

THE COMMUNIST

Vol. XIII

MARCH, 1934

No. 3



FROM THE CONTENTS

The Third International and Its Place
In History *V. I. Lenin*

Milestones of Comintern Leadership
Alex Bittelman

The Armed Revolt of the Austrian Workers
V. J. Jerome

How Not to Apply the Open Letter
Gertrude Haessler

Lessons of the Economic Struggles, and the
Work in the Trade Unions. *Jack Stachel*

DeLeonism in the Light of Marxism-Leninism
Walter Burke

**Fifteenth Anniversary of the
1919 COMINTERN 1934
20 Cents**

THE COMMUNIST

Vol. XIII

MARCH, 1934

No. 3



FROM THE CONTENTS

The Third International and Its Place
In History *V. I. Lenin*

Milestones of Comintern Leadership
Alex Bittelman

The Armed Revolt of the Austrian Workers
V. J. Jerome

How Not to Apply the Open Letter
Gertrude Haessler

Lessons of the Economic Struggles, and the
Work in the Trade Unions. *Jack Stachel*

DeLeonism in the Light of Marxism-Leninism
Walter Burke

Fifteenth Anniversary of the
1919 COMINTERN 1934
20 Cents

New "INTERNATIONAL" Books

W O M E N W H O W O R K

By GRACE HUTCHINS

The first comprehensive book from the Marxist viewpoint dealing with the conditions of ten million working women in industry and on the farms.

288 pp. Illustrated

Boards \$1.00 Cloth \$2.00

D R I V I N G A X L E

By V. ILYENKOV

A novel of socialist construction centering around the struggle against sabotage and for production in a large locomotive plant in the Urals.

455 pp.

Boards \$1.25 Cloth \$2.00

LENIN ON THE JEWISH QUESTION

A selection from his writings and speeches on the Jewish and national questions. *Order in quantities.* FIVE CENTS

THE WAR FOR THE LAND IN IRELAND

By BRIAN O'NEILL

The land struggles of the Irish peasantry from the 18th century to the present time and the movement for Irish independence.

200 pp.

Cloth \$1.50 Boards 75c

THE COLONIAL POLICIES OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

By RALPH FOX

From the opening of India and Africa to the present time, with special emphasis on the colonial liberation movements and the role of the English working class.

128 pp.

75c

New Pamphlets

THE EYES OF THE MOVIE

By Harry Alan Potamkin

10 cents

HAWAII, by Harry Weinman

10 cents

MURDER IN CAMP HOHEN-STEIN—*Stories of the fascist concentration camps.*

25 cents

SIX SEAMEN, By Mike Pell

15 cents

IN A RING OF FIRE,

By I. Ovrachenko. *The civil war in Crimea.*

15 cents

New Editions

HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WORKING CLASS

By A. Bimba \$2.50

TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD

By John Reed \$1.50

RELIGION IN THE U.S.S.R.

By E. Yaroslavsky 15 cents

Order from

Workers Library Publishers


P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th St.), New York City

THE COMMUNIST

*A Magazine of the Theory and Practice of
Marxism-Leninism*

Published Monthly by the

Communist Party of the United States of America

Entered as second class matter Nov. 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879.  209

Vol. XIII

MARCH, 1934

No. 3

C O N T E N T S

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS PLACE IN HISTORY	227
<i>By V. I. LENIN</i>	
MILESTONES OF COMINTERN LEADERSHIP.....	235
<i>By ALEX BITTELMAN</i>	
THE ARMED REVOLT OF THE AUSTRIAN WORKERS.....	249
<i>By V. J. JEROME</i>	
HOW NOT TO APPLY THE OPEN LETTER.....	261
<i>By GERTRUDE HAESSLER</i>	
LESSONS OF THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLES, AND THE WORK IN THE TRADE UNIONS.....	272
<i>By JACK STACHEL</i>	
DELEONISM IN THE LIGHT OF MARXISM-LENINISM.....	302
<i>By WALTER BURKE</i>	
FIGURES ON THE AMERICAN ECONOMIC CRISIS.....	311
<i>By LABOR RESEARCH ASSOCIATION</i>	
BOOK REVIEW	318
<i>Two Months and Ten Days—A Review by H. M. WICKS</i>	

Make all checks, money orders, and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates \$2.00 a year; \$1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada \$2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

Don't Fail to—

Read These Pamphlets of the

THIRTEENTH PLENUM SERIES

•

- Theses and Decisions,**
Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.
- Draft Resolution,**
*Eighth Convention of the
Communist Party, U.S.A.* .10
- Fascism, the Danger of War and the
Tasks of the Communist Parties**
Report by O. Kuusinen15
- The Communist Parties in the
Fight for the Masses**
Speech by O. Piatnitsky15
- We Are Fighting For a
Soviet Germany**
*Report by William Pieck,
Secretary of the Communist Party of Germany .15*
- Revolutionary Crisis, Fascism and War**
Speech by D. Z. Manuilsky05
- Fascism, Social Democracy and
the Communists**
Speech by V. Knorin, Member of the E.C.C.I. .10
- The Revolutionary Struggle of the
Toiling Masses of Japan**
Speech by Okano, Japan05
- War, Intervention and Revolution
in China**
Speech by Wan-Min, China05
-

Order from:

Workers Library Publishers

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th St.), New York City

The Third International and Its Place in History

By V. I. LENIN

THE imperialists of the "Entente" are blockading Russia for the purpose of cutting off the Soviet Republic, as a hot-bed of infection, from the capitalist world. These people, who are boasting of the "democratic spirit" pervading their own institutions, are so blinded by their hatred of the Soviet Republic, that they do not perceive how preposterous their position is. Just think of it: the most advanced, civilized, and "democratic" countries, armed to the teeth and enjoying an undivided military supremacy over the world, are frightened out of their wits by a contagious *idea* emanating from a ravaged, starving, and, in their opinion, half-savage country. This inconsistency alone opens the eyes of the laboring masses in all countries and exposes the hypocrisy of the imperialists, such as Clemenceau, Lloyd George, Woodrow Wilson, and their governments.

We are helped in this respect not only by the blindness of the capitalists, by their hatred of the Soviets, but by their bickerings among themselves and the tricks they play upon each other. They have entered into a regular conspiracy of silence, since nothing terrifies them more than the spreading of correct information about the Soviet Republic in general, and its official documents in particular. However, the chief organ of the French bourgeoisie, *Le Temps*, carried the news about the founding in Moscow of the Third (Communist) International.

We beg to tender to that mouthpiece of the French bourgeoisie, to the recognized leader of chauvinism and imperialism in France, our most respectful thanks for its valuable cooperation. We are ready to send to the newspaper *Temps* our solemn expression of gratitude for the able and timely assistance it gives us.

The manner in which the newspaper *Temps* made up the announcement on the basis of our radio communication discloses clearly the motives which guided this organ of the money-bags. Its aim was to strike at Woodrow Wilson, as if to say: "Behold the kind of people you think it possible to negotiate with!" The wisecracks who write at the order of money-bags do not perceive that

their attempt to frighten Wilson with the bugbear of Bolshevism is transformed in the eyes of the toiling masses into a veritable advertisement for the Bolsheviks. Once more: our respectful thanks to the organ of the French millionaires!

The founding of the Third International took place under such world-wide circumstances that neither prohibitions nor mean and petty tricks of the imperialists of the "Entente", or of the lackeys of capitalism, such as Scheidemann in Germany or Renner in Austria, can possibly prevent the news thereof spreading throughout the world and enlisting the sympathies of the working masses. These circumstances have been created by the proletarian revolution, which is spreading from day to day, from hour to hour. These circumstances have been created by the movement among the toiling masses for *Soviets*, a movement which has acquired such magnitude as to have become truly "International".

The First International (1864-1872) laid the foundation of an international organization of workers to prepare them for their revolutionary onslaught upon capital. The Second International (1889-1914) was an international organization of the proletarian movement which became widespread, but whose growth was accompanied by a temporary lowering of the revolutionary level, and a temporary increase of opportunism, and which ultimately led to the disgraceful collapse of this International.

The Third International was created in 1918, after the protracted struggle with opportunism and "social-chauvinism", especially during the war, had resulted in the formation of Communist Parties in various countries. The formal founding of the Third International took place at its first congress held in Moscow, March, 1919. The most characteristic feature of the Third International, namely, its mission to carry out, to bring into life, the principles of Marxism, and to bring about the realization of the century-old ideals of Socialism and the labor movement, this characteristic feature of the Third International manifested itself immediately in that the new Third "International Workingmen's Association" has to a certain extent begun to identify itself with the "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The First International laid the foundation of the international struggle of the proletariat for Socialism.

The Second International was the epoch of preparing the ground for widespread mass movements in many countries.

The Third International has garnered the fruit of the labors of the Second International, casting off its opportunistic, social-chauvinistic, bourgeois and petty bourgeois refuse, and has set out to *achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat.*

The international union of parties, leading the most revolutionary movement in the world, namely, the movement of the proletariat to throw off the yoke of capitalism, rests at present on an unprecedentedly solid base: several Soviet Republics which, on an international scale, become the incarnation of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and its victory over capitalism.

The world-historical significance of the Third (Communist) International consists in that it began to put into life the greatest slogan of Marx, the slogan which represents the sum-total of the development of Socialism and the labor movement, the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This brilliant foresight, this brilliant theory, is now becoming a reality.

These Latin words have now been translated into all languages of Modern Europe, nay, into all languages of the entire world.

A new era in the world's history has begun.

Mankind is throwing off slavery in its last surviving form: the slavery of wage earners oppressed by capitalism.

By freeing itself from slavery, mankind for the first time passes over to real freedom.

How could it occur that the first country to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat, to organize a Soviet republic, was the most backward country in Europe? We will hardly err if we say that precisely the contradiction between the backwardness of Russia and its "leap" to higher forms of democracy, through bourgeois democracy to Soviet or proletarian democracy, that precisely this contradiction was one of the factors (leaving aside the fact that most of the socialist leaders are still under influence of opportunistic habits and philistine prejudices), which slowed down and rendered it difficult for the Western people to understand the role of the Soviets.

The working masses throughout the world instinctively appreciated the significance of the Soviets as a weapon in the proletarian struggles and forms of the proletarian State. But the "leaders", demoralized by opportunism, continue to worship bourgeois democracy, and refer to it as "democracy" in general.

Small wonder that the dictatorship of the proletariat, when put into practice, disclosed first of all a glaring "contradiction" between the backwardness of Russia and its "leap" *over the head* of bourgeois democracy. It would, indeed, have been wonderful had history made us the free gift of a *new* form of democracy, *unattended by any* contradictions.

Any Marxist, nay, anyone conversant with modern science, if asked whether he believed in the probability of a uniform, harmonious

and perfectly proportioned transition of various capitalist countries to the dictatorship of the proletariat, would undoubtedly answer that question in the negative. In the capitalist world, there has never been any room for uniformity, harmony, and perfect proportions. Every country has brought into prominence now one, now another feature, or features, of capitalism and of the labor movement. The process of development has been uneven.

When France was going through its great bourgeois revolution, thus awakening the whole continent of Europe to new historical life, England stood at the head of a counter-revolutionary coalition; England was at that time capitalistically much more developed than France. The English labor movement of that epoch had anticipated much of future Marxism.

At the time England gave the world the first widespread, actually mass, politically crystallized, proletarian revolutionary movement—Chartism,—on the continent of Europe, weak bourgeois revolutions had taken place in most cases; and in France, the first great civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie flared up. The bourgeoisie defeated the various national battalions of the proletariat one by one, using different methods in different countries.

England offered an example of a country where the bourgeoisie, together with the bourgeoisified aristocracy, created the most bourgeoisified upper stratum of the proletariat. The most advanced capitalist country by several decades as compared with other countries was backward in the sense of the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat. In France the proletariat seemed to have exhausted its strength in the two heroic uprisings of the working class against the bourgeoisie in 1848 and 1871. These uprisings made world-historic contributions. The hegemony in the International then passed to Germany, in the seventies of the nineteenth century, when Germany stood economically behind England and France. But when Germany outdistanced those two countries economically, *i.e.*, in the second decade of the twentieth century, the world-renowned Marxist Labor Party in Germany was headed by a gang of abominable rogues, by a band of scoundrels who had sold themselves to the capitalists, from Scheidemann and Noske to David and Legien, the most despicable hangmen in the service of the monarchy and counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

The course of the world's history inevitably points to the dictatorship of the proletariat, but its course is far from being straight, smooth, or simple.

At a time when Karl Kautsky was still a Marxist, and not the renegade he became when he joined Scheidemann in his struggle for unity with bourgeois democracy in its fight against the proletariat,

or Soviet, democracy, he wrote (at the very beginning of the twentieth century) an article entitled "The Slavs and the Revolution". In that article he drew attention to such historic conditions as were pointing to the possibility of the supremacy in the international labor movement passing into the hands of the Slavonic nations.

Now this has come true. For a time—certainly for a very short time—the supremacy in the proletarian revolutionary International passed to the Russians, as in various periods of the nineteenth century it belonged successively to the English, the French, and the Germans.

I must repeat here what I have said many times: it was easier for the Russians than for any of the advanced nations to *begin* the great proletarian revolution, but they will experience greater difficulties in *continuing it*, in bringing it to a complete victory, *i.e.*, in organizing Socialist society.

It was easier for us to begin, first, because the extraordinary backwardness of the czarist regime resulted in an unprecedented violence of the revolutionary assault of the masses. Secondly, the backwardness of Russia had, in a manner peculiar to that country, merged the proletarian revolution directed against the bourgeoisie into the peasants' revolution directed against the landlords. We began at that point in October, 1917, and our victory would not have been such an easy one had we started from any other point. Marx, as early as 1856, speaking of Prussia, pointed to the possibility of a unity of the proletarian revolution with the peasants' war. From the beginning of 1905, the Bolsheviks had upheld the idea of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat and of the peasants. Thirdly, the revolution of 1905 proved an excellent political training for the masses of workers and peasants, both in bringing home to the most advanced amongst them the "latest in Western Socialism" and in educating them in revolutionary *action*. Without the "grand rehearsal" of 1905, neither the bourgeois February revolution of 1917, nor the October proletarian revolution would have been possible. Fourthly, the geographic conditions of Russia enabled it to hold out, for a longer time than was possible in other countries, against the external superiority of advanced capitalist countries. Fifthly, the peculiar relation of the proletariat towards the peasantry facilitated the transition from the bourgeois to the socialist revolution, it facilitated the urban proletariat to influence the semi-proletarian, poorest strata of the toiling masses in the village. Sixthly, the long schooling in strike struggles, the experience of the European mass labor movement facilitated the rise, in a deep-going and rapidly accentuated revolutionary situation, to a peculiar form of a proletarian revolutionary organization as the *Soviets*.

The listing of the above is of course not complete. But we can limit ourselves for the time being.

The Soviet, or proletarian democracy, has come to life in Russia. As compared with the Commune of Paris, this is the second step of paramount importance in the history of the world. The Soviet republic of proletarians and peasants has proved to be the first stable and lasting socialist republic. As a *new type of state*, it can no longer die. It no longer stands alone.

A great deal, a very great deal, is still required to bring to completion the constructive work of Socialism. Such Soviet republics as may be formed in countries more civilized than Russia, in countries where the proletariat carries more weight and has a greater influence, have all the chances of outdistancing Russia, once they enter on the road of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The bankrupt Second International is dying now; already the process of putrefaction has set in. It is now acting as a henchman to the international bourgeoisie. It may truly be termed the Yellow International. Its most prominent leaders, such as Kautsky, are now glorifying bourgeois democracy which they call "absolute democracy", or—which is still more absurd and more coarse—"pure democracy".

Bourgeois democracy is dead, as dead as the Second International, which did perform a very useful and historically necessary task at a time when the preparation of the working masses for Socialism within the limits of that bourgeois democracy was the order of the day.

The most democratic bourgeois republic has never been, and cannot be, anything else but a machine for the oppression of labor by capital and a political weapon of capitalism, or anything but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The democratic bourgeois republic promised to give power to the majority, but the principle so proclaimed could never be put into practice as long as the land and other instruments of production were objects of private ownership.

"Freedom" in a bourgeois-democratic republic has always been in fact freedom for the rich. The proletarians and the peasants could and ought to have utilized it for collecting their forces with a view to the ultimate overthrowing of capitalism and the annihilation of bourgeois democracy; but they could not, as a rule, *actually enjoy* the benefits of democracy under capitalism.

For the very first time in history the Soviet, or proletarian democracy, has created a *democracy* for the masses, for the toilers, for the working men and the poorest peasants.

Never in the history of mankind has the *majority* of the popula-

tion wielded political power *as completely* as it does under the Soviet republic.

The Soviet republic suppresses the "freedom" of exploiters of labor, of profiteers and their abettors; it prevents them from exploiting the working classes and from making fortunes out of starving people; it suppresses their "freedom" to join forces with the bourgeoisie of other countries against the workmen and peasants at home.

Let people like Kautsky defend such a freedom. No one but a renegade from Marxism, a renegade from Socialism, would uphold that kind of liberty.

The most striking manifestation of the failure of the leaders of the Second International, such as Hilferding and Kautsky, lies in their utter inability to grasp the significance of the Soviet, or proletarian, democracy, its relation to the Commune of Paris, its proper place in history, or its necessity as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

No. 74 of the German periodical, *Die Freiheit*, which voices the opinions of the so-called "Independent" (a misnomer for bourgeois, lower-middle-class) German Social Democracy, published on February 11, 1919, contains an "Appeal to the Revolutionary Proletariat of Germany".

The appeal is signed by the executive of the party and by the whole of its fraction in the "National Assembly", a counterpart of our own contemptible "Constituent".

That appeal accuses the Scheidemanns of a striving to do away with the Soviets, and purposes—this is not a jest—to *combine* the Soviets with the National Assembly, by conferring upon the former certain political rights, and giving them a definite place in the Constitution.

To reconcile the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat! How simple! What a brilliantly philistine idea!

What a pity it has already been tried in Russia under Kerensky, by the united Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, those middle-class democrats who deem themselves the exponents of true Socialism.

Anyone who, in reading Marx, has failed to grasp the fact that, in capitalist society, any moment of acute struggle, any serious collision between the classes, must result in either the dictatorship of the proletariat or in the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, has utterly failed to understand both the economic and the political doctrines of Marx.

The sublimely shallow suggestion of Messrs. Hilferding, Kautsky and Co. as to the peaceful merger of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, calls for special analysis if all the economic and political fallacies heaped up in that most remarkable and most preposterous appeal of February 11 are to be fully discussed. This will be dealt with in another article.



Milestones of Comintern Leadership

By ALEX BITTELMAN

THE proletarian vanguard of the United States can justly take pride in the fact that it participated actively in the building of the Communist International, whose fifteenth anniversary falls in March of this year. At the same time, the revolutionary vanguard of this country can derive deep satisfaction from the fact that it unfailingly received brotherly advice and guidance from the Communist International in the struggle for the revolutionization of the American working class. It was from the outset, and continues to be so, a *mutual collaboration* of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries, organized in a world party, for the victory of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, for the establishment of a World Soviet Republic. The leading role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the Comintern needs neither explanation nor apology. A party that has opened up the epoch of the world revolution, and that is successfully building a classless society on one sixth of the earth, is cheerfully recognized and followed as the leading party of the world communist movement. And by the same token, the leaders of that party—first Lenin and now Stalin—are proudly followed as the leaders of the proletariat and of all oppressed in every country of the world.

The bourgeoisie, and especially its social-fascist agents in the labor movement, speak of Comintern "interference" in American affairs as though the Comintern was something foreign to and outside of the working class of the United States. But that is sheer nonsense. The revolutionary vanguard of the American proletariat, organized in the Communist Party of the U.S.A., is blood of the blood and flesh of the flesh of the American working class; and it is this Party that represents the Comintern in the United States. On the other hand, the Comintern is a *world Party*, and its "interference" in the affairs of its various national sections is nothing else but assistance rendered by all of these parties *collectively* to each of them *separately*. But the social-fascists usually press the point further. It isn't, they say, so much the "interference" itself as the "dicta-

torial" way in which it is done. And the "left" social-fascists (Muste & Co.), sometimes assisted and at others led by the renegades from Communism (Lovestone and Trotsky-Cannon), push the same argument from a somewhat different angle. These—the "left" social-fascists and the renegades—pretend to be concerned with what they call the "national" peculiarities of the American labor movement which the Comintern (so they claim) fails to take into consideration. These claims and assertions would be laughable if they were not the direct reflection of bourgeois nationalism and imperialist chauvinism with which monopoly capital is now trying to fascize its rule and prepare for war. Muste's "Americanism" and Lovestone's "exceptionalism" therefore assume especial value for the New Dealers, the value of the most "advanced" detachments of the imperialist and chauvinist bourgeoisie operating among the more conscious workers.

Stalin has long ago answered these laughable arguments. As to dictation from the outside, he said: "There are no such Communists in the world who would agree to work 'under orders' from outside against their own convictions and will and contrary to the requirements of the situation. Even if there were such Communists they would not be worth a cent. Communists bravely fight against a host of enemies. The value of a Communist, among other things, lies in that he is able to defend his convictions. Therefore, it is strange to speak of American Communists as not having their own convictions and capable only of working according to 'orders' from outside. The only part of the labor leaders' assertion that has any truth in it at all is that the American Communists are affiliated to an international Communist organization and from time to time consult with the central body of this organization on one question or another" (Stalin's interview with the first American trade union delegation to Soviet Russia in 1927). And as to the "national" peculiarities, the refuge of every opportunist, Stalin observes: "It would be wrong to ignore the specific peculiarities of American capitalism. The Communist Party in its work must take them into account. But it would be still more wrong to base the activities of the Communist Party on these specific features, since the foundation of the activities of every Communist Party, including the American Communist Party, on which it must base itself, must be the general features of capitalism, which are the same for all countries, and not its specific features in any given country. *It is on this that the internationalism of the Communist Party is founded.* Specific features are only supplementary to the general features" (Speech in the American Commission of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I., 1929).

GUIDING THE AMERICAN PARTY

We shall sketch briefly the most outstanding events in the life of the American Party where consultation with and advice from the Comintern marked off a special stage in the development of the revolutionary movement in the United States.

The bringing together of all American revolutionary workers into *one Communist Party*—to realize this historic task of the American working class with the least waste of time and energy—was the first of the more significant acts of advice of the Comintern to the revolutionary workers in the United States. Considering the historically delayed organizational break with the opportunists in the Socialist movement, on the one hand, and the heterogeneous character of the left elements in the American labor movement out of which came the Communist Party, on the other hand, this unification was no easy or simple task. The difficulties lay in the “specific” features of American capitalism and of the labor movement. And in the years 1919-1921, the best elements of the American working class had been struggling to overcome the effects of these “specific” features and to arrive at a united and single Communist Party. If it were possible to imagine those years without a Communist International (which, of course, is impossible), these struggles for Communist unity would have been infinitely more protracted, wasteful, and harmful than was actually the case. But there *was* a Communist International, led by Lenin, and consequently, there was made available to the revolutionary workers of the United States the *world experiences* and prestige of the Bolshevik movement which has gone through a long struggle with opportunism and built up a united Communist Party. These experiences the Comintern utilized in order to help the American Communists of those years to solve their own specific problems of unity and these problems were solved. A unified and single Communist Party was materialized in the United States in shorter time, less painfully and wastefully, than would have been the case without the advice and assistance of the Comintern. Is there a single class-conscious worker in the United States who, having familiarized himself with this event, would reproach the Comintern for “interfering” in American affairs or reproach the American Communists for accepting this “interference”? No, only Muste & Co., and the renegades, who echo the chauvinism of the Yankee imperialists, will utter such reproaches.

We come now to another milestone of Comintern leadership. This time it was the problem of breaking through *the walls of illegality* erected by the American bourgeoisie between the young Communist Party and the working class. The Communists, having

been driven underground and outlawed by the forerunners of the present New Dealers—Wilson-Palmer—in 1919-1920, were struggling to find their way to the masses despite the illegality and governmental persecutions. What were the special difficulties for the solution of this problem? They arose from the danger of seeking to achieve legality by sacrificing Communist principles and hiding the revolutionary line, on the one hand, and from the danger of trying to preserve intact the Communist principles by abandoning all serious fight for legal and open work, on the other hand. The way to the masses, the Communist Party could then find only by fighting and overcoming these Right and "left" opportunist dangers. One of the founders of the recently launched *Muste American Workers' Party*, *Hardman-Salutsky*, was at that time especially active in trying to switch the Communist movement to the path of buying legality by sacrificing the revolutionary line. Lacking the necessary Leninist training and experience, the American Communist Party found it extremely difficult to reach the correct solution of this task and was therefore torn between the two opportunist dangers of legalistic liquidation of the Communist Party and underground sectarianism. Once more the American Communists consulted with the Communist International. This was in 1921-1922. And the correct advice came, as it was bound to, and with its help the *Workers' Party of America* was organized which opened up for the illegal Communist Party of America wide opportunities for open revolutionary work among the masses. Illegal work, that is, revolutionary mass work that could not be done openly because of governmental persecutions, was not abandoned but continued; the illegal work supplementing the legal, and vice versa. The Party authority continued to rest in the underground Communist Party, as it should be under these conditions. And when the influence of the Communists in the *Workers' Party* had become firmly established, and the basic revolutionary mass work could be carried on through the *Workers' Party* legally, then the underground Communist Party became merged with the *Workers' Party*, that is, the latter became the Communist Party of the country. American Communism thus solved its immediate task and reached a higher stage in its development towards becoming the mass Party of the American proletariat.

What was it that proved especially helpful for the American Communists in the Comintern advice on legal and illegal work? It was the world and Russian experience of Bolshevism. Under Lenin's guidance the Bolsheviks had repeatedly met and solved such and similar problems and solved them successfully, as history has proved. The Bolshevik solutions, while primarily applied in Russia because there was the Party to do it, were based upon the experiences of

the working class movement all over the world and thus acquired an international significance. The American Communists have been helped by the Comintern in applying these solutions to American conditions. In doing so they have not only *defeated* the efforts of the bourgeoisie to strangle the revolutionary movement in the period of 1919-1921, but have also acquired knowledge and skill to defeat such efforts again, especially in the present period of sharp turn to fascism and war which inevitably brings new attacks upon the legality of the Communist Party and the working class movement as a whole. Will any sincere and militant worker in the United States, who is loyal to his class and its liberation from the misery and sufferings of capitalism, reproach the Comintern for having helped the American revolutionary workers to defeat the Wilson-Palmer persecutions? And will such a worker hold it against the American Communist Party for having accepted this helpful guidance? No, only Muste-Hardman & Co., led by the renegades, will indulge in such reproaches, because this warm and select company is echoing the raging chauvinism of the Yankee imperialists.

The next milestone in the Comintern leadership for the American Party we find on the question of trade union work. On this, more perhaps than on any other question, the left and militant elements in the American labor movement, in the two decades before the emergence of the Comintern (not to go into the pre-imperialist era), had got themselves tangled up in insoluble difficulties, torn between reformism and anarcho-syndicalism, only because they were unable, by their own efforts, to restore and further develop the revolutionary teachings of Marx and to apply them to the United States of the imperialist era. Lenin did that; but the American militants (even they) were too provincial, not enough international, because still influenced by bourgeois ideology, to find out what Leninism stands for and what it could do for the progress of the American working class. The Comintern brought the American militants and lefts closer to the world labor movement and to the basic problems of the American labor movement. The trade union question was one of them. The young American Communist movement struggled painfully to throw off the ballast of Gompers-Hillquit reformism and DeLeon-I.W.W. sectarianism, sometimes falling victim to the former, at other times to the latter, and occasionally to both. Even the best and most experienced among the left and militant leaders of the American workers, the builders and founders of the revolutionary movement of the American workers in the imperialist era, such as the late Charles E. Ruthenberg, as well as the present leader of our Party, William Z. Foster, were able to rid themselves and our movement of the old ballast of op-

portunism only by coming closer to Leninism and into the Comintern. By becoming *more international*, the proletarian vanguard in the United States has become also *more American*, because the international experience, as it is incorporated in Leninism and in Comintern guidance, helped the American Communists to come closer to the basic masses of the American proletariat and to begin to function as the leaders of its struggles against American capitalism.

It was Comintern advice and guidance that helped the American Communists to turn full face to the building of a left-wing in the reformist unions beginning with 1920; it was the advice of the Comintern that helped formulate a correct solution to one of the basic problems of the American proletariat—the organization of the unorganized into trade unions; it was advice of the Comintern on independent leadership of the economic struggles by the revolutionary elements that helped formulate strike policies and tactics; it was Comintern advice of how to revolutionize the labor movement, through organization and leadership of the daily struggles of the masses and systematic exposure and struggle against the reformists, that helped the American Communists to prove to wide masses of workers and toilers that the C.P.U.S.A. is the only true proletarian party in the United States and the leader of all exploited. In short, at every stage in the development of the revolutionary trade union movement in the United States (T.U.E.L., class struggle unions of the T.U.U.L., the application of the united front on the trade union field, the fight for trade union unity, etc.), it was with the help of the Comintern that the American revolutionary workers were able to find the correct way, to correct their errors and, through manifold changes in tactics, to press on to the goal of building a revolutionary trade union movement in the United States.

Comintern influence on the development of revolutionary trade union policies in the United States has especial significance. Here as in other capitalist countries the imperialist bourgeoisie, with the help of the reformists, succeeded in *splitting the working class*, setting the small minority of "labor aristocrats" against the basic mass of the proletariat. Following out this policy, the reformist trade union bureaucracy was persistently shutting out of trade union organization the bulk of the American proletariat, especially its most oppressed and exploited sections. This it was that constituted and still constitutes one of the chief weaknesses of the American working class. And the most damning indictment against the A. F. of L. bureaucracy is its discrimination and exclusion of the Negro proletariat. It is significant, therefore, that the first question which Comrade Stalin put to the American trade union delegation was: "How

do you account for the small percentage of American workers organized in trade unions?" And he added: "I would like to ask the delegation whether it regards this small percentage of organized workers as a good thing. Does not the delegation think that this small percentage is an indication of the weakness of the American proletariat and of the weakness of its weapon in the struggle against the capitalists in the economic field?" This was in 1927. Lack of space does not permit to deal here with the answer of the delegation. Suffice it to say that this delegation, made up as it was of so-called progressives, really bourgeois liberals, was in its answers, at best, very helpless and confused. But the intent of Stalin's question is clear: Why don't you organize the workers in trade unions? Why don't you strengthen them against the capitalists? And it was in this direction that the Comintern threw the full weight of its influence and advice in the American labor movement. Organize the basic sections of the proletariat into unions, liberate the existing mass trade unions from the stranglehold of the reformists, and unify the trade union movement of this country—this was the nature of Comintern guidance to the revolutionary workers in the United States. Tactics and methods of work might vary, depending upon the state of the class struggle. In the light of recent events, the Communist Party favors the organization of independent unions *in those cases* where such a measure would constitute a *step in advance* towards the revolutionization of the trade union movement. But the strategic aim always remained the same, and for this aim the Communist Party fights bravely and persistently and with increasing effectiveness. The general crisis of capitalism, undermining the basis of existence of large numbers of the "labor aristocracy" as well as of the working class as a whole, creates ever more favorable conditions for the realization of this aim. So, we ask again: can any American worker, who is alive to the needs of his class and is willing to fight for them, find anything to object to in this "interference" of the Communist International in American affairs? And will he object to the Communist Party of the U. S. accepting and taking deep satisfaction in such "interference"? No, he will not. Only Muste and Co., abetted by the renegades, will object and will call it "outside dictation", because these groups echo the mad chauvinism of the Yankee imperialists.

We shall now relate another significant instance of Comintern leadership in the U.S. In the years 1921-1924, one of the important phases of the American labor movement was a widespread urge for the organization of a Labor Party. The left-wing in the Socialist Party, and the first Communist Party conventions, took a

completely negative attitude towards it. But in their struggle to establish contact with the masses and with their movements against capitalism and its major political parties, the American Communists came to adopt the position of active participation in the Labor Party movements. The aim of this position was to accelerate the existing break-away movement of the workers and toiling farmers from the capitalist parties and to direct this movement along the channels of independent working class political action. Comintern influence and advice strengthened the American Communists in this determination, thus helping to overcome the various sectarian objections to such a policy. But it also did something else; it tried to guard the American Communists against some of the reformist dangers. For instance, the danger of forcing the organization of a Labor Party before there was a sound proletarian mass basis laid for it; or the danger of the Labor Party movement becoming a tail end to the petty-bourgeois Farmer-Labor movements with the inevitable submerging of the workers and the young Communist Party into this petty-bourgeois outfit controlled by bourgeois politicians. The Comintern advice was: Beat back your sectarian tendencies, participate actively in the Labor Party movement, build unceasingly your own proletarian base and the proletarian mass base for the Labor Party, especially by building the revolutionary trade union movement, and fight against all Right opportunist tendencies to submerge the workers in petty-bourgeois movements. Unfortunately this advice was not always followed, with the result that the Communist Party itself began to flirt with the petty-bourgeois farmer-labor party and with the late La Follette (1923-1924). If continued, such flirtation might have become highly dangerous for the cause of working class independent political action and for the Communist Party. Again Comintern advice was thrown in to straighten out the Party's line, and at the Sixth Congress of the Comintern the American experiences were evaluated afresh. This was done in the light of the general analysis of the world (and American) situation which showed the weakening of the relative stabilization of capitalism, the approach of a new and sharper phase of its general crisis, and the consequent growing radicalization of the masses. This was in 1928. And the Congress said to the American Communists: "Concentrate on the work in the trade unions, on organizing the unorganized, etc., and in this way lay the basis for the practical realization of the slogan of a broad Labor Party, organized from below."

No wonder Muste, Hardman-Salutsky and Co. do not like Comintern "interference", because it helps to expose, and cuts straight across, the reformist machinations of this "left" social-fascist outfit. In 1922, the Communist Party was forced to expel from its ranks

this same Hardman-Salutsky because he was working hand in glove with the A. F. of L. bureaucracy and the farmer-labor party politicians *against the organization of a Labor Party* and against the labor party policies of the Communist Party of which he was then a member. Now, when the Communist Party concentrates on building the firm proletarian base (in the unions and in the shops and among the unemployed) upon which alone, as experience has shown, a broad Labor Party organized from below can come into existence without the danger of its becoming the tail end of reformist and bourgeois farmer-labor politicians, the same Salutsky-Hardman, this time in company with Muste, proceeds again to collaborate with the A. F. of L. bureaucracy and the farmer-labor politicians to oppose the line of the Communist Party. Only now, having "learned" from experience, he and Muste are using the very Labor Party slogan for this purpose, for the purpose of obstructing the radicalization of the masses and of steering this radicalization into Farmer-Labor party channels. The Comintern has helped the American workers and their Communist Party to expose and fight against this and similar "left" maneuvers of the reformists; it has helped and is helping to build organized proletarian strength and to unite this strength with the exploited toiling farmers under working class leadership. With Leninism as its guide, the Communist Party of the U.S. is fighting for the organization of the *alliance* between the workers, toiling farmers, and Negroes under the *hegemony of the proletariat*, concentrating on developing the working class, politically and organizationally, as the true leader of this alliance. Can the American class-conscious workers, and militant toiling farmers, reproach the Comintern for thus guiding the American Communists and the struggling masses of the U.S.? Can they object to the American Communists accepting and following out this advice? No, they cannot and they do not. Only Muste, Hardman and Co. raise such objections and this they do because the Yankee imperialists do it.

We come to a milestone of Comintern leadership in the U. S. that has been especially fruitful in making the fight for proletarian internationalism live and real and in projecting the liberating mission of the American proletariat in a most concrete and telling manner. We refer here to the Communist program for *Negro liberation*. It was no accident that this was the problem—the Negro problem in the U. S.—that it took the revolutionary workers of America *the longest*, in point of time, to become aware of and to find a solution for. Bourgeois ideology, the "white prejudices" of the old slave market, had poisoned the minds, not alone of the backward strata of the toilers, but also the most advanced sections. And thus we find that the left-wing of the Socialist Party which formed the Com-

munist Party somehow "overlooked" the national-revolutionary significance of the Negro liberation struggles. And even when the American communists had finally begun to grapple with the Negro question in a Leninist way, starting practical mass work to organize the white and Negro toilers to struggle for Negro rights, there still was considerable hesitation and confusion among the weaker elements of the Communist movement to project boldly the full Leninist solution of the problem. Once more came the "outside" influence of the Comintern; and what did it say? It said that the struggle against discrimination and for Negro rights is a revolutionary struggle for the national liberation of the Negroes, that we must fight for complete Negro equality, and that in the Black Belt the full realization of this demand requires the fight for the national self-determination of the Negroes, including the right to separation from the United States and the organization of an independent state. Furthermore, it was the interpretation of Leninism and its application to the United States as made by the Comintern that showed the American Communists that the agrarian revolution in the Black Belt, where the Negro masses are mostly peasants and semi-serfs, is the basis of the national-liberation movement and that this movement is one of the allies of the American proletariat in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Lovestone renegades advocate the bourgeois theory that capitalist development itself, the "industrialization of the South", will solve the Negro question. The Communist Party—following the lead of the Comintern—says that only the national-revolutionary movement of the Negroes, as an organic part and ally of the proletarian revolution, will solve the Negro question. From this point of view, the American Communists are able to expose the Muste-Hardman position on this question as bourgeois liberalism in words and Yankee white chauvinism in deeds. Will the Negro workers, farmers, and city poor consider the Comintern advice on the Negro question as "outside dictation"? No. They will, as they actually do, receive this advice with outstretched arms and will continue in ever-larger masses to rally around the Communist Party as the leader of the liberation fight. And will the white workers, those belonging to the dominating nationality in the United States but who are already awake to their true interests, will they perhaps resent this advice as "outside dictation"? No. Some of these class-conscious white workers may still hesitate because they are as yet not completely free from the bourgeois curse of white chauvinism, but none of them will say that this advice is not in the best interests of the American working class and of all exploited.

Let us now cast just a glance (space does not permit more than

that) at still another "dictation" from the Comintern—the advice to the American Communists and to the revolutionary trade union movement to make the demand *for unemployment insurance* one of the major issues of the class struggle. Not that the American Communists were not aware of the importance of this demand, but (for a time) they had not managed, for various reasons, to project this demand into the mass struggles in a really effective way. The Comintern began to stress this issue long before the outbreak of the economic crisis with its 17 million fully unemployed. Seeing the permanent unemployed army of over 4 million workers in the years of "prosperity", and foreseeing the end of relative capitalist stabilization which would catastrophically increase unemployment, as it did, the Comintern undertook to prepare the proletarian vanguard, the Communist Party, and through it the whole working class for effective struggle against unemployment. The Communist Party, guided by the Comintern, eventually succeeded in making this demand, together with the demand for immediate relief to the unemployed, a major issue in the class struggle of the United States. And it is indisputable that whatever relief was "granted" to the workers, through governmental agencies and otherwise, was a result mainly of the struggles initiated by the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade-union movement. Furthermore, these struggles had a powerful revolutionizing effect upon wide masses of workers. Will the unemployed American workers, who know these facts, as well as the class conscious employed workers, resent this "interference" of the Comintern in American affairs? No, they will not; they will say: if this is what Comintern leadership means, we are all for it, despite the chauvinistic "Americanisms" of the Right and "left" social-fascists and their renegade companions.

And lastly—the *liquidation of the factional situation* in the Communist Party. It is on this, more than anything else, that the Muste-Hardman outfit, led by the Lovestone renegades and the Trotskyist counter-revolutionaries, choose to illustrate the "outside dictation" and interference of the Communist International. Well, the facts speak for themselves. By the early summer of 1929, the factional cancer had been spreading to the vitals of the Communist Party for many years was beginning to threaten the most serious consequences. A break up of the Party into various pieces with some of them getting switched into the channels of "left" reformism, others getting tangled up in some hopeless sectarian nooks, while still others being caught in the nets of Trotskyism, seemed almost inevitable, if a quick and radical end was not made with the factional situation. And remember: these were the dangers confronting the Communist Party at the very threshold of the economic crisis,

that is, at the time when the American working class needed and was going to need this Party more than ever in the history of the American class struggle. But this disaster *did not happen*. And why? Because the Comintern spoke to the American Party with authority and wisdom; in so speaking, in pointing out the dangers and the way to avoid them, the Comintern *released the initiative and creative activity* of the overwhelming majority of the Party, the initiative that had become paralyzed during the years of factional fight; and on the basis of this initiative of the Party membership, with the help of this power, the Party was able to cleanse itself of the hopelessly factional elements and of the Right and "left" opportunist groupings that went with the factions and thus laid the basis for the subsequent unification of the Party and its fresh start on the field of revolutionary mass work. The Comintern did "interfere"; there can be no doubt of that. And it is fortunate that it did. And if you wish to know what precisely it was that fired the imagination and enthusiasm of the membership and sympathizers of the Communist Party of the U.S. to endorse and follow out the advice of the Comintern in making an end to factionalism and in cleansing itself of the Lovestone opportunists and the conciliators, read once more Stalin's speeches on the question. We must quote at least this:

"I think, comrades, that the American Communist Party is one of those few Communist Parties in the world upon which history has laid tasks of a decisive character from the point of view of the world revolutionary movement. You all know very well the strength and power of American imperialism. Many now think [that was spoken in May, 1929] that the general crisis of world capitalism will not affect America. That, of course, is not true. It is entirely untrue, comrades. The crisis of world capitalism is developing with increasing rapidity and cannot but affect American capitalism. The three million now unemployed in America are the first swallows indicating the ripening of the economic crisis in America. The sharpening antagonisms between America and England, the struggle for markets and raw materials and, finally, the colossal growth of armaments—that is the second portent of the approaching crisis. I think the moment is not far off when a revolutionary crisis will develop in America. And when a revolutionary crisis develops in America, that will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole. It is essential that the American Communist Party should be capable of meeting that historical moment fully prepared and of assuming the leadership of the impending class struggle in America. Every effort and every means must be employed in preparing for that, comrades. For that end the American Communist Party must be improved and bolshevized. For that end we must work for the complete liquidation of factionalism and deviations in the Party. For that end we must work for the re-establishment of unity

in the Communist Party of America. For that end we must work in order to forge real revolutionary cadres and a real revolutionary leadership of the proletariat, capable of leading the many millions of the American working class toward the revolutionary class struggle. For that end all personal factors and factional considerations must be laid aside and the revolutionary education of the working class of America must be placed above all."

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM AS AGAINST IMPERIALIST CHAUVINISM

For the class conscious American workers, but especially for its younger generation, there is great significance in the fact that the two militant working-class fighters in the labor movement of the United States in this century—the imperialist era—the two men who represent most fully the best and most advanced achievements of the American working class, Ruthenberg and Foster, that both of these became the builders of the Communist Party, the builders and followers of the Communist International. Ruthenberg we have lost altogether too soon; March 2 of this year marks the seventh anniversary of his death; but the value of his work in founding our Party, in pointing the way to the Communist International for other thousands of workers, and in guiding our movement for many years, this will never be lost. Now our movement has Foster as the leader. And while he is temporarily disabled by terrific exertion in the class struggle, Comrade Foster's power of attraction to our Party, the power that has brought and will continue to bring into our ranks and to the Comintern all that is militant, honest and creative in the American working class, this power has never weakened but is growing stronger with the sharpening of the class struggle. Ruthenberg and Foster came to the Communist International because in the proletarian internationalism of Lenin's teachings, which guide the Comintern work, both had found the solution of all those problems and tasks that confronted them and the American working class in the present epoch. Ruthenberg's experiences had been acquired in the Socialist Party, chiefly on the political field; Foster's, on the other hand, were acquired mainly on the trade union field. The revolutionary instinct and consciousness of Ruthenberg could not but rebel against the narrow parliamentary limitations of Socialist Party politics; while the revolutionary consciousness of Foster, and the logic of the great economic struggles which he had organized and led, could not but make him rebel against the narrow "economism" of Gompers as well as of anarcho-syndicalism. Both, Ruthenberg and Foster, were therefore led to Leninism and its conception of a "new type" of Party as the only ideology that offered a revolutionary and proletarian solution for their problems. And

these were the problems of the American working class and its revolutionary vanguard. The coming together of these two revolutionists and their followers into one working class party marked an historic event of the first magnitude. The meaning of this event was, that for the first time in the history of the American working class, there came to an end the traditional separation between the advanced revolutionary elements of the trade unions, on the one hand, and the revolutionary elements of the Socialist (political-parliamentary) Party, on the other. This traditional separation was perhaps the largest single factor that had retarded, in the past, the coming into life in the United States of a proletarian revolutionary party of the Leninist kind. Ruthenberg and Foster started the process of liquidating this separation by coming together in the building of the Communist Party in the United States. To this they came by the inexorable logic of the class struggle in the United States and the point *at which they met* and joined hands was *Leninism and the Communist International*.

In the fifteen years of its existence the Comintern has grown into a true World Party. It has reached the high stage where all "Communist Parties are carrying out one single line of the Comintern", a stage where all "Communist Parties are united by the Executive Committee of the Communist International into a single centralized World Party which the Second International never had and never will have" (Piatnitsky, Speech at the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.). In this lies the main strength of the world revolution and the guarantee of its inevitable victory. It is this that makes possible, for the first time in the history of the world, the effective carrying out of a *world revolutionary strategy*, the only road to victory over capitalism. And it is in Comrade Stalin, since Lenin's death, that this strategy has found the greatest formulator, interpreter, and organizer. With the deepest pride in this achievement, the class-conscious workers of the United States, the militant farmers and revolutionary Negroes will celebrate the 15th Anniversary of the Comintern. It is with the same feeling of pride that they will realize that they belong to a World Party together with the glorious Party of the Soviet Union; that they belong to a world Party which is daily guided by such proved leaders as Manuilsky, Kuusinen, Thaelmann and Piatnitsky; and that by building the revolutionary movement in the United States we are also building the world power of the proletariat for the victory of the world revolution.

The Armed Revolt of the Austrian Workers

By V. J. JEROME

IN THE REVOLT of the Austrian workers history has written in characters of fire and blood its confirmation of the thesis adopted but two months earlier by the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I.—the thesis which declared that “the objective prerequisites for a revolutionary crisis have matured to such an extent that at the present time the world is closely approaching a new round of revolutions and wars.”

The Austrian revolt is not a happening beginning and ending in one land. Together with the general strike in France, which it followed with such surging swiftmess, the armed revolt of the Austrian proletariat signalizes the oncoming of a wave of civil war in Europe. It signalizes the beginning of the workers' counter-offensive against the convulsive efforts of the bourgeoisie to thwart their revolutionary wrath by fascist methods of rule. It represents the breakdown of the policy of social democracy and the turn of the masses in the “exemplary” party of the Second International to bolshevik methods of struggle, to bolshevik objectives.

What were the specific conditions leading to the revolt in Austria? What were the factors bringing forth the magnificent heroism of the Austrian workers and what the factors preventing their victory? What are the prospects for further revolutionary struggles toward a victorious conclusion for the Austrian proletariat?

The answer to these questions is furnished by an analysis of the peculiar manner in which Austria has come to be affected by the general crisis of capitalism, both as regards her inner situation and as regards the inter-imperialist conflicts which swirl as in a maelstrom about this little Danubian country.

Austria occupies a key position in the struggle waged around the Danubian region by three imperialist powers. In the forefront among the disputed issues rises the “Anschluss” movement, the effort at Austro-German unification—which brings up immediately the revision of the Versailles Treaty, which, in turn, draws into the welter of contradictions all the imperialist Powers with their train of vassal States.

The Versailles “Peace” Treaty, which had as co-signatories the

social-chauvinists Paul-Boncour; Vandervelde; Hermann Mueller; Gustav Noske, butcher of the German working class, and the first Chancellor of the Austrian Republic, Karl Renner; was devised as an instrument for colossal oppression by the victor Entente Powers. By that treaty the toiling masses of Germany, weighed down by capitalism "at home", were condemned to tribute-slavery by international finance-capital; Austria was deprived of the right of self-determination; and many millions of people in Alsace-Lorraine, in South Tyrol, in West and East Prussia, in Upper Silesia, in Poland, were subjected to oppression through forcible annexation. The misery of the Versailles Treaty weighs, however, also on the toiling masses of the "victorious" countries. Using as a pretext their role of guarding or opposing the Versailles system, as the case may be, the various imperialist Powers and their vassals are feverishly arming, burdening the masses with immense expenditures for a new world slaughter, unleashing fascist offensives against the revolutionary upsurge of the toilers, and preparing war for a redivision of the earth in an effort to find a way out of the crisis. The interests of the world proletariat set it, naturally, against the Versailles Treaty. But the end which it seeks to bring to the Treaty is not through imperialist revision, but through the revolutionary destruction of capitalism which prevents the right of peoples to self-determination and deprives the world of the basis for peace.

The movement for Anschluss, with the German influence it has promoted in Austria, has, since 1918, disturbed the "equanimity" of the Versailles Treaty. With Hitler's accession to power the prospects of the challenge for Anschluss loomed large in Germany's foreign policy. The Nazi effort to achieve the union with Austria is, however, strangely enough, not the attempt to realize the old-time foreign policy of imperialist Germany, but arises, in fact, in its very intensification, from a modification of that policy. For the foreign policy of Hitler and Rosenberg represents a criticism of Germany's pre-war project for setting up a colonial empire by wresting possessions from the imperialist marauders that had anticipated her on the historic scene. Instead, the Nazis hold, Germany should have striven first for the extension of her frontiers in Europe so as to build for herself a strong continental base for advancing her project for colonial possessions.

"For Germany," Hitler tells us in *Mein Kampf*, "the only possibility for the realization of a sound territorial policy, lay in the acquisition of new land in Europe itself."*

And where shall one plunge the carving-knife to apportion to oneself this continental slice? Hitler presents his plan:

* Page 153 (German edition).

"If one should seek to acquire land in Europe, he can realize his aim more or less only at the expense of Russia; in that case the new Reich must once again set out upon the road of the Crusaders of old, in order to provide with the German sword soil for the German plow and daily bread for the nation.

"For such a policy, however, there was to be found in Europe only one ally: England."*

This then is the foreign policy of Hitler fascism: War, in alliance with England, against the Soviet Union! War, to annex Soviet territory, to make of the U.S.S.R. an agrarian *hinterland* for exploitation by German, British and Japanese finance capital. This is the drive of German imperialism which goes far deeper than its anti-Versailles policy, deeper than its antagonism to the imperialist bloc that crushed its power in 1917.

As the path of least resistance toward this objective, German fascism envisages the achievement of hegemony over the German-speaking peoples of Central Europe, the realization of Anschluss with Austria. In addition, the slogan of "Pan-Germanism" has the added merit of whipping up a new frenzy of chauvinism that may for a while longer confuse the discontented masses. But the "path of least resistance" proves to be beset with obstacles. For Anschluss means the accentuation of the Versailles contradictions. It means the precipitation of a new imperialist war. Even British imperialism, though favorably disposed in the main to Hitler's foreign policy—its premier, MacDonald, proposed at Geneva the doubling of the German army—has found it necessary repeatedly to employ terms of warning against Nazi aggressiveness. England's struggle to depose France from her position of suzerainty in Europe leads her to desire a strengthened Germany, as does her need for an ally against the Soviet Union; but she cannot allow the war to be of Germany's making at a moment that is inopportune. France, of course, is against releasing Germany from her isolation, against any alteration of the Versailles treaty. Furthermore, in regards to French interests, Anschluss would result in cutting off from France her important ally, Czechoslovakia. The answer of Czechoslovakia and of Yugoslavia to Anschluss would undoubtedly be immediate invasion of Austria. As for Italy, French hegemony in Europe, sanctioned by the Versailles treaty, confronts in Italian fascism a leader in the demand for revision. Italy feels herself hemmed in by French imperialism, with its sway over the Eastern Mediterranean, and with its vassal States that are obstacles to her aggrandizement in the Danube-Balkan region to which she feels entitled as pretender to the imperialist heritage of the house of Hapsburg in Middle

* *Ibid.*, page 154.

and Southeastern Europe. Therefore, Italian fascism stands with German imperialism in the anti-Versailles bloc.

But, in Hitler's struggle against French supremacy in Europe, Mussolini recognizes the designs of German imperialism to usurp that supremacy—an alternative as abhorrent to the Italian bourgeoisie as the status quo. The annexation of Austria, it is clear, would afford Germany a direct route to the Balkans and endanger Italy's South Tyrol paasageway to Central Europe. In their common fear of Anschluss the anti-Versailles Italian bourgeoisie and pro-Versailles French imperialism find themselves thrown together.*

A strange commentary on the "bloc of the two fascisms" which the Nazi trumpeters proclaimed as Hitler took power! Yet who but the ready victims of fascist demagogy about the Nazi "Revolution" and the "Third Reich" will fail to understand that the imperialist contradictions are not eliminated *but are heightened* by the advent of fascism—and that, therefore, we have Mussolini fascism saying to Hitler fascism: "Good fences make good neighbors".

And what is the attitude of the Austrian bourgeoisie to Anschluss? Surely the Pan-Germanic spirit should move it to unity with the "Third Reich"! But the Austrian master class is at present for the most part otherwise minded. Austrian big business is largely dependent on French and British finance capital. Last August the League of Nations granted the Dollfuss government a new loan of 300 million schillings, to enable Austrian capitalism to pay its foreign debt, which, at the end of the first half of 1933, had risen to about 3,000,000,000 schillings. For this loan, which supplemented the League loans of 1923 and 1932, the Austrian bourgeoisie obligated itself, in accordance with the Lausanne Protocol, to preserve Austria's "independence"; in reality, it subjugated Austria to the League of Nations imperialist policy. In expectation of that loan, Dollfuss had played to French finance capital, as was evident when the pro-Anschluss Dr. Frank, Austria's Ambassador to Germany, was recalled—clearly at France's bidding. But here enters the contradictory factor of Austrian foreign trade. The Austrian capitalists have since the war bent their efforts to transform the country from its present semi-agrarian status into an economically self-sustained land. To some extent there has been a tendency in the direction of a favorable trade balance. Important in this connection is the role played by the Central European countries, which supply over a quarter of Austria's imports and receive over a third of her exports, respectively five times and three times the amounts accountable to the Western European countries. This conflict between

* The dependence of the Austrian bourgeoisie on Italian imperialism and the entrance of Italo-fascism as a rival imperialist counter-Nazi factor in the Austrian situation will be dealt with in the next article.

Austria's dependence on West European finance capital, on the one hand, and on German and Balkan foreign trade, on the other, creates a rift in the Austrian bourgeois groups. The capitalist groups identified with German industrial interests in Austria, such as the Greater Germanists and the National Socialists, are opposed to the Lausanne Protocols and are eager for Austro-German union. However, the decisive section of the Austrian bourgeoisie is now cold to the appeal for Anschluss. The Dollfuss government, naturally, reflects this conflict. The Dollfuss regime is the governmental expression of the National Socialists as well as of the Christian Socialists. Not only for reasons of German trade, but because *the National Socialists represent a component part of Austro-fascism*. The rallying cry of the Dollfuss government is: Defense of Austrian independence! However, this slogan is not so much a cry for freedom from German domination as it is a demagogic justification of Austrian dependence on French imperialism. For annexation to Germany would doom the Austrian bourgeoisie not only to share in the foreign-political isolation to which that land is condemned by the Versailles Treaty, but to be reduced to a mere province of the German Reich. Moreover, in her present strategic position amid the conflicts of surrounding imperialist powers, Austria lends herself to a convenient trafficking, the profits of which her bourgeoisie is naturally loth to surrender.

Echoing the Dollfuss battle-cry: Defense of Austrian independence!—the Austrian Socialist Party released the slogan: Against Anschluss, for the neutralization of Austria on the principles of international law! Both slogans had but one meaning—the subjection of the Austrian toiling masses to foreign finance-capital.

Against this concerted demagoguery, the Communist Party of Austria, in the interests of the Austrian toiling population, declares itself, in the present situation, as opposed to Anschluss with Nazi Germany, since such a union would mean the incorporation of Austria in Hitler's bloody "Third Reich".

The Communist Party declares that the Austrian people can achieve self-determination only through the victory of the proletarian revolution, only on the basis of a Soviet Austria in unification with a Soviet Germany.

The buffer state diplomacy which has characterized the foreign policy of the Dollfuss government is closely interlinked with the domestic policy. By maneuvering between outer imperialist embroilments, the Dollfuss dictatorship can pretend to be fighting for Austrian freedom, a piece of demagogic *Hochpolitik* calculated to favor its fascist offensive at home. The clerical-fascist Dollfuss dictatorship, which was called into command by Austrian monopoly

capital close upon the heels of Hitler's coming to power, has been confronted with the task of composing the conflicting forces of the Austrian bourgeoisie, with a view to overcoming the inner crisis through an organized terroristic onslaught upon the working class. Dollfuss ushered in his regime by abolishing the freedom of press and assembly, following this move with the limitation of trial by jury. Immediately afterwards came the dissolution of the *Schutzbund*—the Republican mass defense corps, containing the most revolutionary social-democratic proletarian elements. These measures were accompanied by the systematic disarming of the working class through house-to-house searches in the proletarian quarters of Vienna and other big cities. Wholesale imprisonments of Communists were soon followed by the outlawry of the Young Communist League, of the International Red Aid, and finally of the Communist Party. The fascist methods of the Dollfuss government further showed themselves in such undisguised Hitler-like measures as the establishment of concentration camps, the coercion of workers into fascist formations, and the introduction of forced labor (*Arbeitsdienstpflicht*).

Thus, Dollfuss belied his demagogic pretensions that he was taking the field in a holy war upon Nazi-ism.

And all along, by a series of emergency decrees bearing the clear Nazi imprint, the clerical-fascist Dollfuss dictatorship made deep inroads upon the living standards of the Austrian toiling population. An Order issued on April 24, 1933, robbed the Austrian workers of the right to strike. Avowing "to protect the economic system against stoppages of work", this Order made participation in, or agitation for, a strike punishable by a fine as high as 2,000 schillings or imprisonment to the extent of six months. Trade unions were to be held responsible for consequences from strike activities carried on by them or their representatives. Special provisions were made in the Order for the protection of scabs against expulsion from trade unions in which they might be members. Ostensibly, the Order proposed to outlaw only those strikes that had an object other than the improvement of conditions of work and all strikes in government enterprises, in public utility undertakings, and in all undertakings of special public importance. But its breadth of scope, and the special board set up to determine whether a strike came within the purview of the Order, were guarantee enough that the strike-weapon in Austria was thenceforward illegal.

On June 13, 1933, the government issued two Orders, one providing for compulsory arbitration, the other for the annulment of collective agreements in all public works. Simultaneously, wages were cut on relief works in various districts. A month later, the Dollfuss government ordered the reduction of unemployment bene-

fit, varying from 0.14 to 2.10 schillings. In addition, in true Nazi manner, various categories of unemployed were excluded from benefit—a device that has enabled Dollfuss to hide the true extent of unemployment in Austria, since the indices are based upon the receipt of benefit.*

To carry through these attacks on the working class, the Dollfuss regime needed, of course, not only a mass base for its operations, which it found in broad sections of the petty-bourgeoisie, but an agency within the ranks of the proletariat. That agency was Austrian social-democracy.

By 1932 the leadership of the Socialist Party of Austria found itself compelled by the terrific mass impoverishment and the accompanying Left-radicalization among the social-democratic workers to admit that capitalist stabilization had lost its basis.** But a short while before, this "Left" social-democratic leadership had sung pæans to the omnipotence of "organized capitalism". With social-

* *Industrial and Labour Information* for January 8, 1934, published in Geneva by the International Labour Office (League of Nations), basing itself on statistics of employment exchanges, puts the number of unemployed in Austria as of December, 1933, at 354,899—a figure of very grave import for so small a land.

** A "Report of the Department of Overseas Trade on the Financial and Economic Position of Austria," recently issued by the British Government and abstracted by *Engineering* (London), Jan. 12, 1934, reveals such facts as the following:

In the relatively "normal" year of 1929, 40 per cent of those attached to the engineering trades (heavy industries) were unemployed, and 92 per cent (!) of those in the coal mining industry. It is admitted that "conditions have not improved in this respect since 1929."

In the coal mining industry, for instance, in which the home production, about 7.4 per cent of the imports, registers an increase over the production ten years previously, "the increased output is *due entirely to the introduction of improved methods of mining*, since the number of pits working has declined from 15 to 4 during the decade, while the number of employees concerned has decreased from 1,922 to 1,295 during the same period." The same tendency is reported for the lignite mining industry: from 1923 to the end of 1932 production was increased by nearly 50 per cent, despite a decrease in the number of pits from 77 to 42 and in the number of workers from 18,634 to 9,643. Thus, about half the number of men produced about double the quantity of lignite as compared with pre-War conditions.

This is likewise true of the iron ore industry: Erzberg, in Styria, contains Austria's richest deposits of iron ore, estimated to contain about 350,000,000 tons. Here also employment has diminished severely: during the period 1928-1932 the number working declined from 3,791 to 744 and the market value of the output shrank by 18 per cent of the 15,500,000 schillings realized in the earlier year. The abstract continues: "It is, therefore, satisfactory to learn that improvement of conditions appears to have taken

democracy the world over it had preached to the workers that capitalist rationalization was the basis for the growth of their material welfare. As late as January, 1930, the theoretical organ of Austro-Marxism could still say:

“Capitalism has organized economy, it has organized it on an international scale. It has suppressed free competition. As for anarchy of production, of that there can be no question.”*

But at the 1932 Party Congress, Otto Bauer conceded:

“There is a ferment in the world. Capitalism has lost its stability. The confidence of vast masses throughout the world in capitalism is destroyed and cannot be restored. And the political confusion in the capitalist world today is only an accompanying phenomenon of the process of dissolution of capitalist world economy.”

Let it not be thought, however, that this statement was advanced as an analytical preliminary to a revolutionary program of action. Not the cry for action sounded in those words, but the note of fear. Fear of the growing mass disillusionment with bourgeois democracy, of the rising solidarity between the social-democratic and Communist workers in common struggles, prompted Bauer to declare at that Congress:

“There is no disputing the fact that many recent events have to some extent shaken the faith in democracy. This is especially the case with some of our young comrades.”

His democracy was in danger! Bourgeois democracy, the cause to which Austro-Marxism had dedicated its heart and soul—bourgeois democracy was in danger! And Bauer was alert to his role

place recently, and that there was a likelihood of increased *production*—not necessarily employment—“of ore during the remaining months of last year.”

Engineering states further: “The general influence of the financial position on the heavy engineering industries is shown by the fact that during the last year only one blast furnace worked for 37 weeks, as compared with five working for 187 weeks in 1929.”

Further data: The drastic curtailment of Austrian government expenditure resulted also in a virtual standstill for the cable industry; the Federal Railways have been prevented from placing anything but the smallest orders for new rolling stock; the Steyr automobile works began a “temporary” shutdown in the summer of 1932, reducing the number of employees to 40 per cent of the 1929 figure; the entire Viennese metal industry (engaged principally in finishing processes) has been bled white by the low purchasing power of the world markets. In short, “it is difficult” concludes the very much puzzled writer, “to find grounds on which to base any hope for the immediate improvement of the prevailing conditions in this trade.”

* *Kampf*, January 30, 1930.

of organizer of capitalism's main social support in the workers' ranks. It is the "great and glorious task of the Austrian proletariat", he declared that day, "to maintain here an island of democratic liberty".

To the workers of Austria, grown impatient at the paltering of social-democracy; to the masses demanding revolutionary fighting methods against the Heimwehr and the Nazi storm divisions; to the working people joining in spontaneous Socialist-Communist united front manifestations—to the Austrian proletariat pressing forward for a revolutionary offensive against capitalism, Otto Bauer presented the land of their enslavement as an island of democratic liberty for the working class.

Viennese "Marxism" of *Gemuetlichkeit!* Let capitalists and Bolsheviks engage in conflict; but Austro-Marxists—never! May the turbulent sea of imperialism rage around us, may fascism come to neighboring shores, may revolutions sweep over other lands—ours is an island of democratic liberty, the maintenance of which is our great and glorious task!

Proceeding on this assumption that the Austrian workers are living in a democracy, the Austrian Socialist Party, from the very beginning, threw its whole weight of support behind the Dollfuss government. Turning to good account his conflict with the Nazis which he wages out of deference to French finance capital, Dollfuss readily utilized the proffered social-democratic support. Like his German antecedent, Hindenburg, who had likewise been favored and given power by social-democracy, Dollfuss, protected by the social-democratic designation "lesser evil", could now proceed freely with his fascist measures.

In explanation of its assistance to Dollfuss, social-democracy presented him to the masses as the preserver of Austria from fascism. To strengthen the hand of this "liberator", the Austrian Social-Democratic Party repeatedly offered him grants of extraordinary powers.

At the 1933 Party Congress, when the Dollfuss regime had given incontestable evidence of its fascist nature, social-democracy declared:

"Determined to defend the independence of Austria, social-democracy by no means refuses to grant the State, so long as immediate danger exists, the necessary weapons against fascism, which is threatening the democratic republic and its independence. But exceptional measures against the fascist danger must not abolish the liberty and equality of the democratic mass of the working people."

And social-democracy could boast of having furnished the necessary weapons to the State. It could boast of having broken every

resistance of the Austrian working class to the fascist regime; it could boast of having taken no stand against the order to dissolve the Schutzbund; it could boast of having permitted the outlawing of the Communist Party; it could boast of having prevented the Austrian proletariat from rising on March 4 against the establishment of the fascist dictatorship; it could boast of having blocked at every turn the fighting united front of the Austrian working class against fascism.

The growing indignation of the Austrian workers against the Dollfuss fascist terror and against the treachery of social-democracy compelled the Social-Democratic Party to release a slogan for revolutionary action. Otto Bauer declared himself in favor of a general strike and revolution, *should any of these four conditions arise*:

1. If the Dollfuss government should overthrow the social-democratic municipality of Vienna:
2. If the Social-Democratic Party should be illegalized;
3. If the government should incorporate the trade unions into the patriotic front;
4. If it should proclaim a fascist constitution.

Nothing can better exemplify the "Left" maneuvers of which Austro-Marxist social-fascism is capable: To the fascist government all possible assistance; and to the workers—the promise of a general strike and revolution when their organizations will have been destroyed, when they will be compelled to fight with their backs to the wall!

With what perfidious demagoguery the Social-Democratic organ, *Wahrheit*, declared:

"In *any* of these cases the working class must rise in order to defend the freedom of the people, its organizations, its right to existence. The Austrian workers must realize that the hour may come in which the enemy will compel them to take up the decisive fight. They must be determined to fight rather than to surrender without a fight! Should it, however, come to a fight, then the enemy will employ all his means of force in the most ruthless, brutal manner. The working class can then be victorious only if it boldly uses all the means of power at its disposal. Then the old slogan of revolution will apply: audacity, audacity, and again audacity! Should it come to a *general strike* and the *revolution*, then there will no longer be any possibility of compromise, but only the choice: either to go down fighting gallantly or victory and power!"

But in that self-same article, there appeared the reassuring aside to the bourgeoisie:

"Austrian social-democracy has always conducted its fight within the limits of the law. It still remains now within the limits of the law."

A notable opportunity for proving in action the sincerity of its revolutionary slogans had presented itself to social-democracy on March 14, immediately after the establishment of the Dollfuss fascist regime, when the Communist Party of Austria addressed a united front offer in the form of an Open Letter to the Social-Democratic Party.

The Letter proposed a proletarian united front for the repulsion of the government attacks upon the rights of the working class. It proposed the adoption of the sharpest trade union fighting methods to force the annulment of the emergency decrees. The united front was to struggle for the disarming and the dissolution of the Heimwehr and the Nazi storm divisions, as well as for the withdrawal of the military from Vienna. It was to fight for the reinstatement of the victimized railroad workers. It was to launch a campaign of struggle against the reductions in wages, unemployment benefit, and pensions; against the dictatorial powers of the social welfare minister; against the capitalist government. It called for the nation-wide establishment of unified fighting committees of social-democratic and Communist workers.

Social-democracy at first ignored, and later rejected, the offer. Instead, it made a common front with the Dollfuss government. In the conflict between the clerical black-shirt fascism of Dollfuss and the brown-shirt fascism of Hitler, Austro-Marxism called for "concentrating all forces upon preparations for struggle against the menace of the main enemy—Hitler nationalism". Dollfuss, so the Bauers and the Renners taught, as the Welser and the Leiparts had taught in relation to Hindenburg, was the lesser enemy, the lesser evil. In fact, since Dollfuss, too, was fighting the "greater evil", was he not in reality an ally of the proletariat? What mattered, therefore, to the proletariat the surrender of "minor strategic positions" against the common front for the preservation of "democracy"?

The factory councils were being suppressed? the Chambers of Labor, fascized? the workers' self-defense corps, dissolved? the working class quarters, searched for arms? the Heimwehr fascist hordes, empowered for terrorist offensive?—what were these "trivial" losses against the greater gain of "democracy"?

Different, however, was the view of the Austrian working class. The fascist offensive of the Dollfuss government brought about an even greater impoverishment of the masses. The peasants were growing desperate. Despite the ban on meetings, unemployed dem-

onstrations began to take place shortly after Dollfuss took power—in Vienna, in Upper Styria, in Lower Austria. The political strike of the compositors in protest against government censorship attested to the revolutionization of the industrial workers. In defiance of the anti-strike order, the miners of Styria engaged in a strike that had important political implications—a strike that was the first clear revolt of the Austrian workers against the fascist regime. The strike of the miners in the Alpine works was an open challenge to the anti-working class emergency decrees of the Dollfuss regime. It bade fair to extend to the entire mining and heavy industry in the land. Prompt action was needed, if capitalism was to save itself. The reformists came to the rescue. With their aid the government succeeded in breaking the strike. But as fascism sought to entrench itself, numerous nation-wide demonstrations of a militancy unprecedented in the history of the republic broke out to protest the prohibition of the freedom of assembly and press, the reduction of unemployment benefit, the dissolution of the Schutzbund, and the search for weapons in proletarian quarters. These demonstrations were spontaneous outbursts in which social-democratic and Communist workers joined in one fighting front. Over the heads of their leaders, who had cynically rejected the Communist Party's united front offer, the social-democratic workers were forging their natural proletarian bond with the Communist workers in militant mass manifestations, in strikes, and in indignation rallies. Increasingly, it became clear to the Austrian bourgeoisie that social-democracy was rapidly becoming insecure as an apparatus for preventing the proletarian way out of the crisis, and the Dollfuss government advanced with fascist offensives to the sharpening of its terrorist dictatorship.

(To be continued)

How Not to Apply the Open Letter

By GERTRUDE HAESSLER

(*A reply to the article by J. A. Zack in the February issue of THE COMMUNIST, entitled "How to Apply the Open Letter".*)

"It is only natural that a Social-Democrat who conceives the political struggle as being identical with the 'economic struggle against the employers and the government', should conceive 'organization of revolutionists' as being more or less identical with 'organization of workers', and this, in fact, is what actually happens; so that when we talk about organization, we literally talk in different tongues. I recall a conversation I once had with a fairly consistent Economist, with whom I had not been previously acquainted. We were discussing the brochure *Who Will Make The Political Revolution?* and we were very soon agreed that the principal defect in that brochure was that it ignored the question of organization. We were beginning to think that we were in complete agreement with each other—but as the conversation proceeded, it became clear that we were talking of different things. My interlocutor accused the author of the brochure just mentioned of ignoring strike funds, mutual-aid societies, etc.; whereas, I had in mind an organization of revolutionists, as an essential factor in 'making' the political revolution.

"After that became clear, I hardly remember a single question of importance upon which I was in agreement with that Economist!

"What was the source of our disagreement? It is the fact that on questions of organization and politics the Economists are forever lapsing from Social Democracy into trade unionism. . . ."

(Lenin, *Iskra Period*, Vol. II, p. 187.)

For over six pages out of a ten-page article in the February *Communist*, Comrade Zack speaks of applying the Open Letter in the shops. As one of those "Party members who have been most active for the last few years in trade union work", he welcomes the Open Letter, "since it is possible now, much more than ever before, to throw the entire strength of our movement behind the realization of our main line—to organize in the basic industries". For over six pages Comrade Zack speaks a language which leads one to believe that he has whole-heartedly understood and accepted the

Open Letter's main line—to penetrate the factory proletariat with the Party.

Then, like Lenin and the Economist, the Open Letter and Zack find they have been speaking a different language! The Open Letter has in mind the Party—but Comrade Zack, for over six pages, has been speaking as a “union organizer and of methods of organizing average workers”! And from that time on, there is hardly a single question of importance upon which the Open Letter is in agreement with Comrade Zack! Lenin, back in 1902, had come to grips with “trade union politics”. Now the Open Letter in 1934, in America, has the self-same task all over again.

Comrade Zack interprets the main line of the Open Letter in his own peculiar way. He quotes from it as follows:

“. . . the progress made in various activities amongst the proletariat . . . is not basic as long as we do not make progress along the main line, the main strategic line, which is to penetrate the factory proletariat.”*

Comrade Zack speaks for pages of “realizing our main line”, of “organizing of the workers in the factories”, of “tackling a factory”, of “penetrating the factory proletariat”. But he tells us he is speaking as a Union organizer! Does the Open Letter have to tell us to base ourselves on the factories to organize the Union? That is absurd! Surely we are not going to begin building trade unions *outside the factories!* The Open Letter, in speaking of “penetrating”, of “gaining a base”, of “winning influence”, “to establish firm contacts”, etc.,—with the decisive sections of the proletariat, in the basic industries, etc.—is speaking of *the Party*.

No member of the Party may underestimate the great importance of building the Unions in the shops—the Unions, which the Open Letter calls the “highways to the broadest masses of workers”. But Comrade Zack cannot see the forest for the trees. Build the Unions first, and then build the Party, says Zack with his mechanistic “stages theory”.

Zack polemizes against those leading functionaries of the Party who, in his opinion, “somehow hold to the theory that the Party must be built first in the factory, then the Union”. Of course, Comrade Zack simply fastens these theories onto these functionaries.

* I could not find the quotation from the *Open Letter* upon which Comrade Zack bases his entire argument, anywhere in my copy of the *Open Letter* (the penny pamphlet issued by the Central Committee). I went over it many times but could not find it. But since the text is in line with the *Open Letter*, I will accept it. My quarrel is not with the text, but with its interpretation.

The whole conception of placing one first and the other second, be it Party or Union, is wrong. We build the Union as we build the Party. We build the Party as we build the Union. Is anyone foolish enough to believe, as Comrade Zack thinks they believe, that first we must politicalize the workers by agitation and propaganda on political issues, and then bring them to a realization of the need for union organization? And vice versa, could anyone, especially after having read Comrade Lenin's *What Is to Be Done*, believe that the stages theory works the other way, that first we organize workers into economic organizations, and then build the Party as a sort of superstructure? And yet, with all of Comrade Zack's phrases about building the Party also in the factory, this is exactly what he believes must be done.

Lenin also met with this viewpoint back in 1902. He sharply repudiates the "political superstructure" views of the Self-Emancipation of the Workers' Group. In speaking of their manifesto he says:

"Similarly these authors do not 'repudiate' politics, they merely say (merely!), repeating what was said by V. V., that politics are the superstructure, and therefore, 'political agitation must be the superstructure to the agitation carried on in favor of the economic struggle; it must arise on the basis of this struggle and give precedence to it.'"

(Lenin, *Iskra Period*, Vol. II, p. 127.)

"Examine this view", continues Comrade Lenin, "from the standpoint of the opinion prevailing among all Economists, that political agitation must *follow* economic agitation. Is it true that, in general, the economic struggle 'is the most widely applicable method' of drawing the masses into the political struggle? It is absolutely untrue. All and sundry manifestations of police tyranny and autocratic outrage, in addition to the evils connected with the economic struggle, are equally 'widely applicable' as a means of drawing in the masses. Why, then, should we beforehand *restrict* the scope of political agitation by declaring *only one* of the methods to be 'the most widely applicable', when Social Democrats have other, generally speaking, not less 'widely applicable' means?"

(Lenin, *Iskra Period*, Vol. II, p. 140.)

Here is the crux of Comrade Zack's attitude; a quotation from his own article:

"A Party that cannot penetrate into the basic factories and organize the Union there, is not a Bolshevik Party. It is a merely philosophizing sect that shirks (as opportunists do) the hard work of bucking up against monopoly capital. A party incapable of making even the first essential steps to the decisive sections of the working class. Many are the 'left' apologies made not to do this work. One of them is that the union cannot be organized in the

plant until we have a Party there, 'double secret'; and that the way to get the Party is to get out a Party factory paper first. The result of this sectarian opportunist conception and approach conceived in isolation from the masses is that both the Party paper and the Party groups turn out to be very much of a miscarriage. Experience bears out the fact that it is the union which is the mass bridge to the Party politically and *organisationally*, and that the building of the union is the best mass approach to the building of the Party, and the method of uniting the masses for the struggle to defend their immediate interests and raise and secure their political development."

Here is the whole conception of playing Party and Union against each other. Here is the whole conception that, because Party papers have been badly handled in the past, and as a result have had some pretty bad consequences for Party and Union in the shop, that Party papers are basically harmful. Here is not the Bolshevik conception that the Party papers, which are basically necessary in the shop, should adopt the proper methods. Here is a crude conception that since the Party papers did harm to the work, abolish them, and start with the more logical task, of building one step first—the Union—and then when we have the workers firmly under our control in the Unions, we can perhaps take a chance of inoculating a few of the picked ones with the germ of Communism. He says:

"We, as the vanguard, interpret the events for the masses and draw for them doctorial and professional conclusions, thus forming 'theoretical' groups on an utterly sectarian conception, and such groups as have been built, stand in this utterly sectarian conception. Thus has the mass of the Party's factory work been done in the past. . . ."

Does this disprove our "main line"—which, in the light of the Open Letter, is to form a base *for the Party* in the shops? It does not. It simply proves that our methods of work so far have, unfortunately, been wrong, and have betrayed great inexperience. But we will improve these methods—not abandon them.

Comrade Browder, in his report to the Eighteenth Plenum of our Central Committee, speaking of *Party* shop papers, said:

"How are we to build the stronghold of the Party in the shops if in the first place we ignore and neglect shop papers? . . . To the degree to which we recover our line on this weak sector of the front, and begin to really establish a battery of papers worthy of the name, we can begin to perform this tremendous task we have set ourselves of establishing the Party stronghold in the shops."

Comrade Zack does not "ignore and neglect" the Party shop papers. He simply and brutally murders them. He even proposed

in the District Secretariat in Cleveland that no Party shop papers be issued in District 6. Can you imagine one of our concentration Districts without a Party shop paper? And yet that is the state of affairs in the Cleveland District. Of course, the leadership in the District is taking strenuous measures to root out any such conception, and is now vigorously pushing the work of reviving and improving Party shop papers, and founding new ones.

Notice, Comrade Zack, that Comrade Browder very carefully robs you of your ammunition in his formulation. He says: "begin to really establish a battery of shop papers *worthy of the name*". That is our task—to make our shop papers worthy of the name. Our task is not to kill them off.

In the reviews of shop papers appearing fairly regularly of late in the *Daily Worker*, it has been attempted to make of them shop papers "worthy of the name". The object was not merely to criticize, but, by analyzing them, to help in improving them. The two extremes of Party papers have been dealt with. *The Ground Hog*, issued in the Illinois Coal Fields, was criticized for having too much the character of a left union opposition paper. *The Dock Worker*, issued on the Duluth docks, suffered in its October issue from the same defect. On the other hand, *The Yard Voice* is issued by the Party unit in the Brooklyn Navy Yards. It consists of a series of political articles, with not one single word from beginning to end, on shop organization and building up the union. Here are the extremes that give Comrade Zack his ammunition for sniping at the Party shop papers. It is wrong, Comrade Zack, to attempt to kill off these papers. What you must do is to help teach these comrades how to utilize these papers to help build up union organization—the highway for the Party to the masses—and how to mobilize these strategic workers—miners, dock workers, and armaments producers for the proletarian revolution. Can there be such a thing as "step by step"? Can there be such a thing as depriving these important Party units in these basic industries and plants of their most important means of bringing before these strategic workers our Party campaigns and slogans, our entire program? How can we bring before them the burning political slogans of the day—the conquest of power, the setting up of a Soviet America?

A further word on shop papers in this connection. While we should always welcome the appearance of Union shop papers in shops, and should endeavor by all means to utilize them, by articles signed by Communists, to bring forward the Party policies and tactics, experience has shown that they are insufficient for bringing forward the Party and its program and cannot replace the Party papers. *The Yard Worker*, for instance, the Party paper in the

Brooklyn Navy Yards, was created because the Party comrades in the shop found it impossible to bring the Party program to the workers through the Union shop paper already existing.

Comrade Zack is not building the highway to the masses with his Unions. He is building a wall between the Party and the masses with his Unions. There is sectarianism and sectarianism, Comrade Zack, and that sectarianism which springs from the right danger, opportunism, is the more dangerous and must be fought the more sharply.

Comrade Zack thinks he is being very highly political when he says:

"It is now possible for us, due to the fact that every factory worker is deeply concerned with the measures of the government as expressed in the Recovery Act, to carry on a tremendous campaign, a uniform campaign, against the government—the government that is trying to impose upon every worker a lower wage scale and has already succeeded in imposing higher prices for food and living. Until now we have had to expose each boss separately in every factory. Now, by exposing these measures of the government, we expose the general capitalist program as embodied in the N.R.A., and through such exposures, entrench ourselves among the workers."

But if this statement is taken in the light of Comrade Zack's general trade-union primacy approach, his argument resolves itself as follows: The economic struggle is becoming interwoven with the political struggle. The intervention by the Government in the day-to-day life of the masses is introducing more and more the political elements of the struggle. The fight against the Government measures on the economic issues leads to a fight against the Government. Hence, we have but to bring the workers into trade union organizations, to develop the economic struggles, and our political work will naturally flow therefrom.

This thesis may seem to be identical with the thesis of the Party which lays the emphasis on the economic struggles as the road which we must take to win the majority of the working class. But in reality this is not identical with the Party's viewpoint. The fact that the Government is fixing wages, that the Government has become a factor in the every-day life of the masses, *creates the conditions* for raising the class-consciousness, the political level, of the workers, but does not automatically, spontaneously, do this. It is necessary for the *Party* to show to the workers that the Government is their enemy; to expose the N.R.A. program; to expose the class-collaboration policy of the Government; to unmask the demagogy of the Government and of the social-fascists; to propose an alternative program to the workers; to hammer home, on the basis of the ex-

periences of the workers themselves, the correctness of our viewpoint; etc., etc. By that means *the favorable conditions* already created will be *utilized by the Party* to achieve the political elevation of the working class.

In the last period serious deviations have occurred in the struggle against the N.R.A.—hesitation in exposing the N.R.A. in the economic struggles as an instrument of the greater exploitation of the workers, and in many cases hesitation to fight against Roosevelt. And why was this so? Because the conception of spontaneity, of the automatic transformation of the economic struggle into the political struggle, permeates many of our comrades, and in such cases, weakens not only the political struggles but also the economic struggle.

I do not discuss here in detail the necessity for connecting up the economic struggle with the revolutionary way out, which can be done only by the persistent work of the Party. This latter point is of particular importance in view of the “political animation” of the masses at the present time, about which Lenin wrote:

“We must bear in mind that in one year of political animation, the proletariat can obtain more revolutionary training than in several years of political calm. That is why the tendency of the above-mentioned Socialist consciously or unconsciously to *restrict* the scope and content of political agitation is particularly harmful.”

(Lenin, *Iskra Period*, Vol. II, p. 85.)

Comrade Zack relies too much upon the spontaneous development of the economic struggle into the political struggle, but a long time ago Comrade Lenin disposed of this question when he dealt with the wave of strikes in Russia in the 'nineties:

“Taken by themselves, these strikes were simple trade union struggles, but not yet Social-Democratic struggles. They testified to the awakening antagonisms between workers and employers, but the workers were not and could not be conscious of the irreconcilable antagonism of their interests to the whole of the modern political and social system, *i. e.*, it was not yet Social-Democratic consciousness. In this sense, the strikes of the nineties, in spite of the enormous progress they represented as compared with the ‘revolts’, represented a purely spontaneous movement.

“We said that *there could not yet be* Social-Democratic consciousness among the workers. This consciousness could only be brought to them from without. The history of all countries shows that the working class, exclusively by its own efforts, is able to develop only trade-union consciousness, *i. e.*, it may itself realize the necessity of combining in unions, to fight against the employers and to strive to compel the government to pass necessary labor legislation, etc. . . . Trade unionism does not exclude ‘politics’ altogether as some imagine. Trade unions have always conducted

political agitation and struggle (not but Social-Democratic ones)."
 (Lenin, *Iskra Period*, Vol. II, p. 114.)

Comrade Zack has not observed another peculiarity of the situation in the United States. The workers are becoming revolutionary. They are engaged in unprecedented struggle. They are streaming into the trade unions. Though we have in this upsurge participated in struggles, led 200,000 through the revolutionary unions in strike struggles, established contact with A. F. of L. workers and influenced the course of their struggles, nevertheless, the majority of the workers seeking organization entered into the A. F. of L. unions, and the A. F. of L. and Socialists were able to secure the lead of some of the major battles.

And why was this so? Aside from the policies of the Government, of helping the A. F. of L. bureaucrats, it was due to the failure of the Party to realize that its main task is to throw its full energies into the organization of the workers, into the leadership of their economic struggles, *which is impossible without convincing the workers that class organization and victorious struggle are possible only through the leadership of the Party and the revolutionary unions*; to fight for the unity of the workers against the offensive the reformist leadership. The narrow "trade union" approach of Comrade Zack restricts this very political (agitational, organizational) fight against the reformists and mars the success of our struggle with the A. F. of L. leaders and Socialists.

Can these tasks be achieved if the face of the Party and the revolutionary unions is hidden, as happened in many cases? Can this be done by running away from the "Red Scare"? Can it be done by continuing the sectarian division, which so often manifests itself, between political and trade union work, and which Comrade Zack's conception deepens? It is not at all accidental that Comrade Zack does not give the proper answer on how to meet the "Red Scare", when he says in his article:

"There are two ways of meeting the 'red scare'. One is to retreat, which leads to capitulation before the enemy. The other is to meet it head-on in a popular fashion. Tell the workers what the boss is aiming at, that he wants to eliminate the more experienced, radical element, in order to render the strike impotent and to demoralize the organization, that we stand for unity . . .", etc., etc.

This position is clear, but inadequate. The first method is not "meeting the Red Scare", but it is running away from it. The second method is too narrow.

What is the "Red scare"? It is the attempt of the capitalists

to bring their agitational and police machinery into force, to scare off the workers from revolutionary organization and struggle on the grounds:

(a) That the Communists are not interested in the economic struggle of the workers and are trying to capitalize the economic struggle for their "narrow" political ends;

(b) To create the impression that the social reformists are interested in the immediate concerns of the workers and that the bosses have no objections to dealing with such officials who do not want to overthrow the system; in connection with these two points, to make use of the prejudices instilled by the bourgeoisie into the workers against the Communists; and

(c) To use terror against the workers and to create the idea that this terror is due only to the participation of the Communists.

The aim of the "Red Scare" is to split the ranks of the workers, to prevent their unity, which is growing in the camp of the working class. It is clear that the defeat of the "Red Scare" requires that the Communists daily, *before the struggle and during the struggle*:

(a) Convince the workers that they are fighting for their immediate demands;

(b) That the Communists are the most active in the struggles and are inseparable from the workers and are their most trusted leaders;

(c) That they are the best fighters for unity of the workers' ranks, and that the labor bureaucrats are splitting the ranks;

(d) That the bourgeoisie, particularly in the present period, will not make concessions on economic demands unless forced by the mass power of the workers, and that the labor bureaucrats do not fight for the immediate demands; to show to the workers that the bourgeoisie is partial to the labor bureaucrats and against the Communists, because they count upon these bureaucrats not to fight for the demands of the workers, but to betray them;

(e) To show to the workers what the Communists and the revolutionary trade unions are, what they really stand for, smashing the ideas that they are "outsiders", "a small group of trouble-makers", etc., etc., and showing particularly their stand toward the unity of the workers;

(f) Showing to the workers the relation between the crisis and their economic struggles and how the workers can get out of the crisis.

These tasks, dexterously applied, are the way to fight and defeat the "Red Scare", to defeat the attempt to isolate the Party. But this group of tasks shown why we cannot cut down the weapons we

must use—as Zack proposes; it shows why we cannot and should not counterpoise Party work and trade union work.

What does the building of the Party in the shops mean? It means to build the Party nuclei, to make them active. It means for the nuclei to take up the economic day-to-day grievances; to establish contact with the other workers in the shop; to organize them into shop committees, trade unions, into other mass organizations; to achieve ideological and organizational leadership in the shops; to become the leaders of the trade unions we form; to overcome the illusions of the workers in the shops; to combat the influence of the social-reformists; to isolate the social-reformists; to establish the solidarity of Negroes and whites by combatting chauvinism; to fight for the unity of employed and unemployed; to fight against imperialist war; to break down the illusions of the workers with respect to American democracy; to combat the attempts of the fascists to build up influence among the workers in the shops; to spread Communist ideas among the workers; to convince them that between the maximum program of the Communist Party and the day-to-day class struggle of the workers there is no gulf, but a definite interlinking; to make them realize that it is necessary to unite their ranks for the overthrow of the system.

Only this conception of rooting the Party in the shops can build trade union organization; can maintain and develop that which we organize; strengthen the workers, so as to make them able to defeat the bosses' war designs and the attempt to develop the fascist dictatorship; can meet the requirements of the present moment, the demands imposed upon the Party in the close approach of "a new round of revolutions and wars".

In connection with all these tasks it is clear that the Party must recruit members, new readers for the *Daily Worker* and the rest of the Party press, etc.

This conception of building the Party in the shop eliminates any dualism between the task of our political work and trade union work.

At the base of Comrade Zack's argument is an underestimation of the depth of the crisis and the readiness of the masses for revolutionary struggles. Comrade Zack therefore fears that Party work in the shop will hamper, rather than help, Union organization. This is an opportunist fear which Comrade Zack is courageous enough to express, but there are other Party members who have this same right tendency, but who suppress it for fear of being labelled deviators. It is better to come out with it, as Comrade Zack does, so that it can be thrashed out. Comrade Zack simply and honestly misunderstands the Open letter.

We've got to put the Thirteenth Plenum Resolution into effect. We've got to throw ourselves whole-heartedly into accepting the Open Letter in its true meaning. We've got to throw ourselves whole-heartedly into the task of winning over the strategic sections of the working class for our final aim—the setting up of the proletarian dictatorship in America. Comrade Zack's tendency to place trade union work against political work objectively makes of the Party an impotent sect. Likewise, for this very reason, such a conception limits revolutionary trade union work. That is essentially the sectarianism which opportunism creates, and which holds us back from winning the majority of the working class for the proletarian revolution.

Lessons of the Economic Struggles, and the Work in the Trade Unions

By JACK STACHEL

(Submitted in place of a draft resolution as a basis for discussion, from which will be produced the Resolution on Trade Union Work.—Ed.)

1. The conditions of American workers continue to grow worse. Wages for the workers as a whole, as a result of direct wage-cuts, unemployment, and part time work, are only a little more than one-third of the average wages for the years prior to the beginning of the present economic crisis. The capitalists continue to introduce the most intense speed-up. Despite the recent small improvement in production as compared with the lowest point reached during the crisis, the number of unemployed remains at the figure of sixteen millions with but a small number of them absorbed in temporary C.W.A. jobs, while for the remainder the relief allowances are being sharply reduced. Long hours of labor continue in most of the important industries, side by side with ever more widespread staggering of labor under the pretense of reducing hours. With the growth of the crisis has come a greater and more subtle discrimination against both the employed and unemployed Negro workers, as well as against the foreign-born workers, and women and youth labor.

2. The Roosevelt-N.R.A.-New Deal, under the guise of raising wages, reducing hours and the right to organize, has meant only a greater exploitation and enslavement of the toiling masses. The capitalists have increased their profits enormously, while real wages have declined, as a result of (a) the setting of fixed minimum wages which the capitalists on the one hand violate and on the other hand tend to make the maximum; (b) a reduction of hours without a corresponding increase in pay; (c) the rise in prices, especially exorbitant for the very necessities of life which the masses must buy. The right of organization supposedly guaranteed by section 7a of the Recovery Act has been exposed as a new instrument in the hands of employers for the development of company unions, in order to block the desire of the workers to organize into genuine class trade

unions. It is used to support the corrupt and boss-controlled A. F. of L. top bureaucracy in building their organizations wherever the workers are progressing or wherever there is danger of the rise of militant class unions—not for the purpose of fighting the employers but of disorganizing and disrupting the struggles of the workers. The N.R.A. machinery, through its labor boards on the one hand and the most brutal police and military force on the other, has been used with the aid of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats for the purpose of breaking up workers' struggles and workers' organizations. This attack is not limited to the independent class unions of the Trade Union Unity League against whom it has been most vicious (Ambridge, Helper, Utah, etc.), but is directed also against those workers in A. F. of L. unions who take up a course of militant struggle over the heads of the leaders (Weirton, captive mines, etc.). At the same time the government has extended the use of forced labor through various transient camps, through the municipalities, and especially through the C.C.C. in which some 300,000 unemployed young workers under army officers are being prepared for the new imperialist world war. The appointment of army men to supervise C.W.A. jobs is a further step in this direction, in line with the open statements of the Assistant Secretary of War, Woodring. The whole period of the existence of the N.R.A. and all the struggles that have taken place clearly show that *only through their own organized efforts can the workers gain organization, gain the right to organize* (New Mexico miners, agricultural workers, New York shoe workers, fur workers, textile workers, etc.). The right of organization under the N.R.A. has meant only the right of the capitalists to organize unhindered their giant monopolies, for the greater exploitation and plunder of the masses, while to the workers it has brought company unions, a strengthening of the position of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats against the workers, a greater use of terror coupled with compulsory arbitration.

3. The outstanding development in the labor movement during the past year has been the rapid rise in strike struggles, and the militant character of the strikes. About a million and a quarter workers were involved in strikes during the past year and the first weeks of this year. This is the largest number since 1919, and in the face of mass unemployment takes on an even greater significance than the actual number by itself would indicate because of the fact that the number of workers in the factories is considerably less than at any previous period in the last two decades. At the same time the millions of unemployed upon whom the capitalists based their hope of breaking the strikes showed a growing and remarkable solidarity with the struggles of the employed. Among the big strikes

there was hardly one in which the capitalists were able to recruit strikebreakers from the ranks of the unemployed. The strikes of the past year, in contrast to the first years of the crisis, embraced almost all industries. The miners continued to occupy the honorable position of being in the front line of the struggle. A new feature was the entrance of tens of thousands of automobile workers and steel workers into the strike struggles, for the first time in more than a decade. Large sections of textile workers, garment workers, shoe workers, agricultural workers, packing house workers, furniture workers, building workers, in fact, workers of almost all industries were drawn into the struggle. A significant development has been the beginning of the strikes of the seamen, who have carried through over 50 successful strikes, about half of which were a result of the concentration policy (Munson line) undertaken by the Marine Workers Industrial Union, which organized and led all the strikes, the first in about 10 years. In these strikes large sections of Negro workers (steel, mining, needle, food, agriculture, etc.), women workers (textile, shoe, garment, food, etc.), and colonial (agricultural, seamen) participated. Youth labor played an increasing and important role in practically every strike in every industry.

The overwhelming majority of these strikes were carried on for increase in wages, shorter hours without reduction in pay, improvement of the conditions of work, and the right of organization. In this sense the strikes bore definite elements of an offensive character, as differentiated from the strikes of past years which were mainly of a defensive character, against wage reductions, speed-up, etc. A new feature in the demands, put forward in a number of strikes for the first time in this country, was for the recognition of the shop committees. In these strikes a large part was played by the company unions, who tried to block the workers' fight for organization. The recognition of worker-selected unions as against company unions became more and more an issue in the rising strike struggles. Three important strike struggles preceded the Roosevelt N.R.A. policies. First came the mass strikes of the Detroit auto workers, organized by the Auto Workers Union (Jan., 1933), in which the workers succeeded in gaining substantial concessions from the employers. Second came the mass strikes of some 50,000 shoe workers of New England (Feb. and March), led by a number of independent unions. The militant struggles of these shoe workers were betrayed by the reformist leaders of the Shoe Workers Protective, and by the reformist-socialist-Lovestone-renegade leadership who gave away the workers' victory by handing the entire settlement of the strike over to arbitration. The third important strike struggle took place around April 1st when 16,000 miners led by the united

front committee of action under the leadership of the National Miners Union compelled the operators to give in to many of their demands.

It was in such a situation of rising and successful struggles that Roosevelt took office. The increase in production that started in the month of April, resulting from the low level of the crisis because of the disorganization in the banking system (bank holiday) and the speculative hopes of the capitalists, served to raise still more the fighting spirit of the workers. From all sides the workers were formulating their demands and pressing them upon the employers. The capitalists strove to arrest the growing mood for struggle through small wage concessions, which only served to further stimulate the workers' struggles. Strikes increased. It was at this point that the Roosevelt government, acting in the interests of the capitalists, came forward with the N.R.A., promising the workers wage increases, shorter hours, and the right to organize, to be established by legislation and without strikes. This without doubt tended to create illusions among the workers and for a while the strike struggles subsided. But as the workers saw the capitalists increasing their production in the hope of inflation, and preparing to go to battle against the workers with plenty of goods stocked up, the workers, becoming impatient with N.R.A. promises, began to act. Thus the biggest of all strikes, the miners' strike (July) of Pennsylvania, took place under the slogan, "Let us force the adoption of the coal code." Workers in other industries followed the same course. Here it must be mentioned that the workers who had already begun to organize for the purpose of struggle greatly increased their organizations during the period of the N.R.A. legislation and before the codes were put into effect. The A. F. of L. bureaucrats, who had not planned the rapid organization of the workers (mining) but were confronted with the mass organization campaign and the preparation of struggles through the T.U.U.L. unions and the initiative of the rank and file, issued the slogan, "Organize for bargaining through the N.R.A.," and warned against strikes. The July miners' strike, like many other strikes of A. F. of L. workers, took place without the sanction of the A. F. of L. leaders, who in most cases, however, did not dare come out openly against the strikes because of the fighting mood of the workers. It was only with the most widespread use of demagoguery and terror that the labor leaders and the Roosevelt government—the latter intervening directly—succeeded in sending the miners back to work with the promise that the coal code would be adopted with dispatch. Many of the strikes took place under the slogan "Roosevelt did his share by adopting the N.R.A.—now let us strike to gain what is promised in the N.R.A." Thus the

N.R.A., while creating illusions among the workers, also through these very illusions helped at this point to stimulate the strike struggles of the workers—struggles through which more and more these same illusions were shattered.

This is borne out by the fact that the strikes which took place in the fall (second miners' strike, the strike of 65,000 silk workers, etc.) were strikes directed against the codes worked out by the employers, the A. F. of L. bureaucrats and the N.R.A. The strikes of the A. F. of L. auto workers in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, the strikes of the workers in many other industries, became strikes directed against the N.R.A.—directed against the government. Thus the strike struggles in the latter part of the year bore definite elements of a political character. More and more the workers began to realize that the N.R.A. was a class instrument of the capitalists forced upon them by the Roosevelt capitalist government for the purpose of carrying through a worsening in their living standards to increase the profits of the capitalists. The Steel and Auto codes with their minimum wages below the prevailing wages of the workers, with their company union and individual merit clauses, convinced the workers that they had been betrayed by the government and labor bureaucrats who sat on the Labor Boards and approved these wage-cutting and strikebreaking codes. The masses became more and more convinced of this as the government and the employers went over to a more open and vicious use of terror to break the strike struggles of the workers—struggles in which the workers put forward demands against the provisions of the N.R.A. codes for their industry. The breaking of the Weirton strike (A. F. of L.) through police terror and arbitration, the massacre of the steel workers in Ambridge who were led by the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union, the terror against the N.M.U. miners in Gallup, New Mexico, and Helper, Utah, and against the agricultural workers in California, the betrayal by the A. F. of L. and the N.R.A. of the textile workers' strike, the attempt of the N.R.A. through Assistant Secretary of Labor McGrady to destroy the militant left wing union of workers and force the workers into the A. F. of L., the refusal of the A. F. of L. leaders (Lewis) to fight for the recognition of even the U.M.W.A. in the case of the "captive" miners—all this served to further expose the whole of the N.R.A. in the eyes of the workers.

Most of the strikes before the N.R.A. ended in victory, or at least in partial victory, for the workers (auto, mining), especially those led by militant class unions. The partial strikes in the spring and summer also resulted in the workers gaining concessions. But when the N.R.A. with its strikebreaking machinery was perfected,

the workers were in most cases betrayed by the A. F. of L. leaders into accepting the N.R.A. codes, which to most of the workers meant no improvement (Illinois miners, textile workers, etc.). Those workers who had no strong organization (steel, auto) were completely betrayed. Those who were led by the militant unions or by oppositions in the A. F. of L. unions, or in which there were strong left-wing oppositions, were able to force some concessions (New Mexico miners, New York shoe workers, A. F. of L. cleaners and dyers in Philadelphia, seamen, agricultural workers, etc.).

Similarly with regard to organization. The workers did not gain the right to organize and bargain collectively through the N.R.A. The N.R.A. gave the same recognition to the company unions as to the workers' organizations, and in practice this meant the right of the employers to organize company unions and refuse recognition to the workers' organizations. Even A. F. of L. unions were not recognized (auto, steel) unless the workers were able to force such recognition through struggle. At the same time the T.U.U.L. unions which carried on a militant struggle and had the support of the mass of workers were in many cases able—especially in the partial strikes, and in the lighter industries—to force the employers to recognize their organizations, or at least the shop committees elected by the workers (New Mexico, shoe, garment trades, Buffalo, Pittsburgh steel and metal plants, etc.).

4. Our Party was slow in taking advantage of the favorable situation for the organization of the struggles of the workers. One of the reasons for this was the still existent underestimation of the moods of the masses for struggle (mining, needle, textile, auto,—Paterson, Allentown, Detroit, etc.). As a result of this the Party organizations and the fractions were not fully orientated for the leadership and the development of the struggles. In addition to this the following characterization of the Twelfth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. as to the failure of the Communist Parties to rouse the masses for struggle fully applied still to our Party:

“The chief cause of the insufficient development of the struggles is the still unsatisfactory application of the line of independent leadership of the economic struggles, on the basis of the tactics of the united front from below, the underestimation of the partial struggles in the weak contacts in the factories and among the unemployed, in the weakening of the revolutionary positions in the reformist trade unions, in the inability to expose the maneuvers of the reformist trade union bureaucrats, openly or concealed by ‘left’ phrases.”

Added to this must also be the failure of Communist fractions in the T.U.U.L. unions to fight decisively for the consolidation of

the gains in the struggle and to utilize it for the further development of the struggle (auto), the failure to build the union while at the same time leading the struggle on the basis of the united front (April miners' strike), failure to quickly recognize a changed situation (growth of the U.M.W.A. in the Pittsburgh area), failure to adopt mass methods of work corresponding to the degree of activity of the masses (steel, auto), etc. All these weaknesses in the work of the Party and the Party fractions in the T.U.U.L. and the A. F. of L. unions contributed to considerable lagging behind and the loss of initiative to the reformists (Paterson, second mass automobile strike of Detroit, miners' strike, dress strike in New York, etc.).

But despite these tremendous weaknesses of our Party, the Party played a very important role in the strike struggles of the last year. This role was made evident not only in the strikes led by the independent class unions affiliated to the T.U.U.L. but also in the strikes of the A. F. of L. unions and the various independent unions.

The T.U.U.L. unions, stimulated by the activity of the Party as a whole and through the Communist fractions, led the strikes of 200,000 workers out of a million tabulated for this period. These strikes were in the auto industry, mining, marine, shoe, garment workers, textile workers, agricultural workers, steel and metal workers and numerous other industries. The strikes of the agricultural workers and the seamen were led exclusively by the unions of the T.U.U.L. The Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union organized and led strikes of the steel workers in Ambridge, Greensburgh, McKeesport Standard Forging, numerous strikes in the metal and foundry plants in Buffalo and the strikes of the workers in the light metal industry in New York. It was the S.M.W.I.U. that began and stimulated all the strikes of the steel workers during this period, as a result of which there took place the biggest steel strike (Weirton) since 1919. The New York organization of the T.U.U.L. led over 50,000 workers in strikes—the overwhelming majority of which ended in substantial gains for the workers (shoe, furniture, needle, food, laundry, metal, etc.).

The California organization of the T.U.U.L. led 44,000 workers in strike out of a total of 63,000 in that state. The T.U.U.L. organizations also led the majority of the strikes in the packing industry, among the lumber workers. The most serious defeats suffered by the T.U.U.L. unions during this period were the loss of initiative to the independent mechanics' organization among the auto workers in Detroit, the almost complete liquidation of the National Miners Union in the Pittsburgh and Ohio regions, the loss of initiative in the New York dress industry where the A. F. of L.

unions were even able to absorb some of the organization of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union. In Paterson also the T.U.U.L. union did not make more organizational gains (weavers, etc.) because of the fact that the Party and the National Textile Workers Union were not orientated for the development and leadership of the masses.

The unions affiliated to the A. F. of L. or the workers fighting under its banner constitute 450,000 of the total of one million tabulated. The overwhelming majority of these were in the mining, garment and textile industries. Other important sections of the workers involved in strikes under A. F. of L. leadership were steel workers (Weirton), local transportation workers (Philadelphia, etc.), packing house (Chicago), auto workers (Chester, Pa. and Edgewater, N. J.), and numerous scattered industries. Our Party played an important role in all of these strikes, either as the opposition within the A. F. of L. union (needle trades strikers) or through joint actions with the A. F. of L. workers in strikes led simultaneously by the T.U.U.L. unions (Paterson silk strike). In both the miners' strikes and the Weirton strike our role was an insufficient one, as a result of our isolation from the mass of the organized workers in these strikes. But even here, through the agitation carried on by the Party and the T.U.U.L. unions, we were able to influence greatly the course of events in the struggle. Here it must be stated that because the A. F. of L. leaders carried on a policy of discouraging and breaking strikes, and because of the weakness of the T.U.U.L. unions, the A. F. of L. bureaucrats were able to stop many of the developing struggles.

An important role in the present strike struggles was played by the various independent unions. The strikes to date under their leadership total some 200,000 workers, since the beginning of last year. Outstanding among these struggles are the shoe workers' strikes in New England (50,000); the anthracite miners' strike (20,000); the strikes led by the Mechanics Educational Association in Detroit, Flint and Pontiac (15-20 thousand); the strikes of the silk workers of Allentown and other sections of Pennsylvania (10-15 thousand); the strikes of hotel workers in New York, led jointly by the T.U.U.L. union and the independent Amalgamated Food Workers; the recent strike of the New York taxi-drivers led by four independent unions; the strike of the packing house workers in Austin, Minn., in which the workers for days held the factory; and the strikes of the radio and other metal workers.

Our Party played an important role in almost every one of the strikes led by the independent unions, through the Communist frac-

tions and militant oppositions. In the shoe strike it was only the workers in Haverhill who, led by the militant opposition, forced the employers to give them wage concessions, while the workers in the other sections were betrayed through arbitration. In the auto strikes it was the Communists and members of the Auto Workers Union within the independent union who mobilized the masses for militant picketing, raised the fighting demands, and fought for the establishment of the united front of the workers, and as a result gained considerable influence. In the Allentown and vicinity silk strike the leadership of the independent union stood on the program of militant class struggle and jointly with the National Textile Workers Union, and other independent unions of Paterson influenced by the left wing, organized the united-front National Strike Committee. In the strike of the New York hotel workers, the organized left wing within the Amalgamated together with the Food Workers Industrial Union was able to force the reformist and Muste-Gitlow-Lovestone-Cannon leadership to retreat before the workers and succeeded in establishing the united front of the strikers through one united strike committee. The small but active T.U.U.L. organization was able because of its militant program to play an important role in the recently concluded spontaneous strike of over 30,000 taxi drivers.

A large number of strikes involving hundreds of thousands of workers entered the strike struggles without any union affiliation. This was true especially of many shop strikes, and of a whole series of strikes in the textile industry in the South. In general, because of the treachery of the A. F. of L. and the weakness of the Party and the T.U.U.L. unions, most of the strikes still bore great elements of spontaneity, while a substantial number were purely spontaneous. Nevertheless, in the strikes led by both the A. F. of L. and the T.U.U.L. unions there was a greater element of preparation and organization for the strikes through the rank and file initiative in the A. F. of L. unions and through the T.U.U.L. organizations.

The Socialist Party leaders in all these struggles were part and parcel of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, carrying through all their treacherous policies. They repeated the words of Wm. Green that "this is no time to strike" (Norman Thomas). They preached reliance upon the N.R.A. and the Roosevelt government. In the unions under their leadership they carried through the worst forms of betrayal of the workers. The "left" socialists tried to cover up their betrayal with mild criticism of the N.R.A., and were quick to recognize the mood of the workers against the A. F. of L. bureaucrats, even taking up the slogan of independent unions with the intention of bringing them into the A. F. of L. through the back

door. The Musteites played no independent role in the big strike movement, thus demonstrating their isolation and bankruptcy. In none of the important strikes did they participate through their organization, the C.P.L.A. (now the American Workers Party), or through their outstanding leaders. While in the beginning claiming to be against the N.R.A. and for the united front, they quickly exposed themselves as unwilling to support the fight for the united front (Paterson strike), or to support any of the struggles of the militant unions (steel). While concealing their true motive they, however, gave sufficient proof that their position was one of support for the A. F. of L. leadership with but mild criticism and a plea to Green that racketeering be eliminated from the unions. Only in the New York Amalgamated Food Workers did the Musteites show any influence, and here not among the workers, but through some of the Lore top allies. The position of the Musteites was, however, exposed through two of the members of their National Committee, Ryan of the Hosiery Workers Union, and the renegade Salutsky of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Muste refused openly to take a stand against Ryan, who openly sabotaged the Cleveland United Front Trade-Union Conference, or against Salutsky, the editor of *Advance*, official organ of Sidney Hillman who became one of the outstanding advisers of Roosevelt and Perkins.

An especially treacherous role in the strike movement was played by the renegades, the Trotskyites (Cannon) and the Lovestoneites. However, only in the food union did the Trotskyites play any considerable role. The Lovestoneites became the mercenary troops carrying through the most treacherous policies for the labor bureaucrats. Chief among these were: Ch. Zimmerman in the needle trades, Keller in the textile industry, and I. Zimmerman in the shoe industry. None of these groups has as yet been able to hire out its services in the basic industries. Their whole policy cannot be distinguished from the Green-Woll policy, except, perhaps, by the fact that they act as the provocateurs for the government and the labor lieutenants of the capitalists.

5. Another outstanding development in the labor movement in the past year has been the growth of the trade unions, and particularly the fact that the A. F. of L. unions have been able to attract about half a million new workers into their organization. The growth of the A. F. of L. unions was in the first place among the miners, the needle workers, the textile workers, corresponding to the mass strikes in these industries led by the A. F. of L. unions. But the A. F. of L. has also been able to organize large sections of workers, mostly into the federal unions, in such important industries

as steel, metal, auto, rubber, etc. In many cases these organizations were built by the workers themselves who then applied for a charter to the A. F. of L. Council. In other cases the employers have helped to organize the workers into the A. F. of L. organizations for fear of the T.U.U.L. and other militant unions (mining, silk, needle, etc.). The open shop employers, the steel trust, the auto magnates do not yet, however, feel that they wish to have their workers organized into the A. F. of L. unions, believing that through the company unions, the open shop, they can keep the workers from organizing into unions. They fear the A. F. of L. unions not because of any distrust of the A. F. of L. leadership but because of the fighting spirit of the workers and the demonstrated growth of oppositions within the A. F. of L. unions where the workers act over the heads of the leaders. The Roosevelt government has been more outspoken in its support for the A. F. of L. unions, believing that in this way they can best stop the struggles of the workers and block the growth of the T.U.U.L. and other fighting unions of the workers.

At the same time, the government has at no time taken a stand for full A. F. of L. organization and against the open shop and company unions, only carrying through maneuvers where the resistance of the workers is growing (captive mines, Weirton, etc.).

The A. F. of L. bureaucrats through Wm. Green have made the threat that there is no room for any other labor movement outside the A. F. of L. This is an expression of their fear of the growth of the T.U.U.L. and independent unions outside the A. F. of L. The Lovestone-Cannon renegades and the Musteites echo these threats of Green by declaring that the workers and all their organizations must be brought into the A. F. of L. Muste's half hearted statement for independent unions shows his special role to try to divert the more leftward workers from the path of class trade unions.

Side by side with the growth of the A. F. of L. there has been a growth of the unions outside of the A. F. of L.—the unions of the T.U.U.L. and independent unions of various shades affiliated neither to the T.U.U.L. nor the A. F. of L. The T.U.U.L. unions and those working under its guidance and leadership were able during this same period to recruit over 100,000 new members from among the steel and metal workers, shoe workers, miners, marine workers, packinghouse workers, textile workers, needle workers, agricultural workers, food workers, etc. At the same time many of the independent unions have shown a substantial growth while others have been organized. There are today close to 150,000 workers organized into various independent unions, at least 100,000

of which were organized during the recent period. The independent unions exist among the miners, textile workers, shoe workers, auto workers, food workers, radio workers, aeroplane workers, government postal workers, technical workers, teachers. Here we do not include the mass unions of the railroad workers, which we consider on the same basis as the A. F. of L. unions. These facts indicate that there is developing a trade union movement, both of the T.U. U.L. unions, which even after some decline number at least 100,000 members, and of independent unions, which have a membership of some 150,000 throughout the country. The fact that the T.U.U.L. unions and the independent unions were able to recruit some 200,000 workers at the same time that the A. F. of L. unions with its tremendous apparatus, its support of the government and many of the employers were able to recruit only half a million workers shows that there is developing an independent trade union movement outside the A. F. of L. It also shows that there are workers who, while not willing to join the A. F. of L. unions, have not yet been reached or are not yet ready to join the T.U.U.L. unions as they are today constituted.

6. There has been a tremendous growth of company unions during this period. This perhaps more than anything else shows, first, the extent to which the mass of workers in the basic industries are still unorganized—that is, in genuine unions, whether reformist-controlled unions or class trade unions—and shows, secondly, that the open shop employers are not yet ready to bring the A. F. of L. forward to organize all the workers. Some estimates place the number in company unions as high as five millions. Thus far the only acceptable estimate was made by the National Industrial Conference Board. Returns from 3,314 companies engaged in manufacturing and mining, all having a capitalization of \$500,000 or more and embracing 27% of all the wage earners now employed in manufacturing and mining, a total of 2,586,000 workers, show that 1,181,000 have individual bargaining or the open shop pure and simple, 1,164,000 have “collective bargaining” through some form of company union, and only 241,000 or 9.3% have labor union agreements. To show further the increase of company unions since the N.R.A. the statement discloses the following figures, based on only a partial report of these same companies: company unions, an increase from 34.1% to 61.3% since the N.R.A.; union agreements, an increase of only from 44.4% to 54.5% since the N.R.A. Thus we can see that less than 10% of the workers are organized, that the company unions have doubled while the number of workers in trade unions has grown only slightly. Bearing in mind that these figures cover only some 27% of the wage earners in manu-

facturing and mining and leave out transportation and other industries, the estimate of some five millions in company unions would not seem to be an exaggeration. Further light upon this situation is shown by the following figures:

	<i>Union Agreements</i>	<i>Company Unions</i>
Mining	89.8	7.0
Clothing	50.1	15.1
Printing	21.7	25.9
Textiles	18.2	14.6
Metal	2.8	63.8
Chemical	0.9	37.3
Rubber	2.6	79.6
Food	5.4	33.4
Petroleum	1.2	55.5

These figures are of course challenging in the sense that we industries has there been an increase in trade union organization, and correspond to the fact that the main gains of the A. F. of L. have been made in these industries. They also show that the mass of the workers in the basic and trustified industries remain unorganized.

These figures are of course challenging in the sense that we must take up the work in these company unions in a systematic and persistent manner. These company unions vary, some being only committees appointed annually by the employers, and others of the type that conduct regular meetings, carry on elections, etc. Our tasks will be different therefore in the various company unions, but in each case our objective is to win the workers for the organization of genuine class trade unions. Not only the N.R.A. but the A. F. of L. leadership bears the responsibility for the growth of the company unions. The A. F. of L. policies, their betrayal of the workers, their willingness to embrace these company unions into the A. F. of L. in return for per capita, their betrayal of the struggles of the workers, their conversion of many of the A. F. of L. unions into semi-company unions shows that only the militant struggles of the rank and file under the leadership of the Communists, and a thorough exposure of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats, will be capable of winning the workers organized in the company unions for independent class struggle unions. The possibilities for work in the company unions was already demonstrated in a number of cases through the company union elections, conversion into an independent union, etc. (Northampton Pennsylvania Cement).

7. The A. F. of L. during the period has not only recruited a half million members but has lost nearly 400,000 of the old members who were either expelled because of unemployment or dropped

out because they found that the unions did not fight for their interests. Many of those newly recruited are not today in the A. F. of L. because they have been betrayed in the struggle. Many of the federal locals have already disbanded and have sent back their charters (Edgewater). Others have reorganized as independent unions (aeroplane workers of Connecticut). There is unrest among large sections of the newly organized federal locals because the A. F. of L. is betraying their interests, because the A. F. of L. refuses to allow them to function as industrial unions based upon the shop and insists on breaking them up into the various internationals by craft, or because the A. F. of L. refuses to allow them to organize the various federal unions into an independent international within the A. F. of L. (Akron rubber, Buffalo aeroplane, etc.). In some cases the federal locals of the A. F. of L. have entered into a joint united front with the independent unions in the same industry and are moving towards an independent national organization (radio, etc.). In a number of cases the A. F. of L. federal locals are growing strong and gaining the workers' demands only because they have adopted a fighting policy and elected a left wing leadership (Kenosha, cleaners and dyers of Philadelphia, etc.). In the mining, textile, and needle trades where the gains have been greatest the left wing is making itself felt and is taking steps to organize the growing revolt of the masses against the leadership. Large sections of the A. F. of L. workers, told that they would get everything through the N.R.A. and should not resort to strikes, are questioning the necessity of maintaining the A. F. of L. organization since it does not fight for them. But above all, the situation within the A. F. of L. is marked by the constant growth of the opposition movement under the leadership of the Communists, which has already expressed itself in the support for the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill, in the mass referendums in support of the demands for lowering of dues, for reducing the salaries of the officials, for the exemption of dues to the unemployed (painters, carpenters); in the elections of left wing supporters and Communists to office in locals and leading bodies (miners, textile workers, needle workers, food workers, a number of federal unions in the more basic industries); it was further expressed by the fact that in the A. F. of L. convention a left wing delegate for the first time since 1923 spoke and presented many important resolutions, in the militant though small delegation of the left wing opposition in the recent convention of the U.M.W.A., and the mass resolutions that were clearly anti-administration, in the taking up more and more of the strike struggle against the leadership of the A. F. of L. and the N.R.A., etc.

In answer to these developments the A. F. of L. bureaucrats

who are part and parcel of the capitalist system strive to make the unions more and more auxiliaries of the state so that they can better suppress the growing revolt of the rank and file; they have already begun a whole series of expulsions with the aid of the Socialists and Lovestone renegades (painters, Local 9 and 22 of the I.L.G.W.U., etc.). They increase their struggle against the T.U.U.L. unions, openly calling for their suppression by the government (Green's statement to the State Department; Woll's statement in the name of the Civic Federation). At the same time they try to carry out a number of maneuvers to fool the workers. They speak about a more "flexible" policy on the question of industrial unions, they speak about the 30-hour work week, announce a "demand" for wage increases, pretend to fight for unemployment insurance by supporting the Roosevelt reserve plan, etc. They especially carry through all their demagogic maneuvers around the N.R.A., calling in reality for a strengthening of the N.R.A. machinery against workers in the name of "greater benefits to the workers under the N.R.A.", and appeal to the N.R.A. to outlaw the company unions and make the A. F. of L. the official government unions.

Our Party and the left wing in the A. F. of L. unions, though we can record serious progress in beginning systematic work in the A. F. of L. unions, must however admit that only a small section of the Party has been mobilized for this work, that there still exist both right and left deviations in the work in the A. F. of L. unions, that especially we have not yet fully reorientated our work in the A. F. of L. unions and the mass unions of the railroad workers on the most important unions and strata of the workers (miners, metal, textile, railroad, etc.). Furthermore the maneuvers of the A. F. of L. leadership are not fully and in time exposed (30-hour week maneuver, etc.). The District Committees and the lower Party organizations do not give regular and systematic guidance to the work in the A. F. of L. which because of the growth of the A. F. of L. unions and the whole development of the last years takes on much more importance than heretofore. There is still open and especially hidden resistance to a decisive course to win the A. F. of L. unions. Such a position is incompatible with the line of the Party.

8. While the T.U.U.L. unions as a whole have grown, not all of the T.U.U.L. unions can record progress. The auto workers' union, which in the beginning of the year carried on successful strikes, did not maintain its gains in membership and is today organizationally extremely weak. The textile workers' union, despite the many struggles it carried through in New England and New Jersey, remains still a very small organization and is stagnating in the concentration points (Lawrence, New Bedford). Of the important

unions in the basic industries only the Marine Workers Industrial Union has had a slow but steady growth among the seamen, while it is only beginning to make some headway among the longshoremen (Norfolk, etc.), and the Steel and Metal Workers Industrial Union which, although it lost the majority of the over 20,000 members recruited last year, still maintains an organization of many thousands in some of the large steel mills and especially in the smaller metal plants and in the lighter section of the industry. The agricultural workers' union has made great headway, and some progress can be recorded by the unions of lumber workers and cannery and fishermen, all of which are located and have their entire membership in the West. The unions in the lighter industries (shoe, food, needle, furniture) have strengthened their position among the workers.

On the whole the T.U.U.L. unions are gaining prestige among the masses as fighting trade unions. There has been an improvement in overcoming the former almost purely agitational character in the work of the T.U.U.L. unions. They have begun to learn to act as trade union organizations. This is expressed in the preparation for strikes in a more serious manner; in the better understanding of the necessity to fight for the material gains of the workers; in the formulation of the strike demands; in the taking up of the problems and grievances of the workers in the factories generally and not be merely strike organizations; in the more successful application of the tactic of the united front. There has also been an improvement in the inner life of the T.U.U.L. unions. Beginnings are being made to overcome the tendency to make out of the T.U.U.L. unions duplicates of the Party. There is a greater emphasis on the development of trade union democracy, attention to dues, to charters, to regular meetings, etc. Beginnings are on the way towards utilizing the International Workers Order for the development of some of the insurance features of the unions, while the main emphasis remains the fight for unemployment and social insurance. Some steps are already taken for the development of educational work. This is already expressed in the improvement and the stabilization of *Labor Unity*, and the publication of union papers by most of the unions.

With regard to the work in the factories and the reorganization of the unions on the basis of the shops, considerable headway has been made. Most of the unions with the exception of the very small shops have been organized on the basis of the shop (metal, shoe, auto, etc.).

While the above improvements in the work of the unions are to be noted, weaknesses in many cases still prevail and are a hindrance to the growth of the unions. Chief among these mentioned

are first the still continuing inability to defend the interests of the workers in between strikes, through various forms of partial struggle, the inability to adopt methods for carrying on the struggle under great difficulties and terror (Ambridge), the inability to maintain the organization in the larger factories upon a reorganized basis after defeated strikes; *one of the weakest phases of the work of the unions is the inability to carry on constant and systematic work of concentration in the most important branches of the industry and the key factories.* In the inner life of the union the outstanding weaknesses still remain the failure to train the membership and prepare them for all events, and the promotion of new leaders from the ranks of the workers.

The right danger was greatly manifested in the work of the T.U.U.L. unions in the recent period. This was expressed in illusions regarding the N.R.A., capitulation to proposals of the N.R.A. boards, arbitration. It was further shown in the resistance to politicizing the struggle on the basis of the actual needs of the struggle itself, aside from the general interests of the working class as a whole; in the failure to take up the fight for the unemployed both within the union and generally; in resistance to taking up the special demands of the young workers, and the Negro workers; and in a liberal attitude to the question of child labor.

The T.U.U.L. unions have not established a definite practice of raising the special demands of the young workers in every struggle, do not systematically develop the initiative of the young workers. All this, as the recent struggles have shown, made it all the easier for the young workers who do not know of the treacherous role of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats to fall under the influence of these reformist leaders. With regard to working women, there still is lacking a sufficient understanding of their growing importance in industry, especially in view of the growing danger of imperialist war. The work among the Negro workers is one of the weakest phases of the work of the T.U.U.L. unions. The Negro workers have shown through the struggles in which they have participated (strikes, unemployed struggles, Scottsboro, etc.) that there is a tremendous fighting spirit among them to organize and struggle. But the Communists in the T.U.U.L. unions as well as in the A. F. of L. and independent unions have not taken up the fight to win the Negro workers to the trade unions with sufficient force. The T.U.U.L. class unions have the greatest possibility of drawing the Negro workers into the unions precisely because of the great exploitation of the Negro workers and the discrimination of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats against the Negro workers, their policy of Jim Crowism, etc. The T.U.U.L. unions have adopted a correct pro-

gram for the needs of the Negro workers. But this program remains on paper. In countless strikes carried on by the T.U.U.L. unions there is an absence and even a failure to put forward the special demands for the Negro workers. Often this is explained by the fact that there are no Negro workers in this or that industry or craft. In this very exclusion lies the discrimination against the Negro workers and the fighting issues for the T.U.U.L. unions. The N.R.A. codes either entirely excluded (textile) or fixed lower wages for the Negro workers through the wage differential for the Southern states. The T.U.U.L. unions did not take up a serious struggle against this obvious discrimination. In many of the T.U.U.L. unions the leadership does not conduct a sufficient struggle against white chauvinism, does not understand the necessity for a special approach to win the Negro workers but hides under the liberal slogan "that we treat all members equally". In practice this means to perpetuate the inequality and discrimination against the Negro workers in industry, in the ranks of the unemployed, etc.

The main responsibility for this situation rests with the Communist leaders in the central apparatus of the T.U.U.L. and the various national organizations that are affiliated to the T.U.U.L. It is aside from the obvious underestimation of the work among the Negro masses by the T.U.U.L. unions, also an expression of a lack of understanding on the part of the Communists in the leading posts of the T.U.U.L. organizations, of the leading role of the Negro proletarians in the whole struggle of the Negro liberation movement.

The T.U.U.L. has given increasing attention to work among the colonial workers in the U. S. (agricultural workers, etc.), to the solidarity with people oppressed by Yankee imperialism (Cuba). But the work among the millions of colonial workers, a large section of whom are in the basic industries, has not yet received the necessary or systematic attention.

9. Through the initiative of the Communist Party the fight for trade union unity has become a force among large sections of the workers. The Communists in the trade unions were able through their influence in these organizations to carry through the Cleveland United Front Trade Union Conference against the N.R.A. and the policies of the A. F. of L. bureaucracy, to raise the slogan of one class independent union in the shoe industry, which was carried through already with some success, to raise the slogan of one united independent class union of the silk workers in the course of and after the recent strike, to raise the slogan of the building of one united class union in the food industry, which is finding a ready response among the workers of all the unions, espe-

cially in New York City. The Communists have also through their influence in the left wing opposition in the various miners' unions raised the slogan of the unity of the miners into one fighting organization free from the policies and influence of the Lewises. In a whole series of strikes the Party was influential in establishing the fighting united front of the workers. In the face of the splitting policy of the reformists whose whole class collaboration policy is based upon dividing the workers, in the face of the Mustes and renegades whose whole role is to confuse the leftward moving masses and save the influence of the reformist leaders, only the Communist Party and those organizations accepting its leadership have raised the banner of trade union unity. But not merely unity. Unity on the basis of struggle. A fighting united front. A united front that will be an instrument of the workers to fight against the attacks of capital and to free themselves from the class collaboration policies of the reformist A. F. of L. leaders, the socialists and renegades. Upon the basis of the class struggle the Communists stand for the unity of the workers in every industry. It is in this direction that we put forward, in the face of the development of a number of independent unions, the policy of uniting in the first place the workers of the T.U.U.L. union and the independent unions into one class trade union. Such a union will not be in opposition to a union in the same industry of the A. F. of L. It will unite with the workers in the A. F. of L. for the struggle, stimulate the struggle of the A. F. of L. workers, and lay the basis for one class struggle union in the industry on the basis of the class struggle, through the isolation of the reformist and treacherous leaders from the masses.

It is in this same spirit the Communists entered into the building of one union in the shoe industry and accepted the decisions of the convention even though it did not fully meet the correct program of the T.U.U.L. and even though the independent union did not affiliate with the T.U.U.L. It was the Communists through their correct policy and influence in the Shoe and Leather Workers Industrial Union who helped the rank and file delegates at the convention to adopt the basic planks of a fighting class union and blocked the road of the Lovestone renegade Zimmerman in dragging the shoe workers into the A. F. of L. It is in the same light that the Communists must continue to fight, first of all for the unification of the workers' unions in every industry, aiming to unite the fighting independent unions, the masses of independent unions who in many cases are dominated by the same corrupt leaders as Green and Co. (Maloney and Capellini in the anthracite, Percy in the P.M.A., the renegades and Musteites in the A.F.W., etc.),

to fight for the unification of the T.U.U.L. unions and the independent unions jointly into one fighting class center and *Independent Federation of Labor*. In putting forward this policy we must avoid, on the one hand, merely changing the name of the T.U.U.L. into I.F.L. This would not be a real united front. On the other hand, we must hold steadfast to the principles of the class struggle and not become another A. F. of L.

10. The leadership of the Party in the trade union work remains extremely weak despite the Open Letter and control tasks adopted by the C.C. and the Districts. The majority of the Party members remain outside of the unions in most of the districts (including such concentration districts as Chicago, Detroit); in the Party as a whole, the important progress made was with but a small section of the Party. Communist fractions, without which there can be no real leadership by the Party in the work of the trade unions, remain weak and receive little attention. The District Committees do not yet even feel the responsibility for constantly guiding, controlling and improving the work of the fractions. In many cases the fractions do not exist at all. There still persists a social-democratic division between Party work and trade union work. Still less attention is paid by the Party organizations to the development of work in the A. F. of L. unions, the Railroad Brotherhoods, etc. In the recent strike struggles we saw a resistance of the Communists active in the strikes to building the Party, to distributing the *Daily Worker* and other Party literature, while the Party organizations also gave but little attention to utilizing the strike struggles for bringing forward the Party among the workers. This can be seen from but one example. Less than 1% of the members of the Steel and Metal Workers Union have been recruited into the Party. As a result of this failure to build the Party, many of the trade union organizations fall to pieces. It was also this weakness which contributed largely to the inability of the unions to withstand the open attacks and inner maneuvers carried through by the capitalists during the struggles (Ambridge, Greensburgh, Carnegie, etc.).

There is, both on the part of the Party organizations that are responsible for the leadership of all the work of the Party and on the part of the comrades most actively engaged in the trade union work, a failure to appreciate the role of the trade unions as the link to the masses, not merely for the purpose of developing the economic struggles, but of revolutionizing the masses as a result of these struggles—winning the masses for the program of the Party for the overthrow of capitalism. The role of the economic struggles and the role of the Party was especially emphasized by the E.C.C.I.:

"The economic struggle of the proletariat is assuming more and more a *revolutionary* character, and combining, in an increasing number of cases, with various elements and forms of political activity, is, at the present stage, in the overwhelming majority of capitalist countries, the *fundamental link* for leading the masses to the forthcoming big revolutionary battles. *The greatest possible development and strengthening* of the struggle of the proletariat against wage cuts and the worsening of the conditions of labor, the exertion of all the efforts of the Communist Parties and the revolutionary trade union organizations to ensure the independent leadership of strike struggles and the unemployed movement, the raising of the fighting capacity of the masses, leading them on the basis of their own experience from the struggle for everyday partial demands to the struggle for the general class tasks of the proletariat—represent the *chief tasks* for all sections of the Communist International, especially under the conditions of the end of capitalist stabilization."

* * * * *

"The XIIth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. reminds all sections of the Comintern that the Communist Parties, which represent the interests of the working class as a whole, are responsible for the organization of the economic struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist offensive. . . ."

TASKS OF THE PARTY IN TRADE UNION WORK

1. The first task is to mobilize the entire Party membership for revolutionary trade union work. This means the carrying through of a campaign to enroll every Party member eligible into the trade unions. Drawing the lessons from past efforts and bearing in mind that the overwhelming majority of the Party members are relatively new members, this cannot be achieved through mere formal decisions or threats of discipline. It can only be carried through on the basis of a thorough enlightenment of the membership as to the chief tasks of the Party, the reasons for our making work in the factories and trade unions the chief task. This was fully explained in the Open Letter which raised before the Party the question in the most fundamental manner. Unless the Party establishes its roots among the decisive sections of the industrial proletariat it cannot become a mass Communist Party. The discussion must be brought into every Party nucleus, into every trade union fraction. The Party leadership must not only convince the Party as to the correctness of and urgency of carrying through the Open Letter, but also help the membership to carry through the tasks. Every District, section, nucleus, and especially shop nucleus, must work out its plan of work on the basis of the policy of concentration, assign the most experienced and developed comrades for leadership in the trade union work. Steps are to be taken to build the trade union fractions and assure their guidance through the Party Committees. In raising be-

fore the Party work in factories and trade unions as the central task, care must be taken to overcome the opportunist conception of trade union work. Our trade union work is not an end in itself—the trade unions are for the Communists a bridge to the masses. As part of our Communist work in the factories, the Party nuclei in the factories must receive the greatest attention from the leading committees. They must receive guidance and support in building the union in the shop, the shop committees, the publication of a *Party factory* paper, recruiting into the Party. Bearing in mind the tendency to hide the face of the Party, the liquidation of many of the factory papers of the Party into trade union organs, the Party committees must patiently explain and stubbornly fight against such deviations.

2. The mobilization of the Party for the work in the factories and trade unions cannot be carried through on the basis of an abstract campaign, or as a matter of routine. It can only be successful as part of the preparation of the Party to at once take up the fight in each factory in each industry where there are Communists in the struggle in defense of the interests of the workers. The analysis of the Thirteenth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. stated that the inner and external antagonisms are becoming sharper in all capitalist countries and that we are closely approaching a new round of revolutions and war. Already the Twelfth Plenum emphasized that the “present period is pregnant with rapid turns of events”. To take advantage of the situation, to be prepared for the coming events, to mobilize all forces in the struggle against fascism and imperialist war—such are our pressing tasks. The recent struggles, the continuation without a let-up of the strike struggles in one industry after another, show that major class battles are maturing. Our task is not to wait for these struggles, but to accelerate their development. This cannot be accomplished by correct resolutions alone. It requires, of course, that we root out the underestimation of the radicalization of the masses which was responsible for our Party lagging behind in many struggles of the past year. But it also requires that we prepare ourselves organizationally to lead these struggles. To take up the development of the fight for the workers’ needs in the factories; to raise the confidence and fighting spirit of the workers; to develop their capacity to struggle by extending in the factories the Party and trade union organizations, to develop the united front of all workers; to build strong fighting oppositions in the A. F. of L. unions. The central issues around which the struggle of the employed and unemployed workers can be developed are:

- a. For increased wages, especially in the face of the rising cost of living;
- b. For the shorter work day without reduction in pay; against the stagger plan;
- c. Against lay-offs; against speed-up;
- d. For Unemployment Insurance, as embodied in the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill;
- e. For relief to the unemployed;
- f. For continuation of C.W.A. jobs at higher wages;
- g. For the rights of Negro workers to all jobs at equal pay; against discrimination on relief, C.W.A. jobs, etc.
- h. Special demands for young workers; women workers;
- i. For the unconditional right to organize; against compulsory arbitration;
- k. Against all forms of forced labor; the right to organize on C.W.A. jobs, in C.C.C. camps.

On the basis of the policy of concentration, the Party must give special attention towards the preparation for the coming struggle among the miners, steel and auto workers, marine workers, railroad workers, chemical workers, textile workers.

4. The development of the T.U.U.L. unions must receive the greatest attention. Especially must we concentrate on strengthening the work and leadership of the Steel, Auto, Marine, Textile and Miners' Unions. A decisive turn towards the work in the A. F. of L., greater attention to work in the independent unions implies not a weakening but a strengthening of the work of the T.U.U.L. unions. With the development of the struggles of the workers, the exposure of the N.R.A., the incorporation of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats as the government agents in the trade unions, the T.U.U.L. unions, and especially in the basic unorganized industries (steel, auto, chemical, etc.) can play a decisive role and can experience a rapid development. The Party must conduct a sharp struggle against any liquidatory tendencies, and expose the slander and maneuvers of the renegades who call for the liquidation of the T.U.U.L. unions because they wish to strengthen the A. F. of L. bureaucracy of which they have become a part. In order to take full advantage of the developing struggle the Communist fractions in the T.U.U.L. unions must call for the carrying through of ideological and organizational preparations in the most important unions for the coming struggle. They must insist on the carrying through of the policy of concentration, persistent work in the factories, the strengthening of the leadership in some of the unions of the T.U.U.L. and strengthen the leading committees of the T.U.U.L. on the basis of more collective work of a representative

committee embracing comrades from the most important trade union organizations. The coming Convention of the T.U.U.L. must be organized on the basis of a broad mass campaign involving the largest sections of the workers in the decisive industries.

3. The work in the A. F. of L., which in most districts is still primarily limited to the work in some sections of the building trades, must be extended to the miners, textile workers, and railroad workers especially, as well as among the federal locals in metal, rubber, etc. The whole Party must be roused to the necessity of carrying on systematic work in the A. F. of L. unions. The work in the A. F. of L. unions today takes on greater importance than heretofore, because of the influx of new members and the efforts of the government to force workers into the A. F. of L. unions in many industries. The Communist fractions must be built in the A. F. of L. unions, and they must raise the question in each industry and in each locality of the building of broad left-wing oppositions and unite them for the purpose of establishing oppositional leadership to carry on the struggle on the broadest possible basis. The character of the work of the oppositions in the A. F. of L. unions and Railroad Brotherhoods must be radically changed. In the first place, there must be a break with the legalism that still dominates most of the oppositions, preventing the development of the independent struggles of the workers. Secondly, the oppositions must not remain merely on the top or be based on occasional local union meetings. They must be reorganized on the basis of the factory. Only in this way will they be able to take up the independent leadership of the struggle. The slogans and issues enumerated above are the central issues around which the A. F. of L. workers can be mobilized for struggle. Special emphasis must be given to the development of the fight for the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill. The oppositions must also raise the questions of democracy, the rights of the rank and file, elections for all posts for which the left wing must fight, against gangsterism and racketeering, against high salaries for union officials, for reduction of dues, exemptions to unemployed, etc.

4. The oppositions must prove to the A. F. of L. workers that the Communists and their supporters fight for the interests of the workers, fight to build the union, for the unity of workers, while the bureaucrats are betraying the interests of the workers, plundering, splitting and destroying the unions as instruments of struggle against the bosses. The Communists must put forward in the interests of the struggle united action with the T.U.U.L. unions and other organizations. They must defend the independent unions before the workers from the attacks of the bureaucrats, exposing the

bureaucrats as the splitters of the workers. When the A. F. of L. union is a mass organization, and no other unions exist, the Communists should join these organizations and call upon the workers to join them and fight for the opposition program. In general, however, the slogan calling upon all workers to join the A. F. of L. is not serving the interests of the workers. Each union and each industry must be examined before proper action can be decided upon.

WORK IN THE INDEPENDENT UNIONS

5. The work in the independent unions must receive regular and systematic attention. The different types of independent unions require a different approach. In general, these unions can be subdivided into four categories: a) the independent unions that differ very little from the A. F. of L. controlled unions (Progressive Miners, Anthracite Mine Workers Union, etc.); b) Unions more or less standing on a class struggle basis and in which the Communists participate in the leadership, but which still include left reformists and renegades in the leadership (United Shoe, Amalgamated Food Workers, etc.); c) independent unions that accept the program of class struggle and are led by Communists or honest left elements (Allentown, postal workers, etc.); d) all sorts of shop and local organizations of a semi-company union character, usually dominated by company men through whom the company hopes to stop these workers from affiliating themselves with the labor movement.

The Communists must penetrate all of these unions, organize Communist fractions, set before themselves the task of making these unions real class organizations on the basis of developing and leading the struggles in defense of the interests of the workers, through constant enlightenment as to the lessons of the class struggle, by showing these masses in life the leading role of the Communist Party as the organizer of the fighting united front in their interests. We must strive for the unification of the workers of these unions in each industry with the T.U.U.L. union in the same industry into one fighting class trade union. Without penetrating and winning the workers of these organizations for a genuine class struggle for unity with the T.U.U.L. unions, it is idle to talk about the building of a representative and authoritative *Independent Federation of Labor*.

The policy of uniting these unions with the T.U.U.L. union in the respective industries, and into an Independent Federation of Labor, will not be achieved in a single step. Many intermediate steps may be necessary, and can be applied. Already, experience

shows such possibilities through (a) joint struggles of the T.U.U.L. and independent union (New York metal strike); (b) formation of a joint council of the workers in the T.U.U.L. and independent union (Jamestown metal).

It stands to reason that around the Communist fractions in the union must be drawn all workers who accept the program of the revolutionary trade union movement. In A. F. of L. unions dominated by reformists, their task is to isolate the reformist leaders, win the membership for our class policies. In the independent unions close to the T.U.U.L., such broader groups will serve to more rapidly win the organization for our policies through their clarity, firmness, and discipline.

6. A careful study must be made of the company unions in the basic industries. Our policy is to expose these organizations as instruments of the employers against the workers, to arouse the hatred of the workers against them, and to smash them. In order to achieve this, we should utilize every possibility for speaking to the workers wherever such meetings are called. To make proposals which will expose the company agents and bring about the greater fighting spirit of the workers, to try to gain the election posts wherever they can be utilized to expose the company union and rally the workers for action. It is, of course, necessary to carry on such work with the greatest caution so as not to be exposed too quickly and dismissed from the factory. The Party nucleus in the factory, the Party shop paper, and the trade union where such exists, must give much attention to the problems of the work within the company union. A very important method of struggle against the company union is to expose its workings in the *Daily Worker*. For this purpose, as well as for the work in the factory generally, it is necessary to develop worker-correspondents in the factory. The fight for shop committees, elected by all the workers, can in many cases be achieved through successful utilization of the possibilities for work in the company unions. Since our object is to build class trade unions in the factories, and since many workers are prejudiced against all unions because of the betrayals of the A. F. of L. bureaucrats, we must carry on an exposure of the bureaucrats and their policies, and present in contrast the program, the leadership, and the organizational forms of the class trade unions of the T.U.U.L.

7. The fight for the unification of the revolutionary unions and the independent unions must be developed immediately by beginning a mass agitational campaign through discussion, through resolutions in the independent unions, through the work of unification of these organizations in the different industries. Already, a number of left-reformists are conducting secret negotiations for the

formation of an independent trade union center under their leadership in order to block the formation of a class independent trade union center. At the same time there is the danger that many of the independent unions will be swept into the A. F. of L., especially through the maneuvers of the Socialists and renegades (Shoe, Electrical), unless we immediately raise the perspective of a class independent trade union center and conduct a campaign for its realization. It was the failure of the Party to recognize in time the forces making for the growth of independent unions which made it possible for the Pearcys, Cappelonis, Maloneys, etc., to mislead the leftward moving workers and rally them into independent unions of a reformist character. Similarly, our failure to carry forward throughout the fight for the amalgamation of the various independent shoe unions played into the hands of the Socialists and Lovestoneites, who attached themselves to the movement and continue to play an important role.

The Party must understand that the independent unions left by themselves will be the prey of every reformist misleader, and will play into the hands of the bosses and the A. F. of L. bureaucrats. At the same time, our perspective cannot be the formation of a class independent trade union center which will exist side by side with the T.U.U.L. center and the A. F. of L. Rather our perspective is that by fusing these independent unions with the revolutionary trade unions, we can develop in the U. S., side by side with a powerful opposition movement in the A. F. of L. unions and the Railroad Brotherhoods, a relatively broad class trade union center.

The Independent Federation of Labor will not come merely through the change of name of the T.U.U.L. and through resolutions. It will come as a result of an ideological and organizational campaign in both the independent and T.U.U.L. unions, as well as among the unorganized. At the same time, while it must be based on the broadest conceptions of the united front, it cannot base itself on any compromise with the policies of class collaboration. It must stand squarely on the principles of the class struggle, and through its structure and leadership, be capable of organizing and leading the masses of the American workers in struggle in defense of their immediate economic and political needs, as well as against the capitalist efforts to get out of the crisis through fascism and imperialist war.

8. The trade unions have not yet been drawn in on a mass scale to fight for the needs of the unemployed and especially for unemployment insurance. Even the revolutionary unions have not yet given serious and systematic attention to this task. The Communist fractions in the trade unions must take steps to change this

situation in the shortest possible time. The movement for social and unemployment insurance must unite, in the first place, the full forces of the revolutionary trade union movement and the mass organizations of the unemployed. This is the chief immediate demand of the entire working class. Around these basic forces must be gathered the other sections of the toiling population. This fight must be developed on the basis of the united front to a higher level, including political demonstrations and strikes for the realization of the Workers' Social and Unemployment Insurance Bill. The trade unions must be mobilized to play the central role in this struggle.

The broadening and consolidation of the mass organizations of the unemployed must proceed upon the basis of an intensified struggle for cash relief from local, state and national governments; against all forms of forced labor; for full trade union rates of wages on all civil and public works. All of these struggles must be connected with the mass campaign for unemployment insurance as contained in the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill. Solidarity actions of the unemployed organizations with the trade unions must be developed and stimulated. All necessary special organizational forms must be found to include various categories of local relief workers, civil works employees, public works, etc. Most resolute fight must be developed against the separate existence of rival organizations of the unemployed; and the members of all existing unemployed organizations must be rallied around the slogan, for the complete fusion and unification of all organizations of the unemployed.

9. (a) Special measures must be taken immediately to execute the Party decision regarding the winning of the Negro workers for the trade unions. All Communists in the T.U.U.L. or independent unions, in the A. F. of L. opposition, are obligated to raise this question in their organizations and conduct a constant fight for them. There must be no strike, no struggle in which we fail to raise the general and special demands of the Negro workers. Similarly, these questions must be raised in every factory, in every trade union. The revolutionary unions must set the example before the whole of the Negro masses in the struggle for the economic interests of the Negro workers. The revolutionary oppositions in the A. F. of L. must similarly show through their deeds that their exposure of the bureaucrats as arch-chauvinists is backed up by the actual struggle for the interests of the Negro workers. We must raise the demand for the employment of Negro workers on the basis of equality with the white workers on all jobs and at equal wages. The Communists in the unions are obligated to carry on a struggle against all forms of discrimination practiced against Negro workers, and work for their

election to all leading posts. Nor must the revolutionary trade unionists limit their fight in the interests of the Negro masses to the fight for immediate economic demands. We must fight for the adoption by the masses of trade unionists and by all workers of the full Communist program for the Negro toilers, including the fight for self-determination in the Black Belt. As a step in the direction of carrying through the above tasks, it is urgent to undertake a campaign of enlightenment in the trade unions and oppositions as to the Communist position on the Negro question, to organize special trade union conferences of white and Negro workers in the respective industries and localities for the raising of these issues and the mobilization of the white and Negro masses to struggle for their realization.

(b) The Party must give more attention to the work among the millions of agricultural workers. Aside from the strategic importance of these workers in capitalist economy, without organizing them, the Party will be unable to establish the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle in the countryside.

(c) The development of fascism in Germany has emphasized before our Party the burning necessity of struggling for the working class youth, large sections of whom are robbed of the possibility of entering industry. At the same time, the young workers in the industries play an increasingly important role in the struggles of the workers. The revolutionary unions and oppositions have not yet learned and in many cases resist the raising of the special demands of the young workers. A turn must be made if we seriously wish to carry through the struggle against fascism and war.

Demands for the young workers must be adopted by all revolutionary trade unions and oppositions as to hours, wages, etc., to meet the special needs of the young workers. They must be afforded full rights of organization and promoted to all leading posts in the unions. The Communists must mobilize the unions to fight against the militarization of the youth in the C.C.C. camps, demand for the youth relief, C.W.A. jobs, unemployment insurance. An end must be put to the liberal position on child labor. Our fight is for state maintenance for all child laborers who are thrown out of industry and not merely "the abolition of child labor."

(d) The fight for the women workers takes on added importance with the imminence of the war danger. The A. F. of L. unions have always discriminated against women workers. The opposition in the A. F. of L. has thus far not yet taken up this issue. The situation is not entirely satisfactory in the revolutionary unions. Even the National Textile Workers Union has only a small percentage of women, although the majority of the workers are women. In view

of the present situation, we must take decisive action to organize the women workers, and carry on a fight for their interests.

10. The Communists in the trade unions must undertake to bring the program and policies of the Party before the masses. A struggle must be conducted against all opportunist deviations which wish to limit the struggles of the trade unions to purely "trade" questions. The trade unions as the basic mass organization of the workers must fight for all the needs of the workers. This, of course, cannot be achieved through a sectarian commandeering of the masses. The Communists must win the workers for such a struggle on the basis of utilizing every economic struggle for broadening the outlook and perspective of the workers to revolutionize them, and win the best elements to the Party. Especially is it necessary to win the workers for the struggle against imperialist war, against fascism, for the defense of the Soviet Union, etc. On the basis of the struggle for the pressing economic and political needs of the masses coupled with the bold putting forward and explanation of the Party program, we must lead the masses in struggle not only for our immediate goal, but for the overthrow of capitalism, and the establishment of a Workers' and Farmers' Government (Dictatorship of the Proletariat).

DeLeonism in the Light of Marxism-Leninism

By WALTER BURKE

TO DATE a number of attempts have been made, particularly by Russian Marxist writers, Raisky and Angorov in the main, to give a Marxist-Leninist estimation of the Socialist Labor Party and its dominating figure and ideologist, De Leon. With the exception of Karl Reeve's articles printed in the June and August, 1928, issues of *The Communist*, these contributions fell short of their object. In an article published in the September and October, 1930, issues of *The Communist*, Raisky compares De Leon with Lenin and states that the only division between the Bolsheviks and De Leon was De Leon's "failure to understand the inevitability and necessity of a transitional epoch in the form of a Dictatorship of the Proletariat." * The essence of Raisky's article is that De Leon was a revolutionary Marxist. Angorov, in estimating the political ideology of De Leon (*Law of Revolution*, number 4, 1927), attempts to divide De Leonism into three parts—three "streams", as he calls them—menshevist, anarcho-syndicalist, and Marxist. It is true that De Leonism is a mixture of menshevism and anarcho-syndicalism, including utopianism, but it is incorrect to say that it also includes Marxism. For Marxism is indivisible. It cannot be divided into "streams". It is one whole. Marxism is the unified theory, practice and organization of the class struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat; for Communism.

Thus, Lenin, in his pamphlet *The Teachings of Karl Marx*, defines Marxism as a "system of the views and teachings of Marx" (My emphasis—W.B.). Lenin speaks of

"The remarkable consistency and unity of conception of Marx' views, acknowledged even by his opponents, which in the totality constitute modern materialism and modern scientific Socialism as the

* To a recent Russian translation of a number of De Leon's works Raisky has written a foreword, dated March 10, 1932, in which he corrects, in the main, his mistakes in previous works, but does not fully free himself from them.

theory and program of the labor movement of all the civilized countries of the world. . . ."

We see then, according to Lenin, that Marxism can be such only when Marx's views are understood in their totality. Any attempt to divide Marxism into "streams" is to fall into opportunism.

De Leon's political activities began with his support of Henry George and his "single tax" theory in the 1886 presidential elections. Later on he fell under the influence of Edward Bellamy, the author of the utopian novel, *Looking Backward*, who presented a theory of peaceful nationalization of the means of production. During this period, De Leon accumulated many utopian and reformist ideas, which he later tried to reconcile with Marxism, but from which he largely did not free himself even in the last years of his life. In 1888, De Leon joined the Knights of Labor. His closer contact with the labor movement made him dissatisfied with the utopian and single tax theories. He began to study Marx, whose follower he claimed to be.

In 1890, De Leon joined the Socialist Labor Party, which was then composed mainly of German immigrants. Due to his extensive learning, his devotion to the working class and his journalistic and oratorical abilities, he soon won the leadership of the party. From that time on, the history of the Socialist Labor Party became inseparably connected with De Leon's political biography.

De Leon entered the labor movement in an epoch which marked the passing of American classic capitalism into imperialism. The United States was being converted into one of the most powerful capitalist countries.

After the Civil War the structure of American capitalism changed rapidly. In the 70's, Rockefeller organized the Oil Trust. A few years later, a sugar trust was organized. The close of the 19th century marked a sharp tendency towards concentration of capital, resulting in the concentration of the proletariat in large enterprises. Lenin, in his book, *Imperialism*, used the U. S. Steel Trust as an example of this concentration at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

In the 90's, United States imperialism ventured forth on a colonial policy and the capture of markets to provide an outlet for its surplus products and export capital. American imperialism began to conquer commanding positions in the Caribbean Sea and the Pacific Ocean. In 1893 the Hawaiian Islands were annexed to be used as a base for penetration into the East. In 1898, after provoking a war with Spain, the U. S. annexed the Philippine Islands, Guam, Porto Rico, and established a protectorate over Cuba.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the U. S. blossomed out

as a classical country of monopoly capitalism. Under the cloak of democracy, monopoly capitalism became integrated more and more with the government apparatus. Under this cloak, a dictatorship of finance and industrial capital was established. The end of the 19th century marked the end of free lands and the "exceptional" conditions for the growth of American capitalism.

The rapid growth of American capitalism hastened the splitting up of American society into two great and directly contraposed classes: bourgeoisie and proletariat. But the specific character of the development of American capitalism, coupled with the opportunist policies of the labor leaders, hindered the rapid development of the class consciousness of the American workers.

The rate at which capitalism developed in the United States placed the native-born workers in a relatively privileged position, giving opportunities for sections of them to raise themselves into the ranks of the petty-bourgeoisie, and thus tending to blur class lines and to cultivate illusions of democracy. The existence until the end of the 19th century of vast stretches of free land acted as a safety valve tending to draw much explosive away from the industrial centers. For years, few workers expected to remain as such for long. Many looked forward to the time when they could get a homestead, buy a farm, or go into business.

Another factor that to some extent acted as an obstacle to the development of class consciousness of the American workers is the extensive immigration which went to make the American working class a composite of many different nationalities.

The sharp changes in the social and economic life of the country definitely reflected themselves within the American labor movement. Within the working class qualitative changes took place. On the one hand, we had large masses of unskilled workers, mainly foreign-born and Negro, who were just then being drawn into industries and whose conditions were deplorable. On the other hand, we had a small section of the working class, the skilled workers, bribed by the super profits of American imperialism, which were being secured by the greater exploitation of colonial peoples abroad and the unskilled and Negro workers and peasants at home. In no country has this division of skilled from unskilled workers been practiced on such a large scale as in the United States. In this way American capitalism created an aristocracy of the working class, the social base for reformism in the labor movement.

The rise of American capitalism to the power it held at the beginning of the twentieth century was far from a peaceful process. Alongside of the growing imperialism there developed as an active force against it a strong working class which offered

militant resistance to the American bourgeois. Some of the greatest class battles between the American proletariat and the bourgeoisie took place in the period of rapid expansion of American capitalism after the Civil War. This forward march was interrupted by devastating periodic crises. "This was an era of struggle, the bitter 1877 railroad strike, the spectacular rise and struggles of the Knights of Labor, the great 8-hour day movement of 1885-6, the American Railway Union strike, the Homestead strike, etc.)* These struggles showed the militancy of the American working class. The crushing of these strikes by force of arms showed also that the American bourgeoisie will fight every inch of the way to protect its booty with the greatest ferocity, not hesitating to call out the armed forces of its State to crush the revolt of the workers.

In the period of rapid development of American capitalism, while the American workers and the rank-and-file trade union membership were radical, the leadership of the trade unions gradually began to move to the right. Under the pressure and bribery by the bourgeoisie this movement to the right was hastened after the execution of the Chicago anarchist leaders of the great struggle for the 8-hour day in 1885-7.

The late 90's found two national trade union organizations in the field: the Knights of Labor, loosely organized and fast losing ground; and the American Federation of Labor, which was to dominate the American trade union movement.

In the period dealt with above, the political movement of the American working class was expressed in the Socialist Labor Party, which was founded in 1877. But this party was composed mostly of German immigrants, former members of the Social Democratic Party of Germany. Due to its sectarian policy the S. L. P. was unable to adapt its work to American conditions and reach the masses of the workers. Within the trade union field the policy of the S. L. P. was to bore from within, basing itself primarily upon the German trade unions and not on the broad strata of the American workers.

De Leon's entrance into the S.L.P. was a big factor in turning the face of the Socialists to the American workers. Up till that time the official organ of the S.L.P. had been issued in German. De Leon was responsible for the issuance of the first English Socialist newspaper in this country.

De Leon believed in party control of the press and its use as the most important weapon of the party. In his speech on *Unity*, printed now in pamphlet form, De Leon stated that "the press

* Foster: *Misleaders of Labor*.

is the most potent weapon of the movement. . . . The movement must own its press, or the press will own it. Hence the Socialist Labor Party holds to the strict party-ownership of its press."

De Leon's editorship of the party press, in spite of its difficult language, theoretical mistakes, and sectarian approach to the masses and problems, sharply criticized the bourgeois system of society and its labor lieutenants in the ranks of the working class and did much to awaken the class consciousness of the American workers, educating them in the spirit of class struggle.

De Leon gave much of his time and attention to the trade union movement, fighting against craft forms of organization and the reactionary leadership of the trade unions. De Leon's industrial unionism had many weaknesses, such as the failure to base organizations on factories, believing them to be the force of the working class which can overthrow the bourgeoisie through a "lockout", thus substituting the industrial unions for the party,* etc. Yet it was a revolutionary step forward as compared to the craft form of organization represented by the A. F. of L.

De Leon stood for democratic centralism in the party, for strict party discipline and the subordination of the will of the minority to the majority. He was opposed to the reformist parliamentarism of the German Social-Democratic Party. He was for revolutionary parliamentarism, for the utilization of the parliamentary tribune for work destructive of capitalism.

An outstanding feature of De Leon's work was his uncompromising struggle against the traitorous leadership of the A. F. of L.** and right opportunism in general in the American labor movement and, to some extent, within the Second International.

De Leon's struggle against opportunism in the American labor movement and in the Second International was weakened because: (1) He failed to understand the social roots of opportunism within

* In the *Burning Question of Trade Unionism*, an address delivered in 1904, De Leon states: "The trade union question has a supreme mission. That mission is nothing short of organizing by uniting and uniting by organizing the whole working class industrially—not merely those for whom there are jobs, accordingly not only those who can pay dues. That unification of organization is essential in order to save the possible and eventual victory from bankruptcy, by enabling the working class to assume and conduct production the moment the guns of public power fall into their own hands or before if need be, if the capitalist political chicanery pollutes the ballot box."

** *Two Pages from Roman History*: "... The labor leader of today is nothing but a masked battery, from behind which the capitalist class can encompass what it could not do without—the work of enslaving and slowly degrading the working class."

the international labor movement. He failed to see the qualitative change in capitalism taking place before his eyes at the end of the 19th century—capitalism entering into its decay; the passing of free competitive capitalism into monopoly capitalism, into the fusion of industrial with banking capital—imperialism; (2) he did not see that opportunism takes on two forms — Right opportunism, against which he struggled, and “left” opportunism, in his case taking the form of sectarianism of which he was the bearer. His struggle against reformism, carried on in a sectarian form, resulted in strengthening opportunism in the American labor movement.

While De Leon in his work, *Flashlights of the Amsterdam Congress*, very sharply characterizes Kautsky, Vandervelde and other reformist leaders of the Second International, at no time does he in this, or any other of his writings or speeches, carry on a struggle against the Second International leadership for its outright revisionism and betrayal of Marxism.

In the United States his sectarian struggle against the open reformism of the A. F. of L. leadership and the Socialist Party objectively helped the growth of reformism by abandoning the workers who were not yet fully conscious of their class interests, to the leadership of the Gomperses, Mitchells, Bergers, and Hillquits. In like manner was his fight ineffective against the leadership of the Second International, the reformism of which he justified with the view that in the European countries there existed “a feudal class, still mighty, though crowded by its upstart rival, the capitalists,” which made the struggles in these countries not yet between the workers and the bourgeoisie, but “between capitalism and feudalism.”* Hence, according to De Leon, a socialist revolution even in a country like Germany was not possible.

On the basis of this theory De Leon developed his theory of American exceptionalism, a theory of a proletarian revolution taking place in a country most industrially developed in which feudalism has been abolished. “The moment feudalism is swept aside,” says De Leon, “as here in America—from that moment the ground is ready for a revolution to step in.”**

De Leon’s justification of revisionism and reformism in the German Social-Democratic Party and his failure to understand the essence of revisionism are clearly stated in the following quotation from the same work, (p. 202):

“But the principle now christened ‘revisionism’ which, as shown in the debates, has previously undergone a series of equally damaging

* *Flashlights of the Amsterdam Congress*, p. 192.

** *Ibid.*

christenings and survived them all, and in the end asserted itself, is in the nature of things un-uprootable, so long as feudal soil lasts. . . . Conditions still peculiar to Germany have forced the social-democracy to come down from the air and place itself upon the only field there was to take a stand, on the field of reform."

Thus, according to De Leon, feudalism, and not imperialism, breeds revisionism in the labor movement.

If we take the basic questions of Marxism—the dictatorship of the proletariat, the role of the Party, the question of allies of the proletariat, mass political strike and armed uprising, the national and colonial question, we shall see that De Leon's theory of the proletarian revolution is not Marxist, that it is a revision of Marxism in the most vulgar form. Here, of course, we must differentiate between De Leon and the revisionists like Bernstein, Kautsky, etc. The revisionists of the Second International knew Marxism in its orthodox form. Their revisionism was developed in line with the interests of imperialism of their own countries. It was a conscious effort to betray the interests of the proletariat and to tie them to the chariot of colonial exploitation. While De Leon, having the sincerest intentions of serving the interests of the working class, studied and tried to assimilate Marxism. He did not achieve this aim, due to his background and the organizational and theoretical weakness of the American labor movement. The Germans, who were the most advanced section of the American working class, who composed in the main the S.L.P., and from whom De Leon assimilated a portion of his "Marxist" theories, did not understand the theory themselves, but treated it as a dogma and not as a guide to action. In a letter to Sorge, dated Nov. 29, 1886, Marx, writing on the American labor movement, thus criticized the Germans of the S.L.P.:

" . . . the Germans have not been able to use their theory as a lever to set the American masses into motion, to a great extent they do not understand the theory themselves and treat it in a doctrinaire and dogmatic fashion, as if it were something which must be committed to memory, but which then suffices for all purposes without further ado. *For them it is a credo and not a guide to action. . . .*"

Under these historical conditions the result of De Leon's efforts to assimilate Marxism was an eclectic theory of the proletarian revolution, fundamentally based, not on Marxism, but on Bellamy's utopianism.

Thus, in spite of the two different starting points of European and American revisionism, as represented by De Leon, the same objective is reached, that of cutting out all that is revolutionary in Marxism and making it acceptable to the bourgeoisie.

DE LEON'S SECTARIANISM

At the time De Leon entered the socialist movement, the S.L.P. was working in both the Knights of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, boring from within in its attempt to win the leadership of the trade union movement. But De Leon's coming into the leadership of the S.L.P. soon changed this policy. De Leon, of a hasty, autocratic nature, soon fell foul of the two branches of the organized labor movement.* He broke with the A. F. of L. over a skirmish which occurred in 1890 between that organization and the New York Central Labor Federation. The latter body, controlled by the Socialists, accepted the affiliation of the S.L.P., a method practiced by the German labor movement of that time. But when its delegate, Lucien Sanial, appeared at the following convention of the A. F. of L. he was denied a seat.** The result was that the S.L.P. decided to withdraw its forces from the A. F. of L. and endeavor to capture the decaying K. of L.

After some five years of hard work the Socialists became a factor in this organization with De Leon as their outstanding representative. At the 1894 General Assembly of the K. of L., De Leon joined forces with Sovereign against Powderly, then the leader of the organization. Together they overthrew Powderly, but the victorious Sovereign, disregarding his political bargain, refused to reward De Leon for his assistance by appointing Lucien Sanial as editor of the official national journal. This provoked De Leon, and under his influence the Socialists broke with the K. of L.

De Leon's withdrawal from the two organizations left him but one alternative—to embark on a policy of dual unionism. Gathering his few forces, De Leon set out to organize the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance. But, as Foster remarks in his *Bankruptcy of the American Labor Movement*:

“The Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance was still-born. It never amounted to more than a handful of militants, the masses refusing to rally to its standard.”

Here De Leon's mistake lies not in establishing separate unions. His mistake was that he established sectarian unions, not unions on the basis of mass movements, but on the basis of a small number of revolutionaries disconnected from the unorganized workers in the factories, and that he *discontinued work in the old unions*, leaving the workers in these organizations under the influence of reaction-

* *Ibid.*, p. 26.

** *Ibid.*

ary leaders. Lenin, in *Left Communism—An Infantile Disorder*, states:

“Not to work in the reactionary trade unions means to leave the backward, insufficiently developed working masses under the influence of the reactionary leaders, agents of the bourgeoisie, labor aristocrats of the bourgeoisified workers.”

This sectarianism of De Leon was carried further in the 1900 Party Congress (after the opportunist wing had split from the Party, mainly on the trade union question, with the resulting formation of the Socialist Party in 1899). At that congress the S.L.P. adopted a resolution forbidding members of the party to hold office in craft unions or to admit into the party any officials of the A. F. of L. unions, thus severing all possibilities for influencing the members of the craft unions. Likewise, all partial demands—minimum program—were stricken from the party program.

The failure of the Socialist Trades and Labor Alliance to make any headway among the American workers did not discourage De Leon and his followers. Profiting to some extent from the experiences with the organization of the S.T.L.A., De Leon joined with the Western Federation of Miners in calling a broad conference in 1905 of all revolutionary-minded unions for the establishment of a national organization of industrial unions. The result was the organization of the Industrial Workers of the World.

De Leon and his followers worked in the I.W.W. till 1908. When the St. Johns (anarcho-syndicalist) forces got control of the I.W.W. at its 1908 convention, they proceeded to strike out the clause from the constitution calling for the combination of political with economic action. The rejection of political action by the I.W.W. brought De Leon's sectarianism sharply to the fore. With a handful of followers he withdrew from the I.W.W. and organized the Workers International Industrial Union, which, like the S.T.L.A. was still-born, never having more than several thousand members, and was liquidated entirely in 1925.

From this time till his death (May 11th, 1914), he continued his sharp criticism of the A. F. of L. leadership and that of all other organizations of workers; but his voice failed to reach the misled workers.

Concluding in general our survey of De Leon's activities in the trade union field, we shall pass over to the examination of his understanding of the basic problems of the proletarian revolution.

(To be continued)

Figures on the American Economic Crisis

AS OF JANUARY, 1934

By JOHN IRVING and PHIL MAYER

(*Labor Research Association*)

A "NEW prosperity" is upon us, if we are to believe the bourgeois business prophets, a prosperity, admittedly bought and paid for by inflated government dollars, by some 7,000,000,000 government dollars.

This new "prosperity" follows the infusion of government money into the different sections of the country. A billion dollars is being poured directly into the cotton, wheat, corn and tobacco fields—the government bounty to cotton, wheat and tobacco growers, and hog raisers for curtailing the output of these products. Another one and one-half billion dollars is flowing into agricultural regions in increased value of their produce as a result of this curtailment program and the depreciation of the dollar. And the effects are an increase in automobile sales in 14 agricultural states of 100% over a year ago. Mail order houses are doing 20% to 25% more business now than last year—in the agricultural areas of the country. That nearly takes care of the increase in retail prices noted in these pages last month.

Then there are the three billions for various public works programs—chiefly war preparations, the hundreds of millions that are being expended in the fascization of the American youth in the civilian conservation camps, the temporary CWA, CWS and other public charity doles.

It is solely because of the inordinate rise in automobile production and cotton consumption that the *Annalist* Index of Business recorded the rise of 4 points between December and January, from 69.6 to 73.6. (See Table 1.)

But while *production* of automobiles and of textiles has increased unseasonably, their consumption is beginning to lag. The textile industry has been accumulating stocks, the highest on record (see Table 7). Passenger car registrations in January 1934 were 25% below those of the preceding month, as well as 26% below those of January 1933. As the *Annalist* of March 2, 1934, puts it: "There are, moreover, in the latest new car registrations figures, no indications of any such sweeping revival of demand for automobiles as

one might easily infer from current newspaper reports." Apparently the rush to buy automobiles with the funds supplied by the government is already slackening. Furthermore, says the *Annalist*, "Some observers believe that there has been considerable manufacture of automobiles *in anticipation of labor difficulties*". (Our italics.)

Wholesale prices (Table 5) have risen 1.4 points, from 70.8 to 72.2 but per capita weekly earnings for the 89 manufacturing industries reporting (Table 4) rose exactly one cent between November and December, from an average of \$18.02 to an average of \$18.03. At the same time employment and payrolls (Tables 2 and 3) continued to decline and commodity stocks on hand (Table 7) remain high—textiles, both manufactured and raw, reaching new highs.

And when the present provisions for government bounties are exhausted, as they will be not long after we enter the new fiscal year beginning July 1, 1934, this whole new superstructure of inflation prosperity must break down. Unless new government credits are created, inflation pyramided upon inflation, all the way to Greenbackism, with its consequent intensifying exploitation of the workers' labor power, a further lowering of their standard of living, and the next collapse.

Special attention should be called this month to the details in the employment and payroll figures which cannot all be reproduced in Tables 3 and 4. The decline in the general index of employment, between December and January, of .8 points and in that of payrolls of .4 points shown in these tables is misleading in that the inordinate "unseasonal" rise of employment in a small number of industries obscured the decline that occurred throughout the vast majority of the industries reporting. In our own tables, it will be noted that in the combined average we have, for instance, the rise in the employment index of automobiles from 59.9 to 72.8, and in the payrolls index for automobiles from 42.2 to 53.5, figures sufficiently large to offset all the declines in the other industries listed. The employment and payrolls indexes of anthracite mining supply a similar offsetting figure. The fact is that between December and January 68 of the 89 manufacturing industries, reporting employment and payrolls data to the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, showed a decline in payrolls. Of the non-manufacturing industries, 10 of the 16 reporting showed a decline in either one or both of the employment and payrolls indexes.

It remains but to add that the decline in payrolls and employment reported for the December-January period is the third consecutive monthly decline, the highs for the first wave of Rooseveltian "prosperity" having been reached last October.

TABLE 1—PRODUCTION¹

THE FIELD	Dec.	January		—Highest ² —		—Lowest ² —	
	1933	1934	1933	Index	Date	Index	Date
General Index	69.6	73.6	63.1	116.7	7 29 ³	58.5	3 33 ⁴
Steel ingot production.	54.3	48.8	26.5	145.8	6 29	19.5	3 33
Pig iron production . . .	42.1	42.7	19.8	151.5	7 23	16.8	3 33
Automobile production.	41.6	54.1	47.7	172.6	12 23	17.5	10 32
Lumber production ⁵ . . .	51.9	58.7	40.7	145.9	4 29	34.0	2 33
Cement production ⁵ . . .	34.8	—	36.9	136.9	1 28	34.4	9 33
Cotton consumption . . .	68.5	88.8	82.9	140.3	6 33	60.5	12 20

¹ The *Annalist* Index of Business Activity. "Normal", that is, the computed long-time trend, with the seasonal variations eliminated, equals 100%. The indexes given here should be thought of as percentages of this "normal".

² The highest and lowest indexes for any month since 1919; for lumber and cement, since 1920.

³ Date figures in this and other tables are abbreviated by numbering months (7|29, for example, means July 1929, etc.).

TABLE 2—EMPLOYMENT¹

THE FIELD	Dec.	January		—Highest ² —		—Lowest ² —	
	1933	1934	1933	Index	Date	Index	Date
A. Mfg. Ind. (1926=100)							
Gen. Index (89 Ind.) . . .	70.1	69.3	56.6	110.9	6 23	55.1	3 33
Slaught. & meat pkg. . .	106.8	105.2	84.5	132.6	12 23	82.5	3 33
Cotton goods	95.9	96.7	74.8	128.2	3 23	55.5	6 32
Knit goods	86.8	82.3	79.3	(³)	—	(³)	—
Silk and rayon goods.	61.6	61.6	59.7	(³)	—	(³)	—
Wool. & worsted gds. ⁴	84.9	86.9	71.4	98.5	10 29	49.2	6 32
Men's clothing	67.1	67.3	62.1	126.6	3 23	55.9	6 32
Women's clothing	56.6	61.8	63.6	140.4	3 23	45.4	7 32
Iron and steel	72.9	70.8	50.6	108.5	3 24	50.1	3 33
Elec. machinery, apparatus and supplies . .	61.7	60.1	46.4	127.3	9 29	45.3	3 33
Foundry and machine-shop products	58.2	58.1	41.6	120.5	7 23	40.8	3 33
Automobiles	59.9	72.8	51.6	134.5	4 29	38.2	10 32
Steam rail. rep. shops.	48.6	48.0	46.7	127.5	8 23	38.2	10 32
Boots and shoes ⁵	70.8	75.4	73.1	99.2	9 29	68.2	11 31
Gen. Index (1929=100) ⁶	72.2	71.4	58.3	114.2	6 23	56.8	3 33
B. Non-Mfg. Industries (1929=100)							
Anthracite mining	54.5	64.1	52.5	107.1	12 29	39.5	6 33
Bituminous mining	75.4	75.8	69.8	107.7	2 29	58.6	7 32
Telephone and teleg ⁷ ph	69.4	70.2	74.6	103.7	8 29	68.1	8 33
Power and light	81.8	82.2	77.7	106.4	8 30	76.9	1933 ⁴
Retail trade	105.4	84.6	76.9	126.2	12 29	71.4	3 33
Steam railroads ⁸ (1926=100)	54.0	—	53.0	109.4	8 23	51.5	3 33

¹ Compiled by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, except steam railroads (non mfg.) which is compiled by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

² The highest and lowest indexes for any month for manufacturing industries since 1923, except for knit goods, and silk and rayon goods, for which there are no comparable figures prior to 1932, and for woolen and worsted goods, and boots and shoes since 1929. All non-manufacturing industries since 1929, except steam railroads since 1923.

³ Converted from 1926=100 to 1929=100. ⁴ Same index for March, April and May, 1933.

TABLE 3—PAYROLLS¹

THE FIELD	Dec.	January		— Highest ¹ —		— Lowest ¹ —	
	1933	1934	1933	Index	Date	Index	Date
A. Mfg. Ind. (1926=100)							
Gen. Index (89 Ind.)	49.8	49.4	35.8	109.4	5 23	33.4	3 33
Slaugh. and meat pkg.	91.8	91.6	67.1	129.7	12 23	61.4	3 33
Cotton goods	77.1	79.6	48.4	135.9	5 23	32.9	7 32
Knit goods	66.5	53.4	48.4	(¹)	—	(¹)	—
Silk and rayon gds.	45.5	45.8	35.8	(¹)	—	(¹)	—
Wool. and worsted fids. ¹	65.4	66.8	49.9	100.7	10 29	32.6	6 32
Men's clothing	39.2	43.1	31.3	143.0	3 23	25.9	6 32
Women's clothing	35.8	42.6	34.8	155.6	3 23	25.6	7 32
Iron and steel	44.4	42.5	21.4	110.2	3 24	19.5	8 32
Elec. machinery, apparatus and supplies	44.9	43.2	30.5	130.8	9 29	28.9	3 33
Foundry and machine-shop products	36.1	36.1	20.9	118.8	6 23	19.4	3 33
Automobiles	42.2	53.5	35.3	147.8	4 29	21.6	9 32
Steam rail. rep. shops	40.0	37.6	34.5	128.2	10 23	31.3	8 32
Boots and shoes ¹	46.6	53.6	40.1	102.4	8 29	37.2	11 32
Gen. Index (1929=100) ¹	49.6	49.2	35.7	109.0	5 23	33.3	3 33
B. Non-Mfg. Industries (1929=100)							
Anthracite mining	44.3	73.2	43.2	137.2	12 29	30.0	5 33
Bituminous mining	50.8	51.3	36.1	116.6	2 29	24.4	7 32
Telephone and teleg ¹ ph	67.7	69.0	71.7	106.6	7 30	64.6	9 33
Power and light	74.4	73.8	73.0	107.8	6 30	69.4	4 33
Retail trade	80.3	68.8	62.7	120.6	12 29	55.1	3 33
Steam railroads ¹ (million dollars)	—	—	114.0	271.0	10 23	108.5	2 33

¹ See footnotes for Employment, Table 2, above.

TABLE 4—PER CAPITA WEEKLY EARNINGS¹

THE FIELD	Dec.	1933				
	1932	Dec.	Nov.	Oct.	Sept.	Aug.
A. Mfg. Industries						
All (89 Ind.)	\$16.99	\$18.03	\$18.02	\$18.81	\$18.67	\$18.93
Slaught. and meat pkg.	20.20	21.22	19.86	19.72	19.65	19.78
Cotton goods	10.39	12.33	12.64	13.09	13.11	13.22
Knit goods	13.15	14.73	15.46	15.80	15.24	14.97
Silk and rayon goods	12.76	13.86	14.29	15.01	14.40	15.26
Wool. and worsted gds.	16.01	16.61	16.12	17.03	17.54	17.52
Men's clothing	11.41	13.96	15.39	17.21	17.11	16.10
Women's clothing	15.97	17.06	16.92	20.12	22.39	15.68
Iron and steel	12.50	17.49	17.20	19.71	19.19	21.94
Elec. machinery, apparatus and supplies	19.93	18.63	20.47	20.25	20.61	20.79
Foundry and machine-shop products	16.18	18.55	18.57	19.05	18.45	18.74
Automobiles	20.17	19.97	20.11	20.95	21.60	23.72
Steam rail rep. shops	22.76	23.30	23.55	25.49	23.33	24.47
Boots and shoes	12.76	15.33	14.95	16.61	17.87	17.42
B. Non-Mfg. Industries						
Anthracite mining	26.21	23.68	22.80	31.49	31.09	28.41
Bituminous mining	14.25	17.33	17.39	16.67	15.78	16.37
Telephone and telegraph	26.27	26.42	26.61	26.40	25.60	26.32
Power and light	29.24	28.85	28.40	29.27	28.18	28.26
Retail trade	18.83	18.44	19.19	19.64	19.56	19.48
Steam railroads ²	120.7	—	—	123.9	110.5	125.3

¹ Compiled by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, except steam railroads (non-mfg.), which is computed from figures of Interstate Commerce Commission.
² Per capita monthly earnings.

TABLE 5—COMMODITY PRICES AND COST OF LIVING

THE FIELD	Dec.	January		— Highest ⁵ —		— Lowest ⁵ —	
	1933	1934	1933	Index	Date	Index	Date
A. Wholesale Prices							
All (784 Commodities) ¹	70.8	72.2	61.0	167.2	5 20	59.8	2 33
B. Retail Prices							
Food ¹	65.8	65.1	58.9	135.9	7 20	55.8	4 33
Combined Index ²	88.0	88.5	71.1	98.1	1 31	69.4	4 33
C. Cost of Living ³	74.4	74.6	70.9	118.9	7 20	68.8	4 33
D. Agricultural⁴							
Farm prices	50.3	51.8	37.7	105.8	8 29	36.3	2 33
Prices paid by farmers	76.7	75.4	66.3	99.4	2 29	65.7	3 33

¹ Wholesale prices and retail food prices compiled by U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; retail food prices converted from 1913=100 to 1926=100.
² Fairchild's combined index of department store articles (Dec. 1930=100) including infants', men's and women's apparel, home furnishings and piece goods.
³ Cost of living compiled by National Industrial Conference Board; converted from 1923=100 to 1926=100.
⁴ Items under agriculture compiled by U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics; converted from Aug. 1909-July 1914=100 to 1926=100.
⁵ The highest and lowest indexes for any month since 1919, except for combined index

TABLE 6—CONSUMPTION¹

THE FIELD	Nov.		December		— Highest ² —		— Lowest ² —	
	1933	1933	1932	Index	Date	Index	Date	
Dept. store sales ³	65.0	69.0	60.0	114.0	9 29	57.0	3 33	
Dept. store stocks ³	69.0	65.0	60.0	113.0	8 20	53.0	4 33	
Chain store sales ⁴	83.0	88.0	79.0	(³)	—	(³)	—	
Mail order and store sales (millions of dollars)	52.0	62.0	51.6	90.0	12 29	15.0	7 21	
Exports, inc. re-exports (mill. dollars)	184.3	192.6	131.6	928.4	6 19	105.2	4 33	
Imports (mill. dollars)	128.5	133.2	97.1	552.6	6 20	79.4	7 32	

¹ Compiled by the U. S. Department of Commerce.

² The highest and lowest figures for any month since 1919, except for chain stores (19 companies) for which there are no comparable data prior to 1932.

³ Index based on dollar value; 1923-25=100.

⁴ Index based on dollar value; average same month 1929-31=100.



TABLE 7—COMMODITY STOCKS ON HAND¹

(1923-25=100)

THE FIELD	Nov.		December		— Highest ² —		— Lowest ² —	
	1933	1933	1932	Index	Date	Index	Date	
Domestic (All)	171	170	153	171.0	11 33	72.7	8 20	
Manufactures (All)	110	111	96	128.0	2 30	68.6	11 19	
Chemical products	111	111	121	141.0	3 30	42.1	8 20	
Food products	102	101	66	144.7	1 19	66.0	10 31	
Iron and steel	96	94	81	158.0	2 30	38.9	12 19	
Textiles ³	185	192	76	192.0	12 33	67.4	3 29	
Raw Materials (All)	215	213	193	215	11 33	67.7	7 19	
Foodstuffs	218	213	177	230	10 29	60.8	6 20	
Metals	124	124	109	167	11 31	50.9	4 19	
Textile materials ³	294	295	282	295	12 33	43.0	7 24	
World								
Cotton	216	220	229	268	8 32	75.0	6 23	

¹ Compiled by the U. S. Department of Commerce.


² The highest and lowest indexes for any month since 1919, for textile manufactures, since 1921, and for textile raw materials, since 1920; cotton since 1920.



NOTE ON CHART

This is a "ratio" or "logarithmic" chart. On it distances measure differences in per cent rather than in absolute values. Thus, on a regular chart a change of, say 5 points will cover the same distance whether it represents an increase or a decrease, and whether it is a change of, let us say, from 25 to 30 or from 50 to 55. On a ratio chart an increase covers a smaller distance than a decrease (an increase of five, from 20 to 25, is an increase of 25 per cent, a decrease of five, from 25 to 20, is a decrease of 20 per cent). And the same amount of change from a higher level covers less distance than from a lower level. (A rise of 5, from 25 to 30, is a rise of 20 per cent; a rise of 5 from 50 to 55 is only 10 per cent). The ratio chart is preferable for our purposes because we are using curves representing different classes of data for which the concurrent rates of change rather than corresponding absolute amounts of change are significant.

The curves for employment and payrolls are based on the general indexes for 89 manufacturing industries; the *Annalist* Combined Index of Production has been converted to 1926=100. Farm Prices and Prices Paid by Farmers are on their original base of August 1909-July 1914=100.



BOOKS

BOOKS

TWO MONTHS AND TEN DAYS

THE PARIS COMMUNE, Vol. V, Little Lenin Library. International Publishers. Price 20 cents.

Reviewed by H. M. WICKS

When Thiers, Favre and Company, the defenders of bourgeois France, with the assistance of Bismarck and Von Moltke, slaughtered 30,000 men, women and children in the streets of Paris and jailed and exiled 45,000 more, the bourgeoisie of the whole world hailed their triumph as marking the end of Communism. They imagined that the history of the rise and fall of Communism was forever confined to the stormy days of the Paris Commune—from March 18 to May 28, 1871.

The calumny of the bourgeoisie and their prostituted journalists who tried to efface the memory of the heroism of the Communards did not go unanswered. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, founders of the theory and practice of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, not only took up the defense of the Commune, but drew the revolutionary conclusions that the Paris Commune had given bodily form to the dictatorship of the proletariat. But they did not content themselves with encomiums. Over a period of years they analyzed every experience of the Commune and placed their conclusions at the service of the workers of the world. In the fires of the Commune were forged weapons that have devastated the citadels of capitalism. Marx and Engels, during their lives, tried to make these weapons available to the toiling masses. After their deaths, the social-democratic philistines did everything in their power to deprive the workers of these weapons by distorting in the most infamous manner the revolutionary theory and practice of Marx and Engels.

While the leaders of international social-democracy were distorting and suppressing the revolutionary lessons drawn from the Commune by Marx and Engels, the best student and interpreter of these founders of the revolutionary proletarian movement, Vladimir Ilyich Ulianov (Lenin), was not only popularizing but developing these lessons.

An invaluable service to the revolutionary movement and to the working class generally has been rendered by the International Publishers in taking the most important articles and excerpts from the larger works of Lenin on the Commune and publishing them in one pamphlet. This pamphlet is valuable not only because the genius of Lenin rescued Marx's teachings on the Paris Commune from the revisionist and centrist falsifiers; it is more than that. It is a brilliant Marxist application of the lessons of the Commune to the revolutionary experiences of this century.

In this collection of writings there are two characteristics of Lenin's writing that are particularly impressive. First, his capacity to explain in easily

understandable and impressive language the most complicated political problems and, secondly, the masterly way in which he brings forth a mass of quotations from Marx and Engels against the Bernsteins, the Plechanovs, the Kautskys. Certainly no one can read this compilation of Lenin's writings on the Commune without realizing that the doctrine of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is the central point of Marxism; that all the economic and philosophic works of Marx and Engels were definitely combined with this revolutionary principle, thereby forming a complete world outlook for the proletariat.

Particularly devastating for those who, following Kautsky, hold that the proletariat can use the machinery of the capitalist state for the "political transition period", is the quotation from Marx's letter to Kugelmann, written on April 12, 1871, at the height of the Paris Commune:

"If you look at the last chapter of my *Eighteenth Brumaire*, you will see that I declare the next attempt of the French revolution to be: not merely to transfer the bureaucratic and military machinery from one set of hands to another—as has occurred hitherto—but to *break it up*."

Then, the shattered machinery of the state is to be replaced by a transition form, which can be known as nothing other than "the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat". (Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*.)

Just as Marx and Engels, for years, studied every experience of the Paris Commune and placed their conclusions at the disposal of the working class that there might be forged more powerful weapons for the struggle to overthrow capitalism, so Lenin, as the most consistent Marxist of his time, examined the experiences of the revolution in Russia of 1905, and, as the leader of the Bolshevik Party, applied in this era and on a much higher level, the revolutionary experiences of the Paris Commune. In 1908, less than three years after the 1905 revolution, Lenin, speaking in Geneva on the anniversary of the Commune, not only hailed the magnificent achievements of the Commune, but explained its shortcomings. He then said:

"But two errors robbed the brilliant victory of its fruit. The proletariat stopped half way: instead of proceeding with the 'expropriation of the expropriators', it was carried away by dreams of establishing supreme justice in the country, based on the common national task. For instance, institutions such as the bank were not seized; the theory of the Proudhonists re 'equitable exchange', etc., still held sway. The second error was unnecessary magnanimity of the proletariat; instead of annihilating its enemies it endeavored to exercise moral influence upon them; it did not attach the right value to purely military activity in civil war, and instead of crowning its victory in Paris by a determined advance on Versailles (whence the Thiers, Favre government had fled), it hesitated and gave time to the Versailles government to gather its dark forces and prepare for the bloody May week."

How correct Lenin was in making the question of the proletarian dictatorship the central point of his strategy and tactics is seen in his matchless leadership of the Bolshevik Party at the head of the proletarian revolution of October, 1917. Then, on the basis of that world-shaking achievement, new lessons were drawn which, placed at the disposal of the world revolutionary movement, have raised it to an incomparably higher level.

Such a pamphlet as the compilation of Lenin's writings and speeches on the Commune is of special significance today when there are gathering together all the elements of a world revolutionary crisis; when the concrete

question of the proletarian dictatorship is on the order of the day in a number of countries.

In the light of the Marxist-Leninist teachings on the Commune it is possible to gauge somewhat the contemptible infamy and the vile treachery of the social-democratic leaders who have paved the way for fascism; especially do these lessons apply with telling effect to the events in Austria where the toiling masses, deserted by their social-democratic leaders, defended themselves with arms in hand against the organized butchery of the Dollfuss fascist regime. Compare, for example, the invincible revolutionary leadership of Lenin in the period from 1905 to 1917 and the first years of the Bolshevik triumph, and the irreconcilable fight to wipe out the remnants of the old ruling class carried out by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union under the leadership of the best disciple of Lenin, Comrade Stalin, with the immeasurable infamy of Otto Bauer, the leader of the "Austro-Marxists". When it was apparent that great class battles were approaching in Austria, the leaders of the social-democracy, instead of preparing the masses for struggle, aided the Dollfuss regime in its attempts to disarm the workers and sanctioned by inaction the arming of the very scum, the offscourings of all classes, for the organized massacres of working men, women, and children. How much Marxism there is in the Austrian "school" can be gauged by the words of Bauer. In his first public statement after he fled to Czechoslovakia the leader of the social-democratic bureaucracy of Austria said:

"But the important things I have to tell you are those concerning events in Austria since the date of the Hitler triumph in Germany. Since that date our party has made the very greatest efforts to come to an agreement with the government."

The balance of the interview is a long recital of how the social-democratic leaders groveled before Dollfuss, continually reiterating promises to do all in their power to render the working class helpless. Their policy was, not to prepare to smash the capitalist state, but to render the working class helpless before the violence of organized capitalist frightfulness and, like their cohorts in Germany and elsewhere, pave the way for fascist tyranny.

This pamphlet of Lenin can be used to forge powerful weapons for the working class against the treachery of the social-democratic leadership and against the capitalist class whom they serve. Every Communist, every class-conscious worker, should be familiar with the lessons of the Commune and their application by Lenin to the central problem of today which is, the dictatorship of the proletariat versus the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

March Marks the Fifteenth Anniversary
of the
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

*The program and policies of the Communist International
are contained in the following pamphlets which
every worker should read:*

- PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL**
Together with Constitution and Statutes **.10**
- THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR
AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS**
Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the
Communist International **.10**
- THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT IN THE
COLONIES**
Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the
Communist International **.10**
- THE TWENTY-ONE CONDITIONS OF ADMIS-
SION TO THE COMMUNIST INTERNA-
TIONAL—By O. Piatnitsky10**



On the SEVENTEENTH PARTY CONGRESS—Read:

STALIN REPORTS

**The World Situation—The Internal and
International Situation of the
Soviet Union**

**Report on the Work of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the
SEVENTEENTH PARTY CONGRESS**

96 pages

Price 10c



Order from:

Workers Library Publishers

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th St.), New York City

READ

SPREAD

THESE PAMPHLETS

- WHY COMMUNISM?—Plain Talks on Vital Problems.**
By M. J. Olgin (*Also available in Spanish and Italian languages*) 10c
- WHY THE WORKERS UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL—How It Can Be Won—**By I. Amter 2c
- EQUALITY, LAND AND FREEDOM—A Program for Negro Liberation** 5c
- FARMERS UNITE THEIR FIGHT—Report of Farmers' Second National Conference** 15c
- SOCIAL DEMOCRACY—STEPPING STONE TO FASCISM—Or Otto Bauer's Latest Discovery—**By D. Z. Manuisky 5c
- DIMITROFF ACCUSES—Concluding Speech at the Leipzig Trial** 3c
- THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY LIVES AND FIGHTS—Banned Literature Distributed Under the Hitler Terror** 5c
- WHAT EVERY WORKER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT THE N.R.A.—**By Earl Browder 2c
(*In the Spanish and Italian Languages, 5c*)
- 70,000 SILK WORKERS STRIKE FOR BREAD AND UNITY,** By John J. Ballam 10c
- BEHIND THE SCENES** of the 53rd Annual Convention of the A. F. of L. 5c
- THE SOVIET UNION—YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED—**By Margaret Cowl 3c

Order from

Workers Library Publishers

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th St.), New York City