbitration which has since resulted in the signing of a new three year agreement. It provides for a conciliation board to settle all disputes. The agreement failed, however, to decide the important question of a subsistence wage which is referred to an independent conciliator for adjustment.

Shortly prior to the South Wales walk-out the Scottish miners struck also to enforce the seven and a half hour workday act. They returned to work on a somewhat similar basis as the former. While the Scottish miners struck those of South Wales were kept on the job and only after the defeat had been administered to the former were the latter called out. Thus do the union bureaucrats, among them Arthur Cook and others who were once hailed as the "great leaders of the Left wing", divide and defeat the rank and file workers.

At the present moment the officially registered unemployed workers in Great Britain number over two and a half million. The bosses now have no need of what was called Mondism, i. e., the British form of class collaboration. They are directly on the offensive. Obviously in such a situation the lock-out, not yet well known in this country, becomes an extremely dangerous weapon against the workers. It cannot be defeated by the tactics pursued by the reactionary trade union heads.

MacDonald Again "For Labor"

After a considerable period of comparative "tranquility", so much worshipped by the bureaucratic officials, the British workers are beginning to resist the attacks. The labor party, having reached its pinnacle in being his majesty's government, has had another opportunity to demonstrate its faithful service to capitalism. MacDonald advised the coal miners to forget the seven and a half hour workday law enacted by his government and to accept the stretch-out over eight hours. One of the "great pledges" of this government was to repeal the Tory trade union limitation bill. What will happen to this "pledge" is with usual cynicism of bourgeois scribblers indicated by Charles Seiden in his New York Times

By ARNE SWABECK

dispatch of January 28th, partly as follows:

"Premier MacDonald was forced by the organized labor elements of his party to put the bill on his Parliamentary program for this session against his better judgment. He has fought hard for it, so thereby seriously risking the life of his government and his own political fortunes. If it comes out of the committee in such an altered form that the trade unions are unable to recognize it Mr. MacDonald will be able to drop it without taking another chance for defeat on the third reading. (sic!)"

What Has Become of Minority Movement?

One may ask, what has become of the Minority Movement once counting the support of over a million workers? Is it entirely wiped out, or does the present objective situation offer no opportunity for activity and growth? The latter could hardly be the case. It would perhaps be more correct to say that it is still suffering the consequences of the miserable Stalinist policies pursued by the British Communist party leadership during the last few years.

The general trade union officialdom is today making little or no pretense at shielding its reactionary views. The former "progressive" front is entirely absent. At the Nottingham Trade Union Congress last summer a majority in reality favored the Empire Economic Unity of Lord Beaverbrook. And from the *Inprecorr* we are informed that only two militant delegates spoke in opposition to these views.

No doubt the Communist leadership in the Minority Movement committed the cardinal mistake of building around the fake progressives of the Robert Williams, George Hicks, A. A. Purcell and Arthur Cook stripe. When they had the opportunity to reveal themselves in their true light and take their stand with the other reactionaries, the movement collapsed. Since the advent of the Stalin leadership in the Communist International this has been the record elsewhere also. The plunges into Left adventurism of the British revolutionists entering into

a head-on collision with the capitalist labor party; with the "social fascist" trade unions and into the building of new "revolutionary unions" could, of course, not prevent the collapse.

However, of more fatal consequence yet became the rank opportunist policy of the united front with the liberal labor politicians in the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee. The British revolutionary movement still suffers from its effects. This effort to leap over the stages of the slowly developing Communist party, which may have seemed revolutionary, could have no other results. It was false even prior to the general strike.

It was designed by the Stalin régime to become the means of rallying the British workers to prevent intervention in the Soviet Union. The Left Opposition replied already then: "The more acute the international situation becomes, the more the Anglo-Russian Committee will be transformed into a weapon of English and international imperialism."

We have seen since that the committee itself in reality became a means of shielding the reactionary designs of the Trade Union Council by making the "progressive" front appear more real. The impact of the millions on strike threw these "progressive" fully back into the camp of the bourgeoisie. They became the most effective betrayers of the strike. But any criticism the Communists at the time attempted to direct against them was in advance negated by the prestige they enjoyed in being partners in the "unity" committee with the representatives of the revolutionary Russian workers. Ever since, the British Communist party, together with the Minority Movement has experienced a constant decline both in numbers and influence upon the course of the working masses. It could not be otherwise. Simultaneously, and to almost precisely that degree, the influence of the Trade Union Council and of the capitalist lieutenants in the leadership of the labor party has grown. And grown to a point where they are yet able to divide and defeat the British workers.

The isolated position of the British Communist Party and the Minority movement reflects its internal life. There is not yet an organized Left Opposition. However, with great struggles looming on the horizon and thereby, the growth of the real problems of the revolutionary movement, the experiences of the failures are bound to become expressed in the development of such an Opposition.

But to return to the question of the experiences in the workers' struggles and the problems of strike strategy, we intend, in the next issue, to bring some further examples from France, Germany and the United States and to draw some conclusions.

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

Feb. 21: THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE SOVIET UNION

By Max Shachtman

Feb. 28: DIALECTIC MATERIALISM: A REVOLUTIONARY SCIENCE

By Arne Swabek.

March 7: THE SITUATION IN THE NEEDLE TRADES

By James P. Cannon

at the

LABOR TEMPLE

14th Street and Second Avenue

Open at 8 P. M.

Admission: 25c

Auspices: New York branch, Communist League of America (Opposition).

For a United Front on the Unemployed

(Continued from page 1)

cific stage of development our tactics must lay the basis for correct preparation and direction of the next one. Correct tactics lead toward the revolutionary goal. Wrong tactics lead away from it and strengthens the enemy. A correct approach to the problem of ameliorating the working class needs of today, and now so acutely pressing, prepares for the battles of the rising labor movement tomorrow. Agitation slogans and immediate demands can present no solution in themselves and should not be so designed. They are, by the very nature of the class struggle, strictly limited in their character. That is, they can offer means of temporary amelioration. And they must be a help to unite the workers on the basis of their common interests and to set them into motion against their class enemy. They cannot solve the problem. Only the proletarian revolution can do that.

We propose unity of action of the Communist forces and, in advancing the following concrete program, we offer our fraternal co-operation with the official Communist Party in the struggle for the unemployed.

1. Common recognition of the capitalist offensive and of the defensive character of the general working class movement as the outstanding feature of the present moment. This requires a line of tactics which take this feature of the situation into account. Proceeding from this our tactics must naturally grow in boldness in preparation for the next stage when workers' struggles can pass over to the offensive.

2. The central immediate demand must be the *Six hour day without reduction in pay*. More than any other demand this has the quality both of offering real and tangible improvement of the workers condition and become a means to unite the working masses and set them into motion against their enemy. The Communist forces must take upon themselves particularly the duty of *arousing the existing labor unions and workers organizations* and welding them together into a powerful movement for the shorter workday.

3. It is essential for the working class also to fight against the murderous capitalist rationalization and speed-up of the workers. Similarly to fight for immediate unemployment relief, and for a system of unemployment insurance at the expense of the capitalists and their governments. In this connection we must always emphasize that the workers can obtain even the smallest measures of relief and reforms only through direct pressures of their mass numbers.

4. It is essential that the unemployment movement adopt the slogan and fight for extension of large scale credits from U. S. capitalism to the Soviet Union. The

further success of the great industrialization progress of the Soviet Union, is bound up with facilitation of an increase of supply of machinery for the immediate future from the capitalist countries. For this the Soviet Union needs credits. The orders which such credits will enable the Soviet Union to place in America will provide more work for the unemployed here. The great importance of this demand, for which we must arouse the workers to fight, consists in the fact that it unites the struggle of the American workers for their most pressing immediate needs with the industrialization program of the Soviet Union. Thereby it cements the bonds of American workers with the Soviet Union and makes them real participants in its struggle toward socialism.

5. To actually provide the broadest possible basis for the movement, Unemployment Councils should be organized as genuine united front bodies. Such councils when growing out of the movement struggling unitedly for the needs of the unemployed and against the capitalist offensive can become genuinely representative of the masses. The official Communist Party must revive and apply the united front as Lenin taught them. This means, in the present situation, to make direct proposals to the trade unions, the socialist party and the workers organizations for a common struggle for the above demands. On the basis of such proposals a strong agitation should commence among the workers in the ranks of these organizations. The fact that the reactionary leaders of the trade unions will reject our proposals, or refuse even to discuss them, is no reason to refrain from making them. Such an attitude on the part of the leaders will only deepen the contradictions between the bureaucracy and the workers and widen the basis for Communist influence. An energetic application of these tactics, on the basis of a realistic and correct program, will create the conditions for a real movement on the issue of unemployment. This is the need of the hour. Up to now the struggle has been a demonstration of the vanguard. It must be transformed into a mass movement under the leadership of the Communist vanguard. A correct evaluation of the situation, a correct program and the tactics of the united front are the ways to this transformation.

6. The main duty of the Communists in the unemployment situation is, as always, to become the leading force of ever broader working masses, proceeding from the immediate needs toward the final working class goal. There is no solution to the unemployment problem except through the proletarian revolution. In our agitation and struggles we must always make this clear.

National Committee
Communist League of America (Opposition)

At the Fresh Grave of Kote Zinzadze

By LEON TROTSKY

It took altogether extraordinary conditions like czarism, illegality, prisons and deportations, long years of struggle against the Mensheviks and especially the experiences of the three revolutions to produce militants like Kote Zinzadze. His life was bound up entirely with the history of the revolutionary movement for a period of more than a quarter of a century. He passed through all the stages of proletarian uprising, beginning with the very first propaganda circles to the barricades and the seizure of power. For long years he conducted menial labors of illegal organization, and at the time when the revolutionists were tied up in the net of the police he devoted himself to unifying them. Later on he was at the head of the extraordinary Commission of Transcaucasia, that is, at the very center of power, during the most heroic period of the proletarian dictatorship.

When the reaction against the October had changed the composition and the character of the party apparatus as well as of its policies, Kote Zinzadze was one of the first to begin a struggle against the new tendencies hostile to the spirit of Bolshevism. The first conflict took place during Lenin's illness. Stalin and Ordjonikidze, supported by Dzerzhinsky, had made a coup d'état in Georgia, replacing the nucleus of old Bolsheviks by careerist functionaries of the type of Eliava, Orechakashvili and others. It is precisely on this question that Lenin was preparing to launch an implacable battle against the Stalin faction and the apparatus at the twelfth congress of the party. On the 6th of March 1923, Lenin wrote to the Georgian group of old Bolsheviks, of which Kote Zinzadze was one of the founders: "I am wholeheartedly with your cause. I am outraged by the coarseness of Ordjonikidze and the connivance of Stalin and Dzerzhinsky. I am preparing for you some notes and a speech."

The subsequent march of developments is sufficiently well known. The Stalin faction crushed the Lenin faction in the Caucasus. This was the first victory for reaction in the party and opened up the second chapter of the revolution. Zinzadze, tubercular, bearing the weight of decades of revolutionary work, persecuted by the apparatus on every step, did not for one moment desert his post of struggle. In 1928 he was deported to Bakhshi-Sarail where wind and dust did their disastrous work on the remnants of his lungs. Later on he was transferred to Aloutcha where the rainy winter completed the work of destruction.

Some friends wanted to gain admittance for Kote to the Goulpriche Sanatorium at Suchom, where Zinzadze had already several times before succeeded to save his life during some particularly acute aggravations of his sickness. Of course, Ordjonikidze had "promised", Ordjonikidze "promises" much and to everybody. But the cowardliness of his character (coarseness does not exclude cowardice), has always made of him a blind instrument in the hands of Stalin. While Zinzadze was literally fighting against death Stalin struggled against all attempts to save the old militant. Send him over to Goulpriche on the coast of the Black Sea? And if he recovers? Connections might be established between Batum and Constantinople. No, impossible!

With the death of Zinzadze one of the most attractive figures of older Bolshevism has disappeared. This fighter who more than once risked his life and who knew well how to chastise the enemy, was a man of exceptional mildness in his personal relations. A debonaire mockery and an almost malicious sense of humor were combined in this tested terrorist with a tenderness one might almost call feminine.

The serious illness which did not for an instant release him from its hold not only could not break down his moral resistance, but did not even succeed in overpowering his ever jovial state of mind and his tender affection for humanity.

Kote was not a theoretician. But his clear thinking, his revolutionary flair and his immense political experience—the living experience of three revolutions—armed him better, more seriously and more firmly than does the doctrine formally digested by those who lack the fortitude and perseverance equal to Zinzadze's. As the Lear of Shakespeare he was every inch a revolutionary. His character revealed itself perhaps even more strikingly during the last eight years—years of uninterrupted struggle against the advent and the entrenchment of the unprincipled bureaucracy.

Zinzadze fought organically against everything resembling treachery, capitulation and disloyalty. He understood the significance of the bloc with Zinoviev and Kamenev. But morally he never supported this group. His letters testify to all the sim-

licity of his repugnance—it is impossible to find another word—toward revolutionaries who while wanting to safeguard their formal membership in the party, deceive it by renouncing their ideas.

No. 2 of the "Bulletin" of the Russian Opposition has published a letter from Zinzadze to Okudjava. It is an excellent document of tenacity, clearness of thought and conviction. Zinzadze, as has been said, was not a theoretician, and he voluntarily left it to others to formulate the tasks of the revolution, the party and the Opposition. But every time he detected a false note, he took his pen into his hand and no "authority" could prevent him from expressing his suspicions and from making his replies. His letter, written on the 2nd of May last year and published in the Bulletin No. 12-13. (p. 27) testifies best to this fact. This practical man, this organizer safeguarded the purity of doctrine more attentively than some theoreticians.

In Kote's letters we often encounter the following phrases: "a bad 'institution' these hesitations". And further: "woe to the people who can't wait", or "in solitude weak people easily become subject to all

sorts of contagion". Sentiments of an unshakable fortitude penetrated Zinzadze and upheld his feeble physical energy. He considered even his sickness as a revolutionary duel. According to one of his letters he was solving in his struggle against death, the question: "who will conquer?" "In the meantime the advantage remains on my side," he adds, with the optimism which never abandoned him, several months before his death.

In the summer of 1923, speaking of himself, that is, of his sickness, Kote writes to the author of these lines from Bakhshi-Sarail: "... many of our comrades and friends have been forced to separate themselves from life, in prison or in some place of deportation but in the final analysis all this will only serve to enrich revolutionary history which educates new generations. The Bolshevik youth, clarified by the struggle of the Bolshevik Opposition against the opportunist wing of the party, will understand on whose side the truth rests. . ."

These words, simple and yet sublime. Zinzadze could write only in an intimate letter to a friend. Now that the author is no longer among the living, these lines may and must be published. They resume the life and the morale of a revolutionist

The Demagogy of the German National Socialists

By ROMAN WELL

It is not by accident that the German Fascists call themselves "national socialists". Socialist teachings are deeply rooted in the German proletariat. The forms and degree of organization of the German proletariat are higher than in any other capitalist country. Equally great are the traditions and experiences of the German workers in their economic and political struggles against the bourgeoisie.

The Fascists in Germany employ the word "socialist". By this means they hope to be able to draw close more easily to the "German workers poisoned by Marxism". Their principal task, with which they have been charged by the magnates of heavy industry, is to divert the proletariat from the class struggle and to destroy the proletarian organizations. The leading bourgeoisie understands the necessity for the German Fascists to employ radical phrases. It knows very well that this means is indispensable in the struggle for the destruction of the proletarian forces. That is why German Fascism, supported financially by the magnates of heavy industry, can afford to agitate with radical phrases.

In the *Voelkischen Beobachter* (January 15), the central organ of the German Fascists, a speech of the deceased officer, Goebbels is published. Here is what he said at a demonstration in Munich:

"It is only when the capitalist system will be abolished that socialism can be established."

Very radical! After similar declara-

tions made publicly by the chief of the Nazis, many naive people can only believe that the national-socialists are thinking seriously about socialism.

But quite different are the actions of the national-socialist leaders. They are the organizers of strike-breakers. Every workers' struggle is supported by them in phrases, but they undermine them in reality. They have learned not to come out openly for the abolition of strikes, because in this way they will close to themselves the road to the minds of the workers. An example of the "socialism" of the Nazis has already been pointed out here. They have pronounced themselves in the Reichstag against a proposal for special taxes on the profits of large stockholders.

Today we have a new example of their "hatred" of the trusts and particularly of Jewish financial capital. The Nazis demanded and voted a proposal for a subsidy of seven million marks for the German copper trust, Mansfeld A. G. Who are the principal stockholders in this trust? Otto Wolf and Jacob Goldschmidt. At the same time that the Nazi fraction pronounced itself for this proposal, the Berlin organ, *Angriff*, wrote on January 7:

"This business man Otto Wolfe. A perfect type of these great modern magnates, determined to the point of unscrupulousness, with no regard for the fate of thousands, and if need be, for tens of thousands of

of a high order. They must be made public precisely because the youth must be brought up not only with theoretical formulas but also by examples of revolutionary tenacity.

The communist parties of the West have not yet produced militants of the type of Zinzadze. There is their principal weakness, which is determined by historic reasons, but which for all that does not cease to be a weakness. The Left Opposition of the western countries is not an exception—in this case—and it must well take note of it.

It is precisely to the Opposition youth that the example of Zinzadze can and ought to serve as a lesson. Zinzadze was the living negation of every sort of political careerism, that is to say, of the capacity to sacrifice the principles, the ideas and the tasks of the cause for personal ends. This does not at all mean the negation of justified revolutionary ambitions. No, political ambition is a very important force in the struggle. But the revolutionary begins there where personal ambition is entirely subservient to a great idea, submitting itself voluntarily to it and merging with it. To flirt with ideas, to dabble in them for purposes of a personal career—that is what Zinzadze pitilessly condemned through his life and through his death. The ambition of Zinzadze was an ambition of unshakable revolutionary loyalty. It should serve as a lesson to the proletarian youth.

January 7th, 1931.

men, one of the greatest powers in the German mining industry. . . . The capital of Otto Wolf is estimated today at one hundred million marks."

Thus, with the public approval of the Nazis, this multi-millionaire receives a gift of seven millions in taxes out of the millions of famished workers. There is no more obvious example of demagogy than that of these criminals. And yet the Nazis do not lose their influence. On the contrary, the results of the recent economic struggles, the abandonment without a struggle of the vital positions of the working class by the leadership of the reformist unions who participate directly and openly in the cutting of wages, the continual policy of treason of the social democracy, multiplies the ranks of the desperate and drives them into the arms of Fascism.

Reformism and Fascism

This was recently recognized publicly by the "Left" social democrat, Seydewitz, in an article in the recent number of the *Klassenkampf*:

"The fact that the reductions of wages are accepted or will be accepted without fight by the trade unions, creates the premises for a more easy formation of the Fascist nuclei within the working class itself."

This means that the reformist bureaucracy renders deep services to the Fascist movement, that the social democracy is preparing the road for Fascism.

* * *

The Fascists are today being called upon to decide. Their partisans, who have been systematically incited by the demagogy of the leaders now demand deeds. They are pushing their leaders into the path of a counter-revolutionary insurrection. This sentiment appears so strongly that it obliges Goebbels to calm his supporters. These gentlemen would like better to come to power without an insurrection, by compromises and coalitions. In one way or another, the decisive struggle between the proletariat and Fascism is approaching. Will the strength of the proletariat be strong enough to crush the Fascist hands? This question can be answered only from the point of view of the relations between the party and the working class.

Our party in Germany is not pursuing a policy that can gather the proletariat. It is precisely upon the degree of the assembling of the workers that depends for the most part the victory or the defeat of Fascism. The German working class has little confidence in the unity cries of the Centrists. The formation of Communist trade unions at this moment is considered by the social democratic and non-party workers as a breach in the united front of the working class. A little while ago the Central Committee of our party came together. The *Rote Fahne* considers its resolutions as decisive. We will return to them. Certainly the policy of the party will be decisive if the leadership changes its policy and adopts a correct one. Even now a consistent policy can consolidate immensely the positions of the working class.

Nothing but a Leninist policy of the united front can, on the one hand, strengthen the militancy of the proletariat, and on the other, unmask the Fascist demagogy before the pauperized workers.

Berlin, January 1931.

The Ghezzi Case

The anarchist press has for some time now put forward the case of Ghezzi, an Italian anarchist imprisoned in the U. S. S. R. The party press has contented itself with replying by speaking of "anti-Soviet activity", etc. But the Left Opposition cannot be content with such replies.

Ghezzi is a revolutionary Italian worker, an anarchist-Communist. He participated in the struggle against Fascism in Italy, was compelled to flee to Germany, and once more could only escape the butchers by receiving asylum in the U. S. S. R. He lived there as a worker, and did not in any way abandon his ideas.

In 1923, he was arrested by the G. P. U.; he remains incarcerated in Suzdal, under the most miserable conditions, doomed to death like so many others. The Communist Opposition must express itself on this subject.

It is perfectly true that anarchists have committed and can commit acts directed against the proletariat dictatorship. In such a case, they must be judged. There are codes of proletarian justice in the U. S. S. R., worked out in the first years of the revolution. If the Soviet government considers it necessary to bring anarchists before the Soviet tribunals, it must bring proofs, obtain a conviction, and observe a prison régime compatible with the proletarian dictatorship.

But the Stalinist apparatus has brought its savagery into class justice also. It has replaced the Soviet tribunals by the administrative, discretionary justice of the G. P. U. We protest against this with all our strength. If Ghezzi is guilty, he should be tried. The Soviet government must bring

proofs of his guilt. If not, he should be liberated. The case of Ghezzi is not isolated: hundreds of anarchist, syndicalist, Communist and ultra-Left workers are in a similar position, victims of Stalinist arbitrariness, which reflects the pressure of classes hostile to the proletariat.

As to the Bolshevik-Leninists imprisoned or deported (Left Opposition), we do not demand that they be tried. Their activity, their point of view, are those of the vanguard of the proletarian dictatorship. We demand their immediate liberation, their recall to work in the party and Soviets, their readmission into the Communist party.

BULLETIN of the RUSSIAN OPPOSITION

The latest issue of the official organ of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition, published as a double number, has just been received. Some of the material contained in this highly interesting issue is as follows:

Success of Socialism and the Dangers of Adventurism — Declaration of comrade Rakovsky and Others—Statement of Rakovsky, Muralov and Others to the Central Committee of the Russian Party — Comrade Selinitchenko in Stalinist Exile — A New Victim of Stalin (Comrade Kote Zinzadze) etc., etc.

25 Cents a Copy

Order from

THE MILITANT

84 East 10th Street New York, N. Y.

American Syndicalism and Problems of Communism

By JAMES P. CANNON

The following is the introduction by comrade Cannon to the pamphlet coming off the press this week by Leon Trotsky on "Communism and Syndicalism". Price 15 cents a copy, 10 cents in bundles.

The arguments brought forward in this pamphlet are devoted specifically to the problems of the labor movement of France, the classic land of syndicalism. But dealing as they do with such fundamental questions as the rôle of the revolutionary workers' party, the state, the bureaucracy in the labor movement and trade union tactics in general, they have universal application. This is particularly true of America. The historical development of the revolutionary labor movement in the United States has posed the question of syndicalism in its specific American form (the I. W. W.) with especial prominence. The task of assembling the revolutionary elements in the working class into a single body has been greatly hampered by theoretical confusion on the issues which the author illuminates in these pages. Some of these losses are irretrievable, for neither movements nor their participants can stand on one spot. Degeneration is the unfailing price for failure to develop and advance. In the period since the war we have seen not a little of this degeneration in the camp of the class conscious workers, and precisely for this reason. Much can yet be gained, however, by a clarification of the questions. This pamphlet, so sharp and clear in its reasoning, so fortified in every line by the tested theory of Marxism, can justly be called a timely and significant contribution to this work of clarification. For that reason we believe it deserves the particular attention of the American revolutionaries.

THE I. W. W. AS A REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

In the decade before the world war the proletarian revolt against the parliamentary reformism of the Socialist Party and the sectarian sterility and legalism of the Socialist Labor Party found two main points of crystallization. One of these was the Left wing in the S. P. The other was the I. W. W. Both of these movements had elements of a revolutionary party. The task of Communism in America was to unite them into a single revolutionary organization. To the failure to understand this task, and consequently the failure to accomplish it to any appreciable degree, we owe not a little of the weakness of the American Communist movement. A large share of the responsibility for this belongs to the party itself. It could not see the revolutionary implications of the I. W. W. movement and did not know how to mature and assimilate them. But this fact does not absolve the revolutionary syndicalists from responsibility. They contributed more than a generous measure of prejudice and dogmatism to the issue. If the party walked blindfolded the I. W. W. militants, for the greater part, put stumbling blocks in its path.

In its essence the pre-war I. W. W. was a variant of French syndicalism. Its distinctive features were its centralized form of organization and its indifference toward the syndicalist theory of the rôle of the "militant minority".

In its struggle against parliamentary reformism and legalism the I. W. W. introduced and popularized a number of ideas and practices of a decidedly progressive and revolutionary character, ideas which retain their validity today. Its emphasis on "direct action" was an anticipation, incomplete it is true, of the Bolshevik principle which puts the mass action of the workers above parliamentary activity. Its advocacy of industrial as against craft unionism prepared the way for modern organization of the workers. Another progressive feature was the emphasis the I. W. W. placed on the unskilled—the most deprived and exploited, the most numerous and potentially the most revolutionary section of the working class. From its first convention onward it declared solidarity with the Negro and welcomed him into its ranks. The members of the I. W. W. went through a number of historic class battles and displayed unexampled militancy and sacrifice. Solidarity with all struggling workers everywhere and an unceasing emphasis on the revolutionary goal of the struggle were central features in all of its activity.

These aspects of the I. W. W. were its strong, progressive and revolutionary side. That it represented, as did revolutionary syndicalism in general, a step forward from parliamentary socialism was acknowledged by the theses of the second congress of the Communist International. That it occupied a place in the vanguard of the American working class was attested by the fierce persecution launched against it. Particularly during the war the attacks of the govern-

ment were concentrated on the I. W. W. The significance of the war-time persecution consisted in the fact that it was led by the Federal government, as distinguished from the customary local persecutions arising out of purely economic strikes. This persecution had a national, political character, an acknowledgment in itself that the I. W. W. was no more a trade union but a revolutionary, and therefore a political force.

The weak side of the I. W. W. movement, as of the syndicalist movement on an international scale, was its theoretical incompleteness. Because of its indifference to revolutionary theory it did not and could not pose the fundamental questions of the revolution in their full implications and find the answer to them. As a consequence the movement contained a contradiction within itself. There cannot be a really revolutionary movement without a revolutionary theory, as Lenin said long ago. The conditions of the war sharpened the class relations to an extraordinary degree and exposed this contradiction with shattering force. The negative attitude toward the state—the ostrich policy of "ignoring" the state—disarmed the movement when this same state—the "executive committee of the capitalist class" and "its special body of armed men" was hurled against it. The proletarian reaction against parliamentary reformism, developing into opposition to "Politics" and indifference to political questions in general, left the I. W. W. without a compass before the complicated problems of war, problems which in their very essence were political to the highest degree. The justifiable hostility to bourgeois and reformist parties grew, as a result of loose thought, into an opposition to the concept even of a proletarian revolutionary party. This was the crowning theoretical error of the movement of American syndicalism, or industrialism. It prevented the conscious organization of the proletarian vanguard into a single uniform body able to work out the program of the revolution and strive for its application with united force.

THE SHORTCOMINGS OF THE I. W. W.

The experiences of the war and the Russian revolution disclosed the shortcomings of the I. W. W. as well as those of the Left wing in the S. P. The problems elucidated in the living experience of the Russian revolution became, as they remain to this very day, the touchstone for revolutionary organizations throughout the world. The Marxist teachings on the state and on the rôle of the workers' party as the vanguard of the class, without which the class cannot raise itself to power, received brilliant and irrefutable confirmation in the Bolshevik revolution. Adjustment to these lessons taught by life could not be evaded.

In the failure to make this adjustment is written the whole story of the post-war degeneration of the I. W. W. The record of this entire period is a record of the steady and systematic displacement of the I. W. W. from its old position in the vanguard of the struggle; of its transformation into the antipode of its former revolutionary self. Insofar as the upper and official stratum of the organization is concerned the keynote of anti-capitalism sounded in the best days has been transformed into anti-Communism. Out of a militant body of revolutionaries they strive to make reactionary sect.

"No politics" and "no party"—these are the formulae under which this degeneration has proceeded. And together with them has gone the slogan of "no leaders"—that slogan of demagogues who themselves aspire to leadership without qualifications. As has been remarked before, the leadership of the Communist party contributed to the tragic failure to build the new Communist movement in part on the foundations of the militant I. W. W. Intellectualism, condescension, the control and command sickness, played here, as always, an evil rôle. It is necessary to understand this and to say it plainly. But an understanding and acknowledgment of this fact cannot undo the past. We must start from where we are. If we bear in mind the mistakes of the past in order to avoid them in the future something can yet be done of positive value for the revolution. It is not too late even now to make a place for those syndicalist workers who are imbued with a hatred of capitalism and the will to struggle against it—and there are many of them—under the Communist banner. It is quite true that the official party leadership is unable to do this, as it is unable to solve any of the problems of Communism. All the greater, therefore, is the responsibility of the Opposition.

In the ranks of the former members and sympathizers of the I. W. W., and to a lesser extent within the organization, are experienced militants who have not forgotten the old tradition, whose concepts do not begin and end with the phobia against Communism. Their spirit is alien to the spirit of the Gahans and Sandgrens. They are sympathetic to the Russian revolution and to Communism. Only they have no faith in the party. Their skepticism about the American Communist party has had a certain amount of justification, as we have always known. But, granting serious defects in the party, what is to be done about it? As we see the thing—since we proceed from the point of view that a party cannot be dispensed with—one must either struggle to reform the party or, if he thinks it is hopeless, form a new one. We, the Opposition, have taken the former course. The great mass of the radical workers who have lost faith in the dogmas of the I. W. W. without acquiring confidence in the party have fallen into passivity. The post-war prosperity, which depressed the entire labor movement to a low point, facilitated this passive attitude. "Nothing is happening. Let us wait and see," became a sort of platform for many during this period. People who had been concerned with the problem of making a revolution turned to the problem of making a living while awaiting further developments.

TASKS OF MARXISTS

But what now? The economic crisis is smashing all this calm routine. Class relations are being sharpened and all the conditions are being created for a revival of the militant labor movement. What path will this movement take and what part will be played by those who consider themselves to be revolutionaries? This question calls for an answer. In any case it can not be answered with a waiting, or passive attitude. A time of storm, and that is what is before us, above all is a time when nobody can stand aside; that is, nobody who doesn't want to play the part of a reactionary. Revolutionary health requires exercise.

Lovestone and Brandler

The Revolutionary Age (No. 10), gives us a brief summary of the international conference of the Right wing Opposition groups recently held in Berlin. What actually took place at this conference, its political significance for the movement, and the future of the Right wing, we will still take occasion to elaborate upon in future issues of the Militant. Here it is interesting to make a remark or two on an instructive phase of the Lovestone group's participation.

The leading spirits at the Right wing conference were the heads of the opportunist Brandler group in Germany. In his report, Lovestone refers to this and similar groups in Europe as the "healthy . . . forces marshalled under our banner in the determined struggle to bring back the world party of Communism to the line and policies of Lenin". Other laudatory observations on the pristine Bolshevik purity of the Brandler group have been published in the Right wing paper for some time now.

Exactly on what date Lovestone discovered the virtues of the Brandler group—especially the fantastic idea that they were fighting for Leninism—it is difficult to say. All that written records can establish is that Lovestone since 1924, fulminated against the Brandler group as a hopelessly opportunistic, Right wing faction. To a certain extent, the Lovestone group in the party built its reputation as fully-blown "Leninist" of the Stalin-Zinoviev-Bucharin era, upon its attacks on Brandler and Thalheimer. In fact, one of its main cards against the party minority in those days was an open or veiled accusation that it was somehow or other connected up with Brandler.

Less than two years ago on the eve of his expulsion from the party and directly afterwards, Lovestone still sailed under the flag of anti-Brandlerism. Startling as it may seem to-day, one of Lovestone's main points against those in his group who had turned against him (Bedacht) was that the latter had been entertaining ideas of connecting with Brandler—something which Lovestone of course, indignantly "rejected". Here is what he wrote in his "Appeal to the Comintern" issued to the party:

"We do not believe that the Communist International will be fooled by the fraudulent [so!] accusation of Bedacht against comrades Gitlow, Lovestone, Wolfe, that they proposed to establish relations

In such a moment as the present one—which is a time of preparation for the great days impending—it is good to shake the advanced sections of the labor movement with discussion. And it is doubly fortunate if the discussion is precipitated by an objective Marxist analysis which, at the very beginning, lifts the fundamental questions to the high level of theoretical consideration. Such a service is rendered to the American movement by comrade Trotsky in the collection of articles which this pamphlet comprises. We have no doubt that it will make its way and be the means of strengthening the current of Communism in the resurgent labor movement of America.

This pamphlet is composed of a collection of articles written by comrade Trotsky at various times on the problems of the French labor movement. The first articles were written in the early part of 1923 after Monatte, the leader of the revolutionary syndicalists, and the group associated with him had just entered the Communist party of France. The two articles written toward the end of 1929 takes up the discussion again after the intervening period of more than six years—a period in which Monatte had steadily retreated to his old position and consequently widened the chasm between him and the Communists.

The following article, entitled "Monatte Crosses the Rubicon", written at the end of 1930 draws a balance to the discussion with the syndicalists who had crowned their reactionary trend by a bloc with Dumoulin. Dumoulin is one of the prominent leaders of the C. G. T., the reformist general labor federation. Once a syndicalist of the "Left", he betrayed the movement and took a leading part in the expulsion of the revolutionary wing of the C. G. T. which resulted in a split and the formation of a rival general Federation in 1921. Now he is talking "Left" again and this serves as the cover for the passage of Monatte into the camp of reaction through the medium of a bloc with him.

The final article in the pamphlet deals with questions of Communist policy in the trade unions which are at present the subject of discussion in the French section of the International Left Opposition.

with Brandler and Thalheimer. The party records will show that it was over the protests of both Bedacht and Foster that the first resolution against Brandler and Thalheimer was adopted by the American Political Committee. Furthermore it was Bedacht who proposed in Moscow to comrades Gitlow, Lovestone and Wolfe to establish connections with Brandler and to keep a permanent representative in Berlin. This was instantly rejected by the comrades and it comes with bad grace from Bedacht to try to ascribe his proposals to others. When he is making his confessions, it would be well for him to confess his own errors in place of ascribing them to others who did not share them." (Emphasis in original.)

As to Bedacht, we have no special reason to doubt the charges made by Lovestone especially since Bedacht is spiritually closer to the solid social democratic school of Brandler than would appear on the surface today. But what about Lovestone? What feats have Brandler and Thalheimer performed since the above was written to cause such a violent somersault in political position on Lovestone's part? The answer is not far to seek: just as water finally finds its level, so the Lovestones, for all their temporary diversions into other streams, finally find their Brandler and the Brandler find their Lovestones.

What is particularly instructive here is the method of the Right wing an inherent characteristic of their whole political course. Lovestone pulled a number of Communist workers out of the party under a barrage of attack upon Brandler. He never unfolded to them his opportunist platform in full, that is, he simply adopted the classic method of every opportunist misleader. Little by little, with a measure of skill, no doubt, he led them imperceptibly into the camp of Brandler. Substitute "Muste" for "Brandler" and you get the same result: for he roared against "Muste, the social reformist" when he left the party with a fury excelled only by the softness with which he casts a coy and desirous eye in the direction of "Muste, the honorable progressive" today. Lovestone could never have hoped to get even the support he did get in the party, by presenting his real platform in advance, and he knew it. And he has not yet presented it in full. The depths of the swamp at which he will come to rest have not yet been reached.

The «Left»: Saviors of Reformism in the Socialist Party

By MAX SHACHTMAN

With its customary facility, the Stalinist press has solved the whole problem of the new movement in the socialist party: The "militants" [i. e., the socialist party Left wing under the leadership of Louis Stanley] have come into existence as part of a cunning conspiracy by Hillquit and Oneal to dam the irresistible onward sweep of "mass radicalization". Since it is not with the shallowness of Centrism that we are concerned here principally, but with the pretensions of the "militants" themselves, the analysis submitted by the *Daily Worker* can be dismissed provisionally with the safe prediction that not too much time will have to elapse before a different song is sung. Nevertheless, this movement, which has already created a stir in the socialist party and was numerically so well represented at the recent New York Local convention, calls for an examination into its significance and rôle.

For some time ago now, a spirit of discontent has been growing in the socialist party, particularly among the younger members. The aspiration of the leadership for a dead calm in the party, an aspiration twice buttressed by mass expulsions of Communist workers, is now again encountering an obstacle.

Twice now, the reactionary leadership of the S. P. has encountered resistance from the membership to its course of completing the conversion of the party into the third party of American capitalism. In 1919, the decisive split was consummated between the proletarian, that is, the Communist wing of the movement, and the petty bourgeois, or social democratic wing. At that time, more than half of the membership of the party was expelled in order to insure the domination of the Hillquit, Berger, Gompers, and Oneal clique. In 1921, a second wave of Communist support mounted in the socialist party no longer comprising tens of thousands, it is true, but nevertheless contributing some hundreds of workers to American Communism.

THE SOURCES OF THE "LEFT" WING

Since that time, the degeneration of the S. P. has proceeded with a steadily accelerated rapidity. For the workers who were expelled, the leadership substituted a recruitment among the petty bourgeoisie. For the tepid sympathy it was compelled to manifest towards the Bolshevik revolution, it substituted a cold antipathy, a collaboration with avowed counter-revolutionists. It linked its destiny ever more closely with the reactionary requirements of the Gompers, and later, the Green dynasty in the labor movement, and became its direct agent in the struggle against the Left wing movement in the trade unions. At its New York convention, it finally gave formal recognition to the already accomplished fact by striking out of its constitution all mention of the class struggle. The leadership of Debs, which typified the best days of American socialism, gave way to the petty bourgeois liberal direction of Norman Thomas.

From a timid party of class struggle, in fine, the socialist party has become the bold pioneer of class treachery. There is today hardly a reactionary cause in the labor movement that cannot find the explicit or tacit support of the S. P. hierarchy.

This process, in every essential a replica of the development of the international social democracy, encountered no internal resistance up to recently for two principal reasons: firstly, the proletarian wing of socialism was already outside the party and in the form of the Communist party was conducting a frontal attack against the S. P. all along the line; secondly, the decay of the S. P. proceeded parallel to the "de-radicalizing" effects of the years of American prosperity, and was in every sense an adaptation to this prosperity and its short-lived ideologists. The first signs of the depression, and then the heavy blows of the crisis, however, were bound to reduce a reaction to this degeneration in the labor movement as a whole, and in the socialist party as a section of it. The reaction took the form of a discontent with the conservative policies of the leadership; the discontent has been crystallized in the rise of the so-called "militant group" of Stanley-Bright-Coleman-Porter-Schapiro and others.

But this gives only the barest outline of the new movement in the S. P. It has other, more instructive, characteristics. The last decade of Hillquit leadership, that is, of gross class collaboration, has served to discredit the socialist party, and along with it social reformism in general, in the eyes of the class-conscious workers of America. To the extent that the latter are politically active, or become politically active, the bulk of them support the Communist movement or incline in its direction. Moreover, the fact that the crisis and the rising class discontent in the country coincided with the

S. P. being stripped of every militant characteristic, has only served to heighten the contrast between labor's need of a class struggle program and reformism's program of submission and betrayal.

The S. P. today cannot even hope to give adequate expression to the discontent of the workers; it does not pretend to lead them in struggle against the offensive of capital. The gap between it and the progressive and revolutionary workers grows wider to the exact extent that the gap between it and the petty bourgeoisie is closed.

To put it in a different form: Just as the deeds of Mueller and Co. have served to discredit social reformism in Germany, and just as the second ministry of MacDonald has accelerated the discredit of social reformism in England, so also—and necessarily on a smaller scale—has the reactionary course of the S. P. priesthood served to discredit social reformism in the United States. And just as the resistance of the social democratic workers and the pressure of the class struggle has produced the Seydovitz group in the German social democracy, and the Leftward development in the I. L. P. in England, so also—and again necessarily on a smaller scale—it has produced the Stanley faction in the American S. P. But in every single case, the object of the leaders of these minority movements has been to rehabilitate social reformism in the eyes of the workers. This incontestable truth is not changed for a single moment by the fact that the workers following them may, and frequently do, have different objects in mind.

What do Maxton and Seydovitz want? They want to set up against the policy of Grzechinsky, who shoots down the Berlin proletariat on May Day, of MacDonald who slaughters India's masses and keeps Britain's in starvation, a policy of social reformism that will be palatable to the dissatisfied workers—but not the policy of revolutionary struggle. And Messrs. Stanley, Bright and Coleman? Playing their rôle on a smaller stage though they do, it is nevertheless the same rôle of Left social reformists, not revolutionists striving towards Communism, but desperate reformists. The S. P. must be dressed up. Instead of uniting with Green and Woll, as Hillquit does, it must "fight in the trade unions"—for the reformist program. The S. P. must not be liquidated into a Deweyist "third party", as Thomas wants, it must be preserved intact and inviolate—as a distinctly social reformist party. That is the only way, according to the "militant" leaders, for the socialist party to "adjust" itself to the "new situation" produced by the crisis. That is the only way to recruit the support of the workers and prevent them from going to the unrealistic Communists. That is the only way to make reformism acceptable to a section of the working class.

WHO ARE THE "MILITANTS"

The Maxtons, Zyromskis, Seydewitzes, and their folio editions like Stanley and Co., are the saviors of reformism. Their "radicalism" is purely conjunctural, like stocks on the market, and it rises and falls with the rise and decline in the fighting mood of the workers. When the latter is at ebb, the Left wing reformists are content to leave the direction of party policy in the hands of the Real-politiker, the old reactionary party statesmen. When it rises, they are aroused by the threat that the workers' movement may overflow the bulwarks of reformism and pour into the ranks of Communism. In the periods of decline, they are the quiet office boys of the Right wing bureaucracy; in periods of working class ascent, of crisis, they are the recruiting sergeants for reformism, the emergency brake on the advance of the workers.

Leonard Bright, who has now become so militant, was the agent of the Gompers bureaucracy in expelling the Communists from the Office Workers Union years ago; McAllister Coleman, another "militant" in the S.P. was (and for all we know, still is) the agent of the Fishwick gang in the Illinois miners union, and in his weekly column of comment in the *New Leader*, always distinguished himself in rabid attacks upon the Communist movement. Stanley, the principal spokesman for the S. P. "Left wing", does not find it incompatible with his "Marxist" position to write a series of laudatory articles on the glistening virtues of the shopkeepers' administration of the socialist party in Reading.

But they are nevertheless conducting a fight for the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, a fight against Hillquit, Lee and Oneal! Even if that were true, radicalism for export purposes is very cheap: it costs next to nothing to say a

cutting word or two in New York about what MacDonald is doing in India (that's England's funeral), or a good word for what the Bolsheviks are doing in Russia. But it is not true. The Stanley group, despite all the ado that has been made, is a long, long way from fighting for the proletarian revolution in the U. S. S. R. The most casual examination of the "Russian resolution" it introduced at the New York City convention of the S. P., and around which the whole struggle within the S. P. was centered, will suffice to demonstrate the superficiality of this contention.

The resolution is based upon two ideas, the first of which should endear Stanley to the heart of Gannes and the *Daily Worker* instead of earning him so much abuse: (a) the endorsement of the reactionary theory of socialism in one country; (b) the defense of bourgeois democratic rights in the Soviet Union. Startling as our contentions, particularly the first, may sound, it is confirmed by the words of the resolution itself:

"Because we are anxious for the complete realization of socialism in Soviet Russia we look forward to the removal of two obstacles: (a) internal: the cessation of the extermination of minority opinion which is inconsistent with the socialist ideal and blinds workers to the fundamental achievements of Soviet Russia, and (b) external: the immediate recognition of Soviet Russia, the stopping of interference by foreign powers with the industrial plans or developments of Soviet Russia. . . (the five year plan) is the method by which the first attempt is being made in history to create the socialist society within a brief span of years."

DEFENDERS OF BOURGEOIS DEMOCRACY

The creation of a "socialist society within a brief span of years" in backward, agricultural Russia alone, provided only that "interference by foreign powers with the industrial plans or developments of Soviet Russia" is prevented—that is the very essence of the reactionary-utopian idea invented by Stalin in 1924—or rather, not invented, but copied from the teachings of every opportunist leader in the international socialist movement since the days of George von Vollmar. The same idea, advanced by the predecessors of Stanley in the socialist party to prove their radicalism (we refer to Engdahl, Kruse, Trachtenberg, Olgin and Co. in 1920-1921), was contemptuously rejected by the Communist International at the time as we shall later show by incontestable documents.

As for the other section of the "militants" resolution—the resolution which Lovestone declares "very closely approximates a Communist position—it is simply whining defense of the "rights" of the footmen of bourgeois democracy in the Soviet Union, the Mensheviks and the S. R.s. Against the extermination of what "minority opinion" is Stanley protesting? Against the Stalinist repression of the Bolshevik-Leninists, against the persecutions of the Left Oppositionists who are conducting a struggle against the infiltration of Menshevik and bourgeois elements into the structure of the Russian revolution? Of course not! Stanley was the first of the S. P. spokesman to open up an attack upon the "Trotskyists" when we were first expelled from the American party. What he is interested in is a little "freedom" for Russian Menshevism; for the darling of Abe Cahan, Abramovitch; for the unhampered propagation in the Soviet Union of the lofty ideals of bourgeois democracy. How closely this "approximates a Communist position" is one of those Eleusinian mysteries which only a Lovestone would even attempt to elucidate. The position it does approximate is that of the bourgeois radical Nation, which is identical with the Stanley resolution in the three essential points: It is for the five year plan and a chance for the "Russians to try it out"; it is against foreign interference with the "Russian experiment in socialism"; it is for the "cessation of the extermination of minority opinion".

Radicalism for export purposes is cheap, we have remarked, especially cheap when it serves to cover up the demand for radicalism in the "domestic market", so to speak, which is increased by the pressure in the ranks of workers who want a program of struggle and not words alone. The export of radicalism in the face of "home requirements" is a type of "dumping" not limited to these social reformists, it is true, but quite characteristic of them nevertheless.

Under the impulsion of the powerful Leftward swing of the British workers some five years ago, the late and unlamented "Left" leaders of the trade unions, Hicks, Purcell and Cook, also discovered the Sov-

iet Union, eight years after the revolution, it is true, but not too late to use this discovery and the praise of Communism's achievements (in Russia, not in England) as a bulwark against the revolutionary movement in Britain itself. Thirteen years after the revolution, it is discovered and politely recognized by the S. P. "Left wing", which finds its protestations of interest in the five year plan a safe and sane method of buttressing the structure of social reformism. The fact that it would be ridiculous to match the power for good and evil of Stanley and Bright with that of Purcell and Swales does not invalidate the essential appropriateness of the comparison by a hair's breadth. If any further proof for this is required, it can be found in the plaintive commentaries of those who specialize in idealizing this "Left wing"; the Lovestone faction. It is on their "Russian position" that the "militants" are "clearest", says the *Revolutionary Age*. And the is not by accident. On the contrary, it is precisely with this "definitely friendly attitude towards Soviet Russia" that the very "indefinite" attitude towards revolutionary problems in the United States is to be covered up.

(Concluded in Next Issue)

The «Dictatorship» Debate

Close to five hundred workers packed the New York Labor Temple on February 14th, to hear a debate on the subject: "Is a Proletarian Dictatorship Necessary?" between comrade James P. Cannon, representing the Communist point of view in the name of the Left Opposition, and Walter Starrett, editor of the *Road to Freedom*, for the anarchist point of view. The debate was highly successful from every point of view, and the interest with which the workers present listened to the debaters was the main indication of this fact. Starrett made a feeble presentation of the "orthodox" petty bourgeois point of view of the anarchists on "liberty" and "against any kind of state" or the "limitation of individual freedom by any form of coercion". When he was driven to the wall by comrade Cannon's pointed questions, however, he was compelled to admit lamely that an "anarchist revolution" would be compelled to use force to overthrow the ruling class and organize a red army to crush the counter-revolution. Comrade Cannon, who had given a concise presentation of the class nature of the state and the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship as a transition to Communism, pressed his advantage by showing that a red army could be organized and directed only by a centralized power, that is, the proletariat organized as the ruling class. Starrett's superficial endeavor to identify the workers' state with Mussolinian Fascism was thoroughly destroyed by comrade Cannon, who elaborated on the class differences between the two, a little point which the liberal-anarchist debator had simply forgotten. The same fate was encountered by Starrett's attempt to use the Stalinist abuses and deformations of the proletarian dictatorship to bolster up the anarchist position. Comrade Cannon pointed out that it was precisely because Stalinism was weakening the proletarian dictatorship, that it was the channel through which the world and Russian bourgeoisie was seeking to dilute the dictatorship, that the Left Opposition was conducting its struggle for cleansing the movement of Centrism.

The presence of over half a hundred Party members was noted in the hall, and they gave hearty support to the presentation of comrade Cannon. Starrett, by the way, spent a good part of his time in venomous attacks on comrade Trotsky as the "butcher of Kronstadt", but the bulk of the audience was cold to these abusive remarks.

A good deal of Militants and other literature was sold throughout the audience.

☐

CANNON LECTURE IN BOSTON

All Boston militants are cordially invited to attend the lecture arranged for Saturday evening, February 28, 1931, at the I. W. C. Center, 457 Blue Hill Avenue (Grove Hall), Roxbury. Comrade James P. Cannon, of the national committee of the Communist League, will speak on the "Prospects of the New Union Movement," a subject of particular importance to the progressive and Left wing workers. Admission is 25 cents, and tickets can be bought at Shapiro's Bookstore, 7 Beach Street, or at the door. Auspices of the Boston branch of the Communist League (Opposition).

Voices of Protest from the Bolsheviks in Exile

(Belated though it is in publication here, the declaration which follows retains all its timeliness and importance. It was addressed as a supplement to the declaration of the Bolshevik-Leninist Opposition by the group of Oppositionist deportees at Kansk and sent as a protest to the Sixteenth Congress of the C. P. S. U.—Ed.)

Φ

For two and a half years, the vanguard of the Bolshevik party has been submitted to a merciless repression. During this time, all the means of repression have been employed in the struggle against the Opposition: calumny and provocation, raids and arrests, deportations and solitary prison, up to assassination itself. The apparatus, assisted by the G. P. U., with the manifest sympathy of the domestic and international counter-revolution, has deported many hundreds of Bolsheviks to the Siberian taiga, to the steppes of Central Asia, to the damp sections of the Upper-Urals, of Cheliabinsk, of Tomsk and Suzal. Up to the Sixteenth Congress, a special commission for the Opposition has been functioning unknown to the party and the working class. The repression against the Opposition has not taken place without leaving its traces in the country. Since then, espionage, provocation, raids have become frequent and customary phenomena in the workers' quarters, in the university communes, and even in the factories. The arrests and the expulsions of old Bolsheviks, of workers, members of the Party and the Communist Youth, have a painful effect upon the party, demoralize the working class and unleash the bureaucracy. There is the most obvious result of the last two years! For its petty factional interests, the apparatus has surrounded the party with a system of espionage so that a denunciation or a secret agency prevail over the decision of a whole organization of the party.

THE PRISONS FOR OPPOSITIONISTS

The most monstrous and absurd accusations have been flung at the Opposition, and continue to be flung without being supported by any proof. The so-called "ideological" struggle conducted against the Opposition, which never went beyond swindler's maneuvers has now reached an unprecedented persecution. This persecution has become a savage repression which has long ago lost every shred of legality and is now entirely aimed at the liquidation of the Opposition, without even recoiling before the party and the working class, brings to the attention of the Congress: (1) in the old prisons which served under czarism for the imprisonment of revolutionists, the Bolshevik-Leninists are now languishing. At the beginning, they chose as their point of control for the isolation of the Leninist wing of the party the central prison of Tobolsk, but when it overflowed, they added to the system of isolating the Bolsheviks the prison of Upper-Urals which was far from adapted to receiving political prisoners. At present, the Oppositionists in prison are divided in the prisons of every corner of the U. S. S. R. In the single solitary prison of Upper-Urals, there are more than 150 men. Many Bolsheviks do their common law term in the Cheliabinsk prison where formerly only the escaped and second offense prisoners had to serve. At the Tomsk station, in the solitaries of Viatka, of Siuszal and Sverdlovsk, they are also Bolshevik-Leninists. For some time now, finally, Oppositionists have been sent into the central prison of Alexandrovsk, into the Ural solitary, that is, into the prisons that served exclusively for criminals and in which there is no political régime. The terms of imprisonment of all the comrades are arbitrarily fixed, the rule being three years, but in certain isolated cases it ranges from five to six years. In the political solitaries the old prison régime prevails which gives the prison administration the monopoly of a limitless autocracy. Cases are known where complaints addressed to the Central Control Commission and to the collegium of the G. P. U. were withheld and not remitted to the addressee, or they were returned with the address of the C. C. C. erased (Urals). Very often the prisons are submitted to the gauntlet (Upper-Urals, Sverdlovsk, etc.), to icy douches (Upper-Urals), to the threat of being shot, which fortunately was not carried out thanks to the revolutionary consciousness of the Red soldiers (Tobolsk). They had medical assistance refused to the badly ill (Tomsk, Uralsk, etc.), suffered imprisonment under conditions which condemned them to physical extermination (for example, at Upper-Uralsk, where the prisoner does not have a space equal to that of a tomb), continual raids applied to the Mensheviks, the Social Revolutionists, the White Guards, until the arrival of our comrades in solitary (Suzdal).

At the time of the Sixteenth Congress,

dozens of old Bolsheviks lead the terrible life of prisoners, condemning their health, undermined by the illegal work before the revolution and by the civil war, to certain ruin. In the Tomsk prison, subjected to conditions of fatal isolation, lives comrade Sosnovsky, suffering from diabetes at an acute stage. Previously, he was submitted to detention at Cheliabinsk where he was imprisoned for the second time (the first time on the eve of the imperialist war). Comrade Sosnovsky has not the possibility of feeding himself normally (prohibited by the prison administration), and has fallen into the hands of incorrigible gendarmes, void of all feeling of incorrigible gendarmes, the working class. These are Rotchin, chief of the secret section of the G. P. U. at Tomsk and under detention now far more is Greenstein, an old Bolshevik, former member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist party, seriously ill, crushed under the blows of the penitentiary administration. At Viatka, is Kavtaradze. At Suzdal, M. Smirnov, who has already gone through three solitaries and two places of deportation since 1929. B. Elzin, Sapronov and many others are isolated in such a manner that it is not even known in what prison holes they may be.

PHYSICAL DESTRUCTION OF LEFT OPPOSITION

(2) From deportation and imprisonment in solitaries, which have not produced the effect hoped for, the apparatus has passed to more criminal means of repression. For a long time now, a group of Oppositionists lives on the Solovskiy Island in a concentration camp. In flagrant contradiction to the decree of the U. S. S. R. in 1926, interdicting the dispatch of political prisoners to Solovskiy, the G. P. U., even at the end of 1927, incarcerated the Oppositionist Piterski there. In the protest addressed in the name of the colony of deported Oppositionists at Tomsk, the following facts are to be found: "At Solovky, a few dozens of our comrades are imprisoned. One of them commenced a prolonged hunger strike in order to demand that the political régime be applied to him. He was thrown into the hole. When he left it, he tried to send a protest to the center, in which he revealed the arbitrary and monstrous régime in solitary. This protest was intercepted. Some time later, this comrade was conducted much further and he has not returned. The official version of the Solovky administration was the following: "Killed in an attempt at flight." The acts of physical destruction of the Bolshevik-Leninists are carefully hidden by the G. P. U.; nevertheless, the Opposition has succeeded, back in the spring of 1928, in revealing the circumstances that provoked the death of comrade Butov, who died after a prolonged hunger strike. The death of Butov was a heroic protest against the provocation framed by the G. P. U. with the object of calumniating the Opposition. In November 1928, comrade Haenrichsen, worker in the "Red Triangle" factory, was cruelly beaten to death. The medical certificate notes wounds on the body and the appearance of strangulation.

The Case of Weisman and Bureaucratism

(Continued from page 2)

in the party—a régime which is the inevitable accompaniment of an untenable policy that only a bureaucratic apparatus can enforce because it would not be tolerated under conditions of workers' democracy.

The Weismans make their way to the top because they have one qualification: unquestioning obedience to the higher authorities and readiness to jam any decision down the throats of the workers concerned. They adopt a new decision for "self-criticism" and against "bureaucratism" every six months—cynically and without giving it a second thought, because they know it is only for the record. The workers never consulted by the Stalinist apparatus about the "leaders" that are handed down to them in a new edition every other week. They are told to accept and keep their mouths shut. They are not allowed a single word about this whole procedure, not to speak of having any control over their officials. And the Weismans know that they are under no control from below. It is precisely this condition—the essence of bureaucratism—which gives the Weismans the opportunity to conduct themselves as they do. And there will be no Weismans only when the workers destroy the roots from which these foul blossoms of Stalinism flourish and poison the atmosphere of the movement.

And is all well now that he is shifted out as the convenient goat for the system of bureaucratism? Not at all, not at all. There is no essential difference between the removed Weismans and the remaining

In January 1930, the collegium of the G. P. U., based itself upon treacherous information of the renegade Karl Radek, condemned to capital punishment comrade Blumkin, member of the C. P. S. U. to his last day. Under conditions that have remained obscure, the collegium of the G. P. U. sentenced to death comrades Rabinovitch and Silov, members of the C. P. S. U., who were accused at their trial of belonging to the Opposition. At the same time, the old Bolshevik, Yosselevitch was condemned to capital punishment, commuted to ten years of rigorous isolation—solely for the crime of having remained loyal to the Opposition after his return from deportation.

THE DESPERATE METHODS OF CENTRISM

(3) The Oppositionists who are deported are constantly exposed to various repressions. The political isolation, the physical and material privation, that is the fate of many hundreds of comrades deported beyond the Urals, thousands of miles from the industrial centers. The insignificant aid, frequently given belatedly, the lack of work, almost dooms the families of the deportees to starvation (Naryn, the region of Priangarsk, Karapalpakia, many regions of Kazakhstan, the region of the North the territory of Komy, etc. Very few of the comrades live under conditions of material security, above all in the cities. The deported Bolshevik-Leninists, deprived of all rights, even of the right to defend themselves against the arbitrary actions of the local chieftains, have actually been outlawed. Under one pretext or another, the most absurd and severe persecutions are undertaken against them, they are prohibited from using the libraries, the lecture halls, the movies (Kansk), they are evicted from their homes (Hodjent), the gauntlet is practiced against them with the aid of the militia (Yalutarovsk, Yeneseisk), their food allotments are diminished (Naryn, region of the North, etc.) The term of deportation as a rule is not limited for anybody and it happens after a year and a half or two years that a new three years are added on the simple excuse of having corresponded with deported comrades. But the most atrocious persecutions strike those who are to continue in the deportation the struggle against the bureaucracy, the local Soviet organizations and the party. For having revealed the "rotteness" in the G. P. U. of Cheboksarsk (Chuvachia), the colony of the Bolshevik-Leninists was submitted to a pogrom. A group of comrades who discovered a nest of former White guards of Koltchak in the district G. P. U. and the local sections of the party (city of Kamen, Siberia) were transferred to Naryn.

Their declarations and protests, addressed to the Central Committee and the C. C. C. remained without a response. The postal isolation deprives the deportees of political relations, even of correspondence with relatives is not assured of an exception. For a good remuneration, the G. P. U. floods the deportees with paid agents who, under the mask of Oppositionists, provoke "amalgams" (Baruaul, Ichim).

Krambergs and Obermeiers. They remain, but the workers do not. The movement pays heavily for the Weismans and those who make them what they are: the upper layer of apparatus men. The Food Workers Industrial Union, with blunder after blunder to its record, blunders conceived by the Fosters and faithfully executed by the Weismans, has lost heavily in membership. The workers most frequently reply to bureaucratism with a hopeless passivity. Many have returned to the A. F. of L. Others, reacting from Fosterman bureaucratism and mechanical control, are seeking refuge in the I. W. W. which, significantly enough is now making a measure of headway among the cafeteria workers, the former stronghold of the Left wing. The Weismans of the second class and the Weismans of the first class cannot carry on with impunity to the movement. Whatever Midas touched turned to gold under his fingers, whatever is touched by these bureaucrats, trained in incompetence and irresponsibility, crumbles into dust.

The F. W. I. U., which has been in a constant crisis since its inception, must be put under the control of the revolutionary militants, those fighters in the ranks which it still has in goodly number, who can guide its destinies intelligently and successfully. The other method, the method of the Weismans and Obermeiers and Jim Jones, has been given more trials than it ever deserved. It has yielded eloquent results. Weisman's case has but served to illuminate them in a harsher brilliance.

The mass repression undertaken in the deportation on the eve of the Sixteenth Congress has as its object the achievement of the extermination of the Leninist cadres of the party. In recent weeks, the best comrades who resisted capitulation, were snatched out of deportation. At Archangel, Alma-Ata, Krasnoyarsk, Milousinsk, Tomsk, Sarakul, Slavgorod, Ufa, Hodjent, Kansk, even on the Angar, hundreds of miles from a railroad, there have been repeated the comedies of raids in which accusatory material was assembled like personal letters, extracts from Soviet papers and from the works of Lenin and Plechanov, books published by the Soviets, etc. The repression still continues today, embracing an ever wider circle of victims. It seems that a new crime is being prepared for the Sixteenth Congress; a "spicy dish" in the words of Lenin, directed solely at masking and justifying all the sordid affairs carried on by the Stalinist leadership against its own party, in order to slander once more the Opposition, to lead the party and the working class into error. Provocation serves as a mask for a shameful repression; slander encourages the criminal method of struggle. With this object, the apparatus blackmailed the party on the eve of the Fifteenth Congress with the aid of the "Wrangel officer", allegedly connected with the Opposition. But it turned out that he was an agent sent in by the G. P. U. (see the stenographic record of the Plenum of the Central Committee of October 1927). With this object, criminal and charlatanist, Yaroslavsky, on the eve of the Sixteenth Congress, attributes to the Opposition the intention of "putting itself at the head of peasant uprisings" and to the Bolshevik-Leninists who are arrested in the deportation, the false accusation is presented of creating anti-Soviet organizations on the U. S. S. R. scale. We warn the Sixteenth Congress that the Stalinist faction, in the struggle against the Opposition, is employing an ever increasing system of repression. In the face of the class enemies, under the conditions of a heavy economic crisis and of the enormous efforts of the proletariat, the apparatus has employed the state's resources for the aims of the factional struggle; in fighting against the Opposition, the apparatus distracts the attention of the G. P. U. from the real enemies of the revolution. By its intolerance for conscious revolutionary thought, the apparatus is destroying the cadres of the party. In associating itself thoroughly with the general proposals of the Opposition, expounded in the document signed by comrades Rakovsky, Muralov, Kasparova and Kossior (removal of paragraph 58, return of L. D. Trotsky from exile, the readmission into the party of all the Oppositionist Bolshevik-Leninists, etc.), the Kansk colony poses before the Congress the following demands:

THE DEMANDS OF THE OPPOSITION

(a) the congress should elect an investigation committee on all the activity of the C. C. C. and the G. P. U. against the Bolshevik-Leninists, especially on the activity of the "secret council", to demand of the C. C. C. and the G. P. U. all material concerning the repression; to name an investigation committee on all the activity of the C. C. C. and the G. P. U. towards the Bolshevik-Leninists to ask for the material the C. C. C. and the G. P. U. have concerning the repression—to demand of the commission to inquire into the conditions of exile and imprisonment of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

(2) to determine the personal culpability of all those who bear a responsibility in the assassination of comrades Butov, Haenrichsen, Blumkin, Rabinovitch, Silov, and the excesses of Solovskiy; to turn over the guilty to party and state justice.

(3) as an immediate measure, to free all the Oppositionists from common law prisons and the Solovskiy correction prison; until a final clarification, to cease all deportation into the concentration camps, to transform to normal conditions the deportation and imprisonment. To free completely the sick comrades and give them the possibility of curing themselves immediately.

(4) to prohibit categorically the G. P. U. from interfering in the internal party struggles, and to suppress the system according to which the members of the Political Bureau are subjected to police surveillance.

(5) to publish the complete results of this inquiry to prohibit secret sentences and the secret destruction of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

(Signed): The Kansk Group: Arvanovsky, Bardanal, Zagovskiy, Zaichuk, Kuzmainskaia, Micho'lov, Romasko, Razovonos, Svitskiy, Sovkin, Fortuskin, Smith.

Organization Notes

KANSAS CITY, MO.

Our small branch in Kansas City has stepped into the lead. Its pledge of \$20.00 monthly for the sustaining fund to secure the regular appearance of the *Militant* and to help build up the Left Opposition is being met on the dot. Not content with this accomplishment these comrades decided to sponsor the publication of the coming pamphlet "Communism and Syndicalism" and already forwarded \$30.00 for this purpose.

Comrade Buchler reports that the members are very actively disposing of our excellent propaganda literature and reaching many workers. The branch has sent in its order for our unemployment leaflet.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Our branch here has engaged most actively in an election campaign in the sixth ward, Minneapolis. Upon the failure of the official party to file a candidate, our comrade John Brinda was entered to utilize the opportunity for Communist propaganda. Our branch held meetings and issued a leaflet containing our unemployment demands and clearly emphasizing the proletarian revolution as the only solution.

Our Minneapolis branch members have been very active for years within the trade union movement in building up Communist influence. Recently they have become the live forces within the city-wide trade union committee of organization and education. This committee has carried on quite a broad campaign for unemployment relief. Our members have made it a special point, and with some success, to push it forward closer toward a realistic and correct program of unemployment demands. The conference called by this committee on Jan. 18 to adopt an unemployment program had an attendance of 175 trade union delegates.

Our Minneapolis branch is now distributing 5,000 of our unemployment leaflets.

TORONTO, CANADA

From across the border we have also received the kind of support which actually makes the publication of more Communist literature possible. Our Toronto branch decided to sponsor a new pamphlet and forwarded a check for \$32.00 for this purpose. They tell us if it is not sufficient they will send more.

During the last provincial elections the official Canadian party failed to really increase its vote despite the economic crisis. It naturally reflects a failure of growth, due mainly to mistaken policies. Our branch did its part by issuing a leaflet of Communist propaganda. It was given good distribution.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Our branch here, after being strengthened by the return to the city of a couple of active comrades, is now functioning well. The members are availing themselves of the opportunity to speak at a working class forum in the city, with good effect. They have started out on real literature distribution ordering our unemployment leaflet and a good supply of pamphlets. Needless to say they are also beginning to make prompt returns for material received.

OUR SUBSCRIPTION CAMPAIGN

Although it is as yet a little early to report concrete results we already have nevertheless news from various points of first steps being taken to increase the *Militant* circulation. The national office has proposed to the branches to organize competing teams to gather new subscriptions, new contacts and also paid renewals. For the three months period up to March First, the special trial sub. offer for three months at 25c holds good. Also for each regularly paid yearly sub. of \$2.00 we offer during this period in addition, and for the same price, the choice of either of the following pamphlets: "Criticism of the Draft Program of the Communist International", or "The Strategy of the World Revolution", both by Trotsky, or "Since Lenin Died" (paper bound) by Eastman.

The best individual sub. getters will return prizes, upon return of sufficient number of our subs., of either the book "My Life" by Trotsky, or "The Real Situation in Russia".

CHICAGO, ILL.

Following right upon the heels of the increasing unemployment situation our branch in Chicago has suffered further depletion of its ranks by several of its active members leaving the city. But efforts are being made to regain what is thus lost by building up new contacts. The branch contemplates several public meetings during the month of March more effectively to bring the Left Opposition viewpoint forward.

Our New Propaganda Literature

In addition to the books and pamphlets already on hand we can now announce ready

for shipment one new pamphlet "World Unemployment and the Five Year Plan" by L. D. Trotsky with an introduction by Arne Swabeck. It sells at 10c, bundle lots 7c. Our unemployment leaflet is off the press and the branches are already being supplied. Those who have not yet placed their orders should hurry before the supply is exhausted.

We have also just received from comrade Trotsky a new manuscript for a pamphlet entitled "The Revolt in Spain". Within about 10 days it will be out in pamphlet form selling at 10c. Our pamphlets on "The Communists and the Trade Unions" by Trotsky, with an introduction by James

Resolution on Program of Expanded Activities for 1931

After a thorough consideration of the situation in the League, the resources and most pressing tasks—to which two meetings of the committee have been devoted in addition to a number of sub-committee meetings—the National Committee makes the following decisions:

The present resources of the organization, even without any substantial gains in membership in the next future, make possible and realizable a program of organizational expansion of our work during the coming year. With the full cooperation of the membership the National Committee will undertake to execute the following plan in progressive stages:

1. To prepare the Second National Conference of the League early in the summer.
2. To organize a publishing company which will insure the regular and systematic publication of Marxist classics at prices which will put them within the reach of workers.
3. To return the *Militant* to weekly publication on a sound basis.

P. Cannon will be ready for shipment shortly thereafter.

Another big step ahead in organizational expansion is contemplated and, the first splendid response is already beginning to become a reality. It can be epitomized in the slogan "A Marxist Library at a price workers can afford". Its realization step by step will mean simultaneous strengthening of our movement. The actual steps to be taken are clearly explained in the National Committee resolution appearing below and really needs no further comment.

Suffice only to add that in presenting this resolution before our New York branch the response immediately turned it into a live reality. \$450.00 became the actual starting point. The branch further pledged itself to raise a total of \$1,000.00. With such splendid response duplicated by other sections of the country the contemplated steps will follow in rapid succession.

4. To begin the publication of a theoretical magazine.

5. To strengthen the staff of the National organization by making further additions to the office and editorial forces and by providing for a field organizer.

6. To organize at least two national lecture tours.

7. To publish the International Bulletin in English regularly.

The financial phase of the program centers around the decision to provide the means for extended publication of literature. It is to be done on such a basis that it will create new sources for the sale of literature as well as the distribution of it through the channels of the League.

The amount necessary to be raised is \$2,000. The financial phase of the whole program outlined above will be concentrated in the campaign to raise the fund for the establishment of extended publishing activities. The profits from this in addition to our regular revenues will release the necessary funds for the financing of the other

features of the general program.

The funds are to be raised in two ways:

1. Flat contributions of substantial amounts from comrades or sympathizers in a position to make them.

2. Soliciting regular ten dollar contributions for which receipts will entitle holders to a discount of one-third on all publications of the publishing company. In view of the fact that this is one major financial campaign of the year on which the whole program depends every member of the organization will be expected to make at least one such contribution.

Smaller contributions and payments on the pledge fund will not be applied to the publishing fund. The pledge fund and the other regular financial revenues of the organization must be continued as before separately. The publishing fund is an EXTRA campaign to make possible the program of expansion. It requires a little extra effort and sacrifice from the membership, and in view of the real forward steps in all fields it will make possible, we believe the comrades will all respond to it with enthusiasm.

The whole program will be developed and realized in sections. As soon as the first five hundred dollars is raised for the project the publishing activity will be immediately increased. When the first thousand dollars is realized in the campaign the *Militant* will return to weekly publication. When we reach the fifteen hundred mark the National Conference will be held. With the raising of the last five hundred the theoretical magazine will be launched and the further strengthening of the staff will take place.

Adopted by the National Committee
Communist League of America

If the number on your wrapper is

63

then your subscription to the *Militant* has expired. Renew immediately.

The Legend of the Public Works Panacea

No sooner are all the indications of the crisis so visible that none but the completely blind can fail to admit their existence, than assurances begin to flow from all official sources that an increase in public works construction will be initiated and the crisis, ipso facto, done away with. Almost every day we are given to understand that so many and so many millions of dollars have been appropriated by this or that legislature for public works and the alleviation of unemployment.

Let us, however, pry from the mass of trash with which we are fed daily, the information as to whether there has been an increase in expenditures for public works construction or not.

The matter of public works is important as a branch of the building trades and a substantial increase in the former would to a certain extent aid in the rehabilitation of that industry. The total of public works construction (including roads) averaged, for the years 1925-1930, about 40 percent of all construction, according to a report of the *Engineering News Record* (January 1, 1931). Its importance should therefore not be minimized. It is of course foolish to believe that increased government expenditures can eliminate unemployment, but at the same time it is also foolish to ignore an item that composes 40 percent of the building trade totals.

No Gains Asked

Now we begin to ask: Was there in 1930, and will there be in 1931, a substantial gain in public works construction, as the government executives would have us believe? The answer is, No—emphatically no. The increase, wherever there has been an increase, is negligible when compared to the totals expended and when adjusted for long time trends, we can say definitely that rather than an increase in most public construction programs there has been a decided drop.

From articles appearing in the *Engineering News Record* (January 1-2, 1931) we learn that if we are to take 1928 as 100, the index for total public works expenditures would be as follows:

	1928	1929	1930	Average 1925-30
	100	95	97.8	89

What do the above figures show? That while the general trend from 1925 through 1928 was on the decrease, since then the total volume has gone down. During the year when most noise was made about increased public works expenditures (1930) the actual volume was only 3 percent higher than in 1929 and was 2.2 percent lower than in 1928.

The above relates to total expenditures. It would be interesting to examine the figures for what is considered in an editorial of the *Record* as "the largest factor in

public works extension, road building". It is here that it is possible to obtain concrete figures both nationally and for the separate states. At the beginning of each year the estimate for the coming year is released by the state highway departments. In regard to this, one must remember that road construction, as is also true of large buildings, does not begin immediately upon somebody's desire to start. Never does less than six months, and usually over a year, elapse from the time the designs begin until the actual construction is started. Work to be done in 1931 is thus already planned in 1930. Only as much as has been designed will be constructed, and not more. It is with this in mind that we can understand the 1931 estimate.

Little Change Recorded over 1930

Quoting from the *Contractors and Engineers Monthly* (January 1931), we read: "Twenty-four states are increasing their 1931 expenditures (over 1930) seventeen are spending less, and seven remain the same." The total estimated expenditure for the 48 states by the state highway departments (including federal aid), compared to the 1930 figure, is as follows:

1930	1931
\$935,000,000	\$937,000,000

This shows the negligible increase of two million in a total of a billion dollars. Combining the figures from the "Statistical Abstract of the United States" (Department of Commerce) with the above, in order to obtain an idea of the long-term trend, we find the percentage increase over the previous year to be the following:

1927 (over 1926) ..	12 percent
1928	18
1930	6
1931	0.2

For the year 1931, the year of preparation for which was 1930, we find an increase of only 0.2 percent. And this, mind you, was the year in which most of the bunk was spread concerning increased road expenditures.

As far as New York state is concerned, there is to be an actual decrease in road construction for 1931 as against 1930. According to figures issued by the Commissioner of Highways Brandt, we find the total for the years 1930 and 1931 as follows:

1930	1931
\$60,000,000	\$55,000,000

There is to be a drop of five million dollars in total expended. At the same time that Governor Roosevelt was giving newspaper interviews assuring the unemployed of increased public construction, the Commissioner of Highways, S. W. Brandt sent out a letter to all adult engineers (October 28, 1930) in which he says:

Brandt Offers Little Hope

"Without question, the legislature and

the governor will be interested this winter in doing everything possible to relieve unemployment. One of the best means at the disposal of the state government is the construction of highways. I have received most of the reports on the progress of plans for 1931 construction and reconstruction and they indicate that while our plan work is going along about as usual for ordinary conditions, they are not going along fast enough to permit this department to take a leading part in the relief of unemployment."

This was written by the man directly in charge of highway construction throughout the entire state. Yet the papers continue to publish article after article relating the "special road building campaigns".

Figures for federal government expenditures tell exactly the same tale. Quoting from the *Engineering News Record* (January 22, 1931): "This week's estimate of total public works construction in 1929-31 includes federal government figures totalling as follows:

1929	\$342,370,000
1930	285,068,000
1931	346,974,000

plus \$150,000,000 of the emergency fund.

The *Record* considers the "emergency construction fund" item in the 1931 figures for the federal government. In actually analyzing this \$150,000,000 we find that, first, it is not \$150,000,000 but only \$116,000,000 (the former was asked for by Hoover, the latter was appropriated). Secondly, only about \$15,000,000 is really being used for federal government purposes, the rest being advanced to the various states as loans for highway construction. The "increase" in road building has already been discussed. So that we find that while there has been an increase over 1930, compared to 1929 however the increase is trifling. One could continue in this way state by state and department by department. The increase in expenditure is nowhere to be found. Increased expenditures mean increased tax rate and the latter is avoided like the plague.

The Communists must reveal these fraudulent construction campaigns of the politicians. The workers derive no return and cannot be fed by assurances of employment even if these promises emanate from "high authorities". The crisis continues to stare them in the face. Only by united action on the part of the workers and workless can the present miserable conditions be ameliorated and eventually done away with. Together with the capitalist system must go its glib politicians, its unemployment and its wholesale misery. The workers must strive towards this aim.

—H. S.