THE MILITANT

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

VOL. IV, No. 5 (Whole No. 64) NEW YORK, MARCH 1, 1931 PRICE 5 CENTS

BLUMKIN...

One Year after his Murder

A year ago Stalin had our comrade Blumkin shot. It is our duty to refresh the memory of the revolutionary workers on this Stalinist crime against the Left wing of the Bolshevik party. The assassination of Blumkin was one of the most cowardly, most perfidious betrayals on the part of Stalin against the entire Leninist party and against the working class that is sincerely attached to the work of the October revolution.

Ever since we received news of the crime, we have not ceased to demand of Stalin and of the party bureaucrats the reasons for which they have destroyed one of the most valiant militants of the revolution. Neither Stalin nor his subordinates of the American party have been able to give us an explanation to justify this assassination. More than that, they have not had the courage to admit openly, before the whole working class, their responsibility for this action.

We pause particularly on this fact because it describes especially well the anti-communist and anti-Soviet character of the Stalinist repression against the Bolshevik-Leninists.

Physical repression against the enemies of the Soviets has been and remains the indisputable right of the proletarian dictatorship. This right was loudly proclaimed by the Bolsheviks without any of that hypocricy which generally accompanies capitalist repression in the so-called "democratic" countries. During the most tragic moments of the revolution, the Soviets and the party, led by Lenin and Trotsky, did not hesitate to severely punish the enemies of the revolution and to take upon themselves full responsibility for their actions. Let us not forget that the trial of the Social Revolutionists, the most ferocious enemies of the revolution, took place before the eyes of the working class of the entire world and under the immediate control of the Russian Communist Party. The dictatorship of the proletariat only profited all the more by this openness. The confidence of the working class in the institutions of the proletarian dictatorship was increased.

The correct policy of the Bolshevik party, its internal regime based on workers' democracy, the devotion and the sacrifices of its militants, the absolute confidence in its leaders were sufficient security for the proletariat against the abuse of the power of repression and a guarantee that the sword of the revolution would be used only against the enemies of the workers' state.

Since the reign of the bureaucratic regime of the Stalinist apparatus, things have changed radically. In the hands of the irresponsible bureaucrats, the weapon of repression against the bourgeoisie and its defenders has become an arm of persecution against the ideas of the Bolsheviks.

To the G. P. U., which had as its purpose the repression of the class enemy, Stalin has added another function; that of suppressing inside the working class and its party all that struggle against the bureaucratic degeneration of the proletaian dictatorship.

The working class does not and will not accept this repression, dictated by the interests of social classes hostile to the proletarian power. The laboring masses do not approve of the terrorist methods which Stalin employs against the proletarian revolutionaries. That is why Stalin has hidden from the working class his crime of February 1930, perpetrated on the person of Blumkin.

The Left Opposition will denounce everywhere the Stalinist repression and the centrist policy in the name of which this repression is carried on. The names of Blumkin, Zinzadze, Siloff, Rabinovitch and the numerous other victims of the bureaucracy will remain alive in the memory of the revolutionary workers.

Φ

"COMMUNISTS AND PROGRESSIVES"

This subject, which has become especially important with the recent development of the C. P. L. A., will be discussed at the lecture by James P. Cannon, on Saturday evening, 8 p m., March 7, 1931, at the Labor Temple, 14th St., and 2nd Avenue. Auspices: New York Branch Communist League of America (Opposition).

Lawrence on Strike!

Textile Workers Rebel Against Wage-Cut and Speed Up System

Definite signs of active workers' resistance to the capitalist offensive are here. In Lawrence, Mass. a total of 10,000 textile workers have struck the American Woolen Co.'s mills against an increased speed up system and a wage cut. These strikers immediately began militant mass picketing. It has thus become one of the early small beginnings of a rising labor movement.

On Feb. 16th, 1931, the strike began with only 33 workers coming out of the Washington Mills combing dept. against the instituted new schedules. It became spontaneous. By Feb. 21st it increased to 8,000. Despite the fact that only fragmentary union organization exists the strike continued to grow to embrace 10,000 workers.

The new schedules provided for increased speed-up. It instituted wage cuts in the form of abolition of all overtime pay and abolition of extra pay for night shifts. It provided for placing of efficiency experts throughout the mills to increase the labor intensity.

The strike involved mainly the three mills of the American Wool Co. The Washington, Wood and Ayer Mills. The Workers demanded time and a half for overtime, double time for holidays, withdrawal of efficiency experts, no discrimination and recognition of the Mill committees to settle special grievances.

The employers fear of these signs of actual resistance became immediately expressed in the brutal efforts of the police to break up picketing. The Company offered to restore the old schedules if the workers would return. Furthermore, as usually happens in such cases the "better citizens" rallied to the company offering their services through an established citizens committee.

The small section of the National Textile Workers Union existing in Lawrence, took a militant lead in this strike. This the employers feared and they refused to deal with these workers' representatives. They called the officials of th N T. W. "outsiders". However, that is always so in a strike; workers representatives are castigated as "outsiders".

On Feb. 26th, the employers succeeded in getting the strikers to take a vote on returning to work granting the concession that there would be no efficiency experts, that the old schedule in force prior to Feb. 16 will be put back into operation and that a committee of mill workers will be met to consider any disputes in the future. They refused to grant time and a half for overtime. Following immediately upon the voting the police-force raided the N. T. W. union headquarters, arresting 11 workers. Of those arrested the following 5—Edith Berkman, Pat Devine, William Murdock, John C. Czarencki and Alex Danilevich are held under bail aggregiating $100,000. Of the 10,000 strikers only about 2,000 participated in the voting, the result of which is announced as 1,651 in favor of returning to work and 453 against. On the face of it this does not look like an expression of the workers' sentiments.

While this strike is entirely of a spontaneous and isolated local character its significance lies in it being a beginning of a new basic tendency. A tendency towards working class resistance. It did not have any previous preparation enabling it to spread on a large scale.

In this fact the present C. P. leadership has a serious responsibility. For a long time it has not only criminally neglected to build a union in the textile industry but has by its narrow factional attitude towards the working class movement removed one after another of officials elected by the union, finally substituting for elections the method of appointing. It permitted a splendid movement in the textile industry of the South to completely collapse. The net result is a union, in an industry holding great promises, reduced to almost nothing.

In view of these beginning signs of working class resistance our slogan against rationalization and speed up assumes real importance. But above all in general agitation the slogan of the six-hour day without reductions in pay should be put forward, as a propaganda slogan. It can become the unifying slogan of working class struggle. It is the main slogan of the rising labor movement. —A. S.

Two Philly Oppositionists Held for Sedition

Two of our comrades, members of the Philadelphia branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) have been arrested on charges of sedition and are being held under $1,000 bail for distributing leaflets in front of a "shelter for homeless men" and for calling on the employed and unemployed workers to demonstrate on International Unemployment Day at the mass meeting of the unemployed on City Hall Plaza.

Comrades Goodman and Morgenstern were distributing our unemployment leaflet. The passage in the leaflet (the Open Letter to the Central Committee of the party) for which they were indicted and which the District Attorney termed seditous, reads as follows:

"There can be no solution to the unemployment problem under capitalism. The solution can be found only in the Socialist revolution and, finally, on a world scale."

For calling upon the workers to fight against unemployment and for the six hour day, against capitalist rationalization and for unemployment insurance paid by the bosses and their government, for long term credits to the Soviet Union (where unemployment does not exist) in order to gain employment for more American workers and at the same time to help put through the Five Year Plan and lastly, for pointing out to the workers that unemployment can be abolished only by the world revolution, our two comrades have been snatched up by capitalist class justice. Together with scores and hundreds of other courageous working class militants they are threatened with imprisonment and with isolation from their class brothers in struggle.

Under the outrageous Flynn Sedition Law of the state of Pennsylvania the Communist fighters Peltz, Holmes, Resetar, Muselin and Zima have already been incarcerated, while Bill Lawrence, Tess Ryder and Anna Lynn are awaiting sentence and Leon Goodman and Berman Morgenstern are up for trial. The ravages of capitalist justice must not be allowed to go on unhampered. The entire revolutionary working class of America must be aroused to action in defense of their valiant pioneers.

Comrades Goodman and Morgenstern, as well as the other arrested Communists need the help of the united forces of the whole communist and Left wing movement in this country, in the fight for their freedom. Thus far, they have been furnished only with an attorney by the Civil Liberties Union. The local organization of the I. L. D. has been appealed to for help, and we are awaiting their response.

On Sunday, March 1, an Anti-Sedition Conference has been called by the I. L. D. in Philadelphia, to organize the struggle against the Flynn Sedition Law as part of the struggle against capitalist class justice all over the country. This Anti-Sedition Conference must be made into a real, united front conference in defense of **all** class war prisoners, into a real fighting weapon of the working class.

In these times of deep capitalist crisis and growing workers' unrest, the savage onslaught of the bosses and their government against the liberties and rights of the workers, as well as against their living standards, can be repulsed only by the combined efforts of the entire working class, by the fighting unity of its revolutionary vanguard. Only a broad united front of struggle, composed of all elements fighting capitalist justice on a revolutionary class basis can save Goodman and Morgenstern, Peltz, Holmes, Lawrence, Ryder and Lynn and the others from the fangs of the bosses and their government —C

Stalin Acts

We extract the following from a letter of the Russian comrades:

. . . "mass arrests have been performed in December. The reprisals have been reenforced especially after the wave of protests evoked by the death of Kote Zinzadze. For communication with the exterior (receipt or report of short news from or to friends) there are arrests or indictments for "communication with the foreign counter-revolution". Apart from this, the material conditions of the deportees are growing worse and worse and they are all completely deprived of work. The deportation camps are more isolated than ever. Not only are no letters received from other deportees, but the mails do not even deliver letters from relatives. **For several months there has been no news of Rakovsky.**

During the month of December a whole series of deportation colonies has been arrested. According to the incomplete information received from Central Asia the following comrades have been arrested: Akirtava, Bogrotov, Japp, M. Joffee, (the wife of the late A. A. Joffee), Kinkadze, Okudjava, Pekler, Proletarsky, Zivzivadze and others.

To these new Stalinist reprisals, the deported and imprisoned Bolshevik-Leninists have replied unanimously: "No reprisals can suppress us. We remain firm and courageous."

Moscow, January 23, 1931.

Alarming news has reached us about Victor Serge (a Franco-Russian oppositionist and the French translator of the works of Lenin). Already imprisoned as an oppositionist in 1928, Victor Serge has been removed from all work and exposed together with his family to dire destitution. Tomorrow, no doubt there will be imposed deportation upon him also.

The repression against communists has nothing in common with the defense of the revolution. It tends to amputate the arm of the class: the party. It falsifies the whole concept of proletarian repression and delivers material into the hands of the enemies of the revolution.

The party must react and cry out aloud:

Put a stop to this shameful repression against communists!

Fire Destroys Trotsky Home

Capitalist press dispatches from Constantinople inform us that a fire which swept the house in which comrade Leon Trotsky and his family were living on the island of Prinkipo in the Sea of Marmora, compelled the inhabitants to flee at dawn and take refuge in a nearby hotel. Comrade Trotsky and his wife, comrade Natalia Ivanovna, have both been ill, with the former confined to bed. The united front of Stalin and the bourgeois governments of Europe has hitherto prevented Trotsky from obtaining the urgently needed medical aid. The fire, whose origin is not yet known, destroyed a number of valuable historical documents, including many manuscripts which had not yet been published anywhere. The extent of the destruction done by the fire—as to that we are not yet able to say. We are awaiting further and more reliable news.

EDITORIAL NOTES

HOW THE MINERS WERE DEFEATED

The article of Gerry Allard in the last number of the **Militant** paints a picture of catastrophe in the Illinois mine fields, the old-time seat of labor militancy and the stronghold of Communism. His remarks on the situation have a value, but that value, unfortunately, is a purely negative one. They are an excellent example of how not to solve the problems of Communism. For that reason, and that only, they deserved publication in our paper.

The Left wing for years was a power in Southern Illinois, based on mass support of the militant miners. The "Save the Union" movement under Left wing leadership challenged all the fakers for supremacy. The coal towns and camps were dotted with thriving locals of the Communist party—the surest sign of a conscious movement. But as has been told before, and as comrade Allard's article points out again, this whole movement has slipped away. The mighty revolt of the miners has been broken for the time being. The rebels have ben corralled again by the labor fakers with the help of Howat and other so-called progressives.

And with it there is "the complete collapse of the Party apparatus" and "the non-functioning of a single local union [of the Left wing miners' union]". In the recent elections the party candidate for senator "polled only 24 votes" in Franklin County where we once had "over 400 party members"! So says comrade Allard, and he ought to know because he is on the spot. He cites these facts as "a clear cut example of weakness." Weakness indeed! Better to say an example of catastrophic defeat. And better yet to ask what are the real causes of it. Instead of that comrade Allard muddles the issue further by argnments over secondary questions.

For the results in the Illinois mine fields there is a chain of causes, one linked to another. Fishwick and Farrington, the direct agents of the mine owners, were sufficiently discredited. They could not recapture the revolting miners by themselves. For this they needed Howat and other pseudo-radicals. This explains the necessary prominence, as decorations, of these elements in the Fishwick union.

But Howat and the other "progressives" in turn could not harness the miners again to the chariot of the mine bosses, driven by Fishwick and Farrington, by their own efforts alone. In order to accomplish this they needed the disruption of the workers' vanguard—the party. The policy of Foster accomplished this for them from within. The policy concocted to fit the exigencies of the spurious "third period", was criminally false. The course of expelling and blackguarding the most reliable Communist militants was absolutely reactionary. By these means Stalinism disorganized the vanguard and prepared the way for the betrayal of the "progressives" and the victory of the reactionaries and the bosses. Foster helped Howat no less than Howat helped Fishwick and the mine owners.

The Communist miners will not be able to take a single step forward out of this blind alley of defeat until they understand its whole chain of causes and their connection with each other. Comrade Allard bears a direct responsibility for the present sad state of affairs. At a critical moment of the fight he deserted the banner of the Opposition and capitulated to the Centrist bureaucrats who were organizing the defeat of the vanguard from within. It is quite necessary to expose the rôle of Howat. The function of "progressivism" as a come-on for reaction is graphically illustrated by the Illinois experience. Even the Opposition, which suffered very little from illusions on this score, can learn something from this example. But we cannot allow a discussion of this factor in the defeat to cover up an even more decisive one—the disarming of the workers' vanguard by the bureaucrats of Centrism.

An emphasis on this side of the question is doubly necessary when comrade Allard is speaking. This is the first and most important lesson of the Illinois defeat. When comrade Allard begins to explain this to the miners we can begin to have some confidence that he will be able to serve the interests of the party and the working class again and to make good some of the great harm he has done. As long as he avoids this question he puts a chasm between himself and the principled policy of the Opposition. We are not in the least interested in self-humiliating "confessions" according to the Stalin ritual. We only want the questions put straight and the lessons clearly drawn.

Not the least of the crimes of Lovestone and Foster was their poisoning the movement with diplomacy. This diplomacy, this muddling, hiding, twisting and obscuring the principle questions, is not a proletarian but a bourgeois method. Let us have none of it in the Communist **League.**

MILLER GOES OVER TO MUSTE

When a man bites a dog—that's news, said Dana; and on the same principle that the unusual is always interesting, when a man goes so far to the Right that he gets expelled from the Lovestone faction, the incident deserves a little notice. Such it seems is the fate—or the fortune, if you prefer—of the well-known Bert Miller and a half dozen or so others who have pooled their intellects in order to produce one great thought. The thought is that the way to serve the cause of Communism in America is to join the Muste organization (the C. P. L. A.) without further parley and to accept its platform. So much we learn from the last issue of the **Revolutionary Age** in which Ben Gitlow reads Miller out of Lovestone's organization for the preservation of Leninism as Lenin never knew it.

This matter has been a topic of conversation on Fourteenth Street for quite a while and the facts were well known before the item appeared in the paper. There are people who, on the grounds of fair play, sympathize with Miller and consider his expulsion a frame-up, or at least a miscarriage of justice. Crime, say these exponents of the Rights of Man, is qualitative not quantitative. If a man is not put in jail for stealing a nickel why should he be arrested for taking a dime? If one is not penalized for mistaking Lovestoneism for Communism, he should not be condemned for making the same error in regard to Musteism. It is only, they say on Fourteenth Street, a question of degree.

Miller's mistake however, from the Lovestoneistic standpoint, is a mistake of tactics. He wants to walk directly to the point of objective instead of circling around to it. In this he violates the traditions of the Lovestone faction; and, moreover, he spoils the strategy. The Right wing movement, it is true, is a break with Communism and a new bridge to social democracy. But there are some Communist workers in the Right wing camp—driven there by the crimes and absurdities of the party leadership—who do not know this yet. They have to be prepared and maneuvered step by step. Lovestone understands this and leads his movement accordingly.

Miller, who is different only because he is dumber, doesn't understand it. He wants to go too fast. Therefore he had to be pushed out and the gate was slammed behind him with a loud and virtuous bang. "He is breaking with Communism", cries Gitlow with crocodile tears in his voice. But the case is not really so bad for Miller and he need have no fear of a permanent separation. The whole character of the propaganda and activity of the Right wing is an assurance that they will catch up with and rejoin him after a while.

Miller, the recruit of Musteism, which is nothing but a wing of social democracy, served his novitiate in the war against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism. As the District Organizer in New York, he put his whole little heart into that crusade. He was the organizer of the slugging squads which attacked our comrades on the street and broke up the meetings at the Labor Temple. Now already, and quite logically, he has developed further the implications of that struggle. This is all true to form. The campaign against the Left Opposition was for him, as it has been for many throughout the world, the starting point and the transition stage for a transfer of class allegiance.

The fight against the Left Opposition has been the training school for treason to Communism. Bessedovsky fought Trotskyism valiantly. He was rewarded with Rakovsky's post as ambassador to France, and then he jumped over the fence of the embassy into the arms of the white guards. Agabekov, a tried warrior against Trotskyism, took the place of the murdered Blumkin shortly before he passed over to the camp of the class enemy. The bottoms of many a soldier in the war against the Left Opposition throughout the world are already firmly wedged into the functionary chairs of social democracy.

Tell us, tell us, Communist workers, why do so many Trotsky-killers turn out to be social democrats and white guards?

TRIFLING WITH THE NEGRO QUESTION

In its struggle against the workers' emancipation movement capitalism plays upon all the dark sentiments of ignorance, prejuice and superstition. This is seen daily and hourly in its endeavors to divide the workers and oppressed people along national, radical and religious lines. The very air we breathe is saturated with these prejudices which arise from class society like foul odors from decaying matter. The revolutionary struggle for the solidarity of labor is also a struggle for knowledge and light on these questions.

These problems have a particular importance and acuteness in America where the proletariat, enslaved by bourgeois ideology, is inflamed against the foreigner, the Jew and the Negro. Communism cannot be other than the mortal enemy of these devastating prejudices, and the Communist party is charged with an irreconcilable struggle against them. In no small degree the party of the proletariat is to be judged by the vigor, and also by the wisdom, with which it conducts this struggle. And it is self-evident that the Negro question takes first place within it. Communist ideas, Communist teaching and practise must break down the artificial wall which bourgeois prejudice has reared between the races; the Communists must be the heralds of a genuine solidarity between the exploited workers of the white race and the doubly exploited Negroes.

This is no question to be played with. Its seriousness and its difficulty are enormous. The deep-seated prejudices of the white workers will not be extirpated by force or terror any more than the justified suspicions of the Negroes will be removed by cajolery. In this field education takes the first place—patient, unceasing and systematic explanation combined with a genuine policy of equality in practise. Such a policy must be as free from discrimination on the one hand as it is free from flattery and demagogy on the other. Only along this path will real progress be recorded.

During their career as leaders of the party, Lovestone, Minor & Co., did their best to spoil this work, as they did others. For discrimination against the Negroes—the instinctive attitude of all petty-bourgeois elements, but an attitude formally impossible in the name of Communism—they substituted an unscrupulous demagogy, and a policy of flattery, condescension and bribery of Negro intellectuals and careerists on the make. By this they attracted not a few outright scoundrels and adventurers while they repelled the self-reliant type of proletarian militants of the Negro race—the type which is offended, and justly so, no less by discrimination than by its twin, condescension. Thereby they arrested the real work among the Negroes and transformed the whole question into a factional football.

The Foster leaders, who have set for themselves the historic task of matching the Lovestone régime in unworthy demagogy and combining it with a stupidity all their own, are now having their fling at the Negro question—and at the Negro. They seem to labor always under a psychological fixation that their time is short and that what they do must be done quickly. The eradication of racial antagonisms, like the creation of a new trade union movement, is a small task for these high-pressure people; a task to be accomplished between plenums, by command. Prejudice against the Negro, that ugly poison which has been injected into the veins of the white workers, is to be removed at one stroke.

The **Daily Worker** of February 24 features the announcement of this major operation. Comrade Yokinen, a member of the party in Harlem, is accused of manifesting a prejudical attitude toward Negro workers. One might think—if this is really the case and not a frame-up as we knew of in the days of the Loevstone leadership—that the incident could be made the occasion for an education of the party on the concrete case. Education however, particularly on such a question, requires a calm atmosphere; an atmosphere free from demagogy, hypocrisy and incitement; an atmosphere created by teachers of the proletariat, not by terroizers.

But such methods are alien to the blustering vulgarians who feel the need to shout down their own prejudices of yesterday. They are going to summon the offending comrade to a mass trial! "This trial", they announce, "must be packed with Negro and white workers." Workers' organizations are asked to send delegations to the sport. The mass trial, they say further, "will be the forerunner of similar trials all over the country." And all this is to be done "so that the Negro workers will know that the Communist party is in deadly earnest in its fight for the Negro masses." Otherwise they would not know.

Just a moment, gentlemen! Aren't you insulting the intelligence of the Negro masses just a little? Aren't you stultifying the party with this stupid campaign of terror? If you have been educating the party properly how does it happen that race prejudice among party members is manifested "all over the country"? For the Negro masses radical persecution is a bitter actuality that confronts them every moment of their lives. They have learned to recognize all forms of this reactionary poison, including that form of so-called freedom from it which protests too much. Take care, triflers, lest your indecent demagogy becomes a boomerang for the party. Take care lest the Negro masses ask: If your own conscience is clear, why do you shout so loud?

—J. P. C.

/ PARIS / COMMUNE

Hold Open
Saturday, March 21, 1931
FOR THE PARIS COMMUNE CELEBRATION
organized by the
New York Branch, Communist League of America (Opposition)
at the
HUNGARIAN HALL, 323 East 79th Street
A Prominent Band Will Furnish Music
Admission 50c 60c at the Door

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 SYDNICALISM (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.

THE MILITANT, Vol. IV No. 5, Mar. 1, 1931. Published twice monthly by the **Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 E. 10th St., New York N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $250. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon Max Shactman, Maurice Spector Arne Swabeck. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York N. Y. under** the act of March 3, 1870 (Total No. 64).

Recent Lessons in Strike Strategy

Last summer, some very militantly fought strikes took place in the northern industrial section of France. About 150,000, mainly metal and textile workers, struck against the provisions of a check-off from their wages instituted by a new Social Insurance Act. Their demands were for a wage increase commensurate with this check-off.

Of the greatest importance for the strategy of the revolutionary vanguard in such a situation becomes the question: What is the basic tendency of the working class movement? To stop a moment here, one notices immediatelf the upward curve of working class struggle. Beginning with the latter part of 1929 strikes again increased in France, in numbers, in participants, in militancy, as distinct from the preceding years. First they embraced merely the lighter idustries but by July last entered also the heavier metal industry. Even the unemployment crisis had not yet invaded France. Conditions were excellent for an offensive struggle.

Was the Communist party strategy based upon such an upward curve? No, on the contrary. The French party had already early in 1928, following Molotov's "brilliant" example at the Tenth Comintern Plenum, placed France in the front trenches of a decisive revolutionary situation. This, of course, did not correspond with objective reality. The reaction produced drove the party, way back to the rear and it found itself at the tail of events when the workers of the North pressed forward in struggle. History is merciless with those who are at the tail of events. The party failed utterly to prepare for this struggle and even to recognize its actual significance.

Workers Divided in the Strike.

The workers of the industrial north are divided in the two existing unions. The major section belongs to the C. G. T., which is under reactionary leadership. The militant union, the C. G. T. U., counts only a minority within its ranks. The latter, as a matter of fact, has witnessed a period of decline throughout the country during the last few years. From its high point of over 500,000 members it has dropped to about 250,000. The party's keeping this union in mechanical leading strings has by no means been a healthy factor. While in the final analysis the question of mechanical control resolves itself into whether or not correct slogans and correct programs are advanced, this is precisely where the party failure lies. Unquestionably this also had something to do with the direct decline of membership and influence. Meanwhile, the union under reactionary leadership has suffered less decline and has even gained a foothold within the militant union in form of a syndicalist opposition going to the Right.

Upon enforcement of the social insurance check-off last July the workers of the north took the initiative in strike over the head of the bureaucrats of both unions. The latter, as a matter of fact, found themselves compelled to move only after about 50,000 workers were already out. The party, caught unprepared, at first advanced a slogan against the social insurance law. Later it corrected itself to the quite ordinary position of demanding a 10 sous hourly wage increase to meet the insurance tax. The reactionaries of the C. G. T. demanded a 5 sous increase, the amount of the actual tax. With no greater distinction prevailing, the majority support went to the reactionaries' demand as one seemingly easier obtainable. The latter were not slow in taking advantake of this development to complete their rôle of betrayal in finally entirely dropping this demand.

A Caricature of Strike Strategy.

Only a few months prior to this outbreak a conference, initiated by the Profintook place in Strassburg, Germany. The C. G. T. U. had its representatives there. The French party leaders were represented. Its "momentous" results were pretty well reflected in the inglorious record of the party and C. G. T. U. leadership in the strikes in the north. The truth is that the conference failed to discuss even problems approximately strike strategy but merely produced long resolutions on the technique of smaller tactical problems And yet even such small tactical problems, when actually faced in the strike, suffered from bureaucratic abuses by this leadership. Through the **Inprecorr** (Vol. 10, No. 35), we are informed, that the party members carried on endless discussions on the forms of strike committees while the workers forged ahead conducting their own struggle. And in a later issue we are told that when strike committees finally came into being they were not even democratically elected.

Both unions established their strike committees, each trying to lead independently. This simply meant that the strikers remained practically leaderless. The cardinal necessity in such a situation—a correct united front policy, was completely negated. The party and C. G. T. U. leadership rejected it. The capitalist agents of the C. G. T. had, of course, no interest whatever in a united front struggle. Theirs was solely the rôle of betrayal and it was made more easy by the failure of the revolutionary section to apply this correct policy. Through the final defeat ensuing, the syndicalist bloc, those who are turning backward to the Right, have now been strengthened in their advocacy of unity of organization. Such advocacy has, of course, nothing in common with the united front policy. While the former can at the present moment mean only the solidification of the control and influence of the reactionaries, the latter policy, correctly applied, would go a long way toward weakening their hold upon the masses.

Little by little the capitalist agents of the C. G. T. and the Socialist party, reinforced by the police and military suppression, were finally able to divide and defeat this splendid struggle of the workers, driving them back section by section with nothing gained. The many failures of correct policy—yes, of correct strike strategy—helped to turn a potential victory into defeat.

Recent German Experiences

In Germany the most recent lessons become of practically decisive importance because of the extremely acute stage of the class struggle. Only a couple of instances need be cited: the Berlin metal workers strike last September and the Ruhr miners strike in January this year. Both of them in different ways became major events. In both instances, the treacherous crawling of the socialist trade union leaders before their masters broke the workers' ranks. But we must add that the serious mistakes committed by the revolutionary vanguard slashed with the sharpness of a razor edge further into the already deep wounds of the German workers.

Basically we note in Germany a sweeping capitalist offensive to lower further the already miserable standard of the workers. With the long duration of the crisis, capitalism could no longer effectively use the coalition social democratic government to stem the tide of working class unrest. The Bruening government came and carried on openly and boldly the wage cutting formerly more cunningly concealed under the social democrats. We note a rise in revolutionary potentialities and simultaneously a menacing growth of fascism. These basic tendencies were particularly reflected in the latest Reichstag elections on September 14, 1930.

In this situation the metal corporations advanced their demand for a 15 per cent wage cut to take effect September 30. The ingenious invention of the social democrats, the compulsory arbitration machinery, set into motion and ordered an 8 per cent wage cut with 6 per cent for all young workers. 140,000 metal workers struck, however, only to become disintegrated and return about two weeks later on a promise of a new arbitration award. Yet, to capitalist Germany, it became a breath-taking demonstration of working class power. But how did the revolutionary vanguard square with its responsibility?

A Sample of Party Strategy

Unfortunately the party leadership,—the German Stalinist edition—had already gauged the decisive revolutionary situation in Germany long before this. Its noisy proclamations for conquest of the streets only left a gap between itself and the working class. Its shrill exhortations against the "social fascist unions" had practically crippled all revolutionary activities among the organized workers. The consequent firmer control over the unions by the treacherous social democratis officials in a strike situation, as we shall see, also became extended to the organized section.

Among the Berlin metal workers strike about half were unorganized. Nevertheless they followed the lead given by the organized section. The party and Red Trade Union Opposition proceeded, not to endeavor to gain influence over these masses through the unions, but through the establishment of their own strike committes and a small rival union to separate further the Left wing from the masses. It proclaimed the abstract slogan of a political general strike instead of starting direct from the economic issue of wage cut to turn the struggle directly against the system and its political state which were the executors of the wage reduction. It could thus not become the factor unfying the workers in a revolutionary direction. This tactic of openly splitting the workers in struggle before their support had been won for a revolutionary ideology could only repel these workers. The revolutionary object is not to split away from the masses but to split the masses away from the reactionary leaders. Thus when the new arbitration award came, providing for the original wage cut to be applied in installments, the workers found themselves compelled to accept the award.

The strike itself, a powerful incentive to the advancing struggles of the German workers, did not attain that objective. The immediate results were a victory for reaction. In this, the serious mistakes of the revolutionary vanguard played their part.

This general line of policy of the Communist party also led to practical disaster in the Ruhr region when continued there. The mine owners served notice of a wage cut of 12 per cent affecting 300,000 miners, to take effect Jan. 15. The reactionary union officials intimated their willingness to accept a 4 per cent cut, thus greatly incensing the rank and file workers. Naturally here was a great opportunity to win mass sentiment, to lead directly all the miners, both organized and unorganized into struggle against the will of the officials; to win mass influence through correct union and strike tactics. The essential point should have been to agitate and organize broadly for a united resistance at the actual commencement of the wage cut. Instead, the party rushed ahead calling a strike entirely over the head of theunions to commence Jan. 1. About 40,000 miners responded, mostly unorganized, but with real militant spirit. The overwhelming majority, however, including the organized section, assumed a waiting attitude, wanting to see what would happen when the wage cut was to take effect on Jan. 15. This again demonstrated that while the organized section can easily become the rallying point for the unorganized in a struggle, the opposite can rarely be the case even under the best of conditions. The picketing instituted by the strikers against the workers, otherwwise willing to resist the bosses' onslaught but to do it in such a manner as to make the union carry the fight, created a wall of antagonism between these two sections. Simultaneously an immense police terror set in.

The party again here advanced as the main slogan "the political general strike" and made the strike object the building of a new revolutionary union. **Rote Fahne** commented: "The Red Trade Union Opposition is pregnant with new unions" (quite similar to what one has heard from the T. U. U. L.).

On Jan. 4, this strike collapsed completely. It failed to draw in the majority of the workers. It lasted only four days. The defeat immediately instituted more police repression to crush any further possible resistance—primarily, however, in anticipation of the final arbitration award to be made. When this comes the workers will already have suffered their major defeat, its advanced section crushed for the time being and the militants further isolated from the masses.

Needless to say that in the serious situation now prevailing in Germany, particularly with the threat of fascism to crush all working class organization, it becomes obligatory upon the revolutionary vanguard to alter fundamentally its strategical line, and to pursue the tactics which will enable it to play is historic rôle.

—ARNE SWABECK.

Organization Notes

NEW YORK: Our branch, here, is the largest and liveliest branch in the League. The members are taking active part in the workers' mass movements! those who are unemployed participate in the work of the Unemployment Councils, others function in the Trade Union field. Ten thousand unemployment leaflets were distributed by this branch and it disposes of one thousand copies of the **Militant**, regularly every issue. In general literature distribution this Branch is far ahead of any other. Its orders for new pamphlets, when off the Press, usually run 500 copies at a time. This is made possible under the able direction of Harry Milton, the branch literature agent.

The Branch conducts a successful open forum once a week. It conducts at present two study classes with two more being organized.

For our program of expansion the N. Y. Branch is taking the lead. It has pledged itself to raise a total of $1,000.00. The individual membership pledges amount to $450.00 with $122.00 in cash already paid in.

PHILADELPHIA: The branch in Phila. is now taking on new life. Last week-end a visit made by Comrade Swabeck was utilized at a workers' gathering which decided to organize a mid-week open forum to be held every Wednesday. Our comrades have already made themselves the most active force in realizing this plan and have hopes for building up a good forum. Comrade Swabeck also spoke at a meting of the Liberal League Forum on the Present Crisis. There were present about 125 workers including several Party members, some of whom took part in the lively discussion that followed. Our Philadelphia branch members are right on the spot in covering meetings with literature and in distributing our unemployment leaflet.

OUR PROGRAM FOR EXPANSION

Replies to our program of expansion have been received from some of our Branches. New York not merely endorsed the plan enthusiastically but also proceeded immediately with helping to put it into effect. The Minneapolis Branch says: "We endorse the plan unanimously. We'll do our part to put it over big." From Chicago likewise comes the word that all members agree this program of expansion is correct and has real prospects of success. From Toronto, Canada, the secretary tells us that while he has not yet had the opportunity to bring the Program before the Branch, he is sure it will be adopted.

These replies indicate that the membership sees possibilities of real progress under this plan and realizes that its goal can be attained step by step; each new step adding new strength. With the firm conviction that we are now facing a rising labor movement, theoretiial preparation of the revolutionary vanguard becomes a most urgent need. "A Marxist Library for every Militant" will be a beginning. Further training in the school of the Class struggle will add the practical experience. An important part of our expansion program is to furnish "Workers' Books at Workers' prices".

The financial response to the expansion program is already indicated in our organization notes by the pledges made and the actual cash receipts of $122.00 from the N. Y. Branch membership. Henceforth we shall present a graphic description of the financial goal of the campaign and the program made to-date. From issue to issue you will be able to watch the growth of a black heavy line (representing cash turned in) towards the goal).

GET AFTER THOSE SUBS ! !

Our subscription drive is under way. New York leads with three new subs and two renewals. Minneapolis follows with four new subs with the rest scattered among the other branches.

Every new sub. means a step forward on the road to the **weekly Militant.** Every comrade in the League must get busy in the drive.

Make it your standing duty to get a sub. a week for the **Militant** and set your eye on those prizes for the greatest number of subs.

Remember! Every new sub. helps build the Weekly **Militant,** helps to transform the **Militant** into a real mass weapon of Marxism-Leninism! Get to work.

Roll Call on the Program of Expansion

Sylvia Bleeker	$ 20.00
Nathan Berman	40.00
M. Sterling	10.00
W. Von Boerstel	15.00
Herbert Cappelis	10.00
M. Lewitt	10.00
Albert Orland	10.00
Part Payments:	
George Saul	2.00
Annonymous	5.00
Total February 24:	122.00

If the number on your wrapper is

64

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

For the Program of Expansion

By JAMES P. CANNON

Taking everything into consideration, the American section of the Opposition gave a good account of itself in the two years that have gone by since its expulsion from the party. The achievements of those two years—modest as they are when measured in the gigantic scale of the proletarian revolution—will undoubetdly have a place of honor in the history of American Communism. Their significance consists in the fact that they represent a beginning. And beginnings always have an historic importance. Our militant fight during these two years has signified the appearance of a counter-current against the stream of retrogression in the Communist movement of America; a small one, but a real one.

Those who have contributed in any way to this historic work may well take pride in it. But the satisfaction which we justly feel with the accomplishments of the first two years does not give us the right to view them as a completed task. Their importance, as has been said before, is the importance of a beginning. Their real vindication will come only if we remember that, if we build on them and multiply them in the coming months.

The pioneer work has accumulated for the Opposition some resources in the form of supporters, sympathizers and experiences. This capital, as it may be called, justifies a program of expansion for the coming year. We have grounds to plan for a leap forward in 1931; and if we work wisely and harmoniously the plan will surely be realized in life. Such is the considered opinion of the National Committee, as expressed in the resolution adopted at a recent meeting and published in the **Militant** for February 15th.

THE TWO THOUSAND DOLLAR FUND

On the one side the resolution asks for a special fund of two thousand dollars, of which the New York branch has already pledged to raise one-half. On the other side, with this special fund, the National Committe will undertake to guarantee the holding of our national conference; to establish a publishing concern which will expand and systematize our publishing activities; to return the **Militant** to weekly publication; to found a theoretical magazine; to strengthen the staff of the national organization and provide for a field organizer; to organize at least two national lecture tours; and to bring out the International Bulletin in English regularly. These are all tasks which cannot be postponed.

To many people this argument may appear, at first glance, as an impossible bargain. But it isn't so, as we will prove when the fund is provided. Every item on the side charged to the responsibility of the National Committee will be made good. The items in the program do not stand separately. They dovetail into each other, and the realization of one will help the realization of the others.

No one should dismiss this resolution lightly as a mere gesture made in a fit of temporary enthusiasm. We have never been inclined to leap over the barriers of circumstance and to promise the unattainable; and the experience of the Opposition struggle have not been calculated to nurture such a tendency. The difficulties of the fight and the hard blows we took have beaten a sterner realism into our heads. The resolution of the National Committee is not a mere paper resolution. It is a realistic plan of action which can be fulfilled in every point. And, unless we sadly miscalculate the actual possibilities and the spirit of our movement, it will be realized without imposing an undue strain on the members and sympathizers of the Communist League.

For some months now it has been evident that the Communist League has been turning the corner and overcoming the slump which took place in our activity after the first big push. For a time we suffered from a certain stagnation which was not without internal difficulties and symptoms of crisis in the organization. The weight of objective circumstances pressed down upon us and our movement seemed to progress at a snail's pace. In such conditions frictions are always accentuated, and difficulties assume abnormal proportions. Isolation puts endurance to the test. Only those groups which have a firm base in principle, which are bound together by uniform conceptions can hold out against it.

It is thanks to the vitality of our principles in the first place, and to the habit of collective work which we brought with us from the struggles of the past, that we were able to emerge from this stagnant interlude without fatal convulsions and splits. Other sections of the International Left Opposition have not been so fortunate, as we know, and for reasons inherent in the concrete conditions which surrounded them. Nor are we insured against such convulsions for the future. But with all that, it is quite manifest that the elements of cohesion are uppermost now in our organization; that we are definitely on the upward grade. Our last Plenum marked the beginning of this turn. The period which has intervened since that time has registered some advances, and most of all it has prepared the ground for others.

THE PROGRESS IN NEW YORK

The strengthening of the forces engaged in the national direction of the League, and the improvement of its functioning generally, has already shown positive results. As was to be expected, the New York branch, which works in the most intimate contact with the National Committee, reflects the improved situation first. The activities of the New York Branch have been multiplied at least four-fold in the past six months, and its Communist character has been strengthened on all sides. If the fact that Weisbord's pitiful maneuvers could cause a flurry in the Branch was evidence of a remnant of its earlier weakness, the vigorous and emphatic manner in which it repulsed them when the issue became fairly joined was a sign of its progress towards political stability.

The branch consists in large part of comrades who are new in the movement. They have to assimilate the A B C's of Communism at the same time that they wage a fight over the complicated problems involved in the work of the Opposition. This presents difficulties, but they are not insurmountable. Ignorance is fatal only for those who are unwilling to learn. One of the first things revolutionaries must learn, if they do not want to disgrace the name, is that speculation over the great tasks of the future is not sufficient. It is necessary to understand the task of the moment, the accomplishment of which will lead us a step nearer to the bigger ones of tomorrow, and to attack it resolutely. Not to pass a resolution on it and then forget it; but to pass a resolution, and mean it, and do it. In this respect we have already seen a great progress in the New York branch in the past six months. And this record gives us the confidence that the promise of the branch to raise one half of the two thousand dollar fund needed for the program of expansion will be fulfilled to the letter.

From the National Committee and the New York branch the spirit of accomplishment will spread to the other branches. The organization nationally will soon begin to gird itself for another advance. Everything argues for this confidence. The part assigned to the various branches to make this advance possible is simple, and comparatively easy. The theory that the members of the Communist League have been overloaded with responsibilities and duties is absurd. Up to now only a handful have really exerted themselves in a manner worthy of Bolshevik-Leninists, and nobody has been hurt. The program outlined in the resolution of the National Committee only calls on the membership to move one step faster. The real march is still to come.

THE SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Second National Conference, already definitely scheduled for the summer, will meet—if we are not greatly mistaken—under the sign of a tightening up of the organization all along the line. "Platonic" members who have fallen into the habit of wearing the proud badge of the Opposition without doing anything to deserve it will be called to order. The Conference should tell everybody that enrollment in the Opposition means not a release from party obligations but the assumption of double ones. The Opposition has assumed a great historic task which cannot be trifled with. What we want and what we must have is a body of militants for whom the revolution is the most serious concern in life; for whom the demands of the movement stand first and above everything.

The Communist League is not yet such an organization, and it cannot become such over night. It will be the task of the Conference to say resolutely that we are going to move in that direction. The program of expansion adopted by the National Committee calls for the first step only. But it is the next step, and therefore the most important at the moment. Let us concentrate on this campaign and finish it before the Conference! Bigger things will follow.

What the London «Worker» Won't Print

(The following letters were written by a prominent member of the British Communist Party to the editor of the **Daily Worker** of London. That the letters did not succeed in passing through the Stalinist censorship does not affect their validity in the least; on the contrary, it indicates the bureaucratic fear of criticism which fills the British representatives of Stalinism, when confronted by the first voices of discussion emanating from Left Oppositionists in England, who are beginning to advance in the necessary strength and clarity required for the constitution of a firm core of British Marxism which has been made a mockery of by the Murphys, Pollitts, Bells and the other "leaders" who, under instructions from the international Stalinist apparatus, have reduced the promising Communist Party of England to a shadow. The letters of comrade Davis follow.—Ed.)

The Editor, **Daily Worker**

Dear Comrade:

I ask you to publish the following:

In the central organ of the party, the **Daily Worker** of today's date, appears a short résumé of comrade Pollitt's activity.

The article purported to show that comrade Pollitt could maintain his claim to be the only workers' candidate in the Whitechapel by-election—which of course he is.

But, how did the party organ try to demonstrate to the workers that Pollitt was really a revolutionary worker?

By pointing to his trade union activity and NOT ONCE mentioning his rôle as a leader of the Communist Party!

This is an ultra-Right line. A hiding from the workers that leadership of the Communist party constitutes the **highest claim** to be representative of the workers. The article is an open denial of the leading rôle of the party.

Fraternally yours,

David Davis

Just in this period, when the working class is in a trough of depression, just when the working class is going through a period of bitter disappointment and realizing the treachery of the trade unions and the Labour party, just at the very crucial moment when the workers need the tonic effect of a call to vigorous action against the bourgeoisie, Pollitt comes forward with his reformistic program!

Pollitt is deliberately leading the party into "tail-endism". He has sunk into the mood of the masses and is dragging the party with him. Hence his sneers: "In the past, we have thought it treachery if we ever put forward demands that did not go the whole hog and include everything under the sun, culminating with frantic calls for a revolutionary workers' government."

If comrade Pollitt ever "frantically called for a revolutionary workers' government" we can be sure that it was only when he was so instructed. We have not forgotten the "frantic" calls for street activities on August the First! What is the basis for this sudden about-turn? Distrust of the workers! The Pollitts argue: "The workers did not respond to our 'frantic' calls in August, therefore they want a reformist Charter and we, the leaders of the working class, must give it to them."

The Left trade union reformists of the Pollitt class do not learn from the history of the working class (though of course they are very susceptible to changes taking place in the policy of the International, being ready to jump this way and that at the slightest hint from above!).

It is only in periods of ascendancy, or, just after such periods, when the masses are flushed with successes and the repression is only just beginning, that the workers spontaneously make strong economic demands. But after a long series of defeats, with capitalism, also in a period of deep depression, the working class needs and responds to calls which may be termed "frantic" by the Pollitts but which give expression to the class hatred of the masses for the bourgeoisie. This does not mean Stalinist adventurism and ultra-Left zig-zags, but steady propaganda in the factories and among the unemployed. Propaganda which lays bare and exposes the cause of the workers' oppression, which sharpens the class hatred of the workers and at the same time gives assurance of ultimate victory.

The propaganda of international solidarity and final aims among the masses, the encouragement of discussion in the party of fundamental problems around present affairs in the International. These are the tonic needed.

This has nothing in common with August the First adventurism! To take part in the daily struggle of the workers means a daily struggle against pessimism, but this has nothing in common with the reformist Charter of Pollitt which springs from the womb of pessimism.

P. S. It might be remarked that after the August First adventure followed the "Charter" of pure reforms, **unlinked with any political issue.** Then, after this article was written, the British C. P. issued, a few weeks ago, a manifesto which ended in a call for a Soviet Britain! Slaps from the Left, slaps from the Right. Zig-zag!

On the «Sectarians»...

"As a result of the situation (in the French trade union movement) a strong movement for trade unity has developed in the ranks of labor. Recently this movement reached organizational expression. A committee has been established, made up of representatives of Left wing elements in the reformist C. G. T. and of opposition elements in the revolutionary C. G. T U. (revolutionary syndicalists, supporters of the Workers and Peasants Party, etc.), for the purpose of developing the movement to amalgate the two trade union centers and establish one trade union federation in France. This movement has already made considerable headway. It is significant that this movement has met with the determined resistance of the 'Unitary Opposition' in the C. G. T. U. which is the shadow of the French Trotskyites. These people always prate of 'united front' and of 'unity' but when it comes to concrete questions they take a position absolutely indistinguishable from the official R I. L. U.—**Revolutionary Age**, 12-20-1930.

"The **Revolutionary Age** of December 20, 1930, reported on the appeal recently issued by a group of members of the C. G. T. (reformist trade union federation), of the C. G. T. U. (Red trade union federation), and of autonomous union organizations for trade union unity, the formation of one united trade union federation in France. Whatever may be the errors contained in this appeal (a syndicalist non-political orientation), the course towards trade union unity is certainly correct and corresponds to the interests of the French working class. The old leadership of the Trotskyist group 'hesitated' a little on this question and seemed about to give way in the direction of trade union unity. But Trotsky discovered this deviation from Trotskyism in time!"—**Revolutionary Age**, 2-14-1931.

So much for Lovestone, who so frequently over-reaches himself in his anxiety to find allies for "mass work", for "unity", —and for the liquidation of Communism. We learn from him that the new movement for surrender to French reformism is following a course which is "certainly correct"—despite a trifling error or so—while the infernal Trotskyists who always "prate of unity" are the only fly in the sweet ointment of unity. Now let us hear from Herr Brandler, Lovestone's German colleague, who, if he is not less anxious to liquidate Communism in the interests of reformism, is at least a good deal more cautious than Lovestone, especially since he has more than half an eye cocked towards a possible reconciliation with the Stalinist apparatus. In the German Right wing organ, we read the following about this same French movement which inspired Lovestone to such praise:

"If the theoretical basis of the trade union unity agitation of the 22, as they are generally called, is thus thoroughly false and indistinct, then its action in the present situation leads to nothing less than a **capitulation before the reformism** of the majority of the C. G. T. leadership and to the enlistment in the anti-Bolshevist front of imperialism together with the whole Second International. The struggle is only one-sidedly conducted against the leadership of the Communist Party of France and the C. G. T. U., but in no case against reformism in the C. G. T. . . It is not only the wrong manner of intervention of the present Comintern and R. I. L. U. leadership in the affairs of the organizations, that is attacked, but in reality the conceptions of Communism. . . . The French working class must have its attention called to the fact that the road of Monatte and his comrades leads o reformism, to anti-Bolshevism and by that to the struggle **against** the proletarian revolution in France and other countries." **Gegen den Strom**, 2-14-31.

The contributor to **Gegen den Strom** has his own reasons for taking the position he does. For the moment it does not concern us here, except to remark that the German Right wing's observations on the French situation reek with hypocrisy, when one considers its fervid flirtations with the French P. O. P., which is such a staunch supporter of the "new movement" towards reformism. What does concern us here is the characteristic attitude of Lovestone, which is in no essential different from that of the Right wing slides back another pace from Communism towards reformism, it covers up this retreat to the social democracy by a barrage of criticism of . . . the Trotskyist sectarians. In truth, it is now axiomatic that whenever you read an attack upon the Left Opposition's "sectarianism" in the Right wing press, you may be certain that the Right wing is seeking to conceal a new step in the liquidation of Communism.—S.

The Right Wing Liquidators and the S. P. «Militants»

By MAX SHACHTMAN

(Concluded from Last Issue)

The "Militant" group in the Socialist party, led by Stanley, Coleman, Porter and Bright, is not the first of its kind to appear in that organization. Since the conclusion of the war, three distinctly Left wing groups have arisen in the S. P. Each succeeding one was progressively weaker than its precedessor—weaker in numbers and weaker in principle. The first Left wing produced the Communist party (or rather, parties) of America. It stood for the Communist International, for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the Soviet system—for the revolutionary principles of Marxism not only in Russia but also in the United States. Its shortcoming and weaknesses are not the subject of the present article; it is enough to say that they were of a fundamentally different character from those that marked the subsequent Left wings in the S. P.

The second Left wing (Engdahl, Olgin, Kruse, Salutsky, Trachtenberg) was a pitiful caricature of the first: it was timid, cowardly, more afraid of joining the Communist International than it was of living under the same roof with the reactionary high-priests of the S. P. Nevertheless, driven by the still existing revolutionary sentiment in the party, it issued public pronouncements of a far different nature than those of the Stanley group. It did not attempt, as do Stanley and his fellow exporters of radicalism at low prices, to defend the Mensheviks, S. R.'s and their "democratic rights" under the proletarian dictatorship. It demanded that the S. P. affiliate (even though with reservations) to the Communist International, an idea as remote from the minds of Stanley and Co. as the planet Neptune is from Mercury. It made public a summary denunciation of the Second International, as well as of the tendencies towards a two-and-a-half International—a radicalism towards which the "Militant" leaders do not even lay claim. In a word, it was so far in advance, from a revolutionary standpoint, of the present "Militant" group that a comparison in any sense favorable to the latter is entirely out of the question.

LOVESTONE AND THE STANLEY GROUP

Now let us interrupt ourselves before reading how the Communists in those days evaluated the Engdahl-Trachtenberg-Olgin-Kruse group, so that we may first see how Lovestone and Gitlow estimate the Left reformist wing in the S. P. today: "The resolution introduced by the Stanley group was thoroughly pro-Soviet **not merely in revolutionary** class content." (Herberg, **Rev. Age**, No. 7, emphasis in original). "It is a resolution which, basing itself on the proletarian character of the Soviet state, **very closely approximates a Communist position." (Rev. Age,** No. 6, our emphasis). **"The differences between the 'Militants' and the Oneals, Hillquits, Lees and Thomases are differences of principle of such a character that they cannot be reconciled within the realms of one party."** (Gitlow, **Rev. Age,** No. 9, emphasis in original).

The "Militants'" position on the Russian revolution — certainly an unerring touchstone for a revolutionist—is thus not only pro-Soviet in its "revolutionary class content" but is very close to the Communist position—at least according to Lovestone. Surely, very little could be added to so flattering a recommendation for a group which not only does not deserve it but ungratefully refuses to accept it.

Let us compare these letters of credit to the manner in which the Communist International evaluated the Engdahl group in 1920 — the Comintern of Lenin's days in which Lovestone so fervidly avows faith. In an open letter to the American Socialist Party after the latter's national convention in May 1920, when the Engdahl minority resolution on affiliation with the "Third" was accepted by the membership, the Communist International wrote:

"The convention was dominated by Centrist and reactionary elements—by the yellow 'reformist politicians' Hillquit, Lee, Stedman, Oneal, Block, Panken; by the 'one hundred percent Americans', Meyer London, Solomon; by the 'State Socialist' and inverted social patriot, Victor Berger; by Cannon [Joseph D. and not James P.] and Soltis, Karlin and Berlin—all of whom have no place in a party affiliated to the Communist International. There was a 'Left wing'—Engdahl, Kruse, Tucker, Holland, etc.—which demanded affiliation to the Communist International and a revolutionary restatement of Party principles; but this group was a pitiful minority, its ideas were confused, permeated by cowardly compromise and petty bourgeois prejudices. In all the convention not one Communist voice was heard."

This is what the Communists said to the vacillating Left Centrists of the Engdahl type, to people who were even then infinitely closer to Communism than nine-tenths of the leaders of the Stanley group, in all probability, ever will be.

But the Stanley group is nevertheless "pro-Soviet", argue the liquidators of the Right wing. Yes, but essentially in the same way that Oswald Garrison Villard or any other advanced liberal is "pro-Soviet". The inexpensive observations in the Stanley resolution on the Five Year Plan being "consistent with socialist philosophy", do not change this fact. The "difference" between Stanley and Hillquit on what the former calls "the extermination of minority [i. e., Menshevik] opinion" is largely the difference between a diplomatic six of one and a brazen half dozen of another.

It is precisely on this point that the cloven hoof of the reformist becomes obvious to anybody but a Lovestone or Herberg—who do not want to look: what irks Stanley is the suppression of "democratic rights" in Russia, that is the suppression of bourgeois democracy. We Marxists are divided by an insurmountable wall from the reformists in the working class, by a class **distinction:** we stand for proletarian democracy, the others stand for democracy "in general", that is, for bourgeois democracy. Whether it is Mr. Lee who frankly "condemns the denial of elementary civil rights" in the Soviet Union", or Mr. Stanley who more plaintively "looks forward to the removal of two obstacles . . . the cessation of the extermination of minority [what minority?] opinion", does not weigh very much either way with us. The Left Opposition is fighting for the rights of the revolutionary proletarian core of the Party and the Soviet Union, but it is bored to death by the interminable repetition of the old Menshevik chorus of praise for the "democratic rights" of the Russian bourgeoisie.

"FRONTIER GUARDS FOR THE SOVIET UNION

But, the **Revolutionary Age** persists in its fervid defense of this newly-found potential ally, the "Militant group" is for the socialist accomplishments of the Soviet Union, and unlike Hillquit, is ready to defend Russia from intervention so that socialism may be built in one country. Only the latter-day apostles of the Right wing can conceive of this as "very closely approximating a Communist position". This song too is an old one, and it does not wear well on the ear. In 1920, Hillquit's S. P., as much and even more under the pressure of the workers as the Stanley group of leaders, adopted a resolution which said: "'Moscow' is doing something which is really challenging world imperialism. 'Moscow' is threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world simply because it is proletarian. Under these circumstances, whatever we may have to say to Moscow afterwards, it is the duty of Socialists to stand by it now." etc. etc.

Stalin at that time was not yet the "best disciple of Lenin", and there had not yet been evolved the theory that Russia could build a socialist society alone provided that military intervention is warded off. The Comintern therefore replied to Messrs. Hillquit, Oneal, Engdahl and Olgin, in the letter mentioned above: "This resolution evidently is based on a misconception of the rôle of the Communist International. **The Communist International is in no sense a defensive organization.** It is an organ of aggression, the general staff of the world revolution." That Stanley has now approached closer to the Stalinist theory of national socialism, and the conception of the international working class movement as frontier guards for the Soviet Union, does not thereby signify that he was approached closer to Communism.

But the workers, the workers, the workers in the ranks! cry the Right wing politicians. It is hard to refrain from laughing to see all the big and little Lovestones, who yesterday could not see the workers at all because their eyes were hypnotically fixed upon the leaders, Chiang Kai-Shek and Purcell and Raditch and LaFollette—display such maternal anxiety about the workers in the ranks. But their new position is hardly an improvement upon the old.

There **are** workers in the ranks of the "Militant" group, and undoubtedly good ones, workers who are striving to adopt a militant policy of class struggle, who are fed up with the disgraceful course of Hillquit and Oneal. That is precisely why the Communists must not adopt the simple-minded policy of the Stalinist theorists, who lump leaders and masses into a single "social-fascist" pot, but must approach the workers who are sincerely willing to fight the capitalist class in such a way as to win them for Communism—which means to win them from their present leadership of Leonard Bright, McAllister Coleman and Louis Stanley. For us, this is the A B C of revolutionary politics. And just because these spurious "Left" leaders, these saviors of reformism, are compelled to garb themselves in second hand radical left-overs in order to accomplish their reformist aims with greater facility—just because of that the Communists must patiently and intelligently make their real rôle clear to the workers who follow them.

Shouting at them will not succeed in detaching their followers for the Communist movement. What is needed instead is such a policy as presses Messrs. Stanley and Co. to the wall on every concrete issue of the working class struggle and enables the workers under them to see in their own experiences to what extent the radical phrases of their leaders match their deeds What is needed, in a word, is the policy of the united front, which was and remains a revolutionary weapon for the mobilization of broad masses of workers in struggles against their class enemy on the basis of concrete issues, struggles in which they will clearly perceive whether it is the Communists or the reformists who represent the today and the tomorrow of the proletariat.

We would not waste two inches of space on the "Militant" group were it not for the fact that it is at one and the same time the channel through which working class discontent with reformism is being confusedly expressed and the channel through which its leaders seek to divert it harmlessly. Precisely because of the workers in it, is it incumbent upon the Communists to tear the rags and tatters of cheap radicalism off the leaders of the group and reveal them as reformists. To do anything but that is tantamount to keeping the workers fettered in the chains of reformism, only one of whose links is in the hands of the Stanleys, for the whole chain is pulled by Hillquit and Lee. And this is just what the Lovestone faction is doing, despite all its declamations about the "workers in the ranks."

THE MECHANICS OF LIQUIDATIONISM

In not a single one of its "analyses" of the "Militant" group have the Lovestone leaders made any distinction between the ranks and their spokesmen. But worse than that has been the outrageously exaggerated idealization of the "Militants" and their policy. Lovestone and Co. are looking for recruits and allies. They cannot find any substantial prospects in the Communist party. Since the Right wing is the bridge to the social democracy, the Lovestoneites look to the S. P. for succor. On the way from Communism to reformism they first encounter the Left reformists of the Muste school on the "trade union" field and the Stanley school on the "political" field.

But the mechanics of this voyage back to the socialist camp are such that Lovestone is compelled to sail there under the Communist flag. The color in the banner has faded considerably in recent times, but the working class crew of the Right wing ship, which is not yet aware of the port charted by its captains, still insists upon flying the flag of Communism. Miller and Benjamin and others did not understand these mechanics, or else they were too impatient to reach the comfort of port; these renegades from Communism changed ships in mid-sea and are sailing home to where they always belonged under the reformist flag of Muste, comforted by the thought that they will meet again their more cautious shipmates of yesterday.

But Lovestone, who wants to arrive on his own ship, continues to sail under a false flag, or rather, one to which he is false. And like other captains before him, he must constantly assure the crew that the promised land is not only in the offing but that it is filled with fabulous wealth, like the riches of the Indies with which Columbus fascinated his men. The social democracy is Lovestone's logical objective after departing from Communism. The miserably poor ideological baggage of the Stanleys and Brights and Mustes is a poor inducement for such a voyage, and the Right wing leaders are simply drawing upon their imagination to ascribe to the former a revolutionary richness which they do not and cannot possess.

Up to now, Gitlow and Herberg have been hardest at work in shaping up the "Militants" as attractively as possible. What else is the meaning of the alleged "revolutionary class content" of Stanley's resolution, of its "close approximation" of the Communist position and of other non-existing virtues which they have attributed to this reformist rgoup? What does it mean when the **Revolutionary Age** gently chides the "Militants" for not demanding the organization of socialist fractions in the trade unions? What is the meaning of Gitlow's indignation at Norman Thomas because he "advocates the liquidation of the Socialist party into a petty bourgeois third party" (as for ourselves, we are quite willing for Norman Thomas to liquidate the Socialist party, but not for Stanley to rehabilitate it)? It means that Gitlow is idealizing the "Left" wing reformists, that the charm with which he invests them is spun entirely out of the thin web of his imagination.

The gifted sculptor of Greek mythology, Pygmalion, spent arduous years in carving out a marble incarnation of his impassioned imagination. It was so beautiful when the artist rested, that he fell in love with the image. So ardent was his love and so intense his desire for the marble to come to life that, with the aid of the gods, we presume, the cold stone was transformed into the living flesh and blood of Galatea, with whom he thereupon lived very happily. In any case, that is the story. But Gitlow is no Pygmalion. Neither his ardor nor his artistic skill in molding Stanley in the image of his desires, neither his imagination nor yet the gods, will succeed in converting the stony figure of Left reformism into a revolutionary Galatea.

No, that is hardly the transformation which the new edition of the saviors of reformism will undergo. They will change and develop, but not in this manner. They have a significant rôle to play yet in the working-class movement of the country, for they are a product of a new situation which will not disappear over night. But that question deserves special consideration.

N. Y. OPEN FORUM

March 7: COMMUNISTS AND PROGRESSIVES
By James P. Cannon

March 14: THE PARIS COMMUNE: 60 YEARS AFTER
By Max Shachtman

March 21: (No Lecture: Entertainment)

March 28: THE SLOGAN OF THE SIX-HOUR DAY
By Arne Swabeck

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).

Chicago Open Forum

MARCH 1: "Trotsky-Stalin and the Theory of Socialism in one Country"
By HUGO OEHLER

MARCH 8: "Trotsky, the Left Opposition and the Five Year Plan
By J. MAKELIE

MARCH 15: "Unemployment, the Six Hour Day and the Communist Party"
JOHN EDWARDS

MARCH 22: "The Three Currents of the Communist Movement and Revolutionary Perspective
By HUGO OEHLER

EVERY SUNDAY 2:30 P. M. at

30 N. Wells St., Chicago

N. Y. DRESSMAKERS' STRIKE

Pressure of space and other unavoidable difficulties have compelled us to omit from this issue a report on the situation with regard to the dressmakers' strike called in New York by the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union. In the next issue, however, we shall print a thorough report on the latest developments and an evaluation of the whole course of the strike. The question of the future of the Left wing union will also be discussed in the **Militant.**

The International Conference of the Rights

BY KURT LANDAN

In the middle of December, representatives of the German, Swedish, Czecho-Slovakian, Alsatian and probably several other Right wing opposition groups met in a conference held at Berlin, in order to create an "International Communist Opposition".

The "managers" of this "International" called by Brandler, whose theoretical pillars are M. N. Roy and A. Thalheimer, seemed at first ill at case. Instead of making known the fundamental lines of their program, **International News** (No. 9, 1930), the international information bulletin of the Rights publishes an article of embarrassed defense to prove that the "International" of the Rights is a unity that has grown up organically and "that it does not at all signify, as Trotsky and the Trotskyites contend, reciprocal tolerance of opportunist horse deals."

And Thalheimer—the style as well as the content betray the pen of the master—after using the example of the "Brunn opposition" in attempting to prove that the organic unity of the international Right soon rid itself painlessly of opportunist deviations, observes with great satisfaction: "What put the Trotsky Opposition on its feet is a caricature of the methods of the C. I. leadership, pushed to their extreme: it is the replacement of the C. I. Executive by a **counter Executive** limiting itself to the person of Trotsky and functioning in the manner of a sect leadership." This justifies the existence of the new "International".

Is There An International Right Opposition?

Thalheimer answers in the affirmative. He attempts to prove that the national Right wing groups have a common estimation of the situation, of the methods and obectives of struggle. Unfortunately, he forgets to say on this occasion that besides this general agreement, there exist nevertheless "little differences". Thus, the American Rights think that the resolutions of the 6th World Congress of the C. I. are correct, but "merely" wrongly applied: while for the European Rights the decline of the C. I. begins with the Sixth Congress itself. As you see, the beauty of the Right "International" has its little defects.

Other matters deserve a certain amount of our attention. While in **Germany** a violent struggle is being carried on against the so-called "legend of the October of 1923"; while Brandler, Thalheimer, Frölich and Walcher constantly seek to prove that the revolution was impossible in 1923 and that the Brandler C. E. C. saved the German party precisely by not attempting that which was objectively impossible, the theoretical brain of the Right "International", M. N. Roy is of an entirely different opinion when he writes:

"If a wrong leadership was the cause of the defeat, then the German comrades cannot **alone be held responsible**" (**Gegen den Strom**, No. 50, 1929. Emphasis mine—K. L.)

Of course, the Right wingers of all countries have numerous common traits. In France, these respectable gentlemen the municipal councillors of the Workers' and Peasants' Party reject the policy of Cachin, Semard and Monmousseau. The same holds true in Alsace. This rejection of the policies of the C. I. is common to all Right wingers. Only in the reasons which they give is there a slight distinction. Brandler, for example, rejects Thälmann for his nationalist deviations, while Mourer and Hueber condemn Doriot and Baron for putting obstacles in the way of "the defense of the fatherland and the rights of the Alsatian people". This much can be recognized: the organic agreements consist of a common rejection of the policies of the C. I. and not in common conceptions of a Communist policy that can be counterposed to that of Centrism.

But it is not in the questions of which they **speak** but in those that they **keep silent** on, that the nationally limited spirit of the Right wingers expresses itself most strongly. This is especially valid insofar as the fundamental problems of the Russian revolution, in the post-Leninist period are concerned. The reasons why **we** take a stand toward these questions with an ever greater emphasis and why we see in the problems of the proletarian dictatorship in the U. S. S. R. the **fundamental problems of the Communist movement** in general are the same as those which led Marx to attach so great an importance to the Paris Commune, and to draw from the experiences the necessary conclusions for the strategy of the proletarian revolution.

A Communist group, which of its own volition refuses to broach the problems of the Russian revolution, and which restricts itself to declaring "that the other sections of the International do not want to interfere within the internal and external activities of the Russian C. P. because they are not sufficiently competent to do so" (Roy), raises in this manner its spirit of national limitedness to the degree of a principle.

This national limitedness naturally leads to a degeneration of the Right wing cadres which have not broken subjectively with Communism. This holds true especially for the working class cadres of the German Rights, which have been raised in the spirit of an "autonomous" German Communism. In contradistinction to the French Rights, the Brandlerites do not reject the fundamental theoretical principles of Marxism-Leninism. However, they too lead, by their latest course of development, to an unbridgable contradiction on the subject of these principles. The point of departure of this inevitable development is their "dualism", the division of the world and the C. I. according to the following point of view: the Soviet Union can build up socialism without being affected by international capitalism. And that is not meant only objectively, but by the course pursued at present, for "the same people who are responsible for the introduction of so many false conceptions in the C. I. follow in Russian affairs a line that is, as a whole, correct" (Roy). This division of the C. I. into a Russian wing that is conducted correctly and an international wing that is conducted wrongly, is not accidental, but is the expression of the theory of socialism in one country extended to its extreme by Thalheimer. While Lenin taught that the Soviet Union cannot detach itself from the entity of the world market that it is, in a certain sense bound to it and that for example, the relation between the domestic prices and the world market is of primary importance for the decisive struggle between the two absolutely hostile social systems—socialism and capitalism—Thalheimer teaches us that there is "no sense" in speaking of the interdependence (Thalheimer says: unity) between the development of the Soviet Union and that of the capitalist world. Since such a dependence does not exist according to Thalheimer and Roy, objectively there does not exist, according to Thalheimer, any connection between the Russian and the C.I. policies of the Stalinist régime.

But since the facts of the crisis in the Russian C. P. and in the C. I. cannot be denied by Thalheimer himself, he is forced to take another step on the road of dualism: the schema of the Russian revolution cannot be applied to Germany, which has an entirely different substance. And since each revolution has its own laws, its own schema, the wisdom of Roy, according to whom the lack of "competence" forbids the different sections to interfere in the problems of the others, is fully confirmed. National limitedness has so to speak, found its "theoretical expression".

Is the existence of a crisis in the heart of the Russian C. P. and the C. I. then simply accidental? No, it is due to the fact that it is **artifically** transferred from the Russian C. P. into the C. I., think the theoreticians of national limitedness.

Fighting in defense of his correct line against the more or less false (occasionally they also say: counter-revolutionary) conceptions of Trotskyism, Stalin, according to them, transfers the schema of the Russian revolution and all of its problems to the C. I., altogether unable to recognize the fact that if a Right wing and a Left wing exist in the Soviet Union, it does not necessarily follow that the same must take place in the C. I.

The historic fact that on the trail of the temporary stabilization of the capitalist system, there followed not only a wave of reaction, that swept over Europe, but also an era of political and social reaction, that settled on the territory of the proletarian dicatorship—the spokesmen of the new "dualism" do not recognize at all.

How can they then understand that the domination of Centrism in the Russian C. P. and in the C. I. is only a reflection of these real phenomena, how can they understand that they themselves, their ideology and their inability to detach themselves from the questions and the methods of yesterday only mirror the pressure that the elements of stabilization brought upon the revolutionary party. How can they recognize the fact that this differentiation must reveal itself most strongly in the Russian party, which, being the party of the proletarian dictatorship, must of necessity assume the character of a monopoly. Is it not deplorable to see Roy end up by wanting to prove that in the proletarian party there cannot, **in principle,** be any place for the birth of ideas unique to the enemy class?

"But the proletariat is so clearly separated from all other classes (the demarcation is more clear in one case than in another) that in its party there is no place for representatives of other classes, with the exception of adventurers and provocateurs. That is why the differences of opinion inside the Communist party do not signify a clash of different class interests." (**Gegen den Strom,** No. 46—Nov. 16, 1929.)

The Right wing Opposition is international. As international as the conditions themselves that have produced it. But there is no **International Right Opposition.** There is only the sum of the various national Right wingers, confined by the narrow national problems of each country. They do not represent the party of **tomorrow,** which will surmount the crisis and which, under the pressure of the Left, will find its path in the rising wave of the revolution. They represent the party of yesterday, a definite period in its development which the party has overcome. In Germany, the type of the Rights is most strongly developed. There the specific traits manifest themselves most clearly. It was there, also, that history once (1923) put them to the test—and they failed.

Berlin, January 1931.

Results of the Minneapolis Special Election

MINNEAPOLIS:—

The death of John Ryan, for years Street Car Co. boss of the First Ward, presented an opportunity to the Communist movement. The First ward is seven-eighths proletarian. Consisting mostly of Russians, Poles, Ukrainians, Italians and some Irish, it is the stronghold of Catholic reaction. It has, therefore, been the stamping ground for the most reactionary politicians on practically every major issue. It is easy to explain why this ward has been a hard nut to crack for the Communists.

Came hard times, unemployment, soup kitchens, evictions and such. Many a loyal church member began to question the ability of the Holy Trinity to do anything in this crisis. In general a breaking away from the conservative traditions can be seen in recent times, on the part of the workers of this section of town. The election of a Farmer-Laborite to office is an indication of this trend.

Certainly this is an excellent field for spreading the Communist message. So we went to the Communist party members. Will the party put up a candidate in this special election? No. The party members were told that the party could not afford a campaign at present, and besides this was an unimportant election. The main election, they said, would be the city-wide election in the spring. We urged the party comrades to put up a candidate, promising our support, especially since the Farmer-Labor party had filed a candidate. But they told us this question was already settled.

We could not agree that the Farmer Labor party should go unchallenged in this proletarian ward. Furthermore, of the 11 candidates filed, there was no representative of organiged labor, no spokesman of the working class.

Our executive committee consequently filed comrade John Brinda for Alderman. Comrade Brinda is a member of the Upholsterers Union and well known in the city and ward as organizer and leader of the Brooks Parlor Furniture strike. He joined the Communist League some time after the strike as a direct ressult of the participation of the Communists in that strike.

We issued 10,000 leaflets dynamically portraying the issues of the election: the misery of the unemployed, their families and children, the hypocricy and corruption of the Community Fund and other charity agencies, the false promises of the bosses and their servants in office: and calling upon the workers to support the **whole Communist program:** the ultimate as well as the immediate demands. We called for the establishment of **Unemployed Committees** who would be empowered to requisition. suitable vacant buildings for administration of relief; $50,000 from the Community Fund for these committees; No evictions for nonpayment of rent; free milk and food for all unemployed workers' children; no discrimination against foreign-born or noncitizens in city work; no private employment agencies, this work to be handled by the Unemployed Committees and the Unions.

We called for a bold and energetic fight for these proposals. At the same time we stated that "Every worker must be made to understand that under the capitalist system there is no permanent solution" and we brought forward the slogan "ORGANIZE—FOR THE OVERTHROW OF CAPITALISM!"

The party bureaucrats learned of our campaign only two days before the primary elections. I can imagine Karl Reeve's rage and anxiety for his job when he "discovered" our campaign. What "deviations" would the C. E. C. now find in his criminal neglect in not filing a candidate! Desperate, but not to be outdone, he issued a last-minute frenzied leaflet, throwing logic and responsibility to the winds, denounced Brinda as a "traitor of the working class, and an agent of the bosses."

Comrades throughout the country are familiar with the careless and irresponsible statements made by the party officials in their hateful attacks on the Left Opposition. But I should like here to enumerate a few typical misstatements of fact used to deceive militant workers.

1. "The Trotskyites make alliances with the Farmer-Labor Party." Any worker who reads the **Militant,** or followed our campaign against the Farmer-Labor Party last summer on the streets of Minneapolis knows this is a lie. Furthermore, our candidate ran AGAINST the Farmer-Labor candidate (Kauth) while the party did not see fit to file against him. Reeve's attack on the Left Opposition therefor was an AID to the Farmer-Labor Party. Party comrades should think this over carefully.

2. "John Brinda **poses** as a Communist." He is a member of the Communist League of America (Opposition). No pose is necessary.

3. "He was thrown out of the Communist party." Brinda never was a member of the Communist party.

4. "He is a traitor and proven enemy of the working class." Try to convince his militant fellow-workers who know him, especially the Brooks strikers.

6. **"The Communist party denounces this candidate as a fraud and an agent of the bosses of this city to confuse the workers and lead them away from a real struggle for immediate relief."**.. (Emphasis in this original).

The broadcasting of this scurrilous literature caused large numbers of Left workers to vote for the Farmer-Labor party, or, in disgust, to abstain altogether. The result is a low rate for Communism. Because of the division in the ranks of Communism, Brinda's vote was cut in two or three. He received 86 votes, while the winner, Kauth (finally elected) received in the 800's. The other eight candidates ranged from 100 to 600. One candidates received 50. The party "sticker" candidate was not recorded.

In this coming city elections, we hope the Communist party will file a full slate of candidates. It has been our established policy in the interest of Communist unity, always to support the Communist party where it has candidates, and conduct a campaign for them on our own platform.

More sympathizers are coming to our aid and helping to lighten our financial burdens. In this connection the Communist League of Minneapolis wishes to express its appreciation to the following, who helped to defray the expenses in the First Ward Campaign. (Those who requested their names be withheld are marked "Anon"):

Anon, $10.00; C. Skoglund, $1.00; J. Lebedoff, $1.00; I. Saffrin, $1.00; Sam Lessin, $1.00; F. Glaser, $2.00; Dr. J. Kurtz, $2.00; V. R. Dunne, $2.50; 5 Anon ($1ea.), $5.00; F. A. Wise, $1.00; L. B. Bortnick, $1.00, I. Eikin, $.50; Anon, $.50; Anon, $2.00.

To Red Needle Workers

(Continued from Page 7)

liquidators of the Lovestone camp, we propose to the worker-members of the party to march together with the workers of the Opposition to strengthen the Left wing and Communism. We are convinced that this united front, based not upon a submerging of principle differences, but upon the acute need of the day, will produce highly beneficial results for the movement as a whole. Those leaders who oppose this united front of the Communist workers are standing in the way of the progress of the movement. Here too we are convinced that the party members will measure up to the task, and, actuated by their devotion to the cause, will know how to act.

Against the reactionaries! Against the Levys and their brand of traitors! Against the Right wing liquidators of the Lovestone group!

For a united front of the party members and the Left Opposition!

Forward to the unity and victory of the Left wing!

The Needle Trades Group.
Communist League of America (Opposition).
Sylvia Bleeker, Secretary

Appeal to the Party Members in the Needle Trades

FOR A UNITED FRONT OF THE PARTY AND THE LEFT OPPOSITION AGAINST THE REACTIONARIES, THE PSEUDO-PROGRESSIVES, AND THE RIGHT WING LIQUIDATORS! (the Lovestoneites)

The pressure of facts in the struggle, and the criticism of the Opposition, has compelled the party leadership to take the first steps in a turn from the former ultra-Leftist position it occupied in the needle trades situation. Insofar as you will compel the Centrist leadership to make it a real turn it will facilitate a closer working together of our joint forces. For this reason we approach you with the question of forming a united front against the black reactionaries, the pseudo-progressives and the Lovestone liquidators. A necessary preliminary to this is to put the situation in the needle trades clearly. The beginnings of the above mentioned turn are evidenced by the following facts:

Indications of the Turn

1. The setting up of Left wing slates in various elections that have taken place in the Right wing unions: the Hatters, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, the Raincoat Makers etc., in contrast to the former policy which was tantamount to boycotting all these elections and leaving the workers in the Right wing unions at the mercy of the corrupt bureaucracy and the fraudulent "progressives".

2. The dropping of the policy for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of withdrawing every individual Left wing worker and affiliating him to the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union.

3. The recent meeting of the General Executive Board of the Left wing union, and subsequent declarations, in which the false analysis of the Right wing unions as "company unions" was partly abolished and those bodies were more properly characterized as reactionary unions in which the Left wing must function in order to win the workers to its cause.

4. The leaflet issued to Local 42 (Blockers) in which the "company union" policy of a few months ago is revised and the proposal made for a fight against the reactionaries within the A. F. of L. union, as the Opposition has been demanding for some time.

These are a few of the indications of the turn that is being made. The Left Opposition which has from the very beginning called upon the Communist workers to conduct a struggle against the pseudo-Communist policies of the party leaders in the needle trades, can only welcome this turn. The policy of yesterday which has not yet been completely cast aside, had the most pernicious results for the Left wing and its union. The once powerful movement influenced by the party in the needle trades was virtually wrecked by the policy of opportunism pursued in the days of the Lovestone leadership and the subsequent policy of ultra-Leftist sectarianism which was introduced by the present party leadership. The influence of the party and the Left wing has been radically reduced among the needle trades workers who once followed it by the tens of thousands. The Left wing union has been cut down to the merest shadow of its former strength: in the cloakmakers, furriers, milliners—in a word, everywhere except in the dress trade where it still has a small hold, it has been virtually eliminated as an organized force. Despite our warnings, the party leaders, under the inspiration of the spurious philosophy of the "third period", cast aside the tested policies of Leninism and adopted instead a narrow and sectarian policy. The Right wing unions, not the smallest reason for whose growth was the blunders of the Left wing, were simply denounced as "company unions" and boycotted. The proposals for Left wing work within these unions was rejected as the proposal of "renegades". The workers in the Right wing unions were lumped together with the bureaucrats and covered with the single label of "social fascists". In an attempt to retrieve ground lost by the mistakes of the past, the Left wing leadership embarked on a course of adventurism, organizing strikes without real foundation in the position of the union or the workers. As the result of the wrong appreciation of the Right wing unions, the Left wing was unable to make any progress in the strikes called by the Right wing: the party leaders could not even decide, at one stage in the Right wing strike, whether the Left wing workers should be called out as well or remain at work in the shops!

This uninterrupted series of mistakes of the past, for which the party leadership bears the entire responsibility, has not passed without leaving deep scars on the Left wing movement. Only a recognition, an examination and an absorption of the lessons of the past will enable the Left wing to lay a solid foundation to build on for the coming period. Without such a thorough study, the new turn will be a meaningless bureaucratic maneuver which will only make the confusion worse confounded.

What must the Left wing understand before it can proceed with its work?

Preliminary Steps for the Left Wing

The Right wing unions have been enormously strengthened. The drift of the workers has been in their directon. The Left wing has been defeated all along the line, and we must proceed with the open and honest recognition that we have suffered defeat. The bosses have become more arrogant than ever before.

The strategy of the bosses has been to support and even revive the Right wing unions through which their labor agents could help to weaken the Left wing and eliminate it as a factor. But the ideal of the bosses is not the Right wing union or any other union. Their ideal is a completely unorganized trade. They prefer the Right wing to the Left wing, and an unorganized mass to any union whatever. The bosses want the workers to bear the burden of the crisis of capitalism, to accept the old, murderous conditions of low wages, long hours, and intense speed-up.

The plans of the bosses to impose ever worse conditions upon the workers cannot be carried through without the open or concealed assistance of their labor agents, the Right wing union leaders. On the other hand, the workers, compelled for a number of reasons to join the Right wing unions, will resist these plans.

It is this conflict which deepens the gulf between the bureaucracy and the union membership and creates a broad basis for the activity of the Left wing and a revival of its influence. If the Left wing pursues a correct policy, it can again become the recognized champion of the interests and needs of the workers and win them away from the Right wing bureaucracy and into the ranks of the militant movement. The problem of the revolutionary elements at the present moment is the speediest accomplishment of this end.

How is this to be done? The Left wing must immediately proceed with the organization of all the militant and Left wing workers within the reactionary unions. Can this be done under the slogan of the workers in the Right wing unions joining the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union immediately? It cannot. All recent experience demonstrates that this is an abstract slogan for the Right wing union workers to which they pay no attention and which only alienates them further from the Left wing. The basis for the organization of the militants in the Right wing unions can only be: The fight for democracy in the union; the unrelenting struggle against the bureaucrats and capitalist labor agents in the organization; the mobilization of the workers for united action against the offensive of the bosses. Does this mean that the Right wing unions can be transformed into genuine instruments of struggle against the manufacturers? The party leaders reply with the categorical denial. To make such absolute declarations in advance means to place huge obstacles in the road of working within the reactionary needle trades unions. The fact is that this question can only be settled in the course of the struggle, which, in turn, cannot be fitted arbitrarily into a rigid mold cast in advance and so inflexible that it cannot be adjusted to meet the ever new realities of a situation. The fact is, and this is demonstrated by the recent history of the needle trades themselves, that the Left wing, by working persistently and intelligently, has been able to win the bulk of the workers in the reactionary unions.

This was the case in the Joint Action fight, in the furriers' union, and elsewhere. Despite the blunders of the past and the manner in which the official leadership of the Left wing has compromised the struggle, the lost ground can still be recovered and a beginning made.

The Theories of "Social Fascism"

It is necessary in the first place to reject completely the whole theory of "company unionism" and "social fascist" unionism, as applied to the reactionary unions by the party. This theory only erects an artificial barrier between the workers in the Left wing union and those in the Right wing union, which only works to the advantage of the Schlesingers and their kin. The organization of the Left wing militants in the Right wing unions must be begun and carried on systematically and seriously. The immediate aim of the Left wing minority must be to oust the reactionary bureaucracy and introduce tested policies of the class struggle in place of class collaboration. We have no illusions about the "desire for unity" of the Right wing bureaucrats. They are the agents of the manufacturers in the labor movement. There is not the slightest doubt that in a desperate attempt to break the workers away from the growing influence of the Left wing, they will again seek to split the unions. They have done this in the past and will in all likelihood seek to do it again. On the banner of the Left wing, however, must be inscribed the slogan of working class unity against the capitalist class. Our aim must be to unite and win over the working class. The bureaucrats are the splitters of the Labor movement: the Communists and the Left wing are its unifiers, not in the name of an abstract unity for its own sake, but unity on the basis of the class struggle.

Is there a basis for Left wing activity in the Right wing unions? All the indications are that such a basis not only exists, but is constantly being extended under pressure of the contradictions between the labor bureaucracy and the real needs of the workers. The Left wing must build on this foundation.

Whose resistance, besides that of the bosses, the state and their direct labor agents, is encountered in this work of regenerating the power and influence of the Left wing?

1. The pseudo-progressives. These are people, like Levy in the cloakmakers' union and similar elements in the other unions, who have a thoroughly discredited past, but, in spite of that, are sensing the mood of discontent among the workers, and seek to mount the rising movement by attaching themselves to a few "progressive" phrases. These phrases mean nothing to them. People without principle — except the "principle" of clique control—they serve as channels into which the discontent of the workers is harmlessly diverted. They are the shields for the Schlesingers and Goldens. Their position in the struggle, which will assume an ever more dangerous aspect as the Left wing really begins its work, must be relentlessly exposed to the workers as a whole.

The Lovestone Liquidators

2. The Lovestone, Right wing liquidators. The rôle of the Right wing faction is to liquidate the influence of Communism and the Left wing in the working class. Taking advantage of the blunders and false line of the official party, which are only a continuation in another direction of the blunders made yesterday by the Lovestone leadership, the Right wing has been able to mobilize a number of workers who reacted against the ultra-Leftist line. But instead of directing their protest in Communist channels, the Right wing has used these workers to pursue a policy of liquidation. The policy of the Right wing group in the needle trades particularly, is summed up in their bloc with the discredited Levy clique, which only serves to rehabilitate the Levys in the eyes of the workers and to hamper the development of a genuine Left wing movement in the reactionary unions. The problem of the Communists—to liquidate the Right wing liquidators—can not be accomplished merely by words or violence, but by opposing to their policy **a correct policy**, and an intelligent enlightenment of the workers as to the rôle they play. But a prerequisite for this defeat of the opportunists is a unification of the genuinely Communist forces, combined with a struggle within the party and the Left wing itself against bureaucratism and adventurism, the counterpart of the Right wing itself. It is towards such a unification that the Left Opposition is striving and is ready to cooperate on a comradely, militant basis with the members of the party.

Does the program of building a Left wing within the reactionary unions mean the liquidation of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union? Not at all! That is the aim of the Lovestone Right wing, but it is not our aim. The greatest hindrance in the way of the clarification of the Communist workers is the unprincipled and cynical identification of our line with the line of the Right wing, which is made without conviction or proof by the party leaders. The Left Opposition proposes a program to strengthen and not to liquidate the N. T. W. I. U. The truth is that the whole sectarian course of the party up to now has resulted in a weakening of the Left wing union, and helped greatly to liquidate it in practice. The responsibility for this ruinous course cannot be shifted onto our shoulders, but must be borne by those who pursued the course and defended it, who still excuse it today, and by creating this bureaucratic confusion made it difficult to adopt a correct course, to carry out a REAL TURN TO THE CORRECT POLICY.

The N. T. W. I. U. must be built up, not on the basis of abstract or false slogans, but in the process of struggle. We have pointed out the need of organizing the Left wing in the reactionary unions as an aid to those workers organized in the N.T.W.I.U. Equally important is the need of systematically organizing the Left wing workers into groups in the shops controlled by the Right wing union. In the unorganized shops, a profound and well organized campaign of organization into the N. T. W. I. U. must be started. We speak of a serious campaign and not one based on paper, with headlines in the party press as their main substance, which naturally die out in a few weeks. In the mixed shops, i. e., where there are Left wing and Right wing workers, the militants must work for the formation of Joint Committees of Action of **all** workers, at the same time strengthening the N. T. W. I. U., by recruiting into it all possible individual workers. These Joint Committees of Action, which have a basis of existence in hundreds of shops, can become a powerful lever for ousting the labor bureaucrats from the trade union movement and strengthening the Left wing immeasurably.

Should not these policies be taken up later, after the dress strike is over? No. On the contrary, they go hand in hand with the question of the dressmakers strike, and their execution will be of great aid to its victory. The strike will never be won by the dressmakers alone. It will be victorious only if the workers in the other branches of the industry are aroused to its support, organizationally as well as financially. These policies are correct for adoption now. The Left Opposition is wholeheartedly behind the strike. Our criticism, which we do not withdraw at any time, of the false leadership, of its lack of preparation, of the half-way measures that are being taken to win over the workers in the Right wing union to the support of the strike—all this does not for a single moment affect our complete support of the workers in this struggle. On the picket lines, in the strike committees, in our press, in our meetings and organization—everywhere, our comrades will be found in the most active ranks of the strike, fighting for its success. The proposals we make for the strike, like our other proposals, will always be dictated by the deepest concern over the strength and triumph of the Communist and Left wing movement, for we have no interests separate from the interests of the working class in general, and the Communist movement in particular.

One Step Forward Has Been Taken

That is why, especially in this critical period of the Left wing's existence, we greet the partial turn in the correct direction, which the party has made, although we realize thoroughly all the limitations of the turn, the fact that the old and false foundations have not yet been destroyed, the fact that those who are in the leadership, who are to execute the turn, will heap blunder upon blunder because Centrism is politically incapable of pursuing a persistently correct line.

It is precisely because of this inherent feature of the Centrist leadership, that we raise here, also a warning against the danger that, turning from the position of ultra-Leftism that it occupied yesterday and still occupies in part, the leadership will move rapidly to the position of open opportunism. Disappointed in its failure to weaken the trade union bureaucrats merely by calling them "social fascists", the Centrists will tend to swing in desperation—as they have done in the past—to a policy of unprincipled alliances with sections of the union bureaucracy. An alarming symptom of this swing to opportunism is seen in the helpless vacillations of the party leadership in making a decision on the dressmakers' strike! In the latest meeting of the party fraction, the leadership came forward with a proposal to put aside the demands for wages and conditions and to strike only for the recognition of the union. In this connection they no doubt have in the back of their heads, the idea of a quick dickering with one section of the bosses thus robbing the strike of all validity. This is not a revolutionary trade union policy—this is business agent unionism. There has been more than enough of this opportunism in the party for which the Foster and Lovestone factions, jointly, were responsible.

We do not therefore conceal the fact that we are not in the slightest degree reconciled with the Centrist leaders of the party, or with their Centrist policies. We propose the unification of the Communist and Left wing ranks. Side by side in the struggle against the bosses, against the pseudo-progressives, against the Right wing

(Continued on Page 6)

THE YOUNG VANGUARD

What Is the Situation in the Y. C. L.?

The convention of the Young Communist League has been long overdue. It is now more than half a year since it should have been held. What is the reason for this long delay? For whom and for what purpose is the convention continually deferred? Merely to ask this question is to reveal in a flash that the Y. C. L. is in a bad crisis. For if any slight but real advance out of the retrogression could have been detected, we may rest assured that the convention would have been held promptly behind a barrage of denunciation of the "renegades" and loud cheers for Stalin, as is now the custom. But those responsible for the present critical condition of the League have preferred periodic postponements with the hope that this would give them an opportunity to crawl out of the morass into which their stupid policies had dragged the League. But they have not succeeded in improving the situation.

The Young Communist League was never so impotent as an independent youth factor in the class struggle as it is today. In a period of economic crisis and mass unemployment of young workers it has become a negligible, insignificant, and utterly ineffectual instrument of the class conscious young workers. This is vividly shown in the inability of the League to rally any young workers and to put up any kind of an effective fight against the deprivation of second class mailing rights of the **Young Worker** by the U. S. Postoffice. The Y. C. L. finds itself isolated not only from the broad sections of the young workers but even from the more advanced and class conscious young workers who in the past followed its leadership. This is not apparent to many members of the Y. C. L who do not understand the functions of the League as a **youth** organization and who mistake the comparatively greater power of the party to mobilize masses for their own strength.

To whatever phase of youth activity supposed to be conducted by the Y. C. L. one turns, it is found that it either does not exist or else has the semblance of life which reminds one of a paralytic old man. The youth sections of the revolutionary unions do not exist except in name; general economic trade union work—we need not even try to speak of it; opponent youth work there is none; anti-militarist activity —if there is any it must be ingeniously concealed; work among the Negro youth—abortive attempts; pioneer work—we hear no shouts of jubilation from this direction. What then? Has there been an increase in membership? 1700 members are claimed (undoubtedly exaggerated) which is about one-half the number at the time of the last convention. The rapid turnover in membership is incontestable. Is there a single substantial achievement to which anyone can point? We are afraid that the champions of the Stalinist line in the League can only resort to their specious self-criticism.

What have been the results of the famous "Shock Plan" which was supposed to have culminated its achievements on September 30, 1930? Or has it been extended ad infinitum? What were the results of the industrial youth conferences in eight industries, the Negro youth conferences against lynching in seven League districts, the mass unemployment youth conferences, all prescribed in the plan? Has a **mass** Negro youth organization been formed, and the Labor Sports Union transformed into a **mass** organization? Has the League membership been doubled? How many of the 48 shop nuclei have been created, and how many of the 85 shop bulletins issued? How many of the 10,000 young workers have been recruited into the T. U. U. L., and how many of the 500 young Negroes into the Y. C. L.? What happened to it all? Has it all been relegated to the archives together with Steuben and Harvey? And were we wrong when we condemned it as stupid adventurism?

One of the most alarming features of the whole situation is that the League is ceasing to function as a Communist youth league and is being transformed into a sort of junior section of the Communist Party. A significant indication of this process is that for the first time the Y. C. L. did not hold its own Liebknecht-Luxemburg memorial meeting (N. Y. C.) and permitted the party to combine this memorial, which was always considered the privilege and duty of the youth to hold, with the Lenin memorial of the party. In the unemployment campaign the special demands of the youth have gained no prominence or attracted any attention whatsoever, while through its own efforts the Y. C. L. has not succeeded in rallying around its demands any unemployed young workers. In the party's election platform not a single youth demand was raised. In the election campaign period the **Young Vanguard** pointed this out and proposed a youth platform. One week before the elections the **Young Worker** carried a long list of youth demands. The **Young Worker** immediately following the elections carried a leading editorial: "ruthless Bolshevik self-criticism"—in true Stalinist style—of the lateness of the appearance of the demands, the lack of any League election activities, etc.! The regular occurrence of such events these days makes one suspect that errors are committed so that one can get a chance to "self-criticize"! In short, the tendency is for the League to carry out less and less its own independent youth activities and youth campaigns, and to participate only in the campaigns of the party.

The greater proportion of the membership in the League is extremely immature and inexperienced, having been in the organization a comparatively short time. They possess no knowledge or previous experience with which to judge critically the policies and the régime of the apparatus. In fact they require an elementary education as to what a young Communist league is, how it functions, and what makes it different from the party. Thus they have no criterion by which to guide themselves. They are taught that the Stalinist lines and policies are sacred and infallible. Any criticism of policies that anyone of them ventures to make is condemned forthwith as Trotskyist. Ideological development consists in convincing oneself that all the Stalinist strategy and tactics are correct. If there are failures and shortcomings it is because the unquestionably correct line is applied incorrectly. In such an atmosphere which does not permit the right and the duty to question the formulas presented, revolutionary thought and growth is crushed and hampered.

Despite this, however, there is a vague dissatisfaction with the Centrist policies. It is unclear and timid. It expresses itself in disapproval of certain minor features of the unemployment campaign and in criticism of the conduct of the dressmakers' strike. It is unable to see the whole crisis in the Communist movement, and the logic of the struggle for trying to correct the isolated false policies which are perceptible to it. Further developments and new Centrist zig-zags are bound to clarify and sharpen the process.

We must attempt to arouse discussion on all the problems that confront the League and relate them to the fundamental questions of the Communist movement in its present crisis. We must force the discussion out of its low, narrow, meaningless repetition of commonplance trivalities and Stalinist stupidities on to a higher plane which will enable all sincere young Communists to see the movement in its broad and historic perspective.

A fresh breeze from the Left Opposition must be blown into the stagnant and depressive inner life of the League. To this purpose, to enable the comrades of the Young Communist League to find their way to the road of Leninism, we must intensify our relentless criticism of the opportunist Centrist policies in the Y. C. L. and pursue a policy of aggressive united frint with it.

—GEORGE RAY.

Kaganovitch Teaches!

At the Ninth Congress of the Y. C. L. of the Soviet Union (which we will treat with at a later date) the spokesman for the Stalin régime in the party, Kaganovitch, made some interesting and revealing remarks: (**Inprecir**—Vol. 11, No. 5.). In contrasting the economic situation of the Soviet Union with that of the United States, this learned Marxist (?) informs us:

"We in Soviet Russia are buying new machines; we are building works and factories in order to set going new and more rapidly working machines. In America things have come to such a pass that they are prepared to place people at slower working machines, to lay idle hoisting cranes and other machines in order to employ as great a number of people as possible. We, on the other hand, want to erect new works for the construction of cranes and other means of transport. In America they no longer wish to have short-hand typists but to have everything written by hand. We, however, are building typewriter factories and wish also to make setting machines. We are going forward to a new technique—in America, however, they are seeking to find a way out by means of technical retrogression!" (Page 108)

And this "theoretician" pilemizes against the Trotskyites! Such is offered as unquestionable reality to the Comsomol Congress! The latter surely is now able to understand the relations between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world, knows how to proceed. For has not Kaganovitch carried out the instructions of Stalin, who we are told by the former, "designated international education of the Y. C. L. as one of the mist important tasks"?

The Dilemma of the War Department

The economic crisis which is sweeping the entire world today has created a dilemma in the War Department, if we are to judge by the letter reproduced below. In the past it was customary to recruit men from tenement neighborhoods and cheap lodging districts, such as the Bowery. Men out of work and facing starvation would enlist just to get food and a place to sleep.

The present depression has of course increased the army of unemployed enormously, and widespread starvation and misery should make it comparatively easy for the recruiting service to get all the men they need for the army. But therein lies the dilemma. An army composed of city proletarians driven by hunger and privation to enlist, would not be made of the right material for a staunch defense of capitalism. Such have too little regard for law and order and our established institutions generally. Their natural sympathies would lie with the workers.

The American ruling class realizes quite well that the time is not so far off when it will have to depend on armed force to maintain the tottering throne of private property, nor does it require military genius on their part to understand that an army composed chiefly of proletarians would not be a dependable army.

No, army recruiting must be more "selective" than in former days. Reading between the lines, one sees that the War Department wants men permeated with the idea that the established order has been ordained by God, men who have been so chloroformed by the sky pilots that they will blindly do the bidding of their pastors and masters.

What kind of response may be expected on the part of the ministers of God thus appealed to? It is to be expected that they will obligingly lend a hand in the noble project of leading the sheep to the slaughter. We saw that in the last World War.

The following is a reproduction of the letetr sent iut by military officials to all the religious shepherds of the ruling class:

HEADQUARTERS . . . Recruiting District
February, 1931.

Dear Reverend:

In keeping with recent instructions of the War Department to make recruiting for the Army more selective, it has been pointed out that leading clergymen can aid materially the Recruiting Service in its effort to secure only high class [sic!] men for the Army.

The Recruiting Service is mindful that many parents appeal to their pastors for advice in matters affecting the welfare of their children. It follows therefore, that an assurance from ministers, priests, rabbis and leaders of various faiths to parents who seek advice in matters pertaining to an enlistment, will play a large part in aiding parents to reach a decision.

A comprehensive publicity campaign is being prepared with the idea in view of acquainting the public at large and parents in particular with the manifold benefits offered to the youths of this country through an enlistment in the U. S. Army.

An open testimonal from representative clergymen will aid materially in carrying on this campaign. It is therefore kindly requested that you express your opinion in answer to the following:—"Would you recommend an enlistment in the Regular Army to a man of good moral character?"

For your information there is enclosed a pamphlet issued by the Army Recruiting Service.

Your reply will be appreciated.

Very truly yours
(Signature)

Youth Notes

The **Young Vanguard**, the voice of the Left Opposition youth, is henceforth going to appear as a regular monthly section of the **Militant.** Through these columns we will endeavor to speak to the youth leaguers, as well as to the general working youth, on the problems and tasks of the young workers and their vanguard, the Communst youth; to rally them around the banner of the Communist League of America (Opposition). The need for an organ which would be the "collective organizer" of the working youth, by reflecting their every day life and struggles; by disseminating elementary Marxist education; through articles on fundamental Communist youth tasks and policies, is exceptionally acute today when the potentialities far outstrip the actualities.

To this end, to help the communist youth movement to create such an organ—we make our beginning with a section in the **Militant.** Readers of these lines should send in contributions. Youth leaguers, young workers, students write!

On February 5, in Philadelphia, Pa. two members of the Young Communist League, Tess Ryder and Anna Lynn were tried and convicted of sedition. The offense consisted in distributing leaflets for a Liebknecht anti-war meeting to the Philadelphia National Guardsmen. The indictment however is much more serious: **It aims at the illegalization of the Young Communist League and through it of all workers organizations.** It reads: "Anna Lynn did unlawfully become a member of an assembly, society, or group, called the Young Communist League of Philadelphia, Pa., of which the policies and purposes are seditious."

Why now, more than ever since the 1919-20 Palmer raids is the offensive of the bosses intensified, especially against the Communists? Why the taking away of second class mailing privileges from the **Young Worker, Vida Obrero, Revolutionary Age and** the **Young Comrade?** Why the attempts to outlaw the Communist movement? The party and league officials answer in unison: Because we are a mass movement; as a war maneuver against the Soviet Union. The first reason has only one weakness—it is untrue. The party still has not gotten completely out of its swaddling clothes. The League is insignificant. The second reason given, while containing some truth, does not however hit the basic point. The attack on the workers' press, the attempt to illegalize the Communist movement is an organic and inseparable part of the general offensive of the capitalist class against the workers. The bosses, who are trying to get out of the present crises at the expense of the workers—which means lowering of wages, worsening of conditions of labor, greater speed-up, mass unemployment—understand that the workers will make desperate efforts to resist. From this they conclude that a vigorous offensive against the working class, especially the Communist, organizations is on the order of the day. In a word, the **possibilities** for the growth and expansion of the party and league, due to the deep-growing discontent of the workers exist and all means are and will be taken to crush these organizations, that is, so as to be able more ruthlessly, and unchallenged to exploit the workers. This explains the attack on the League, on the **Young Worker,** etc.

The workers should answer this challenge with a broad united front. The party and league can lead such a movement only with correct strategy and tactics. The League, especially, is now accorded an opportunity to get out of its sectarian isolation, to make contact with the mass of youth workers, in a word, to become a mass Communist youth league. At present, the calling of youth united front conferences for the defense of the **Young Worker,** for the defense of comrades Ryder and Lynn should be taken as a first step.

HEAR! HEAR!

The **Young Worker** of February 16, informs us: "Comrade Minerich, who is now in the Pittsburg district, writes us something which we want to call to the attention of the whole League. A notice appeared sometime ago in this column about **two** new units in East Ohio. Comrade Minerich, going thru this section, found that the two 'new units' were merely hopes; they didn't exist. We warn the comrades that we will expose every exaggerated report sent into the National Office." (Pg. 6.) Hear, hear! comrade. We'll do our bit to enforce this warning!

—JOSEPH CARTER.