This slogan is a rejection of revolutionary Marxism:

"He who expects the realisation of Socialism without the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a Socialist. Dictatorship is State power directly based on violence. Violence in the epoch of the 20th century, as in general in the epoch of civilisation, is not a fist and not a knot, but an army. To speak in the programme of 'disarmament' is tantamount to saying in general: We are against the employment of arms. In this there also is not an atom of Marxism, just as if we would say: we are against the use of violence." (Vol. XIII, p. 450, Russian Edition.)

Thirdly, Bolshevism also sharply criticised the slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat". This pacificist slogan meant the rejection of the revolutionary struggle and was nothing but a paraphrasing of the "national defence" slogan.

"This is precisely dealing with the question from the government's (which according to the slogan must remain in their old positions, 'preserve their positions') point of view and not from the point of view of struggle of the oppressed classes against their governments. This is a justification of the Jingoism of all imperialist nations in which the bourgeoisie is always ready to say — and they do say to the people — that they are 'only fighting against defeat'. Our vote on August 4th was not for war but against defeat," said the opportunist leader, E. David in his book on the German Social Democracy, "The Okists*). Buvoyed and Trotsky are in full agreement with David if they advance the slogan 'neither victory nor defeat'."

(To be continued.)

IN THE COLONIES

The Indian Nationalist Press and the Anglo-Soviet Rupture.

By Luhani.

The raid on Arcos was given great publicity in the Indian newspapers. Though the Indian press receives its European news through the British Official Agency, Reuter, the majority of the Nationalist newspapers gave greater prominence to the Soviet point of view — as put forward in the statements of Rosengoltz — than to the British official versions.

The entire Nationalist press condemned the rupture as not being justified and as leading to a deliberate disturbance, on the part of Great Britain, of the peace of the world. The Right Nationalist papers, however, made their comments in a subdued tone, restricting themselves to an appreciation of the consequences of the Anglo-Soviet rupture in the domestic affairs of England and in the European arena. The official press of the Indian National Congress, more particularly the press representing the Congress Left wing, condemned the rupture in energetic language and sought to bring out the Asiatic implications of Anglo-Soviet political relations before and after the rupture.

"Forward", the official organ of the Indian National Congress, writes:

"The real quarrel between the British Government and the Soviet Republic lies in the serious conflict of their respective political, economic and social ideals. Britain is a capitalist State while the Soviet stands for Communism. The Soviet Government have destroyed the ramifications of the Lords and Commons and Russia (as opposed to Russia) is not a bitter hatred of the leading capitalist State in the world. This does not exhaust the casus belli. What seems to have frightened the British foreign office all the more is the Asiatic policy of the Soviet Government. The proximity of the Russian territory to the Indian frontier makes the Bolshevik Republic particularly hateful to the British imperialists."*

*) The "Okists" were followers of the Menshevik Org. Committee.

Concluding the article, "Forward" says:

"The systematic propaganda that has been going on for some time past to make Russia appear as a serious menace to the British Empire in India will easily lead the public to believe that Indian men and money will be utilised for teaching a lesson to Bolshevik Russia for her atrocious crime of initiating some of the coloured races of Asia into the secrets of self-determination... How very annoying this must be to our rulers?"

After the actual rupture had taken place, "Forward" says:

"The expected has come to pass. The two antagonistic forces, created by clash of ideals of the British Empire and the Union of Soviet Republics, have become into severe collision, leading to the derangement of the political equilibrium of Europe and Asia. Whether common hatred of Bolshevist Russia or the 'diabolical suspicion' of each other (among the Locarno Powers) which has always led to the reshuffling of political groups in Europe will assert itself, it is difficult to predict. Inductions, however, are not wanting to show that the Soviet Republic is not to be despised with impunity and that British imperialism may be disturbed when the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Union of Soviet Republics was officially announced".

Discussing the motives of the Conservative Government, "Forward" says:

"Their decision was possibly influenced more by consideration of the geographic position of Soviet Union than by the merits of the Communist doctrine. Obviously Russia is believed to be a serious factor to be reckoned with in the new orientation of British policy in the near and far East... Russia rubs shoulders almost with India. Can the British imperialists contemplate the situation with equanimity?"

The following conclusion of the present article of "Forward" is a more or less approximate interpretation of opinion in the Congress rank and file:

"The proximity of the Soviet Republic to India and the possibility of extension of Russian influence over Persia and Afghanistan in the Near East as well as over China in the Far East, are believed to be a far greater menace to British interests than the immediate loss of British markets. The Trade Union Bill and the break with Russia are complementary of each other, calculated to produce the same results, namely to cripple the British workers by depriving them of the active sympathy and support of the only emancipated body of workers in the world. It is a dishonest manoeuvre on the face of it and the intention outrage on the Soviet Embassy carried out by the British government both in London and Peking is aggravated by the blackest intentions that have impelled the Baldwin Government to embark on a ruthless policy of repression at home and gratuitous provocation abroad."
This slogan is a rejection of revolutionary Marxism:

"He who expects the realisation of Socialism without the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat is not a Socialist. Dictatorship is State power directly based on violence. Violence in the epoch of the 20th century, as in general in the epoch of civilisation, is not a fist and not a knout, but an army. To speak in the programme of 'disarmament' is tantamount to saying in general: We are against the employment of arms. In this also there is not an atom of Marxism, just as if we would say: we are against the use of violence." (Vol. XIII, p. 450, Russian Edition.)

Thirdly, Bolshevism also sharply criticised the slogan: "Neither victory nor defeat". This pacific slogan meant the rejection of the revolutionary struggle and was nothing but a paraphrasing of the "national defence" slogan.

"This is precisely dealing with the question from the government's (which according to the slogan must remain in their old positions, 'preserve their positions') point of view and not from the point of view of struggle of the oppressed classes against their governments. This is a justification of the jingoism of all imperialist nations in which the bourgeoisie is always ready to say — and they do say to the people — that they are 'only fighting against defeat'. Our vote on August 4th was not for war but against defeat," says the opportunist leader, L. David in his book on the German Social Democracy. The 'Okiss' of Bukroev and Trotsky are in full agreement with David if they advance the slogan 'neither victory nor defeat'.

(To be continued.)

IN THE COLONIES

The Indian Nationalist Press and the Anglo-Soviet Rupture.

By Luhan i

The raid on Arcos was given great publicity in the Indian newspapers. Though the Indian press receives its European news through the British Official Agency, Reuter, the majority of the Nationalist newspapers gave greater prominence to the Soviet point of view — as put forward in the statements of Rosengoltz — than to the British official versions.

The entire Nationalist press condemned the rupture as not being justified and as leading to a deliberate disturbance, on the part of Great Britain, of the peace of the world. The Right Nationalist papers, however, made their comments in a subdued tone, restricting themselves to an appreciation of the consequences of the Anglo-Soviet rupture in the domestic affairs of England and in the European arena. The official press of the Indian National Congress, more particularly the press representing the Congress Left wing, condemned the rupture in energetic language and sought to bring out the Asiatic implications of Anglo-Soviet political relations before and after the rupture.

"Forward", the official organ of the Indian National Congress, writes:

"The real quarrel between the British Government and the Soviet Republic lies in the serious conflict of their respective political, economic and social ideals. Britain is a capitalist State while the Soviet stands for Communism. The Soviet Government have destroyed the ramifications of the feudal lords in Russia, thus rousing the bitter hatred of the leading capitalist State in the world. This does not exhaust the casus belli. What seems to have frightened the British foreign office all the more is the Asiatic policy of the Soviet Government. The proximity of the Russian territory to the Indian frontier makes the Bolshevik Republic particularly hateful to the British imperialists."

*) The "Okiss" were followers of the Menshevik Org. Committee.

Concluding the article, "Forward" says:

"The systematic propaganda that has been going on for some time past to make Russia appear as a serious menace to the British Empire in India will easily lead the public to believe that Indian men and money will be utilised for teaching a lesson to Bolshevik Russia for her atrocious crime of initiating some of the coloured races of Asia into the secrets of self-determination... How very annoying this must be to our rulers?"

After the actual rupture had taken place, "Forward" says:

"The expected has come to pass. The two antagonistic forces, created by clash of ideals of the British Empire and the Union of Soviet Republics, have become into severe collision, leading to the derangement of the political equilibrium of Europe and Asia... Whether common hatred of Bolshevist Russia or the 'diabolical suspicion' of each other (among the Locarno Powers) which has always led to the reshuffling of political groups in Europe will assert itself, it is difficult to predict. Indications, however, are not wanting to show that the Soviet Republic is not to be despised with impunity and that the British imperialists must regret the day when the rupture of diplomatic relations with the Union of Soviet Republics was officially announced."

Discussing the motives of the Conservative Government, "Forward" says:

"Their decision was possibly influenced more by consideration of the geographic position of Soviet Union than by the merits of the Communist doctrine. Obviously Russia is believed to be a serious factor to be reckoned with in the new orientation of British policy in the Near East... Russia rubs shoulders almost with India. Can the British imperialists contemplate the situation with equanimity?"

The following conclusion of the present article of "Forward" is a more or less approximate interpretation of opinion in the Congress rank and file:

"The proximity of the Soviet Republic to India and the possibility of extension of Russian influence over Persia and Afghanistan in the Near East as well as over China in the Far East, are believed to be a far greater menace to British interests than the immediate loss of Russian markets to British capital. It is doubtful, however, if the rupture of diplomatic relations will materially minimize the danger. It may give a greater impetus to the new orientation of the Asiatic policy of the Soviet Government. If Russia succeeds in extracting China from the tentacles of foreign domination, they will possibly join hands with Britain in a common imperialist exploitation and aggression. The oppressed nations are out for liberty, a new world is fermenting underneath. Russia has given a new note to that music."

"The Indian National Herald" (Congress Left Wing), while not referring to the strictly Asiatic aspect of the Anglo-Russian rupture discussed the rupture in its relation to diplomatic usage and the internal political situation in England. It concludes by saying:

"There is only one word to describe Mr. Baldwin's laboured justification of an extreme step of an absolutely novel character in the diplomatic relationships of civilized powers and that is bunksm. The crux of the matter is the help that the Russian workers unsuitably give to their British comrades who were fighting last year in a righteous cause... The Trade Union Bill and the break with Russia are complementary of each other, calculated to produce the same results, namely to cripple the British workers by depriving them of the active sympathy and support of the only emancipated body of workers in the world. It is a dishonest manoeuvre on the face of it and the whole situation as brought up by the Soviet Embassy carried out by the British government both in London and Peking is aggravated by the blackest intentions that have impelled the Baldwin Government to embark on a ruthless policy of repression at home and gratuitous provocation abroad."
Writing on 28. 5. 27 the "Indian National Herald" maintained that the rupture was meant to lead to war. It said:

"The next phase must be a deadly duel between imperialism and bolshevism and another world war. Britain's break with Russia is not an isolated event. It is a link in the formidable chain which is being forged by imperialist powers - Britain, France, Italy, America and Japan - for the political, economic and moral enslavement of the world. Bolshevism is the menace to the ascendancy of imperialism over the wide world. So Bolshevism must be crushed at the root of the Imperialist Government of England brings out one thing in particular, and that is the burning desire for a decisive encounter with Bolshevism which should decide whether Imperialism or Socialism shall rule the world of the future."

Thus the conspiracy of the British government against the Soviet Union has met with a response in India which is causing great anxiety to the imperialist government in London. Moreover, the attitude of Indian troops in China is by no means calculated to reassure British imperialism regarding the future development in India itself. In fact the British government was compelled to withdraw an Indian battalion from Shanghai in order to preserve it from revolutionary contamination.

**THE LABOUR MOVEMENT**

**The American Needle Trades Struggle.**

By A. G. Bosse.

The present struggle in the American Needle Trades Unions is the culmination of ten years of conflict between the reactionary machinery led by the yellow Socialists and the rank and file led by the Communists and the Left Wing. It is a battle ground upon which the issues between the Right and Left Wing in the American labour movement have been fought out. In the miners, machinists, building trades and all other unions, the basic issues are similar, and a victory for the Communist-led Left Wing in the needle trades will have a great influence upon the struggles throughout the country.

The Needle Trades Unions of 200,000 organised workers, have been brought to the verge of impotency by the bankrupt policies of the reactionary Socialists leadership. The repressions of the bourgeoisie have not only weakened the unions in jobbing and sub-contracting and therefore in the number of small shops, the policy of submitting vital union issues to arbitration by capitalist politicians, and the penetration of the unions by graft and gangsterism have undermined the conditions of the workers and caused a mass revolt. The treachery of the leadership resulted in unorganised rebellions as far back as 1911. But the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and the consequent revolutionary wave throughout Europe, had a profound effect upon the Needle Trades workers, most of whom had participated in the revolutionary movement of Russia.

Various shop council movements started, which, upon the organisation of the Trade Union Educational League (T. U. E. L.) in 1922, were merged into its Needle Trades Section, with a definite political, industrial and inner-union programme. The rapid growth in the influence of this organised Left Wing led to the expulsion of the T. U. E. L. members from the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (I. L. G. W. U.) and the Furriers Union in 1923 - the beginning of the policy of expulsion in the American labour movement. Despite the expulsions of militant workers, the reorganisation of locals on the eve of strikes, the exclusion of Left Wing delegates from conventions, and the changing of the constitutions as the "machine" desired, the Communist-led Left Wing grew and won control of the Furriers Joint Board of New York (in 1925).

Shortly afterward the most important New York locals of the I. L. G. W. U. came under the control of the Left Wing.

The same year the Right Wing bureaucracy of the I. L. G. W. U. expelled three of the largest locals (Locals 2, 9 and 22) representing some 70% of the New York membership, because a Communist had addressed their May 1st Celebration. After a four months' struggle in which the rank and file battled against a united front of Right Wing leaders, the employers and the police, the bureaucracy capitulated, and the local wing won control of the New York Joint Board, the Chicago Joint Board, and locals in many other cities. In all elections the Left Wing came out victorious.

These victories, however, far-reaching as they were, did not change the colour of the national administrations of the unions. The conventions which followed, and where the Left Wing representation remained under the control of the Right Wing bureaucracy, due to the arbitrary system of representation, by which small locals of a few hundred members had as many delegates as large locals with many thousands.

Within a short time after the Left Wing took over control of the Furriers Union, conditions were completely transformed. The union was cleared of graft, corruption and gangsterism. The Greek and retail shop furriers were organised for the first time and the membership of the Union, which in 1924 had been 8000 in the U.S. and Canada, grew to 12,000 in New York alone in 1926. Working conditions improved greatly as did the morale of the members.

In the I. L. G. W. U. conditions had been even more deplorable when the Left Wing came into power in 1925. Union control in the shops was at its lowest point, working standards were completely beheaded, the open shops had greatly increased, and the attitude of the employers had become extremely arrogant. The Left Wing began to rebuild the Union with the aid of the mobilised rank and file. Professional gangsterism was eliminated and the organisation put into the hands of the membership. Despite the sabotage of the Right Wing, who still controlled in some locals, despite the interference of the ousted officials, who became the confidential advisers of the bosses, before long the latter began to feel the power of the union. In the Dressmakers Local 22 alone, the membership increased from 7000 to 11,000 in a few months, and the number of union shops increased proportionately.

The success of the Left Wing in the Needle Trades Unions had completely smashed the hopes of the old machine to recapture the unions by legal means. The bureaucrates therefore formed new conspiracies against the workers. Their opportunity came with the expiration of the agreement between the N. Y. Furriers Joint Board and the manufacturers. When negotiations with the employers began, the workers had put forth a number of demands vital to the needs of the workers, such as the 40-hour week, equal division of work, abolition of sub-contracting, etc. Negotiations were about to be concluded when the International Officials of the Furriers Union attempted to betray the workers by an agreement behind the backs of the Strike Committee. The workers refused to accept the agreement and had to organise a new strike not only against the bosses, but also against the officials who had overthrown the old machine.

The 17 weeks furriers strike, which began in February 1926, was one of the most brilliant struggles in the Needle Trades, and roused the admiration of the workers throughout the country by its militancy and spirit of self-sacrifice. In the ninth week of the strike, when the employers were completely defeated, the International officials, under the leadership of the A. F. of L., attempted to betray the workers by an agreement behind the backs of the Strike Committee. The workers refused to accept the agreement and had to organise a new strike not only against the bosses, but also against the officials who had overthrown the old machine. The Strike Committee recommended that the bosses be given the right to organise and direct the workers yearly. This question of discharge had been the center of the most important strikes in the industry and called forth bitter resentment from the workers, but the International officials of the I. L. G.