

THE statements to which Comrade Losovsky refers were published in the "Sunday Worker," organ of the left wing in the British trade unions, in its issue of June 13. In his article he includes Ben Tillett among the signers of the statement but Tillett's name does not appear in that issue of the "Sunday Worker" in connection with the statement.

We publish in connection with Comrade Losovsky's article, the editorial comment of the "Sunday Worker" published in the same issue in which the statement in question appeared.

EACH and all of us carefully followed up the development of the great British strike, and it is with the greatest interest that we are now watching the miners fight from day to day. The big strike and its little leaders will long serve as an object for study for the workers everywhere who will learn from their example how not to conduct a strike. What is most valuable for anyone interested in the fate of the international labor movement is the evidence of those who participated in the strike and particularly of the members of the general council which brought such a splendid strike to such a shameful close. The statement issued by the general council members after the strike should explain to every worker how this happened; that is the main thing agitating each and every one of us.

That is why particular interest attaches to what the three left general council members, Swales, George Hicks and Ben Tillett, wrote to "Comrades, national and international" in Lansbury's Weekly.

AS one reads interest changes to indignation and that is the feeling the reader takes away. That is because when you take up this statement of theirs you look for one thing and find another; you look for the living word of eye-witnesses, the truth about what happened, and find—well, this wonderful document had best be left to speak for itself:

"The general strike has ended, having served the purpose of urgent and necessary defense. It was the first great effort to command a mighty movement of sympathy towards one section of the community who, up to the expression of national resentment, labored under conditions in the mines of absolute penury. Scores of thousands of men working a whole week were forced to obtain parish relief.

THE government and their satellites met our gesture of comradeship with an armed force: naval, military, police and volunteer; commanded the most lethal modern weapons of warfare and organized from Land's End to John o' Croats for the purposes of repression—and massacre if opportunity presented. To that the British trade union movement met a determined refusal of labor which not merely arrested the organic trades but paralyzed all industry from Land's End to John o' Croats. The government and the employers, even after our courageous gesture of peace, have with wiliness and chicanery endeavored to misrepresent the logical meaning of our act as being one of surrender. How meanly false this cowardly travesty of the truth is will be obvious in a few weeks, if not in a few days.

THE distinct lessons arising out of the dispute are:

"Firstly, a demonstration of power and comradeship greater than has ever been manifested in our British trade union movement.

"Secondly, it showed the economic grip of the workers upon all industries, and whatever may be said or done by the volunteer blacklegs from university or slum, it demonstrated the power that the trade union movement commands over industrial resources.

"Thirdly, we closed a virulent and vehement capitalist press and arrested its circulation of poisonous lies and misrepresentations which

only capitalist organs appear to be capable of.

"Finally, it brought together every class of wage-worker in one common bond of sympathy. It aroused internationally every worker on the continents of Europe and America and our own colonies. It brought forth from the Russian trade union movement a spontaneous gesture of goodwill.

"And if, during the last few days, voices could be heard in our own ranks recognizing as a "wrongful act" the beautiful and magnificent

wanting. It is true that the strike was a great "demonstration of power"; it is wrong to say however that it "served the purpose of urgent and necessary defense." It is correct that the "government and their satellites met the workers gesture of comradeship with an armed force"; correct, too, that the "strike showed the economic grip of the workers upon all industries"; correct, further, that they "closed a virulent lying capitalist press"; but it is wrong to depict the calling off of the strike as a "courageous gesture of peace."

It is still more incorrect, too, to charge the government and the employers with showing willingness in "endeavoring to misrepresent the logical (!) meaning of our act (i.e. the capitulation) as being one of surrender." Does that mean that the general council did not capitulate? Are we to take it that it concluded an "honorable peace"? Odd that nobody has noticed their honorable peace as yet! All three of them protest against the "cowardly travesty of the truth." In this question the "cowardly travesty" lies hot with the government and the employers, but at the door of those who wanted by hook or crook to represent what was a defeat as a victory.

It is true further that the strike "brought forth from the Russian trade union movement a spontaneous gesture of goodwill," but it is wrong to leave it at that and say nothing, not a single word, about the way that fraternal gesture of goodwill came to naught because of the "courageous gesture of peace" the general council made. Isn't it strange that even on this question these three could not find the courage to call a spade a spade?

I think we can stop at these examples; they reveal the true character of their statement in which there follows behind each plain and generally admitted truth a series of wrong, false and apologetic averments.

BUT this declaration is interesting not only because of what is said therein but mainly and primarily because of what has been left unsaid.

A few days after this great strike, when the results of the capitulation had been ascertained, the authors of that same capitulation forget to tell how "a demonstration of power" was transformed into the greatest demonstration of impotency ever seen. They forget to tell us who, and why, brot the whole thing to debacle. More: they even try to defend this incredible capitulation by qualifying as "a courageous (!) gesture of peace" what the English worker calls treachery and cowardice. Again, the miners are still out; are they in the right or not? Should they identify themselves with the general council's "courageous gesture of peace" or continue the struggle? Should the miners be supported or not? How it is possible at a time when a million workers are out on strike for such a question to be passed over in silence?

PRECISELY by doing that, this statement addressed to all and

sundry whitewashes the shameful action of the general council in the strike. It directs and focuses the minds of the workers on what is a false road; with fine-sounding phrases it patches over the crassest treachery and cowardliness; it justifies a crime committed against the working class of Great Britain.

We are not so greatly interested in what these three general council members wanted to say, but what they printed cannot fail to call forth deep indignation in every honest worker. The "Sunday Worker" is wrong, a thousand times wrong, when it acclaims and welcomes this statement issued by Swales, Hicks and Tillett. Declarations like this can only discredit those signing them. What the British and the international proletariat needs is not self-illusions or hectic declarations of this sort, but the naked, the unadorned, the outspoken truth.

Executive Committee of the Red International of Labor Unions in Whose Name Lozovsky Speaks in This Article



1) A. Lozovsky, secretary; 2) Monmoseau (France); 3) Jim Larkin (Ireland); 4) Jovani Jermanetto (Italy); 5) Dimitrov (Bulgaria); 6) Andre Nin (Spain); 7) William Z. Foster (U. S.); 8) Pollitt (England); 9) Van Go-Po (China).

action of the whole of the working class of Great Britain, do not be deceived by it. It is but a sign of weakness in some of our people against which we must all fight and which we must overcome.

"Without wishing to minimize the meaning of words (!), the stupid insistence of the employers to force an admission of wrongful acts was more a sign of their weakness (?) than of ours. Our own comrades and our own membership will neither be bullied nor sidetracked from their purpose. The employers must realize the workers' camaraderie. It is up to them not to challenge that in the future by their own capitalist wrongful acts, because we feel assured that our class, having demonstrated its oneness, will again prove a national and international oneness and courage in aim and in purpose. The capitalists must realize that the right to live and the right to greater citizenship are rights above any pettyfogging law." (Emphasis ours.)

THE first question that naturally arises after carefully reading this statement is: What is it for, who on earth needs this sort of declarations? What were these three general council members aiming at when they issued this statement? An analysis of their statement will provide the answer.

In the statement there are true statements and statements that are plainly wrong, but the main thing is

American "Democracy" in Action

By C. E. Ruthenberg, General Sec'y, Workers (Communist) Party



The Workers Party will not foster the illusion, as is done by the yellow Socialists and Reformists that the workers can achieve their emancipation from the oppression and exploitation of capitalism thru the election of a majority of the members of the legislative bodies of the capitalist government and the executive officials of that government, and by using the existing government to establish the new social order.

The Constitution of the United States was so drafted as to protect the interests of the exploiters of the workers. The merchants, the bankers, the land-owners of 1787 wrote into the Constitution provisions which they hoped would forever protect the interests of their class.

A majority of the people of the United States cannot change the Constitution. The vote of two-thirds of the members of the legislators of three-fourths of the states is required to pass a constitutional amendment. One-fourth of the states, in which there may live only

chised in this country through naturalization laws. Hundreds of thousands of citizens cannot vote because of residential qualifications, which through the necessity of earning a living make it impossible for them to comply with.

The capitalists control thousands of newspapers thru which they shape the ideas of the masses in their interests; they control the schools, the colleges, the pulpits, the moving-picture theatres, all of which are part of the machinery through which the capitalists shape the minds of the workers.

When it serves their purpose the capitalists do not hesitate to expell members of the legislative bodies elected by working class votes. This was done in the case of the Socialist members of the Cleveland City Council and a member of the School Board of that city. These representatives, elected by the workers, were expelled in violation of all law to stifle their protests against the imperialist war. The expulsion of the Socialist assemblymen of New York state is a case of similar character.

Under these conditions to talk of "democracy" is to throw sand into the eyes of the workers. The much-talked of "American Democracy" is a fraud. Such formal democracy as is written into the Constitution and the laws of

candidates, when elected to office, will use the forums of the legislative bodies for the same purpose.

—From the Program of the Workers (Communist) Party.

THE celebration of the Sesqui-centennial of the American Revolution will be signal for hundreds of speeches in which the achievements of the "fathers" in establishing our "great democracy" will be emphasized. The ruling capitalist class will take full advantage of the occasion to once more spread its propaganda that the Revolution resulted in a government "of the people, for the people and by the people."

In all these poems of praise of our "great government," the counter-revolution of 1787 will be forgotten.

The "embattled farmers" of 1776 together with the artisans from the cities who were the backbone of the revolutionary army undoubtedly were inspired with the ideal of setting up a democratic government. They had been driven to rebellion by unbearable economic conditions. They saw in independence from Great Britain and a democratic government, their road to freedom from these unbearable conditions. They fought and won the American Revolution.

With them, fought the Southern planters, the landowners, the bankers and the merchants of the colonies who found their economic interests in conflict with those of the ruling class of Great Britain.

centennial, history is being written which proves the characterization of that democracy as a "fraud" which appears in the program of the Workers (Communist) Party.

Also the capitalist class is united in its struggle against the exploited workers and farmers it frequently has fallen out between different groups within the capitalist class itself. Then we are often treated to the truth about American democracy.

There has been such a falling out on the World Court issue between the interests who are primarily concerned with international loans and investments and those whose interests are in American industry. The prohibition issue also divides the capitalist class in two groups.

As a consequence, we have the primary contest for the Republican nomination in Pennsylvania, and in Illinois, and the exposure of the real character of "American Democracy."

Can anyone read the story of corruption and bribery in which over \$3,000,000 was spent in order to decide the question which capitalist candidate for the nomination for senator on the Republican ticket in Pennsylvania should win and have any further illusions about the boasted "American Democracy." Can anyone read the story of the struggle of money bags in the state of Illinois, in which great sums were expended to decide a similar issue and not know

June Twenty-Fifth

In this issue we print articles by George Hicks and Purcell. We regret very much, for their own sakes, that they confine themselves to speaking of the " unsuspected weaknesses" and "many casualties" revealed by the general strike, without making clear that the weakness was not among the workers but in the General Council.

We regret it because the workers are going to punish the leaders who let them down, and Hicks and Purcell have not said a word so far to show that in the treachery of May 12 they are not in a united front with J. H. Thomas.

Perhaps Hicks and Purcell are preparing to show by deeds what they don't like saying in words.

Well, there is an opportunity still, before June 25, when the Conference of Trade Union Executives assembles. Purcell says: "The class war still goes on." Hicks says: "The conditions that made the general strike . . . still exist." Quite true: a million miners are still locked out. Their wives and children still want bread. And, while German, Butch, and French transport workers are waiting on Britain, British railwaymen and dockers are still handling scab coal. (Indeed, Cook tells us that the N. U. R. and A. S. L. E. F. leaders have actually informed the government of their "willingness"!)

Here is your chance. Cook has appealed to all "Trade Unionists to enforce an embargo upon all coal."

The transport workers and railwaymen behind the miners, and the whole trade union movement behind them all: that is the way to win, it is the way the workers are going, and a fight for these slogans, in speeches, articles, and in committee, is the least they expect of leaders!

—Sunday Worker, June 13.