

The **MILITANT**

VOL. II.—No. 18.

NEW YORK, N. Y. NOVEMBER 30, 1929

PRICE 5 CENTS

The Illinois Miners' Struggle

Crash in the Stock Market

Not all of the soothing assurances of Herbert Hoover and the other spokesman of the ruling class can conceal the fact that the stock market crash was a sharp blow to American capitalist stability, that revealed the anarchy and weakness of the industrial and financial structure of the present system. The heavily inflated stock market, the accumulation of the growth since America's entry into the World War, burst like a punctured windbag.

The Causes of Crash

The Wall Street crash was not due solely to the speculative mania, which only aggravated the situation. Its roots go deeper. Since the end of the World War, the United States became the world's banker. "Easy money" made possible an embarkment on a road of production increase such as has not had its parallel in history, accompanied by an unprecedented export of capital.

The tremendous productive capacity and output of American industry did not, however, entirely correspond with the growth of the American home market. At the same time, with the world market growing narrower, European economy, rehabilitated largely by American dollars, continued to hammer at the doors of the American market with a demand for entry.

The world and its markets, however, have certain physical limitations. The struggle for this market becomes keener every day. American capitalism must have an ever-increasing share of this market commensurate with its top-heavy industrial structure. It must either go forward—which means the inevitable armed conflict primarily with England for a new division of the world market, or else it must vomit up the indigestible over-capitalization of its industry induced by frenzied speculation and investment. This is what happened.

It does not follow, of course, that the collapse on the stock exchange is to be followed immediately by a collapse of American industry. The ups and downs of stock market speculations do not directly reflect the conditions of industry, where money changes hands—under "bull" or "bear" influences—without producing anything or, frequently affecting values. It has been evident for months that American industry has entered a stage of depression in some of its most important branches.

Where the U. S. Will Press

But the United States is still in a sufficiently strong and arrogant position in world economy and politics to endeavor to overcome its economic difficulties at home by pressure on two points: on the U. S. workers in the form of a more intense drive to lower wages, lengthen the work day, speed up the workers, and on Europe, in the form of a decreased ration for France, Germany, Italy, England and the rest of the world market.

From both of these points, United States capitalism will meet with increased resistance. The attempt to issue out of its own difficulties at the expense of the American workers, and particularly of European capitalism, will involve it in the most violent collisions. The American worker, accustomed to a relatively high standard of living, will fight, if not to raise it, at least to retain it. The European countries especially England, will be pushed by the force of events to fight back, at first around "peaceful" conference tables and in the end on the battlefield of imperialist war.

The factors making for war are already resent in embryo. They are maturing rapidly. The crash on the stock market is a harbinger of the coming catastrophe.

Trotsky Greets the Weekly *Militant*

Dear Comrades:

You cannot, in my opinion, better mark the Twelfth Anniversary of the October Revolution than by transforming *The Militant* into a weekly. It is a great step forward. A semi-monthly gave the possibility of assembling the first cadres of the faction. The weekly creates the possibility of direct and permanent intervention in the life of the whole working class.

The weekly, in turn will have to prepare the road to the Daily. But isn't it Utopian to speak of it now? I do not think so. For it is in this direction that the road of development is leading.

In the U. S. S. R., in Germany, in France, the Left Communist Opposition represents a faction that is fighting for influence upon the proletarian nucleus of the official Party. In Belgium, the situation is quite different. The official Party there is entirely insignificant. Well, the Belgian Opposition can and must lead to the role of an independent Party. Upon it devolves the task of fighting for the proletarian nucleus not of the Communist Party but of the Social Democratic Party.

In America, the situation is closer, to that in Belgium than to that in Germany. The essential task of the American Communists consists of direct action upon the revolutionary elements of the class; the struggle for the workers who belong to the official Party or who are misled into the Right Wing not having a great importance. That means that the Communist League in America has all the necessary elements for developing into an independent Party. And if such is the case, the weekly can and must become a stage on the road towards a daily.

I am sending you for the first number of the Weekly my article on the Twelfth Anniversary of the October Revolution, and at the same time my promise of the most active collaboration and the assurance of my devoted support.

Constantinople, October 19, 1929

L. TROTSKY

The Conference at Belleville

By Joseph Angelo

The news as reported in the *Daily Worker* on the Belleville convention of the Illinois National Miners Union is just as far from the truth as that carried in the capitalist press. What the convention was in actuality will be given here.

A Convention of Speeches

The first day of the convention (Saturday) began with speech making and ended with speech making. First Voyzey spoke, then Corbischley, then, following one after the other, Boyce of Indiana, Guynn of Ohio, Kelley from Chicago on the I. L. D. (Kelley is a new one to me, looks more like a business man than a worker—a typical Babbitt), and Allard. Thus the first day of the convention ended with six Communist speakers and after adjournment the rank and file delegates stood outside the convention hall, some with stoical faces and others full of resentment. The miners of Illinois are in revolt. They have had enough of speech making at home. They came to Belleville to help outline a plan of action to build the National Miners Union, to fight the coal operators and their henchmen, the Fishwicks and Lewises, but not to listen to a lot of gibberish from second-hand peddlers. So the first day of the convention created a smoldering volcano.

When I came into the convention hall for the second and last day of the convention (Sunday) my first impression was that I was either in Chicago or New York attending a Communist Party affair. There they were with their important looking brief cases Sklar, Tashinsky, Gebert, Bentall, the great zig-zag Foster, the Toohey, Prokoff (another Party official in Illinois) and others whose names I don't know nor did I care to find out. Evidently this crew of Stalinites were delayed for some reason or other, therefore all the speechmaking and no action on Saturday.

The second day session came to order with Corbischley reading off a list of names that he said were selected by a small committee for the various committees, the resolution, constitutional, finance, credential and wages and demands committees. Corbischley asked for the adoption of his report. The report was amended by the convention adding a rank and file delegate here and there to the various committees. When we got to the wage and demands committee, I placed the name of John Watt in nomination. Immediately the Stalinites present began to protest. Their argument was that the national office should not interfere in district affairs—this from Slinger and Allard. Then I raised the question of Freeman Thompson who is a National Board member and whose name was selected by the small committee for the wage and demands committee. The Stalinites realizing that they had made a mistake in their work moved that all national officials act as an advisory committee in all committees.

After this Toohey took the floor for one of his long-winded speeches which took over two hours, criticizing John Watt for his so-called "operators' neutrality" theory (which is bunk). Toohey ended his long tirade with a resolution on policy, wage and demands and asked for the adoption of the resolution. Immediately, Voyzey put the motion for adoption before the house and the motion was accepted without discussion of any kind from any delegates. Before the delegates knew what happened the resolution had been adopted. Shades

Continued Page 7

Why the Falling Vote?

The New York vote is a warning signal to the membership of the Party. The efforts of the *Daily Worker* to conceal the shameful defeat with outrageously false headlines about the "doubled vote of the C. P." will only serve to deepen the crisis in the Party instead of creating the enlightenment necessary to overcome it.

As for the Socialist Party, it has no special cause for jubilation. In the percentage of total votes, Thomas received less than Hillquit did in 1917, despite the fact that Thomas' campaign was as fearfully "respectable" and as far removed from socialism as that of any liberal reformer. The deeply mired S. P. was dragged a yard further down into the swamp of capitalist degeneration by this year's campaign.

The post election "heated" discussion between Hillquit and Thomas shows where the S. P. is going. It is not a Party of the working class and does not want to be one. It yearns for the "classless" liberal and the dignity of the peanut-stand owner's adherence. The workers who follow Thomas and his Party will serve as vote contributors and nothing more. Unfortunately, the Socialist Party will continue to get working class votes also, so long as the Communist Party continues its "inious policy."

What's Happening in China?

A Question That Every Communist Must Ask Himself and Answer

Among the telegrams of *Pravda* there has been communicated many times during October in the smallest type that an armed Communist detachment under the command of comrade Tchu-Deh is advancing successfully towards Tchao-Tcho (Kwantung), that this detachment has increased from 5,000 to 20,000, etc. Thus we learn, "in passing", from the laconic telegrams of *Pravda* that that the Chinese Communists are conducting an armed struggle against Chiang Kai Shek. What is the meaning of this struggle? Its origin? Its perspectives? Not a word is breathed to us about it. If the new revolution in China has matured to the point where the Communists are taking arms, then one would think that it is necessary to mobilize the International in the face of events of a decisive historical importance. Why then do we hear nothing of the sort? And if the situation in China is not such as puts on the order of the day the armed struggle of the Communists for power, then how and why has a Communist detachment begun an armed struggle against Chiang Kai-Shek, that is, against the bourgeois military dictatorship?

Yes, why have the Chinese Communists risen in rebellion? Perhaps because the Chinese proletariat has already found the time to heal its wounds? Because the demoralized and feeble Communist Party has found the time to stand erect again thanks to the new revolutionary wave? Have the city workers assured their contact with the revolutionary masses of the country? Have strikes spread throughout the country? Has the general strike pushed the proletariat to the insurrection? If such is the case, then everything is in order. But then why does *Pravda* communicate this fact in type used for small announcements?

Zinoviev's Analogy

Or perhaps the Chinese Communists have risen in rebellion because they have received the latest commands of Molotov on the resolution on the Third Period? It is no accident that Zinoviev who, in distinction to the other capitulators, still pretends to be alive, has made a sortie in *Pravda* with an article which shows that the domination of Chiang Kai-Shek is entirely similar to the temporary domination of Kolchak, that is, is only a simple episode in the process of the revolutionary drive. This analogy is naturally quite fit to rearm the soul a little. Unfortunately, it is not only false, but even stupid. Kolchak organized an insurrection in one province against the dictatorship of the proletariat already established in the greater part of the country. In China, bourgeois counter-revolution rules in the country and it is the Communists who have stirred up an insurrection of a few thousand people in one of the provinces. We think, therefore, we have the right to pose this question: does this insurrection spring from the situation in China or rather from the directions concerning the Third Period? We ask what is the political role of the Chinese Communists Party in all this? What are the slogans with which it mobilized the masses? What is the degree of its influence upon the workers? We hear nothing of all this. The rebellion of Tchu-Deh appears to be a reproduction of the adventurist campaigns of Ho-Lun and Ye-Tin in 1927 and the uprisings in Canton timed for the moment of the expulsion of the Opposition from the Russian Communist Party.

Or perhaps the rebellion was let loose spontaneously? Well and good. But then what is the meaning of the Communist banner unfurled above it? What is the attitude of the official Chinese Communist Party towards the insurrection? What is the position of the Comintern in this question? And why, finally, in communicating this fact to us, does the Moscow *Pravda* abstain from any comment?

But there is still another explanation possible, which is perhaps at the same time the most disquieting: Have the Chinese Communists risen in rebellion because of Chiang Kai-Shek's seizure of the Chinese Eastern Railway? Has this insurrection, wholly guerrilla in character, as its only aim to cause Chiang Kai-Shek the greatest possible uneasiness at his rear? If that is what it is, we ask who has given such counsel to the Chinese Communists? Who bears the political responsibility for their passing over to guerrilla fighting?

It is not long ago that we decisively condemned the ramblings on the necessity of handing over so important an instrument as the Chinese Eastern from the hands of the Russian revolution to those of the Chinese counter-revolution. We called to mind

the elementary duty of the international proletariat in this conflict to defend the Republic of the Soviets against the Chinese bourgeoisie and all its possible instigators and allies. But, on the other hand, it is quite clear that the proletariat of the U. S. S. R., which has the power and the army in its hands, cannot demand that the vanguard of the Chinese proletariat begin a war at once against Chiang Kai-Shek, that is, that it apply the means which the Soviet government itself does not find it possible, and with reason, to apply. Had a war begun between the U. S. S. R. and China, or rather, between the U. S. S. R. and the imperialist protectors of China, the duty of the Chinese Communist would be to transform this war in the shortest time into a civil war. But even in that case the launching of the civil war would have to be subordinated to general revolutionary policy; and even then the Chinese Communists would be unable to pass over arbitrarily, and at any moment at all, to the road of open insurrection, but only after having assured themselves of the necessary support of the worker and peasant masses. The rebellion at Chiang-Kai-Shek's rear, in this situation, would be the extension of the front of the workers and peasants of the Soviets; the fate of the insurgent Chinese workers would be intimately bound up with the fate of the Soviet Republic; the tasks, the aim, the perspectives would be quite clear.

The Perspective of the Adventure

But what is the perspective opened up by this uprising of the today isolated Chinese Communists in the absence of the war

and the revolution? The perspective of a terrific debacle and of an adventurist degeneration of the remains of the Communist Party.

In the meantime, it must be said openly. Calculations based upon guerrilla adventure correspond entirely to the general nature of Stalinist policy. Two years ago, Stalin expected gigantic gains for the security of the Soviet State from the alliance with the imperialists of the General Council of the British trade unions. Today he is quite capable of calculating that a rebellion of the Chinese Communists, even without any hope, would bring some "profit" in a precarious situation. In the first case, the calculation was grossly opportunist, in the second, openly adventurist, but in both cases the calculation is made independent of the general tasks of the world labor movement, against these tasks and to the detriment of the correctly understood interests of the Soviet Republic

We have not at our disposal all the necessary data for a definite conclusion. That is why we ask: What is happening in China? Let it be explained to us! The Communist who does not pose this question to himself and to the leadership of his Party will be unworthy of the name of Communist. The leadership that would like to remain discreetly on the side in order, in case of a defeat of the Chinese guerrilla, to wash its hands and transfer responsibility to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party—such a leadership would dishonor itself—not for the first time, it is true—by the most abominable crime against the interests of the international revolution.

We ask: What is happening in China? We will continue to pose this question as long as we will not have forced a reply.

L. TROTSKY

Prinkipo, November 10, 1929.

Schlesinger Prepares His Dress Strike

While Foster Almost Changes the Line—with the Help of a Cable from Losovsky

A classic example of how the American labor bureaucracy, even its so-called socialist wing, conducts the struggle for the "improvement" of the conditions of the workers is afforded by the present campaign of Schlesinger, Dubinsky and their colleagues to organize the dressmakers of New York into the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. The New York Times reports on the negotiations between the union officials and the various bosses' associations read like reports of two boards of directors in different branches of an industry meeting in conference to settle minor questions of dispute for the purpose of improving the productivity and profits of business. Here is a typical news report from the Times (November 15, 1929) which speaks volumes for the level to which the "socialist" leaders of the I. L. G. W. U. have sunk:

"Asserting that the general strike of all dressmakers in the city appeared inevitable as a means of forcing non-union shops to join the respective employers' associations (!) in the industry, Benjamin Schlesinger, president of the I. L. G. W. U. who headed the union contingent at the conferences, appealed to the employers to embrace the union's program and 'do for the dress what has so successfully been accomplished for the cloak trade'.... The result of both conferences was an agreement by the employers to follow the example of the inside manufacturers and participate in the appointment of joint sub-committees of representatives of employers and the union to work out basic agreements which would serve as a foundation for reorganization of the industry when the strike is called."

The Class Struggle is Over!

The labor leaders of our new era have abolished the very annoying business of class struggle and wiped out the clash of interests between the slave of the needle and the master. In its place they have substituted a miraculous brotherly love and a peace that passeth all understanding. All the troubles of the dressmakers are now to disappear with a wave of Schlesinger's magic wand. The workers will carry on a bitter struggle—to force all bosses to join the bosses' associations. The employers will agree to carry on a similar struggle to have the workers join the Right wing union. And why not? The bosses know that as long as the Schlesingers are running the union they have nothing to fear from the "union shop". Schlesinger will see to it that the dressmakers get what "has so successfully been accomplished for the cloak trade". And what has been done there, as every cloakmaker knows, is the legalization by the union of sweat-

shop conditions, winking at the rotten piece work system, the institution of the boss-favored "impartial" chairman, and the like.

The bosses know quite well, despite all of Schlesinger's anxious assurances, that the class struggle will not be abolished this way. It is an old story with them—their primary concern is a constantly increasing profit from the workers, and that the latter will inevitably seek for better wages and conditions at the expense of the boss' profit even under the stifling control of Schlesinger. But what the bosses fear more than the prospect later of militant resistance by the workers is the presence now of the Left wing and its union. To wipe out every vestige of the latter's strength, the bosses will cooperate to the limit with the Right wing and even help to organize the workers into a semi-company union. The bosses are working with Schlesinger in order to wipe out the menace of a strong Left wing movement among the workers, and the Schlesingers are playing the role assigned to them in the capitalist game—the labor agents of the bosses. Because it is to the employers' interests to crush the Left wing movement, it is to the workers' interests to strengthen the Left wing and thereby fortify themselves.

But since the Left wing is no abstraction, but rather an inseparable part of the working class, it must have a policy corresponding to the needs of the workers in general and for the given moment. In the present situation, this is not the case. The Left wing and its union are still bound, helpless, and in ever-deepening confusion. We pointed out in the last issue of *The Militant* that the Left wing union had adopted a criminally wrong policy towards the strike planned by the Right wing. We declared that the decision to remain at work and let the workers following the Right wing do as they please, was a policy of scabbing, of passivity, of desperation, guaranteed to discredit the movement for years. We proposed a policy of action for the Left wing. For our criticism we were denounced (as usual) as "counter-revolutionaries" by Foster and his Lovestoneite counterpart in the needle trades, Zimmerman. But that was before Foster received his monthly cable of instructions from Losovsky, which extricates him from one bad fix only to yank him into another.

Our criticism was of the "stay-at-work-and-ignore-strike-call" policy adopted at the Webster Hall membership meeting of the Left wing union on October 17, 1929, the policy formulated by the Party leaders, adopted by Gold and Zimmerman alike, enthusiastically reported in the *Freiheit* the next day. That decision caused tre-

A NEW ADDRESS

All comrades and friends are requested to note our change of address. All letters for *The Militant* or the Communist League or any of the officers of the organization and the paper should from now on be sent to our new address:

The Militant
25 Third Ave.
Room 4
New York, N. Y.

mendous harm to the Left wing in the needle trades market. It was met with distrustful silence by the Left wing rank and file. Now comes the *Daily Worker* of Nov. 21, 1929, five weeks later—and in its leading editorial it denounces the previous decision, as per Losovsky's latest cable! Says the Foster-Bedacht-Wicks organ:

Yesterday's Wisdom Now a Trap

"Neither can we consider as anything but a tumble into the trap set by the bosses and their agents such statements as 'remain at work' or the still worse elaboration of this statement into 'stay on the job in the shops we control'—statements made by some (!) left wing comrades.... The leadership (of the Left wing union) should undertake at once the organization of rank and file committees composed of members of the I. L. G. W. U., of unorganized workers and of members of the revolutionary union."

This belated bit of "criticism" fails to point out that it was not "some left wing comrades" who advocated the "remain at work" policy, but the official leaders of the union, the expelled Lovestoneite Zimmerman as well as the stamped and approved Stalinites Gold, Wortis and Burochovitch. That this policy was formulated by the official leadership of the Party and put through in the Joint Board by one Party fraction. That this policy was given the seal of approval by an official organ of the Party, the *Morning Freiheit*. That five weeks passed without anyone but The Militant as much as whispering a word of criticism. That Foster, Browder and Co. were so busy denouncing the "counter-revolutionary Trotskyites" for our position on the Party's line that they could not see daylight until Losovsky jerked them up a bit.

However, the policy now adopted is a step forward. That the cable-suspended Party leaders will be unable to make any genuine progress in the dressmakers' situation, if they continue with their "new line", is nevertheless also true. Foster's substitute for the previous policy of capitulation and passivity, is to enter the Left wing union in an adventurist race with the Right wing as to who will be first to issue the strike call leaflet. What is needed, badly needed at the present moment is a genuine movement for a united front of the workers in the dress trade, a closing of the ranks, a fraternization of the Right wing and Left wing workers for a shoulder-to-shoulder organizing campaign and strike against the bosses and their agents in the ranks of labor, for the unionization of the industry and the improvement of the workers' lot.

The present policy of the Party bureaucrats rules such a line of action out of consideration. The Left wing workers must fight for it in spite of the bureaucrats because that is the way the Schlesingers will be smashed, the Left wing built and the workers' conditions bettered. Foster's policy has led to the weakening of the Left wing and the strengthening of the Right wing union. Scores of Left wing workers are registering with the Schlesinger's Right wing union. Well known officials are doing likewise. There is Tunick of Local 6 (a Party member); Martin Feldman, delegate to the Joint Board from Local 6 and member of the T. U. E. L.; Faber, former business agent of Local 22; Goldstein, another business agent of Local 22; Horowitz, manager of Cutters Local 6 (ex-Party member); Reichel, Executive Board of Local 6 (a leader of the Party fraction); Sam Weisbrod, Local 2 (Party member); and these are only a few.

Unless the Left wing makes the necessary turn in the right direction, these signs of disintegration will multiply and willy-nilly it will add fuel to a fire that warms hearts only of Schlesinger and the bosses' associations.

Φ

An entertainment and dance for the benefit of the *MILITANT* will be held Saturday, December 14th 1929 at 8 P. M. at the Hungarian Hall, 323 East 79th Street, New York City. The affair is under the auspices of the New York Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition).

Throughout the World of Labor

The Czechoslovakian Elections

BULLETIN

The latest information on the Czech elections bears out the letter of comrade Lenorovics. The Communist Party suffered a crushing defeat, the Agrarians and the Social Democrats made huge strides forward. The Czechoslovakian Social Democratic Party increased its vote from 631,000 to 963,000 (more than 50 per cent) and its mandates from 29 to 39. The German Social Democratic Party of Czechoslovakia increased about 25 per cent, from 411,000 to 506,000 and its mandates from 17 to 21. The Communist Party dropped from 933,000 to 752,000 and its mandates from 41 to 29. The Czech Agrarians rose from 970,000 to 1,100,000 and are now the strongest Party. The C. P. lost its position as the strongest of the workers' Parties. The Czech S. P. is now the 2nd strongest Party in the country instead of the 4th. The German S. P. becomes the strongest German Party in Czechoslovakia. The bourgeois bloc government, consisting of 5 Czech and 3 German Parties, which ruled for over three years with 157 mandates out of 300, now has between 143 and 144, or a minority, and as comrade Lenorovics points out, will probably have to call into the coalition other parties, the Social Democrats most likely.—Ed.

The election comes this time in an unexpected manner. By a combination of technical maneuvers the bourgeoisie is endeavoring to make a success. The military festival of St. Wenceslas and the coincidence of the election day with that of the birthday of the Republic are to contribute to strengthening of national illusions and to make them serve for the elections. For the bourgeoisie, the great chronic crisis of the proletarian Party is also a circumstance that has its importance.

Finance capital has worked well in the course of the past years. Large sections of the petty bourgeoisie (small peasants, small tradesmen, half-proletarian employees) have been proletarianized, and increased exploitation of the working masses is being carried out. The discontent of the workers is still restrained, but it is constantly rising. The objective conditions are favorable to Communism.

In 1925, the Communist Party got close to a million votes. At that time, seven million voters went to the ballot box. This time there will be about 300,000 more voters. But if the Communist Party gets the same number of votes as in 1925, it will be a setback for it, for in that case the Communist Party would not have an increase to register to correspond to the growth of the voters and the "radicalization" of the masses. It is also proper to point out that the number of votes in itself is not a decisive sign of the strength of the Party—it is only a criterion. At the end of 1928, for example, the Communist Party went through a profound crisis; it was incapable of any action: it received nevertheless more than 800,000 votes.

The Left Opposition has no illusions: The elections will be a defeat for the Party, in spite of the favorable objective conditions for Communism. The socialist parties will gain votes in a high proportion. This fact is all the more grave because one of the Socialist Parties of Czechoslovakia, the Social Democratic Party, was near to crumbling a few years ago. Now, significantly enough, this same Party has just held its election meeting in the largest hall in Prague, the Lucerna. At this meeting, the former king's minister, Vandervelde, delivered a long speech, and, naturally, it was nothing but a lengthy, disgraceful diatribe against Communism and the Soviet Union. The social democrats who formerly held their meetings in the small halls on the outskirts can now speak to large masses, while the Communists must be content with a small hall in the Smichov quarter. This at a time when favorable conditions exist for Communist agitation and propaganda.

Reformist illusions are reviving. This fact is all the more humiliating because it must be noted at a moment when the leadership of the Communist Party is pursuing a self-styled Left policy. But the essentially Centrist character of the leadership can only compromise any real Left policy, because many workers who take the half-measures and the zig-zags for a "Left" policy are disconcerted by the inevitable opportunist effects and become distrustful.

To unmask the Centrist Gottwald-Reinann leadership is the most pressing task for us, for these Centrists are barring the road to impelling the masses toward Communism.

The repression that the bourgeois coalition has not ceased to exercise is now becoming strengthened. Military expenditures are increasing. It can nevertheless be expected that on the morrow of the elections the social democrats will form an open coalition with the bourgeoisie. The Czechoslovak proletariat (out of 7,000,000 voters a good half of proletarians can be counted) wants socialism, but the Party capable of guiding it is wanting.

The bourgeoisie in power has created a strengthened regime of dictatorship, remarkably organized in every field. It is by this means that it can hold the workers in check, for it thus succeeds in retaining the mask of democracy.

The task of the Opposition consists in showing the workers that the lack of success of the Communist Party has not its cause in Communism itself but in the bad leadership of the Party. The present chiefs of the Communist International have not known how to broaden the bases of the revolution, either in Europe or in China, and the result of it is a new rise of reformism, successes for the bourgeoisie, the victory of opportunism in the Communist Parties and the persecution of the Left Opposition.

It is certainly very difficult for revolutionary workers to vote for bureaucrats who are the leaders of the moment. But the votes that will go to the Communists need not be brought to the credit of these leaders who, for a long time now, are no longer considered as the leaders of the proletariat. The real leaders, such as Trotsky and many others, are persecuted, imprisoned and deported. The votes given to the candidates of the Party should be considered as a protest against bourgeois domination, against social peace, as a demonstration in favor of Communism.

H. LENOROVICS

Prague, October 20, 1929.

Φ

The E. C. C. I. Plays with the Life of the Austrian Party

As the Berlin "Rote Fahne" reports, the Plenary Session of the Communist Party of Germany met on October 24 and 25. Under the point "International Report", Remmle reported and remarked among other things as follows:

"The Austrian comrades must put on the agenda the demand for the formation of Workers' Soviets, organize the armed struggle against fascism, that is, immediately, not only theoretically or propagandistically, but practically and organizationally, raise the problem of the proletarian dictatorship."

Were this only the counsel of a Remmle to the Communist Party of Austria, it would really not be worth while to waste even a single word on the matter, but it is not a matter of a Remmle here! At this session of the Central Committee of the C. P. G. there participated representatives of the C. P. of Austria. It becomes ever more clear that it is the E. C. C. I. itself that is issuing the slogan "Form Workers' Soviets" in the present situation: the C. P. of Austria accepts this slogan, even if in a somewhat more cautious form, in the Vienna "Rote Fahne":

"The moment is also approaching when the working class, in order to conduct its struggle, will have to go over to creating Workers' Soviets."

Against this, Remmle polemized indirectly, turned against the slogan as "only theoretical or propagandist" and demanded its immediate realization by corresponding practical measures!

In an article "The Austrian Counter-Revolution is Preparing the Dictatorship" we considered the present situation in Austria in detail. The events since the writing of this article showed that we were right: The Socialist Party is letting the stirring of the masses fade away through numberless safety valves—conferences, meetings, preparedness of the Schutzbund (Defense League)—and confers with the counter-revolution in the constitution committee on the concrete form for legalizing the dictatorship. The "Arbeiterzeitung", central organ of the S. P. of Austria, writes on October 26:

"The population must be prepared for the negotiations to take their time. . . It will therefore be necessary in the first place to wait cool-headed until the negotiations in the sub-commission and in the Rathaus lead to an understanding or to the break."

That is where the main danger lies now: that the still existing disposition to battle will collapse during the weeks-long negotiations in parliament to such a point that

torship without any resistance worth mentioning, as they did with the entry into office of the Schober-Vaugoin clique of the counter-revolution.

To call upon the C. P. of Austria in such a situation "to make the organizational preparations for the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship" is a disgraceful play of the worst and most conscienceless adventurers. It is not the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship that stands immediately on the agenda but the prevention of the stabilization of the counter-revolutionary regime!

It is the task now of the Communist Party of Austria not to dream of the uprising, for which all the social, political and military assumptions are lacking at present, but to concentrate all forces upon combining the political defensive struggle against the planned state of dictatorship with the broadest mobilization of the masses in the factories and the unemployed for economic minimum demands.

Only in this manner can the C. P. A. succeed in winning influence upon broader masses and in creating the pre-conditions for a successful resistance to the Schober regime. There can be no doubt that such a struggle has the tendency to become directly a struggle for power. Only hopeless adventurism, however, is capable of deceiving itself that these pre-conditions already exist.

KURT LANDAU

Φ

The Labor Movement in Greece

Capitalism has reached the zenith of its power. In the West and in the East, in the countries where industry was almost unknown, we see it assuming gigantic proportions, as in Greece for example.

A political maneuver has brought into Greece about two million refugees from Asia Minor and has thereby strengthened the elements of the progressive bourgeoisie who, since the 1909 revolution, have advanced the industrialization of Greece. That is one part of its program accomplished, since this bourgeoisie can dispose of an abundant and inexpensive manual labor. And it may be said that this mass, since its earliest youth, has been lulled by the priests on the "grandeur of Greece which fights for the delivery of its sons from Turkey, despoiler of the Byzantine empire". But once they quitted Turkey, and returned to the country of their origin, these opinions on Christain and benevolent Greece swiftly vanished among the refugees, for now, formed into compact masses of workers in all branches of industry, notably in the spinning industry of Naoussa, as well as the tobacco factories of new and old Greece, working in common has given them new power and a penetrating ideology: the ideology of wages.

With this plethora of a new contingent of exploited, what has been the role of the Communist Party? Almost nil. It let this mass of producers serve as an electoral clientele to the Venizelist or Liberal Party, and it is with their voice that Venizelos was able to defeat feudalism with the petty bourgeois elements he was able to rally against capitalism. In order to know the Party better, we must go back a few years.

Socialism was introduced around 1912-13 by some bourgeois intellectuals who studied in Germany. These professed a sort of pulp socialism, clearly bourgeois, and their Marxism was in reality only degenerated. They are not even worth naming, and merit only disgust, for today they are overwhelmed with responsible positions in the Greek state. And, since the birth of that Socialist Party, at present Communist, those who aspire to establish themselves make use of this Party. Thus, in 1922, while on the Asia Minor front the soldiers abandoned their posts with the cry "Long live Lenin," and, returning home refused to fight any longer for reasons that did not concern them, the Party did not know how to profit by the occasion. It gave a free hand to a military camarilla which diverted the spirit of the rebellious soldiers and led it only against King Constantine, or rather, against Greek feudalism.

The slogan of the C. P. G. in 1925 was: Democracy of the Left!!! that is, cooperation with the liberal bourgeoisie. The functionaries at the head of the Party, are men without principles, without ideology (it is interesting to attend an election which resembles a bourgeois election from every viewpoint; all the means employed by the bourgeoisie are made use of, such as jugs of wine, distribution of alcohol, promises of positions in the Party and the trade unions, etc.) If they are to lose their positions they

Communists, like Pouliopoulos, petty-bourgeois intellectuals, ethically an egoist, always desirous of being the leader. As for another, the ex-Communist deputy, Maximos, he declared from the tribune of the Chamber: "We, the Communists are against all violence", and, from the other side the bourgeois deputies, weeping with laughter, cried out to him: "And Marxism, have you forgotten it." Now the two cronies, Pouliopoulos and Maximos form a socalled Opposition to the Party which is just as harmful to the Greek workers as the Party itself.

The fault-crammed tactic of the Party obliged the sincere and revolutionary elements to seek a remedy for this state of affairs. That happened in 1922-23. To set the degenerated Party on the revolutionary track again, a struggle was begun; but in spite of the readiness of the militants the effort remained temporarily in vain. A division was necessary, or rather the redemption of a minority insignificant in numbers but significant enough from the point of view of revolutionary quality. The work that had to be done was enormous: to prepare the Communists in Greece was the first task, for in the Party, as well as in all the Parties of the C. I. Marxist-Leninist education was virtually dead. A review was created where much of the Marxist-Leninist literature was translated, as well as booklets to facilitate the adhesion to Communism of still uneducated workers.

At the moment of the withdrawal of the most active elements of the Party, this Opposition seemed the result of the special conditions in Greece, but today, we ascertain similar phenomena in all the Parties. The regrouping, which works under the name of the review "Archives of Marxism," and which has gathered numerous elements around the small minority from the outset, has just declared that it shares the ideas of the rest of the Left Oppositions. We can only rejoice at this declaration: an organization like the "Archives" is most qualified to lengthen the chain of the Left Oppositions. . . .

M. KLADOS

Φ

The Chinese Communists and the Sino-Russian Conflict

On October 22, 1929, comrade L. Trosky received a letter from a Chinese Opposition Communist, of which the following is the last part:

"What is your position in the question of the Chinese Eastern Railway? Here (in China) three slogans have been launched, one for each Communist tendency:

"Our own (that is, the Left Communist Opposition): Against the usurpation of the Chinese Eastern Railway by the Kuo Min Tang. Defense of the U. S. S. R. in the interest of the world revolution."

"That of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China: Against intervention. For the defense of the U. S. S. R. in the interest of the world revolution."

"That of the Tchen Du-Siu tendency*: Against the traitorous policy of the Kuo Min Tang."

"A letter from one of our comrades in Moscow informs us that 'it is said' that you have declared yourself a supporter of restoring the Railway to China. That appears to me absolutely unbelievable. Couldn't you write on this question?"

These few lines are weighty arguments in the discussion on the Sino-Russian conflict. In China, as we see by this letter, not a single Communist tendency accepts support of the slogan of reenforcing the Chinese counter-revolution on the back of the Soviet Republic.

The Moscow Press, like that of the Communist International, is endeavoring to pass off the viewpoint of the Korschists, of Urbahns and others for that of the Left Opposition. That is what accounts for the letter from Moscow to Shanghai which repeats that "it is said" that Comrade Trotsky is a supporter of restoring the Railway to the Kuo Min Tang generals. Also, it is significant that a Chinese comrade, separated from him by thousands upon thousands of miles (his letter took 42 days to get to Trotsky) and in spite of the categoric information from Moscow, declares: "That appears to me absolutely unbelievable."

*We are informed that the Tchen Du-Siu group, which the Comintern made the scapegoat for the policy of Stalin-Bucharin-Martinov, has developed a remarkable manner tow

On the Twelfth Anniversary of the Russian October

By L. D. Trotsky

The twelfth anniversary of October finds the Republic of the Soviets in a situation where the greatest successes are combined with the vastest difficulties, and the successes like the difficulties increase simultaneously. That is the essential feature of the situation, it is the great problem.

Industry has made and continues to make stupendous conquests, if they are judged on the capitalist scale. Agriculture in these last years has progressed much more slowly but its rise was indubitable. But, at the same time, we ascertain a wholly paradoxical fact: On the market, there is a very serious scarcity of merchandise which, in spite of the progress in general economy continues from year to year, attaining at certain periods a degree of extreme crisis. The most indispensable manufactured products are lacking despite the headlong progress of industry. And the insufficiency of agricultural products, even though the country has a preponderantly agricultural character, makes itself felt to a really intolerable point. What do these contradictions signify? They have two sorts of causes.

The essential causes lie in the objective situation of an economically backward country which found itself forced to be first to come to the dictatorship of the proletariat and to socialist construction. The causes of secondary order lie in the false policy of the leadership which suffers the influences of the petty bourgeoisie, which pursues a policy of circumstances, which is incapable of understanding the situation at the right time and of utilizing the economic and political resources of the dictatorship in the most rational manner.

The Soviet State does not pay interest on the old debts. It has no, or hardly any tribute to pay to the nobles, to the bankers to the manufacturers, etc. These two circumstances, and above all the second constitute a most important fund for the industrialization of the country.

The unification of the transport industry in one and the same management which is the workers' State, an absolute condition for an economy regulated by plan, has opened up inexhaustible possibilities for a rational application of forces and means, and consequently, for the acceleration of the economic growth of the country.

Such are the tremendous assets of the October revolution. The liabilities, which do not proceed from the revolution itself but from the conditions in which it was accomplished are these: The very low level of capitalist development of czarist Russia; the diffusion of an extremely backward peasant economy; the little culture of the masses of the people; finally, the isolation in which the Soviet Republic is found, hemmed in by a powerful and infinitely richer capitalist world.

The need of expending hundreds of millions annually for the maintenance of the army and the fleet is the most immediate and evident result of the hostile encirclement of the capitalist world.

Another consequence: The monopoly of foreign trade, which is imposed on the Soviet Republic just as imperiously as the army and the fleet. The abolition, or even only weakening of the monopoly of foreign trade (Stalin tried to attain that under the influence of Sokolnikov at the end of 1922) would not only mark a return of Russia to the path of capitalism, but the reduction of that country to a semi-colonial state.

But it must not be forgotten that the monopoly of foreign trade automatically excludes Russia from that international division of labor on the basis of which its capitalist evolution was accomplished. The immediate consequence, at a time when general economy has advanced, has been an extreme reduction in foreign trade. The rapid increase of the resources employed in the industrialization is therefore called forth, to a considerable extent, by the need for the Soviet Republic to produce all that bourgeois Russia received from the outside under much more advantageous conditions. If the socialist regime existed in other countries, the monopoly of foreign trade, of course, would not be necessary, and the U.S.S.R. would receive the products it lacks from more developed countries under incomparably more advantageous conditions than those it was used to when it was a bourgeois Russia. But in the present situation the monopoly of foreign trade, absolutely indispensable to protect

the country, requires

industry quite simply for the defense of the country. Thence, the general percentage of the growth of industry being very high, a chronic insufficiency of manufactured products.

Peasant economy, very scattered by a past tradition, became still more so following upon the October Revolution, in the measure that it had to be after a democratic agrarian revolution.

The diffusion of the agricultural enterprises would have created serious difficulties for the socialist transformation of rural economy in Russia, even in case the proletariat were in power in a more advanced country. These difficulties are much more considerable now that the country of the October Revolution is left entirely to itself. However, the extremely slow rhythm of the socialist transformation of village economy brings on more extended partition of peasant enterprises and is the cause, consequently, of a strengthening of their consuming powers. That is one of the reasons why agricultural products happen to be lacking.

The high cost of industrial products has no less a significance. That is the price industry must pay for its passage from a backward technique to a higher technique, and at the same time it must incessantly assure new investments in industrial branches that have become indispensable as a result of the regime of the monopoly of foreign trade. In other words: The village pays a heavy tribute to socialist industry.

The peasant class makes a serious distinction between the democratic agrarian revolution accomplished by the Bolsheviks and the foundation of a socialist revolution that they have laid. The lands of the State and the landlords are in the power of the peasants; it is a democratic revolution worth about half a billion rubles to the latter, by delivering them from the necessity of paying farm rent. But the peasants pay, as a result of the diversion of prices ("the scissors"), a much greater sum which is set down to the profit of State industry. Thus, the balance of the two revolutions, the democratic and the proletarian, united in October, shows, even now, a minus for the peasant class that can be estimated at several hundreds of millions of rubles. That is the incontestable and most important fact for him who wishes to estimate not only the economic situation but the political situation of the country. This fact must be considered plainly. It springs, at bottom, from the strained relations that exist between the peasant class and the government of the Soviets.

The increasing abatement of rural economy, the persistent scattering of its means, the "scissors" of agricultural prices and industrial prices, in a word, the economic difficulties that are manifest in the village, favor the growth of the power of the Kulaks and the progress of their influence in the country out of proportion to the number of these Kulaks and the material resources at their command. The grain surpluses that belong primarily to upper sections permit them to enslave the poor, to speculate in the sales made to the petty bourgeois elements of the city, and so these surpluses are excluded from the general trade of the State. Grain is lacking not only for export but for home needs. Exports being extremely reduced, the necessity arises not only of giving up the importation of manufactured products but of limiting to the last degree the importation of machinery and industrial raw materials, and in that case the slightest progress of industrialization must be paid for by an extreme tension of economic resources.

Thus is explained essentially, why, with a restoration of economy and a very rapid growth of industrialization, the Soviet Republic does not emerge from the regime of "the queue", a regime that constitutes the most vivid argument against the theory of socialism in one country.

But "the queue" is also an argument against the official practices in economy. Here we pass from the objective causes to the subjective causes, that is to say, primarily to the policy of the leadership. It is beyond doubt that a leadership, even the most correct and perspicacious, could

**"The queue" is now in effect so as to attain objects and products of primary need,

not lead the U.S.S.R. to a building of socialism within the national frame-work if it remained closed to world economy by the monopoly of foreign trade. If the proletarian revolution in the advanced capitalist countries were set back a few dozen years, the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Republic would inevitably fall, succumbing under the economic contradictions, in their pure form, or as a result of a military intervention. In the language of politics, this means that the fate of the Soviet Republic, in the general conditions that we have characterized above, is determined as much by the internal economic direction as by the direction given to the revolutionary struggle of the international proletariat. And, in the end, it is precisely this last factor that must determine everything.

A correct economic direction in the U.S.S.R. is the utilization of the resources and the possibility by means of which socialist progress is accompanied by a genuine and tangible improvement of the condition of the working masses. At this moment, it is not at all a question, practically, of "surpassing" all of world economy—a task which would be fantastic—but of consolidating the industrial bases of the proletarian dictatorship and of improving the condition of the workers, by strengthening the first political principle of the dictatorship, that is, the alliance of the proletariat with the non-exploiting peasants.

A correct policy in the U.S.S.R. must make the dictatorship last as long as possible under the conditions of isolation in which the country finds itself. A correct policy of the Communist International must, as much as possible, bring closer the victory of the proletariat in the advanced countries. At a certain point these two lines must merge. It is only on this condition that the present Soviet regime, full of contradictions, will have the possibility, without any Thermidor, without counter-revolution, without new revolutions, of developing itself into a socialist society on a basis that will go on widening, which must finally, extend over the whole globe.

Time, which is one of the most important factors in politics in general, has a decisive character when it is a question of the fate of the U.S.S.R. Now, the present leadership, since 1923, has done everything to let time pass by without profiting by it. The years 1923, 1924 and 1925 were devoted to the struggle against "super-industrialization": By that was meant a demand of the Opposition aiming to accelerate industrial development; these years were employed in fighting against the principle of a general plan and against economic forecasts. If industrialization then advanced more quickly, it was by empirical means, by jerks, by brutal methods that crushed everything along the road, and from that the expenses of construction have been multiplied. The condition of the working masses has become more difficult.

It is six years ago that the Opposition demanded the elaboration of a five year plan. This demand was met with ridicule at the time, entirely in the spirit of a small boss who dreads to face great problems and broad perspectives. That is what we called Menshevism in economy. In April 1927, Stalin declared, for example, that the hydro-electric station of Dnieper was just as little necessary to the country as a phonograph to a moujik (poor peasant), and at the same time he denied absolutely that the rhythm of our economic revolution depended on world development.

The five year plan has come after a delay of five years. The errors, the transformations and the corrections of the last years took place without any general plan, and it is for this sole reason that the leadership learned so very little from them. One cannot neglect to say here that the first draft was thoroughly imbued with the most niggardly spirit of minimalism, with a great economic timidity. This draft was mercilessly criticized in the Platform of the Opposition. It is only under the action of our criticism which corresponds to the keenest needs of economic development, that the five year plan was remade from one end to the other in the course of the year.

All the grounds invoked against "super-industrialization" were suddenly rejected. The apparatus, which had worked

Menshevism received the order to regard as heresy all that had been considered holy scripture only the day before, and as a set-off to transform into official figures the heresies that were called "Trotskyism" only yesterday. The apparatus—Communists and specialists—were not at all prepared for this: They had been educated in a wholly different spirit. The first attempts at resistance or timid protestations were mercilessly punished. And how could it be otherwise? To allow explanations would be to disclose that the leadership was bankrupt, having lost all the principles of its theory. This time again the apparatus submitted silently. To him* who directed the elaboration of the plan, this formula is attributed: "It is better to stand up for a rapid development than to lay (in prison) for a less rapid development."**

If the new plan were elaborated under blows, it is not hard to imagine, when it is a question of applying it, what resistance it will encounter from the apparatus, nine-tenths of which is more to the Right than the official Right. The Left Wing, from whose platform the essential ideas of the new five year plan have been copied, remains under the hail of repression and calumny. The apparatus lives in expectation of new changes and rights-about-face, not deciding even to call to its aid the union of poor peasants. The Party is placed each time before an accomplished fact. The apparatus has no confidence in it and fears it. Under these conditions, no one sees in the new five year plan the expression of a considered and more or less assured course to the Left. No one, unless it be the capitulators.

As much must be said of the policy of the Communist International. From the alliance with Chiang Kai-Shek, from the theory of the "Bloc of four classes", from the slogan of workers' and peasants' Parties, from amicable collaboration with the General Council of the British Trade Unions that crushed the General Strike, the Communist International in twenty-four hours has arrived at the slogan: No agreements with the reformists, fight against social pacifism for the possession of the streets. The new acute angle of this zig-zag is founded on the theory of the "third period" which can be said to be specifically calculated to spread illusions, to provoke adventures and to prepare a new evolution, as usual, towards the Right.

The twelfth anniversary of the October Revolution takes place at a time when the Soviet Republic and the International are in the greatest difficulties and contradictions that show, by way of opposites, the correctness of the Marxist theory of the socialist revolution. With Lenin, we entered into the October Revolution, profoundly convinced that the revolution in Russia could not have a finished character, independent of the other countries. We estimated that this revolution could only be the first link of the world revolution and that the fate of this link depended upon the destinies of the whole chain. We remain today on this position. The progress, its contradictions, and the progress would be inevitably absorbed by the contradictions if the Republic of the Soviets were not supported later on by the successes of an international revolution.

The exclusion from the Party and the rigorous persecutions exercised against the revolutionary wing in the Soviet Republic are the political expression of the contradictions of a proletarian revolution isolated in a backward country. Paradoxical though the fact may be that the Bessedovskys—and they are innumerable—are the first to expel the Rakovskys, and that on the first occasion they pass over to the Whites, the fact is no less logical for it.

Spinoza said: "Not to laugh, not to weep, but to understand." To understand, in order to continue the fight for the October Revolution.

The thirteenth year will mark an aggravation of the contradictions. The Party deprived of forces and strangled, can be suddenly surprised. At the first great difficulty that arises, the Bessedovskys of all kinds will raise their heads. The Centrist apparatus will show that it is only an apparatus and nothing more. The proletarian

*The reference is to Rykov, who reported on the plan.

**A play on words in the original which loses its point in translation.

Continued on Page 8

The New Unions and the Communists

By James P. Cannon

In the correspondence from the Illinois coal fields there is room for serious thought. These informative and authoritative letters from the fields of battle—models of proletarian journalism giving a fresh meaning to the term "Workers' Correspondence"—cast a searching light upon a disease in the new union movement which threatens its existence.

This sickness consists—to speak plainly—in the importing into the new unions of the labor fakers' arts under the fraudulent banner of "Communist leadership". To the shame of Communism this rotten business held the stage under the Communist Party auspices at the District Conference of the National Miners Union at Belleville, Illinois. And the scene enacted there was only a replica, made cruder by enlargement, of the routine game being played in all the new unions and which is evoking in all of them the inevitable revolt.

The Foster Wrecking Crew

This strangulation and disruption of promising movements for the organization of the workers in important industries is becoming an old story. For a long time the situation among the marine workers has been crying aloud for industrial organization. Experienced and capable militants are not lacking for the job—men who have been thru the mill, who enjoy the confidence of the seamen and know how to organize them. But, thanks to the Foster wrecking crew, the marine workers organization has its being largely in the bombastic headlines and lying news stories of the Daily Worker. The position of the Auto Workers Union was recorded in a letter from Detroit printed in a recent issue of The Militant. The Party bosses have "captured" this union, captured it and locked it up in the Party office where the auto slaves will never find it. The Needle Trades Industrial Union, which had the most favorable chances of all, is today only a pale shadow of what it might have been. And the National Textile Workers Union—the football of Party factionalism since its ill-starred birth—lies paralyzed while the Party experts debate and golden opportunities go by. The new union movement as a whole, inoculated with the Foster medicine, is reeling like a victim of poison moonshine.

What is the matter?

Like the left wing organizations in all spheres of labor activity, this great potential movement of new unionism is registering the ruinous effects of the internal crisis of the Communist Party. The appointed Party leaders carry over into the mass organizations the same foul practices which signalize their rule in the Party. They set as their first task the control of the new unions, and they effect this "control" by methods that insult proletarian intelligence as they offend proletarian morality.

Unearned and appointed leadership has no faith in itself. It prefers mechanical control of half-dead organizations to the struggle for influence in living movements. Foster and Company want "leadership" in the new unions insured in and guaranteed in advance by mechanical measures. Ninety per cent of their "mass work" and 99 per cent of the funds at their disposal are devoted to this barren accomplishment. The result is an absolutely artificial selection of the leading bodies of the new unions and a stifling of their inner life.

Everything is cut and dried in these unions. There is little for the members to do at the meetings except listen to long-winded speeches. There is nothing for them to decide—everything is decided for them in advance. Intelligent non-Party workers are systematically squeezed out thru the application of the asinine formula—which follows the doctrine of the "Third Period" as pestilence follows famine—that everybody who is not a Communist is a traitor. Every Party quarrel is immediately transferred into the union, and one who gets crossways with the Party regime immediately becomes a target for slander and frame-up, as, is now the case with John Watt, president of the National Miners Union.

The reckless gambling with the Workers movement which marked the career of the Lovestone faction as the American representatives of Stalinism, has been elaborated in previous documents—documents which Foster signed jointly with us. The conduct of the present Party bureaucracy, headed by Foster who learned from Gompers, is distinguished from that of Lovestone only by a vaster clumsiness and ignorance.

Belleville's Significance

Of the Foster overseers the needs and interests stand with the impulses

in their deepest ranks towards a genuine workers' movement. The explosion at the Belleville convention of the miners—where 40 or more delegates bolted—is an alarming reminder of this conflict. We see in the miners union—and not only in the miners—the portentous appearance of a line-up of honest rank and file elements against the Party; or, rather of the Party against the rank and file militants—for the Party marines are the aggressors in the whole evil circumstance and are responsible for it.

This revolt from below against neofakerism tricked out in counterfeited Communist badges, which broke out in the Miners' Union and which smolders in others, is a sign of internal health and strength. The question whether it will remain a negative protest or become a positive force for the regeneration of the movement is a burning one. Indeed matters have come to such a pass that the part to be played by the new unions in the stormy days ahead hinges upon that question.

The answer lies in the first place with the politically conscious forces of the Communist vanguard who alone are capable of grasping the problem in its manifold aspects and of organizing the struggle to cope with it.

Without the intervention of the most conscious and uncorrupted elements in the Communist ranks to right the situation the left wing will pay for the sins of Party mismanagement with a recrudescence of syndicalism. Signs of this already are not lacking.

For this struggle we have no new or magic formulas and none are needed. The teachings of Leninism on the work of Communists in the trade unions, as laid down by the fundamental documents of the Communist International, are a sufficient guide. It is time to study them again, to make them part of the consciousness of the revolutionary workers and to set them up against the monstrous perversions practiced today in the name of Communism.

The new unions are at a fork of the road. One way—the way of the Party bureaucrats—leads to degeneration and collapse; the other to a period of expansion and healthy growth for which all conditions are favorable. In the interest of the latter it is of vital importance now for the members and supporters of the Communist League to bring into the foreground some fundamental conceptions, to make a sharper and more aggressive fight for them in

the unions and to organize the conscious militants inside and outside the Party for this fight. The issue must be brought into the open before the workers. The Foster fakers will howl about our exposure of the shameful game they are playing at the expense of the movement. Let them howl! And see that stronger blows are dealt against them.

The organization of the workers for the elementary struggle is the primary revolutionary task, and the building of the new unions the most important medium for its execution. The revolutionaries will fulfill their historic task only to the extent that they understand the proper relations between the masses and the vanguard and create an internal regime in the unions which attracts and holds the masses.

The Need For Workers Democracy

This means a struggle to make the new unions democratic organizations in reality, and not merely in hypocritical declarations. They must function as self-sufficient bodies, freely determining their own course, working out their own rules and selecting their own leaders. The right of expression for various divergent political views and tendencies must be firmly established. The workers who are banded together there for a common struggle against their exploiters must be able to feel that they are in their own house, not the tolerated guests of the Party. The meetings, conferences and conventions of the new unions must have a formal and binding character.

Only so can the new unions develop into genuine mass organizations and unless they become such they are doomed. They must aim to include in their ranks not simply Communists and a fringe of sympathizers, but the masses, without whose participation the unions have no power. Not only the politically conscious, but the politically indifferent, the backward and even the reactionary (who are the vast majority) must find a place in the unions. Formal proclamations on this score are plentiful but mean nothing. What is necessary is a deliberate course in this direction.

The leading forces in the new unions ought to represent a united front of the Communists with the progressives. The shallow-minded, phrase-mongers imagine that the formation of new unions disposes of the vexing problem of progressives. A greater absurdity is hardly conceivable. There is not a single organization of workers which expands beyond the paper bounds of a Party "auxiliary"—that is to say, of a duplicate of the Party membership.

MINNEAPOLIS FOR GASTONIA

Following the issuance of a call for a Unity Conference for Gastonia Defense, signed by active militants in the labor movement of Minneapolis and St. Paul, a large and representative gathering met at Labor Headquarters, October 29, to discuss and act upon the frame-up of the Gastonia textile fighters and the massacre of the Marion strikers.

The meeting was called to order by acting secretary Carl Skoglund, who set forth the object of the conference, namely: to acquaint the workers of Minneapolis with the situation in the southern textile industry, especially the Gastonia trials, and to inaugurate a campaign in Minneapolis to aid the workers in defending themselves while organizing. Skoglund then called for nominations for temporary officers. He was elected as temporary chairman and A. G. Edmunds was chosen temporary secretary. The agenda for the conference was then read and adopted.

Upon a motion, a credentials committee of three was appointed by the chairman, consisting of Lee R. Miller of the Electrical Workers, John A. Nelson of the Steam Fitters and Helpers, and V. R. Dunne of the Communist League of America.

Hedlund Speaks on Case

C. R. Hedlund, well-known left-wing fighter in the Engineers union gave a short summary of the various labor disputes in past labor history and called attention to the new persecutions that are taking place in the Southern textile industry. He urged all workers to unite for the purpose of defending all attempts of workers to organize and to bring all the labor forces into action on behalf of working class defense. The credentials committee then reported the following organizations and delegates in attendance.

Steam Fitters and Helpers, Local 539: John A. Nelson, Platers and Polishers: P. J. Neuman, Broom Makers Union: F. S.

Seake, Bernadotte Lodge, No. 20, I. O. G. T.: Egan Soneson and August Brodin, Electrical Workers Union, Local 202: Lee R. Miller, A. W. Henry Cook and Ed Lawrence Painters Union Local 292: William Lundgren, Stanley Anderson and A. Boerback, Promethean Club, Y. P. Unitarian Society: Arnold Anderson, Mercedes Nelson and Robert Happ, Communists League of America (Opposition): V. R. Dunne, Simon Barach and Carl Cowl, Maintenance of Way Employees, Lodge 144: W. McDonald, Thomas Rudd and Bennee Schreuer, Socialist Party: Leo Gisselin, Minneapolis Federation of Teachers: Amy Edmunds, Alice Dreschler and M. Dietrichson, Workers Club of Minneapolis: Herbert Howes, Warner Day and Morris Hanson, Viking Lodge, No. 10, I. O. G. T.: Sten Gagner, Alfred Engman and Helmer Augustson, Capmakers Union Local 12: I. Hoberman and P. Gordon, Independent Workmen's Circle Br. 89: D. Moses, Sam Lessin and Mrs Schwartz.

All were seated, as well as the signers of the provisional call, and Skoglund was chosen permanent chairman with A. G. Edmunds as permanent secretary.

The opinions of the delegates being then called for, all delegates agreed that whatever differences of opinion might exist among organizations, unity can and must be had on the question of defending persecuted workers. A motion was made that the conference call a public mass meeting as soon as possible to acquaint the workers of Minneapolis with the Gastonia and Marion situations and amended that another such conference be called before such a mass meeting takes place in order to insure greater success. The amended motion was adopted.

All organizations represented by delegates were asked to elect one representative on the executive committee, and the permanent officers were instructed to call an executive Committee meeting as soon as

—where a united front with the progressives is not a categorical condition for growth and development. In America there are only a few thousand scattered Communists among millions of politically indifferent and reactionary workers. The key to the unity and consolidation of the new unions, to the problem of leadership and the expansion of revolutionary influence is combination of the revolutionary with the progressive-minded workers. Without this it is impossible under the present conditions to organize new unions on a mass basis. Pig-headed insistence on a Communist monopoly of the directing organs does not—as experience has amply demonstrated—result in Communist leadership of the masses. It simply results in the exclusion of the masses from the union.

The Mechanical Control Disease

The mechanical control sickness must be eliminated if the new unions are to live. There is nothing revolutionary in the dogma that Communists should control the unions by arbitrary and bureaucratic means. The French Communist Party was severely condemned for this very nonsense at the Fourth Congress of the Communist International when Lenin and Trotsky were at the helm. It is the refuge of feeble people who are afraid of the rough and tumble fight for influence and leadership. In its effect it is sectarian and reactionary. It has become a fetter on the development of a workers mass movement—the primary revolutionary task—and a source of discredit to Communism.

Communist leadership of the masses is one of the prerequisites for the revolutionary victory of the proletariat. But, conversely, the organization of the "million masses"—to use De Leon's classic phrase—is likewise a preliminary necessity to the constitution of a genuine class movement on the road to a struggle for power. It is only in this process that the revolutionary leadership can expand. Tactics and methods at this stage of events ought properly to be judged by how they help or hinder this work of organizing the masses. And by this standard the "mechanical control" idea stands condemned.

Leadership of the masses cannot be "captured" without their knowledge or consent. Communist influence which precedes and evolves into leadership can only be based on service to the broad workers' movement which the workers understand and approve. Serious and consistent work for the building of the new unions in preparation for the great impending struggles will do more than anything else at the present time to promote the influence of the Communists. Clear the way for this work.

possible after the selection of that body.

Resolutions were adopted protesting against the convictions in Charlotte and demanding the release of the prisoners, and another expressing solidarity with the Marion strikers and protesting the murder of five workers by the sheriff and his thugs. Copies were sent to the Governor of North Carolina, to President Hoover, to labor organizations and the press.

The success of the Minneapolis conference shows the tremendous reservoir of support that can be obtained for the defense of Gastonia if a genuine effort is made to organize united action. That such action has been bitterly opposed up to now by the leaders of the Communist Party makes the task more difficult, but, as Minneapolis shows, far from impossible.

Φ

MINNEAPOLIS CLASSES OPEN

The Minneapolis Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition) announces the opening of winter classes for the study of problems facing the labor movement. Two classes are now open: (1) A B C of Communism, with Carl Cowl instructing; (2) American Labor History, with Karl Skoglund instructing. Cowl's class opened Tuesday evening, November 19th at 401 Washington Avenue South at 7:45 p.m. Registration for the classes can be made by all workers by applying to the School Committee at Box 45, Minneapolis.

Φ

THE NEXT ISSUE

The next issue of the Militant will contain the following special articles: Disarmament and the United States of Europe, by L. D. Trotsky; Is the A. F. of L. Becoming Progressive? by Arne Swabeck; The Results of the Czechoslovak Elections and the Crisis in the Communist Party, by H. Lenorovics; The Swindle, by M.

Who Is Leading the Comintern Today?

Continued from Last Issue

In his attacks, first against "Trotskyism", then against Zinoviev and Kamenev, Stalin always hit at the same side: against the old revolutionary emigrants. The emigrants are people without roots who think only of the world revolution... But today new leaders are necessary, who are capable of realizing socialism in one country. The struggle against the emigrants, which is in a measure the continuation of Stalin's letter in 1911 against Lenin is an integral part of the Stalinist ideology of national socialism. Only a complete ignorance of history allows Stalin to have open recourse to this manifestly reactionary argument. After every revolution, the reaction commenced with the struggle against the emigrants and foreigners. Were the October revolution to recede to another stage, on the Ustrialovist road, the next, the third set of leaders would certainly set themselves to hunting down the professional revolutionaries in general: for while these cut themselves off from life by taking refuge in illegal work, the others, the new "leaders", were always rooted in the soil!

Stalin and the Emigrants

In truth, never did the provincial-national narrow-mindedness of Stalin appear so brutally than in this scheme to make the old revolutionary "emigrants" an object of terror. For Stalin, emigration signifies the abandonment of the struggle and of political life. It is organically inconceivable to him that a Russian Marxist, having lived in France or the United States, should have engaged in the struggle of the French or the American working class, not to speak of the fact that most of the time, the Russian emigrants performed important functions in the service of the Russian revolution.

It is curious that Stalin does not observe that in striking at the old "uprooted" emigrants, he strikes above all at the Executive Committee of the International, which is composed of foreign emigrants in the Soviet Union where they are invested with the leadership of the international labor movement. But it is upon himself, as "leader" of the International, that Stalin lets fall the most painful blows: for it is impossible to imagine a more consummate, that is to say, a more isolated "emigrant" than he is toward all the foreign countries. Without any knowledge of the history and the internal life of the foreign countries, without personal knowledge of their labor movements, without even the possibility of following the foreign press, Stalin is today called upon to hammer out and to settle the questions of the world revolution. In other words, Stalin is the most perfect incarnation of the caricatured type of emigrant pictured in his imagination. That also explains why the incursions of Stalin into the field of international questions, beginning with the Autumn of 1924 (the day and the date can be established without difficulty) always have this episodic broken, accidental character, without being any the less injurious for that.

It is not by chance that the thoroughly cynical empiricism of Stalin and the passion of Bucharin for playing with generalizations have marched side by side for a relatively long period. Stalin acted under the influence of direct social collisions, Bucharin, with his little finger, set heaven and hell into motion in order to justify the new zig-zag. Stalin regarded Bucharin's generalizations as an unavoidable evil. In his heart, he believed as before that there was no reason to get excited over theoretical "tempests in a glass of water". But ideas in a certain sense live their own life. Interests become fastened to ideas. Basing themselves upon interests, ideas weld people together. Thus, while serving Stalin, Bucharin fed the Right group theoretically, while Stalin remained the practitioner of the Centrist zig-zags. There lies the reason for their discord. At the Sixth Congress, the discord broke out all the more scandalously the longer it was maked.

The real and not the purely formal interest in the International is determined for Stalin by the anxiety to get the necessary support from the leading cadres for the next zig-zag in internal policy. In other words, what is demanded from the International is an apparatus obedience.

At the Sixth Congress, Bucharin read from a letter of Lenin's to Zinoviev and himself in which he warns them that if the clever and obedient people in the Interna-

By L. D. Trotsky

idiots, they will certainly kill it. Bucharin risked bringing forward these lines only because they were necessary to defend himself against Stalin. In actuality, the warning of Lenin, which rings so tragically today, embraces the regime of Zinoviev, of Bucharin, as well as of Stalin. This part of the "Testament" has also been trampled under foot. At the present moment, not only in the Russian Communist Party, but in all the foreign Communist Parties without exception, all the elements that built up the International and led it in the period of the first four Congresses have been removed from leadership and cut off from the Party. This general change of the leading cadres is of course not accidental. The line of Stalin requires Stalinists and not Leninists.

That is why the Peppers, the Kuusinen, the Martinovs, the Petrovskys, the Rafezes, the Manuilskys and consorts are so useful and irreplaceable. They are made to adapt themselves. In seeking to obtain the obedience of the International, they realize their highest destiny. For many of these pensioners, the supreme bureaucracy has become the preliminary condition for a readiness to make any kind of a right-about-face, on the condition that they feel that they have the apparatus behind them, and at the same time they feel themselves to be the direct heirs of the October Revolution and its harbingers throughout the world. What more do they need? Verily, they are building an International in their own image.

This "work", however, contains a fatal deficiency: it does not take into account the resistance of the materials, that is to say, the living masses of the workers. In the capitalist countries, the resistance appears much sooner, for there the Communists have no apparatus of coercion. Despite all their sympathy for the October Revolution, the working masses are by no means disposed to put confidence in the first stick that is transformed into a leader and to worship the "head of a sardine". The masses cannot and do not want to understand the mechanism of the apparatus. They learn from great events. And they see nothing but mistakes, confusion and defeats. The worker Communists feel the atmosphere growing cold around them. Their uneasiness is transformed into ideological turmoil which becomes the basis for factional groupings.

It is clear: the International has entered into a period where it must atone heavily for the sins of the last six years in the course of which ideas were treated like worthless bank notes, revolutionaries like functionaries, and the masses like an obed-

ient chorus. The gravest crises are still to come. The ideological needs of the proletarian vanguard are breaking through, bursting asunder the ranks of the apparatus. The illusory unity is crumbling to dust in the International more rapidly than in the Russian Communist Party, where the hold of the Party apparatus has long ago given way entirely to economic and governmental repression.

It is needless to point out the danger presented by factional splitting. But up to now no one has succeeded in overcoming factionalism by lamentations. The conciliationism about which they complain so much in all the resolutions, is still less capable of weakening factionalism. It is itself a product of the factional struggle and at the same time its semi-manufacture. Conciliationism is unavoidably called upon to differentiate itself and to be reabsorbed. Every palliation or concealment of differences of opinion will only increase the chaos and give the factional formations a more durable and painful character. The growing turmoil of factionalism can be overcome only by means of a clear line of principle. From this standpoint, the present period of avowed ideological struggle is a profound factor of progress. Only it must not be compared with the abstract ideal of "unity" but with the bitter reality of these last years.

The Three Basic Lines

Three basic lines have come to light on the international scale. The line of the Right, which is an hopeless attempt to resuscitate, under new conditions, the pre-war social democracy, in the best case of the type of Bebel (Bandler and others). The line of the Left, which is the continuation and the further development of Bolshevism and the October revolution. That is our line. Finally, the line of the Center, which is suspended between the two principal lines swerving now from the one, now from the other, devoid of any principle content of its own, and in the last analysis, always serving as a screen for the Right wing (Stalin and his partisans).

Personal regroupings will take place, even in the higher circles. As for the bulk of the Communist masses, inside and outside of the Party, their self-determination is still entirely to be accomplished. The problem is, therefore, to win the masses. This struggle must be endowed with the greatest intransigence. The masses will never be won by hints or by half-words. The dialectic of development is such that the International can be saved from the peril of factional collapse only by a bold, firm and intransigent grouping together of the international faction of the Bolshevik-Leninists.

THE END

A Stalinist Defeat in Staunton

By Albert Glotzer

On November 10, one week following the Belleville conference, the Staunton sub-district conference of the National Miners Union went into session to act on the decisions of the state meeting. The Staunton conference is of tremendous importance because it is the largest sub-district of bona-fide adherents to the N. M. U., and because the bulk of the delegates that walked out of the Belleville conference came from this section of the organized coal fields.

Resentment prevailed in the conference to the methods of internal policy promoted by the Party. The antagonism of a large section of the delegates to the decisions of Belleville on Watt, gave sufficient proof that you cannot transplant the methods of internal factional struggle of the Party when attempting to organize mass unions of the workers.

The conference meeting to act on the decisions of Belleville, had just finished with a reading of the report of the organizational committee, and voted acceptance of the Report on Program and Demands, when Kamenovich proposed that the conference instead of proceeding with the remainder of the Belleville decisions should halt and take up the reports of the locals and act on those. The purpose of this proposal was to draw out the proceedings, until it was too late to take up the matter of Watt. The proposal was accepted but it did not prevent discussion of the remainder of the decisions.

The attitude of the delegates was, that they did not object to the Party partic-

there, and that Watt's activity in Staunton was that of a loyal member of the Union whose activities were commended by the miners of Staunton. The delegates in addition protested the charge that Watt engineered the walkout at Belleville and added that it was thru the efforts of Angelo and Watt that a split situation was prevented and that the miners went back to their respective localities to intensify their activities in behalf of the union.

Toward the close of the conference the resolution of the Belleville conference on Watt was read. The contents of the resolution stated among other things, that Watt was a renegade, opportunist, enemy of the workers and an agent of Lewis! It concluded by demanding that Watt cease his activities in the union pending the action of the National Board on these charges. It was on this particular section that the delegates expressed their dissatisfaction with the state of affairs in the union. Watt, who had been sitting at the conference all day without once taking part in the proceedings rose at this point to give his position to the miners. His speech gave the lie to all the charges against him. What he said in the main consisted of the following:

Watt Declares Position

"Brothers, the issue of Watt has been raised in this conference. It has been stated that Watt is a traitor, an enemy of the miners, an opportunist seeking only something for himself. I have been told to keep my hands out of the affairs of the union. That is the decision of the Belleville conference. I am not going to go against those decisions. I am not going to allow the issue of Watt to stand in the way of the building of the union. If the miners think that Watt should not be the president of the union and that he should not interfere in the activity of the union then Watt will abide by these decisions. But I want to tell you this, men: you must build the union. It is your only solution. There is no other hope except the building of the National Miners Union, and you must do this. It has been said that we must adhere to the Red International of Labor Unions. Lewis has said that the Red Union is unfit for us. He says that we must join the Amsterdam International, that is the place for us. I want to tell you men, that if Lewis says the Red International is unfit for us and that we must join the yellow Amsterdam International then we must tell him our place is with the Red International and against the Yellow International. What is good for Lewis and what he advises us to do, cannot be good for us, or advisable for us to do. In closing, brothers, let me ask you again, not to allow the issue of Watt to divide you. You must go forward united, build the National Miners Union. The charges against me I do not agree with; they are false, but that is the decision of Belleville, and since that is so, I must carry it out. Your hope is your union and you must build it or you are lost."

This speech of Watt is an answer to all the false charges made against him in recent weeks. The position of the Party is one that will not build a miners union. On the contrary it will split it asunder. When Party organizers approach non-party leaders in the union and demand: "You must either join us or we will crush you", then it exhibits a fundamental misconception of the role that Communists must play in the organization of new unions and in the mass organizations. The attempt to create a "pure" leadership of Communists in the new unions spells defeat since it can only be done at the expense of the widest variety of elements that will participate in the building of the new unions. This is particularly evident in the miners union. Communists must strive to give leadership to these workers, to formulate policy for them, but it cannot force the Party down their throats, it cannot prevent them from taking a leading part in the creation of these unions or else it reduces the idea of new unions to a caricature. Unless the Party makes a complete reversal of internal policy, the result will be the destruction of the union.

The BULLETIN of the Russian Opposition

The latest number just received contains articles by L. D. Trotsky, Christain Rakovsky, V. Kossior, M. Okudjava, N. Muralov, F. Dingelstaedt, and others.

INVALUABLE FOR A KNOWLEDGE OF THE RUSSIAN SITUATION

25c each 18

Order From

THE MILITANT

25 Third Avenue,

The Illinois Miners' Belleville Conference

Continued from Page 1

of Farrington and Lewis!

Now understand that as yet there had been no rank and file delegate that spoke from the convention floor. The volcano created by the wrong policy was beginning to smoke.

Watt's Speech

After the resolution that Toohey introduced was adopted John Watt was asked by Voyzey to address the convention. When Watt took the floor the volcano burst into a flame. And right here I want to say that I don't endorse everything that Watt has done, but I must agree with Watt that the position he took at this convention was correct. The first words that Watt uttered in his talk which lasted about 20 minutes was that the convention was not called to hear speeches but to outline a program and a plan of action for building the National Miners Union. He took Toohey's attack on the socalled "operators' neutrality" policy and showed with figures that Toohey distorted what he really said at the last Belleville conference. Watt showed with figures that the coal operators were caught off guard, that there is only a few weeks supply of coal on top, that this is the right time of the season to strike against coal operators and that we must make the most of the squabble between Lewis and Fishwick. Then he criticized the leadership of the Communist Party for trying to isolate him from working among the miners and all those not members of the Communist Party.

Watt made a plea for Soviet Russia, for the Russian Communist Party, but launched into a bitter attack against the leadership of the American Party, using the latest issue of the *Impreccor* (the speech of Losovsky at the 10th Plenum on trade union work) for his attack. Watt said that he considered himself a Communist despite anything that the C.P. may say to the contrary and concluded his talk by urging the miners to build a class conscious and militant union. While Watt was speaking, Foster came into the convention hall and went on the speakers platform, but something went wrong as there was no demonstration from the convention of any kind. As soon as Watt finished his talk, Voyzey turned to Foster and began to say something, but the delegates, one after another, began to make motions for adjournment for lunch. The time was 1:30 p.m. and so the convention was adjourned for lunch.

The afternoon session was convened with Voyzey saying that the convention is now thrown open for discussion from the delegates. But Voyzey failed to mention the fact that the discussion must come only from Communist Party members. So the first discussion that comes from the floor saw Corbly, Slinger, Thompson, Voyzey and Allard on the floor with almost the same speech with little variation: "I am a Communist, Watt is a faker." Rattat rat-tat-tat—just like that one after the other. I tried to get the floor after Thompson spoke but the Stalinites were able to carry a motion to cease debate by a vote of 67 to 30. Then the motion made previously that Watt's case be referred to the national executive board with final decision to rest with the international convention was carried with the same vote.

After the vote was taken and while Foster was being introduced, about 20 delegates arose and walked out of the convention in protest against the action of not allowing more discussion from the floor. Foster thought that Watt had walked out with the delegates and started to attack Watt for the walkout, but after Watt protested against such a line of attack, Foster changed his speech, and spoke about Gas-tonia, the T.U.U.L., etc.

Angelo Urges Bolters Return

I listened a few minutes to Foster's speech and then went out of the convention hall to see what had happened to the delegates that had walked out. The delegates that had walked out had all gathered near the entrance of the convention hall with a few Stalinites among them like Sklar and Kemenovich, calling the delegates who walked out fakers, etc. I urged all the delegates to return and help finish the business. My plea was met with: "No, we're done with the convention, we're going home."

I went into the convention and Foster had finished his speech and a resolution calling upon Watt "to cease all activities among the miners of Illinois" was introduced by Corbly who moved the adoption of the resolution. I moved an amendment to the resolution and pointed out that his case had been re-

ferred to the national executive board and the international convention. My motion was voted down and the resolution adopted with a few nays. Immediately after the vote nine delegates walked out; this time Watt went along.

McMillan, Goldberg, Payer (of the St. Louis branch of the Communist League) and myself immediately got together and walked out before they scattered without. We rented a room in the Lyric Hotel and told all the delegates that bolted the convention to go there for a meeting. While the delegates were going to the new hall, I personally went to Foster and told him that we had organized the delegates that bolted the convention, that the crazy "Left" policy of attacking everyone who was not a Communist as a faker and the machine rule at the convention was responsible for the walkout of the delegates, that the delegates who bolted represented the majority of the National Miners Union. They had serious differences with regards to the incorrect line of the C.P. that is being pursued in Illinois, especially the uncalled for attacks in the mining fields on the leaders of the National Miners Union in Staunton, Livingston, etc., who are not Party members. They are told that unless they join the Communist Party they will be slaughtered and deprived of all work in the National Miners Union. I told Foster that these delegates had a grievance because of the mistakes the Party had made in the Illinois mining fields and that he should come into our meeting to hear of these mistakes committed by the Party for the purpose of changing these incorrect policies before it is too late.

Foster came into our meeting and the delegates began to protest against the actions of the convention for not allowing thorough rank and file discussion on the floor of the convention, protested against the attack on Watt, protested against the C.P. organizers trying to intimidate non-Party miners by threats to carrying out Party orders, against the narrow line of the Party in trying to build not a mass organization out of the N.M.U. but a narrow sect of C.P. members.

Foster's answer to all the protests was his usual one: "Yes, but let's not talk about these things now. All you delegates must come back into the convention, else the capitalist papers tomorrow will say that there was a split in the N.M.U." The delegates said they did not care what the capitalist papers said about them. Before they went back into the convention the uncalled-for resolution attacking Watt must be withdrawn. If that was not done they would go back home, double their work in building the N.M.U. and change the incorrect line being pursued in the N.M.U. They would fight for a policy that would unite not only Communists but also the backward workers into the N.M.U.

After Foster left our meeting, I was elected chairman and the following decisions were made by the 30 delegates present

1. That we fight and organize the miners into the N.M.U.

2. That we protest the action taken against Watt.

3. That we call a conference of the Staunton sub-district on Sunday, November 3, at Staunton, Ill., for the purpose of mobilizing the miners into the N.M.U.

After the meeting every delegate pres-

ent pledged that he would go home and do all in his power to build the N.M.U., to clean out the Lewises and the Fishwicks.

A few words in general about the convention and the future work in the new unions created by the C.P. The bolting of the delegates from the convention was a spontaneous rank and file revolt against the narrow line being pursued by the C.P. in its trade union work. And further, if the Communist League comrades had not been on the job, the delegates would have gone home discouraged and it would have had a very bad effect on the work of building the N.M.U. in Illinois. Our Opposition forces organized the delegates that walked out of the convention and I am correct in saying that our group prevented a split in the N.M.U. and put new life into the rank and file delegates, to fight to build the N.M.U. and change the incorrect policy in the union as framed by the C.P. leaders.

The C.P. did not analyze correctly the situation in Illinois and overestimated its own strength in the coal fields here. What happened before the convention was that the N.M.U. took a sudden surge forward, due to the squabble between Lewis and Fishwick and hundreds of miners joined the N.M.U. in the last two months. The C.P., instead of educating these new members to understand Communism, is trying to force these workers in the N.M.U. by "direct action" to belong to the C.P. or else tell them that they would be prevented from working in the N.M.U. If this is not sickness of some kind, I am Holy Moses. The slogan seems to be: Every N.M.U. member must be a Party member!

Stalinism and Union Democracy

Another impression I got from the convention in Belleville is that no opposition of any kind will be tolerated in the new unions created by the Party. They will be ruthlessly attacked whether right or wrong, even if the Party has to split the new unions wide open. This is part of its general policy to wipe out all opposition instead of trying to win over the opposition to its policy. This was clear to me in the Belleville convention when the first 20 delegates walked out in protest against the bureaucratic and incorrect policy of the C.P. (all speeches, no discussion, etc.)

I repeat, this was a spontaneous rank and file revolt. It was beginning to look very bad from the Stalinite line. Somebody would be blamed for the revolt. Let's make it Watt and thereby save a spanking by Stalin. Fine. Typewriter gets busy. Out comes a resolution against Watt. The second walkout was in protest against the action on Watt. I believe that if the first walkout of delegates had not occurred, the resolution against Watt would never have been read. The rank and file revolt became the "real danger" in the convention and someone had to be blamed in order for the Stalinites to save their own hides.

To the convention the credentials committee reported that 16,000 members were represented. In the committee's deliberations, they figured 8,000 members and if we cut this last figure in half we will come pretty close to the actual membership of the N.M.U. in Illinois. The delegates that revolted represented the strongest section of the union—Staunton-Livingston-Mt.Olive-Springfield section, the membership of which is close to half the total of the N.M.U. in Illinois.

The Daily Worker Lies Like Hell!

A Letter Sent by the Staunton Miners' Conference to the Poison Pen Artists

The following self-explanatory letter has been sent to the Daily Worker for publication:

Staunton, Ill.
November 14, 1929
To the Editor of the Daily Worker
New York City

In compliance with a motion unanimously adopted at the sub-District Conference of the National Miners Union, held at Staunton, Nov. 10th I ask you to retract the following false and slanderous statements pertaining to International President Watt and members of the Staunton Local of the N.M.U., which appeared in the various issues of the Daily Worker as noted:

Oct. 31—"Rank and file will fight to oust him."

Nov. ——"Watt is trying to establish splitters headquarters."

Nov. 7—"Telegrams received at Staunton condemning Watt."

Nov. 8—"Watt issues convention call."

Nov. 9—"Watt built up a little machine in Staunton."

Nov. 9—"Watt, without authority from anyone, came to Staunton."

Nov. 9—"Slinger, the man who built organization in Staunton."

Demands Retraction

While these excerpts do not cover all the accusations placed against Watt and the Staunton members, they are those of the most importance and I insist that they be printed in your publication with the accompanying explanatory letter.

In order to give you the true facts, it will be necessary for me to revert to the Belleville National Miners convention. While that convention was heralded as a rank and file convention, the outcome proved just the opposite. It is true that a number of delegates left the convention hall, and some among that number, were men who helped organize the old United Mine Workers many years ago. These men left the hall, not because of the influence of President Watt, as some seem to believe, but for the reason that they possessed sufficient intelligence to think for themselves. In other words, it

was a spontaneous uprising against the wrong political propaganda. They had come to the convention for the purpose of building a rank and file union and nothing else. To prove my assertion, the convention had been in session almost two days, practically no session from the rank and file was heard, only speeches and more speeches. All for a purpose. But of little or no interest to the membership.

The proceedings of the convention plainly show that business that would ordinarily require days of discussion were accomplished in the last few hours. The reports show that all resolutions were adopted unanimously. Surely some opposition would appear under ordinary circumstances. I have attended many labor conventions in the past, and must admit, some were machine controlled, but the Belleville convention was unrivaled in efficiency.

While I realize that the Daily Worker represents the aims and objects of the N.M.U. leadership, however, if these aims are correct, then surely it is not necessary to publish false and slanderous statements against individuals. President Watt is accused of establishing splitters headquarters, not by the rank and file, as your paper tries to show, but by a certain group who seems to imagine that it possesses super-intelligence.

Everyone who dares to differ with it is called an opportunist. I might say that every delegate from Staunton local, without exception, reported unfavorably towards the Belleville convention. After the reports a resolution was unanimously adopted, condemning the actions employed at said convention. You say, "the rank and file will fight to oust President Watt." The writer of this article attended every session held by the Staunton local, but failed to see this materialize although he does see the Staunton local all but wrecked, due to what took place at Staunton.

Daily Worker Falsehoods

At the Sub-District Conference held in Staunton, Sunday Nov. 10th I read the following, which appeared in your paper issued Nov. 6th, "Livingston local bars renegade Watt and his henchmen, etc." After reading the article, I asked every delegate from Livingston if that were a fact. Every delegate stated that it was not, and that Watt had not been barred by their local.

Under date of Nov. 7 issue—"Telegrams received at Staunton condemning Watt" By whom were these telegrams received? I have had charge of all official documents of this local since its inception, and can say without fear of contradiction, I have neither received nor seen such telegrams.

Issue of Nov. 8th—"Watt issues convention call." This again proves to be a fabrication, as the convention call was issued under instructions of the Sub-District Conference Committee.

Issue of Nov. 9th—"Watt built up a little machine in Staunton." In answering that accusation I shall say, Watt did not build up a machine, but he did help to build the strongest and most active local in the N.M.U. Yes, he did more! Besides doing splendid work in other sections, he was the main factor which caused Livingston as well as Pocahontas locals, to grow with tremendous rapidity. In the same issue you say, "Watt without authority from anyone came to Staunton. Another falsehood. The records of the Sub-District Conference Committee plainly show that Watt at various times was ordered to come to Staunton to address meetings in his vicinity. I might further state that this Sub-District Conference Committee is a committee composed of miners elected from their respective locals. A real body of the rank and file. In the same issue you say, "Slinger, the man, who built organization in Staunton." It is unpleasant to cast any reflections upon Slinger as I well understand that he must make a record, if he expects to remain a member of the C.E.C. of the Communist Party. However as far as Slinger was concerned he is a negligible factor in Staunton, as his presence here is far from welcome. I could continue to expose many more malicious lies, which were circulated thru your press as well as other sources, but that will not build a Rank and File union. A retraction and the publishing of this letter will do much towards creating a solidarity among the miners, which is absolutely necessary if the National Miners Union expects to succeed. I hope you will give this matter the same publicity as you gave the misleading statements.

EDW. C. MORGAN

Sec'y Sub-District Conference
National Miners Union

Φ

AN AUTHORIZED STATEMENT

We have been authorized to state that the little banquet given to the erstwhile Communist Party candidate for Mayor in New York, William W. Weinstone, on the eve of his departure to become the American representative to the E.C.C.I., was not in the nature of an "victory celebration."

