

On Saturday October 11th a conference of young needle trades workers was held in New York by the Youth Section of the N. T. W. I. U. The latter, after having carried on no real activity since its organization, suddenly decided to organize the mass of needle trades youth. This was to be one of the accomplishments of the Y. C. L. leadership under its "shock plan."

Preparation for such an affair is of utmost importance. Since no previous work had been carried on among the youth, because of the general weakness of the N. T. W. I. U.; the fact that the mass of the youth in the industry have never been in any union; these are some of the conditions which necessitate well organized, persistent, conscientious preparatory activity. However the "shock plan" had (!) to be carried out; another "youth conference" had to be added to the record; an almost countless number of conferences of young workers in the various industries were to be held before September 30.

The Needle Trade Youth Conference was therefore originally called for September 21. Two or three afternoon open air meetings were held, a leaflet or two issued, the Shop Delegates Council of the N. T. W. I. U. was notified and preparations were completed! But when the hour for the opening of the Conference arrived, even the official leadership could not go through with it. The handful of delegates who assembled were told that the Conference had been postponed until October 11.

However, very little additional agitation had been carried on. A few more afternoon meetings were held, a notice now and then in the *Daily Worker* and little more. At an open air meeting held a day before the Conference in front of the International Tailoring Corporation, at Fourth Ave., and Twelve Street, no leaflets were issued; the youth speakers did not even know the hour that the Conference was to be held. This in spite of the fact that the head of the National Youth Dept. of the N. T. W. I. U. was present! An otherwise good meeting ended with no organizational results. We do not know whether this is a typical case, but the showing at the October 11th Conference seems to indicate as much.

Of the fifty or so delegates present, the overwhelming majority were from Left wing controlled shops or were previous members of the Union. An insignificant handful were new delegates from completely unorganized places, or obtained during the campaign (?) for the Conference. There were apparently no representatives of large shops.

Called for 2:30, the Conference opened after 4. Most of the time was taken up with talk. Not the kind which would make the delegates feel that they were running the Conference, deciding on policies, etc., but on the contrary, orders were given, telling what should be done, how to do it, how not to function. This was followed by the chairman asking the young workers present to join in the discussion. The

delegates were naturally reluctant. Several of the more experienced rank and filers spoke.

The tone of the reports and comments by the so-called leaders of the Conference was: the youth should be in the leadership of the movement; the young needle workers are the most militant section in the industry; the Youth Dept. of the N. T. W. I. U. is making great efforts to win over the youth; the young workers will be especially needed in the front ranks of the coming dress strike.

The fact that the youth is the most militant, the most active section of the industry has much truth in it, but whether it should lead the struggle is highly questionable. Especially in a class-struggle union, it should be the most experienced, the most theoretically advanced who should lead. And this is usually found among the adults rather than the youth.

Then the time came for a report and discussion on the Program (the draft of which was distributed to the delegates) the chairman was notified by the janitor that the room had to be vacated—the rental time had already expired. The Program Committee report took up a few minutes: It suggested that the Draft be accepted subject to minor changes to be made by the incoming Executive. With no discussion, the report was accepted including a "Plan of Action," (where have we heard this before?) The latter consisted of eight tasks such as the establishment of a functioning Youth Committee of the Union, and a Youth Delegates' Council; the organization of four functioning youth sections of buildings in various crafts of the industry; formation of four shop committees in large places employing young workers by December 15; establishment of training school; support of clothing workers' sports club; of *Needle Worker*; founding of a bi-weekly Youth Bulletin by Nov. 15th, etc. In a word a general plan, which is not very difficult to put on paper, but even if good, required correct strategic and tactical policies to put in practice as well as correct leadership.

After the acceptance of the Program, several of the delegates pledged specific sums of money for the coming dress strike. Motions suddenly came from the floor on Greetings to Minor, then one to Foster, Amter, Raymond; suddenly some one rebuked the Conference for forgetting Harry Eisman the young Pioneer serving at Hawthorne.

A motion was then carried endorsing the Communist Party in the election campaign. The next and final point was the election of a Youth Executive. The main business of the conference squeezed into about ten minutes; the delegates listened; the "leader laid down the line." No genuine steps forward had been taken by the Conference.—J. F.

(The next issue of the *Young Vanguard* will carry a criticism of the Program and the Plan of Action accepted at the Conference).

On the New Farmer-Labor Party Proposal

Continued from page 3

class party people from Montant, A. C. Miller who still sees nothing wrong with running in the Republican Party primaries—and the Left Opposition? It is not difficult to decide.

We would go there only in order to tell them that we shall have nothing to do with their movement—and for no other conceivable purpose. Whom would our agitation and point of view concert in this quiet, confidential conference? Workers, or their rank and file representatives? They will not be present. Or do we expect to convert to a Marxian position the Lovestoneites who seek to liquidate the Communist movement, who feel like fish in water when they are toying with "mass" petty bourgeois movements? Or the Finnish leaders who knowing better, raised their hands to the skies in the Party to expel us, and only broke with the Party when the latter's leaders—under pressure of the Left sentiment in the Party—began in their characteristically clumsy, stupid and ineffectual manner, to deal with the opportunist corrosion eating into the vitals of the Finnish Communist movement in the Northwest. Let the Finnish business men seeking political cover for their opportunism and the corrupt adventurers in the Lovestone camp who are violating every Communist principle once respected in the movement—go their way. We will build seriously and substantially on the founda-

tion of the class struggle.

4. It is asked: What role have we to play in this "movement"? That was the question put by the great strategists of the Pepper-Lovestone-Bedacht school in relation to the LaFollette movement. Only with the aid of the Comintern, at that time under the direct pressure of the Russian Opposition, was the correct answer given. We can give the same reply now. Our role is to disclose the character of this movement publicly to the workers, to reveal its adventurist and opportunist nature to fight intransigently against its deceptions. If Pepperism in 1924 was a tragedy, this pitiful caricature of 1930 will undoubtedly be and is, a farce. We want nothing to do with it.

Our moment, which arose and is developing in the merciless struggle against the revisionism of Marxism in the revolution and its twin adventurism, against all varieties of fakery, exaggeration, of inflated, boosted and "promoted" movements which collapse of their own emptiness can only gain from adopting such an attitude. We are confident that our Minneapolis comrades will concur in our point of view which is dedicated solely by concern over the interests and future not only of our group in particular but the working class movement as a whole.

National Committee
Communist League of America (Opposition)
Per Max Shachtman

Brazil is the fourth South American country to overthrow the government in the course of the last three months.

In Bolivia and Peru, with the sympathy of the great masses, the liberal bourgeoisie staged triumphant movements, and supported by British imperialism managed to defeat the feudal elements which for years, while in power, had worked hand in hand with Wall Street financial interests.

In Argentina the pro-British government of Hipolito Irigoyen was turned out by a military coup of the big bourgeoisie supported by American imperialism. A virtual reign of terror was then instituted against the proletarian organizations. The Communist and anarchist press has been suppressed and several anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist leaders have been executed.

The Brazilian revolt, however, is in reality a much more complex affair than either of the other three countries mentioned. Brazil is in area the largest country in the Western Hemisphere and has a population of 39 million, concentrated principally in different parts of the east and the south. Throughout this immense area the industries and agricultural products are quite diversified and the local governments which have a surprisingly great amount of local autonomy, even to the point of having their own armies) represent generally speaking the respective interests of the local exploiters. The principal crop in the country is coffee, with rubber as an important second and cacao, livestock, grain, mining, etc., also quite important in their respective regions.

The deposed Brazilian government was above all a representative of the coffee interests as was quite natural with coffee as the outstanding commercial product. Brazil produces the bulk of the world's coffee. During the period of crisis which, especially inasmuch as coffee is concerned, has been very long, the government of Washington Luiz has attempted all sorts of schemes to protect, by artificial means, the interests of coffee growers. First came the valorization plan by which the surplus product was stored to force a rise in prices on the market. After the failure of this scheme, loans were secured in BOTH Great Britain and the United States for the protection of these coffee raisers and to relieve the crisis in the industry. The liberal bourgeoisie whose interests conflict violently with those of the semi-feudal coffee producers protested energetically against these extensive foreign loans which benefited the coffee industries alone.

The recent rebellion was brought about by a combination of all the opposition forces, especially those of the petty bourgeoisie, and representing generally the interests of most of the secondary industries of the country. Counting on a wide mass support, which was natural as a result of the years of dictatorial rule under the Washington Luiz regime, the rebellion was initiated by the action of several states and after some fighting was enabled within a few weeks to dominate the country. As the ship was sinking, the army, (whether acting for the coffee growers or not still remains to be seen) threw the president overboard and attempted a compromise with the rebels. The compromise being rejected, the army officers, glad to have saved their own brave hides, were obliged to cede to the demands of the new regime.

A False Analysis of the Situation

The Communist Party of Brazil, and in imitation of it, the American Party also, have continually painted the Washington Luiz government as being pro-British, picturing the interests of the semi-feudal coffee interests as identical with those of British imperialism. Although they quite correctly point out that British investments in Brazil are double those of the U. S., they fail to consider that the enormous majority of the Brazilian coffee crop is marketed in New York. This is an entirely false and over-simple analysis of the real case, as both imperialisms are deeply interested in Brazilian coffee, while the secondary industries are controlled some by one imperialism and some of the other. Inasmuch as the rubber industry is concerned, the Washington Luiz regime has shown decided favoritism to the Ford interests as against their British rivals.

Our comrades of the Leninist Left Opposition in Brazil, through their monthly organ *A Lucta de Classe* have demonstrated clearly the incorrectness of the official Party's analysis, and have further pointed

out that in Brazil, due to the complexities of the economic structure, with the existing diversification of products, each region having its staple, and a mutual though conflicting interest on part of both imperialisms as regards the most important product (coffee), it is impossible to say that either of the two leading imperialist powers actually supported, in the true sense of the word, either one of the two Brazilian parties. Both imperialisms made pacts and agreements with both groups as the particular situation required.

The action of the Wall Street government in rushing to the aid of the old Brazilian regime on the eve of its collapse, undoubtedly induced to lend its support in exchange for promises of future juicy concessions, demonstrates the falsity of the C. P.'s analysis and goes a long way towards confirming that of the Brazilian Left Opposition. Only acrobats can believe the analysis which declares, in the October 21 issue of the *Daily Worker*, that Wall Street, after having supported the rebellion, turned a triple somersault and flew to the aid of the regime that had already been fatally weakened through its own efforts. The Wall Street millionaire are shrewder politicians than certain of the *Daily Worker's* star reporters and are certainly not fools enough to do that.

The official press of the American Communist party has dealt very absurdly with the whole problem from the outset. Until the appearance of the aforementioned article the *Worker* and the other Party organs, shouted loudly that the rebellion was supported by Wall Street. The most ludicrous instance of bureaucratic stupidity of the really naive kind to be found in this already too-much-abused "Third Period" appeared in the *Freiheit* (Oct. 11, 1930), in an article informing us that a "Mass Communist Uprising Captures the Third Largest City in Brazil." Nothing was said in the *Daily Worker* concerning an event, which were it true, would have been of enormous revolutionary significance. In reality all that happened (we were forced to find out through the *New York Times*), was that during a street demonstration of workers in Bahia, several plate glass windows were smashed and a few street cars were overturned. (We will be called counter-revolutionists for saying this, as we are almost every other time that we tell the truth).

The Party Putsch

In Rio de Janeiro however, it seems that the party comrades, staged a melee, in an attempt to "capture power" . . . and were suppressed with numerous casualties, after a couple of hours by the troops and police. The *Daily Worker* commenting on this last isolated outbreak, which bears all the ear marks of a suicidal putsch, says in its issue of October 23, "The fight of the workers under the leadership of the Communist Party of Brazil shows the deep going radicalization of the masses and the fact that the workers and poor peasants are beginning to put forward their independent demands against their own bourgeoisie as well as against all imperialist forces."

The C. P. of Brazil has, unfortunately, already discredited itself before the masses because of its "anti-imperialist" adventures and its election fizzle with the "Workers and Peasants Block." It is incapable with its many opportunist and ultra-Left defects of leading the masses effectively in struggle.

Our small Left Opposition group in Brazil has already in its ranks a number of serious revolutionary fighters expelled from the Party for their consistent struggle against the opportunism of the leadership. The Bolshevik-Leninists of Brazil have before them the task of rallying about themselves the best proletarian elements of the Party in order to reconstitute and build the Brazilian Communist movement, for the organization of the working class and the struggle for Communism in Brazil.

R. BLACKWELL,

If the number on your wrapper is

57

then your subscription to the *Militant* has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.