

Unemployment in Minneapolis

MINNEAPOLIS—

Twelve thousand people jammed the Minneapolis Municipal Auditorium and five thousand more were turned away from the monster unemployment protest meeting called April 23rd by the Organization and Education Committee of the Central Labor Union.

Unemployment Severe

This turnout proves positively the deepening inroads unemployment has made into the lives of Minneapolis workers and demonstrates how they will respond to a crisis in industry. The railroads are putting into effect a 15% reduction in payroll. The building trades see no great pickup in spring building. Layoff, speedup, and wage-cuts are the order of the day. Only the Ford plant seems to be running full blast with 3,300 men, but they also are planning a short season. All conditions were excellent for a packed meeting. The Auditorium was donated by the City Council. Floyd B. Olson, the Farmer-Labor Candidate for governor was the big drawing card. Walter Frank, R. D. Cramer and other labor officials scheduled to speak, Eddie Dunsteter, the theatre organist, and the Kiddie Review, to amuse the crowd.

The stage was set. Amplifiers broadcasted the speeches to every corner of the building. Thousands roamed the corridors trying to sneak in against the Fire Marshall's orders. Yet with all these favorable circumstances the meeting lacked spirit. The speakers quibbled and hedged with the main problems...the chain store boom was stressed...buy union label card goods and solve unemployment...vote for Floyd B. Olson for governor: Labor's friend. Walter Frank's attempt at a real analysis was weak and lacked any concrete proposals for the solution of unemployment, which the workers could profit from.

It is not surprising that over one half the audience dribbled out before the main speaker got the floor. The reason was obvious: No program was laid down to combat and abolish unemployment. Workers know and no spellbinders can convince them otherwise, that the union label hocus-pocus is no solution for unemployment or any other big problem of the labor movement. Frank's vague reference to an "industrial and political democracy" which he somehow picked up in his brief stay in the Communist movement is a cheap "socialist" fig-leaf concealing his seat on the Olson band-wagon.

Cramer Has Ross Pinched

And behind the scenes what do we find? We find a connivance with the police to prevent a real message getting to the workers. The only piece of literature on unemployment distributed at that meeting was put out by the Communist League. R. E. Cramer, editor of the Labor Review, who apparently has influence at police headquarters ordered the literature banned. The cops led us a merry chase and finally arrested Joe Ross who is a member of Cramer's own local, and well known for his activity in the Brooks Parlor Furniture strike. Cramer claims that these leaflets were likely to disrupt the meeting. This proves Cramer's lack of faith and hypocritical disbelief in his own program—or lack of it. Eight thousand of the leaflets were distributed.

It should be noted that the Communist Party in line with its latest tactics "boycotted" this mass meeting of workers as "social-fascist" and went off to talk to itself on Bridge Square about the Communist duty to go to the masses.

The success and fine spirit of the May Day meeting held by the Communist League proved the correctness of our program of working among the masses of workers.

The May Day parade, what it lacked in numbers, made up in spirit and the "Trotskyites" contributed most of the spirit. We introduced the singing of revolutionary songs on the line of march.

The terms "counter-revolutionary" and "renegade" which so sneeringly rolls off

AFTER YEN BAY

The Revolt in Indo-China

The "value" of colonization from the point of view of the economic development of colonized countries has already been stressed. The lovers of hasty conclusions will exclaim: "But then we cannot understand why you fight colonization?" It is to forestall this objection, as simple as it is stupid, that we have added: "Eorn of the brutal fact of conquest and not of the normal process of evolution, the industrial revolution brought about by colonization is thoroughly artificial."

It is now a question of drawing the most important consequences from this observation.

It is obvious that without this political conquest by the European, American and Japanese imperialisms, the present colonies would, as a result of a vital necessity of economic evolution, have entered the path of rational production, of machinism, anyway.

On the other hand, colonial experience gives us an example of a country whose rhythm of development is manifestly retarded by this political domination itself: India. There, the "presence of the alien" has enabled Gandhi to build up and spread his ultra-reactionary theory of non-violence and non-cooperation based on a sentimental reaction against the machine, the devil of the Occident, a reaction which unfortunately keeps the Indian masses, for quite a time too long, alas!, closer to political mysticism than to even a superficial examination of the concrete conditions of the anti-imperialist struggle.

Forty years of military penetration to establish a political domination, which represents a considerable loss of energies which could have made marvels (bourgeois, of course) in the economic and scientific domain and which were wasted in the guerrilla fighting, the conspiracies and struggles of interest between the ruling dynasty and foreign imperialism. And then, when about 1900, the French bourgeoisie began its economic penetration into Indo-China, it was the era of organized waste, for example, works of a million which cost ten times as much in the budget, the friends of the governors pocketing the surplus.

Moreover, the native agrarian bourgeoisie, in conflict with the French industrialists from the very beginning—the latter having at its disposal a powerful military and political force, and still having the memories of the recent civil wars, removed its opponent from the industrial and commercial field.

This struggle for the strengthening of the political power of imperialism, for the "legalization" of an illegal act, the conquest, contributed largely to retard the development of the new economy which the French bourgeoisie wanted as a monopoly, especially at the beginning of its industrial life where the narrowness of its economic field and the little emphasized character of the division of labor did not economically cement the two bourgeoisies.

This is how the difference between French Indo-China, colonized country, and Siam, once vassal of Indo-China, can be established from the economic point of view. The latter, on an area of 630,000 square kilometers, that is, 170,00 sq. km. less than Indo-China, and with a third of its population, has a railroad line 150 percent as developed as Indo-China's (Siam: 2,900 km. Indo-China: 1924 km.)

Thus the native bourgeoisie (we mean the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and not the feudal) born of an artificial clash, is basically incapable of properly fulfilling its historical role.

Smitten with congenital impotence,

..... the tongues of Party bureaucrats these days ring rather hollow and stir resentment in the hearts of non-Party workers, who on revolutionary holidays like May 1st want to see unity of Communist forces before the masters. —CARL COWL

"placed between two fires", it has never been and never will be able to live its independent life. History has inscribed its oscillations now towards the imperialist bourgeoisie (French) without this bourgeoisie, at least till the latest times, uniting or allying itself with one or the other of the two Indo-Chinese social poles.

After many gropings, the Indo-Chinese bourgeoisie is falling pitifully into the only political formula that fits it: Franco-Annamite collaboration based on a vague equality, upon justice and courtesy (!) in reality, upon the unequal sharing, but still sharing, of Indo-China and the surplus values extracted from the forced labor of the Indo-Chinese masses.

Contrary to other bourgeoisies supported more or less by deceived masses, the Annamite bourgeoisie has entered upon the political scene without having first been able to rally any part of the masses. This explains the brutal, "inelegant" manner with which the French government, conscious of this fact, treats it. Twice the most authorized representatives of France, importuned by the demand of our elected bourgeoisies, have told them flatly: "You represent nothing at all."

After this declaration that the native bourgeoisie, artificially born, is incapable of any revolt, we now hear Doriot propound his colonial theory. "Bourgeois democratic revolution first," he recently said in the Civil Engineers Hall of rue Blanche. There immediately unfolds before my eyes with blinding clearness the horrible scenes of torture in China at the time of the Chiang Kai-Shek-Stalin "revolutionary" experiment.

Cannot Doriot understand that the native bourgeoisie, suffering from congenital impotence, will not embark on a democratic revolution, but will align themselves on the side of imperialism?

And besides, there exists a world situation within which Indo-China is included. Capitalism extends to the farthest corners of Asia. The world, despite the fact that politically it is still composed of many nations, tends to form an economic whole. In addition, democracy is sufficiently exposed so that there can no longer be any place for a democratic revolution.

Bourgeois revolution or proletarian socialist revolution no other issue.

But if one can distinguish the real from the formal, it can be said that in reality the world bourgeois revolution parallels capitalist expansion itself in all its forms.

There remains now the proletarian socialist revolution. Of course, that will not be achieved at one blow. There is a complicated process, that is, stages which we can fix only after having thrown light on the situation created by the artificial blow of colonization upon the peasantry and the proletariat, and after having explained the manner of conceiving relations between these two classes, as well as the role of the intellectual revolutionaries. There is also the uneven development of capitalism. This means that the actual revolutionary struggle cannot be limited to generalizations, to theories concocted in the ante-

The Inconsistency of the S. L. P.

KANSAS CITY—

It is amusing how the Socialist Labor Party decries revolutionary action on the part of the workers; and, at the same time, pretends to defend the Soviet Union which was established by revolution. I quote from three separate paragraphs of a pamphlet entitled "Americanism" issued by the S.L.P.:

"It is self-evident that it is the Proletarian Revolution in Russia which has aroused the capitalist class of this country to realization and action. All means are good to a desperate ruling class, as long as the hope is held out of prolongation of power. (Referring to direct action propagandists.) When it is not possible to soften the worker's brain by cajolery, or gouge it out by jingoism, then by all means let it be beaten out by policemen's clubs or shot out by Winchester rifles."

The author of the pamphlet did not consider the fact that the Revolution in Russia would never have been brought about had not the workers of that country dared to face clubs and rifles. Had S.L.P. tactics been followed in Russia, the nation would still have been prostrate under the iron heel of the Romanoffs.

The inconsistency of the S. L. P. is further shown by the fact that its official organ, the Weekly People, has, at the same time, been publishing a biography of Lenin and ridiculing Communists as "comesocists". A Communist alive is, according to S. L. P. reasoning, a hair-brained fanatic, while one dead is a great proletarian hero.

We wonder if both the purveyors of capitalistic and Menshevik bromides are not attempting to soften the brains of the workers by cajolery. One teaches them to acquiesce in robbery; the other fails to teach him the correct tactics wherewith to eliminate the robber. In the present crucial moment, when class lines are being drawn firmly and sharply, when the workers are struggling for emancipation, the S. L. P. continues to sit on the fence and make asinine quips at those who are genuinely laboring to overthrow capitalism.

In the very words of the S. L. P., "all means are good to a desperate ruling power." If they ever examined history, the S. L. P. writers would be forced to observe that no ruling class has ever succumbed without a struggle. The capitalist class is no exception to the rule as its past record and present conduct show.

—HAROLD PREECE

..... room of the international bureau. Step by step, we must follow the dynamic relations of the united forces, the temporary harmony among them, strengthened or destroyed by the later developments of the struggle. We can nevertheless say one thing. The revolutionary party which will succeed is that which, while maintaining an ideological intransigence and fighting the opportunist concessions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution type, will know how, in the field of action, to pass over the "revolutionary compromises" with the temporary allies and to provoke splits within the heterogeneous camp of the enemy.

—AN INDOCHINESE COMMUNIST

SINCE LENIN DIED

By Max Eastman

The book that first told the inside story of the struggle between the Opposition and the bureaucracy in the Communist Party in Russia. The details of how the conspiracy was hatched against Leon Trotsky by Stalin, Zinoviev, Bucharin and others, was recounted originally in this excellent volume. It is invaluable for an understanding of present day events in Russian and the world Communist movement.

158 pages

Cloth bound: \$1.00

Paper: 60 cents

Send All Orders to

The Militant 25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y.