

"The idea becomes power when it penetrates the masses."
—Karl Marx.

SPECIAL MAGAZINE SUPPLEMENT THE DAILY WORKER

SECOND SECTION
This magazine supplement will appear every Saturday in The Daily Worker.

OCTOBER 11, 1924.

The United States and Great Britain

By L. TROTSKY

The chief source of world antagonism is the struggle between the United States and England. Why? Because England is still the richest, the most powerful country next to the United States. England is the main competitor, the chief obstacle on the path of American imperialism. Were England driven into a corner, were her strength undermined, or still better, were she knocked down entirely, then America could have a free hand in her imperialist adventures. Surely, Japan could be easily taken care of. America has all the advantages on her side: money and iron, coal and oil, and also comparatively good prestige in her political relations with China; which country, as we know, America is supposed to be "liberating" from under the yoke of Japan. For America is always "liberating" somebody. That seems to be her vocation. The main antagonism then is between the United States and England. This antagonism is growing and gaining momentum.

The English bourgeoisie has felt somewhat uneasy ever since the first years after the treaty of Versailles. The English bourgeoisie is thoroughly familiar with the intricacies of finance. And she cannot very well shut her eyes to the fact that the American dollar carries more weight than the English pound. She knows that predominance on the money market inevitably results in predominance also on the field of politics. The English bourgeoisie has always exploited to the utmost the power of her pound sterling in her international relations, and now she is watching with horror the dawn of a new era, the era of the American dollar.

The English bourgeoisie is trying not to succumb to despair and is creating all kinds of illusions for herself. The most authoritative English newspapers thus view the situation. They say: "True, the Americans are rich, but after all they are only novices in the imperialist game. They don't know all the tricks and tactics of world politics. We, Englishmen, are incomparably more skillful. The Yankees will need our advice and leadership. Our inexperienced American cousins, who have suddenly grown so rich, will have to call on us for guidance in matters of world politics. That will not be bad business at all. We shall be able to preserve our dignity and at the same time secure a decent fee for services rendered."

Of course, there is a grain of truth in that. I have already given expression to my scepticism regarding the accomplishments of American senators in the field of European geography. In order to do business with Europe, on a large scale it would not seem superfluous to be equipped with a good knowledge of European geography. However, for the wealthy classes, the road to knowledge is always open. We all know that the bourgeoisie has easy access to the arts and sciences. Many a millionaire son whose fathers may have been illiterate look almost like they were born into lordship. It is only the oppressed classes, the proletariat, that are having a hard time in getting education, trying to acquire mastery of the elements of culture. The rich can always find, develop or hire specialists in all the branches of science. The Americans are only beginning to realize their importance in world affairs, but have not gone very far in that respect. The development of the consciousness of American capitalism as to its world mission has lagged behind the development of its economic and political power. The

whole question must be discussed not from the point of view of present day events, but must be taken in the perspective of time, not of many decades, but rather of a few short years.

The mighty high tower of American industry and economy will soon be commanding the world. It is already dominating world affairs to a considerable degree, but not yet to its full extent. The leading role of capitalist Europe in world politics is only an heritage of her past economic strength, but that role no longer corresponds with the impoverished state of Europe of today. It is true that America has not learned yet to fully utilize her strength, but she is gaining that knowledge in the laboratory of Europe's miseries. For some time to come America will still need England as a guide in the ways of world

politics. But only for a short time.

politics. But only for a short time. The English bourgeoisie and it will be a difficult problem to root out from her the feeling that she is the ruler of the world. But America will do that job when she seriously takes it up. In vain is the English capitalist cherishing hopes that he will take on the role of guide to the inexperienced American. Yes, there will be a transition period. The issue involved, however, is not one of skill and experience in matters of world diplomacy, but of actual power, of capital and industry. And industrially, beginning with varieties of oats and ending with the best types of fast liners, the United States occupy the first place in the world. The production of necessities of life in the United States is from one-third to two-thirds of the production of the whole of humankind. Two-thirds of the world's output of oil (in 1923—72

—60 per cent, zinc—47 per cent. America has 35 per cent of the world's mileage of railways, and her commercial fleet, which was practically non-existent before the war, aggregates 25 per cent of the world's tonnage. And, finally, America alone owns and uses \$4.4 per cent of the total number of automobiles of the world. If in gold production America occupies a comparatively modest place (14 per cent), she has managed, however, due to her favorable balance of trade, to hoard up in her vaults 44.2 per cent of the entire gold reserve of the world. The national income of the United States is 2½ times more than the national incomes of England, France, Germany and Japan combined. It is these statistics that will settle all disputes. These figures spell eventual domination over land, sea and air.

What do these figures presage to Great Britain? They foretell that even England will not be able to avoid the common fate of all the capitalist countries. England, too, will be put on a ration by America. Whether Lord Curson wants it or not, he, too, will have to go on a ration. But we must add this. When England will have reached such a stage that she will have to accept openly the American ration, Lord Curson will no longer be at the helm of state affairs. No, he is too proud and snobbish. This job of reconciling England to the inevitability of an American ration will be assigned by the English capitalists to MacDonald.

The self-respect of the politicians of the English bourgeoisie will not permit them to acquiesce in relinquishing to America the political prestige and power of the greatest empire in the world for the price of a scanty ration. There will be needed here the pious eloquence of a MacDonald, Henderson and the Fabians in order to exert pressure over the English petty bourgeoisie and to persuade the English workers that it is best to have peace and agreement with America on the terms of American capitalism. But what does reconciliation with Uncle Sam mean? The above-mentioned statistics tell an eloquent story. And the substance of that story is that England can have peace, if she agrees to go on a ration or else she will have to get ready for war.

All this time England has been retreating before America. The Washington "disarmament" conference is still fresh in our memory. President Harding had invited to the conference England, France and Japan and in the most cold-blooded manner had offered England to limit her navy. This was done despite the fact that England had always preached the doctrine that she must remain, in view of her peculiar geographic position, the "ruler of the seas," and that the strength of her navy must always exceed the combined strength of the two next strongest navies in the world.

The United States have once and forever put an end to all such notions. President Harding began his speech at the Washington conference, as befits such an important occasion, with the solemn statement that "the conscience of civilization has awakened," etc., etc. He wound up, however, in a more business-like language: "To you, England—he said—I will allow 5 units of strength on the seas, for myself I will take (for the present) 3 units and to France 3 units. Why such a comparison? Before the war the American navy was 4 good deal smaller than the English, but during the war the American navy grew con-

AFTER WAR



politics. But only for a short time.

We know how fast a wealthy class in its upward climb changes its character, its appearance and its mode of behavior. Let us take, for instance, the German bourgeoisie. It was not so very long ago that the Germans were considered shy, blue-eyed dreamers, a nation of "poets and philosophers." And only a few decades of capitalist development have turned the German bourgeoisie into a most aggressive, iron-bound imperialist class. It is true that the day of judgment came too soon for the German bourgeoisie. And now we can again observe how the character of the German bourgeoisie is changing. He is fast acquiring on the European stage the habits and methods of a bear's den. The English bourgeoisie, on the other hand is of a more settled and heavier disposition. Its character has been formed during long centuries. Class consciousness and pride has penetrated the very flesh and blood, the very bones and marrow of

per cent, which has now become the most important factor in industry and war, is being produced in the United States. It is true that the Americans are complaining that they are threatened with an oil shortage in the near future. I must confess that soon after the war I regarded such complaints of the Americans as camouflage, as a means to conceal their greed for foreign oil. But geologists actually confirm the fact that, at the present rate of consumption, the resources of American oil will be exhausted within 25-40 years. But by the end of such a period of time, with the aid of her industry and fleet, America will have grabbed the oil resources of all the nations of the world.

The predominant position of the United States is expressed in the following statistics. The United States are producing: wheat—25 per cent of world production, oats about 35 per cent, corn about 75 per cent, coal—50 per cent, pig iron—50 per cent, cast iron—60 per cent, steel—60 per cent, brass

(Continued on page 8)

Machinists' Union Marks Time

By ANDREW OVERGAARD.

In order to understand correctly the machinists' convention held in Detroit Sept. 15, it is necessary to examine the different groupings in the convention and what role they played.

There were three distinct groups. Only one of them had a real program, namely the left wing led by the Communists. The "centrist" group was led by the insurgent faction in the old executive board and by the Fry-Kepler group, and its policy was simply to smash the machine and establish a few election reforms. It was not in favor of any fundamental changes in the organization. The third group was, of course, the old Johnston machine that stood for things as they are and fought against the proposals of both the other groups.

The policy of the left wing was, first, to establish itself as a definite independent group, around its own policies, and then in relation to the other groups, to make what use was possible of their differences by supporting whatever good measures were submitted by either one and bringing pressure to bear on each. The program that the left wing fought for in the convention was one that every progressive could unite upon.

Amalgamation of the metal trades unions into one industrial organization in order to effectively fight against the steel and electrical trusts, was one of the first questions dealt with in the convention, the issue being raised by many left wing resolutions. The Johnston forces proposed only to reaffirm the union's former stand of endorsing it in principle and allowing the officials to ignore it as they have done hitherto. Against this the proposal of the militants was to elect a rank and file committee in the convention for the purpose of carrying on negotiations with the other unions and among their membership to bring it into effect. The center group was not interested, however, and the result was that real amalgamation was voted down, the left wing only casting 70 votes, or less than one-third.

The center group learned a lesson when this question was taken to a vote and disposed of, and they began to organize their forces and also began to look for support somewhere. Of course the only group possible to

approach was the left wing which had decided about the various "center" proposals it would support, such as bi-annual conventions, election of officers every two years instead of four-years terms, an election board to count ballots, etc. The left wing was also in favor of cutting the salaries of the officers; the centrist group, however, was for high salaries, but conceded that point to the left wing. The left wing demanded also that the center group fight on two more fundamental issues, namely, the reinstatement of the suspended members in Toledo, and opposition against the B. & O. plan.

When these issues were finally taken up, the "center" adopted a typically indecisive attitude; some of them voted with the lefts, but none of them fought very hard for these issues. As a matter of fact, the centrists did not like to be mixed up in any affairs which would identify them with the lefts. Most of them, of course, fought against the left wing as a matter of principle, and would be as bad as the present administration if they capture the official positions in the organization.

The compulsory insurance feature submitted by the General Executive Board was voted down by the convention. This was a left wing victory. The fight against the administration was led by the left elements in the convention.

One of the weaknesses of the Johnston machine in this convention was its lack of floor leaders. The former administration forces, like Kepler and Fry, and the so-called insurgents on the board, as well as the vice-presidents who were about to lose their jobs, had deserted and formed a group of their own. Due to the relation of these forces and the antagonisms between the "center" group and the Johnston forces, the administration had to retreat on many issues. Especially did some of the red baiting schemes fall flat. Davidson and Johnston had to resort to fake letters and telegrams in order to discredit the writer, but even those childish tactics failed to bring about the desired procedure.

The majority of the delegates were intelligent enough to understand that the I. A. of M. cannot afford to imitate the capitalist class in red hunting, that there must be room for the militants to ensure the healthy growth

of the organization. Of course, the usual "arguments" were resorted to by the right wing charging the Communists with breaking up the labor movement all over the world. Such renegades as Haberman, who was brought from Mexico, was used to spill the usual tirade against the revolutionists. This, of course, was very easy for Roberto, who admits he is out to make money, and is quite unscrupulous as to methods. But the "anti-red" legislation was withdrawn because the sentiments of the convention was against it overwhelmingly.

The resolution on international solidarity was killed in the course of these developments. The resolution on the labor party was shored aside by the argument that LaFollette will form a party in the next convention of the C. P. P. A., altho the delegates listened quite attentively when the Communists pointed out the illusion and the political class collaboration of the LaFollette movement and about 50 votes were cast against the LaFollette movement.

The question of the B. & O. plan was undoubtedly the most important issue that came before the convention. The administration kept it off the floor until the last minute in order to rush it thru without having to go into a thorough discussion of the plan. Even then, however, the plan was not given a 100 per cent endorsement. The left wing attack had seriously shaken the B. & O. plan and the delegates were very critical. The resolution that was adopted on this question states that where the membership desires to have the plan it may be put into effect.

The administration had to compromise on this issue and modify their intentions of introducing it in the organization as a whole. It was quite significant to note that the Canadian delegation voted almost unanimously against the plan, except for one delegate from Winnipeg, who voted consistently with the old administration. The railroads where the machinists are 100 per cent organized were against the plan. The whole convention took note that the local union at Glenwood shops, where the plan was first tried out, was not represented in the convention. According to the story brot upon the floor of the convention by delegates from Pittsburgh, the men working in the Glenwood shops are opposed to the plan, while the unions

have dwindled in membership rather than grown, under its operation.

The minority report condemning the B. & O. plan was, however, voted down and the officers allowed to experiment some more with class collaboration.

The question of admission of the colored machinists into the organization was bitterly opposed by the southern delegates who went before the ritual committee and had the committee recommend that the colored brothers be not admitted. This question was also put thru in special hurry by the president, supposedly due to the fact it would probably create a long debate, as in the Rochester convention.

One bright spot in the convention was when the recognition of Soviet Russia was endorsed by a practically unanimous vote. This is one of the issues on which the Machinists' Union is completely opposed to the blackly reactionary policy of Samuel Gompers, and the convention in Detroit held its ground on this issue. The machinists are friends of Soviet Russia, even tho they do not yet realize the necessity of unification of the labor movement of the world including the Russian unions.

To sum up the total results of the convention it can be said that a few necessary internal reforms were adopted, but no plans were laid to organize the great masses of unorganized machinists in this country. No changes of a fundamental nature were made by this convention and all basic issues of the class struggle were ignored. Even so, however, this convention did not go to the lengths of reaction that have marked other conventions this year. The left wing went into the convention with a constructive program and established itself as a force to be reckoned with in the I. A. of M. They left the convention with more prestige and respect than before, in spite of all attempts to discredit them. All of the proposed law changes such as the two year election, establishment of election board, bi-annual convention, decrease in salary, etc., will go to referendum and it is up to the militants to carry on a campaign in the local unions for the adoption of these measures, and at all times point out the needs for fundamental changes in the structure and policies of the organization, and fight for further progress.

Automatism In Education

By a Teacher

(Being the Full Confession of an Examiner)

Confession has never been my hobby. The success of an examiner depends upon the pose of inscrutability. But for once, under these extraordinary auspices, I shall consent to reveal the whole truth about my unenviable position.

If an examiner were omniscient (you'll pardon me for suggesting anything so extravagant), he could not possibly accomplish the work set him by our top-heavy educational system. English, French, German, Music, Biology, History, Bookkeeping, Drawing, Chemistry, Physics, Stenography, Latin, Greek, Spanish, common branches, uncommon branches, physical sciences, the arts—not Comte, Spencer and Darwin rolled into one Great Being could adequately or intelligently stand sponsor for so many departments of knowledge.

But I, a mere humble examiner, with no startling originality, no famous books to my credit, no conspicuous scholarship, I am expected to be a Pan-Sophistist. If vanity were not deeper than intellectual honesty, no fair-minded person would volunteer to do (1) the impossible. But pretence, repeated and familiarized, become one's second nature, and a modest man will gradually adopt the pose of omniscience because it pays to appear all-wise. Hence the examiner's habituation to the pose of inscrutability.

The world of mediocrity is awe-inspired by the silence majestic. In a commonplace world, looking wise is almost as convincing as being wise. A fallible examiner, conscious of a thousand defects, must support a devout aspect of perfection and take his chances of not being found out. Precarious existence!

To be more specific: Not only must an examiner pretend to omniscience (that merry masquerading pleaseth one's vanity); he is supposed to be endowed with the powers of white magic and of clairvoyance.

The days of the palm-readers, astrologers, phrenologists-by-intuition, clairvoyants, telepathists, are not numbered in the land of the godly. Far from it. Intuition is the shortcut to wisdom. Intuition is intellectual laziness erected into a philosophy of faith. Mental laziness is necessarily prevalent in a world too busy to stop to think, and to reflect. When we don't know, we apprehend by intuition. An examiner is a transcendental intuitionist! He knows without analyzing, he apprehends without observing, he understands without reasoning, he judges without reflecting.

If this revelation of the truth shocks you, please listen to this bit of tellable evidence. The most important part of any examination (from our intuitionist standpoint) is the "per-

sonality" test. Now, frankly, are there three unacquainted persons in the whole wide world who can agree upon a "rating" for personality? Why, what is personality? Is it something static or dynamic? If dynamic, at what particular stage of its unfoldment shall personality be appraised? Does personality shine in clothes or in character? If in character, how can the unfamiliar observer detect its presence or absence?

What relation has personality to the observer's own conventional prejudices and provincialism? Is the personality test to gain validity, for example, from an appraisal of any one or more of the following attributes?

- (a) An indefinable something.
- (b) Good breeding.
- (c) Self-poise.
- (d) Gentlemanly carriage ("House of Lords" test).
- (e) Charm (womanly woman's test).
- (f) Magnetic power.
- (g) Polish of culture.
- (h) Pleasing first impressions.
- (i) Dignified address.
- (j) A man who knows his place.
- (k) Feeling of reserve force.

(l) Quiet and unassuming manner.

(m) Record of achievements. . . .

What is this mysterious and misty something called personality? To my knowledge as examiner, no scholar or educator or publicist has ever anal-

alyzed that mystic entity! And yet we examiners (for, whatever you think us, don't think us fools) continue to mar or mold the destinies of thousands of men and women, about whose inner lives we know absolutely nothing.

On the improvable assumption that we can estimate, judge and accurately mark personality, we commit an unforgivable sin against the dictates of conscience. Why do we proceed on so unreasonable a presupposition?

The explanation will give some simple-minded folk pain, but the truth will out; at least if there be people clever or honest enough to state it. Since this is to be an unmitigated expose of "inside facts," let nothing relevant or illuminating be concealed. As an examiner, fond of introspection, I may be relied upon to speak the unvarnished truth.

We employ the personality test as a weeder-out of non-conformists. Efficiency—that is, unquestioning obedience to official superiors—depends upon a smooth routine. Smooth routine depends upon willing routinists. Willing routinists are the conscript army of the faithful. The faithful are recruited from among the meek conformists.

The ideal we consciously have in mind is the meek conformist, for upon him we depend for the smooth systematization of pet policies. How

(Continued on page 7.)

Fire from the Red Volcano

By ROBERT MINOR.

History of the Russian Communist Party, by Gregory Zinoviev, president of the Communist International. First English translation appearing in *The Workers Monthly*, into which new magazine have been combined *The Liberator*, *The Labor Herald* and the *Soviet Russia Pictorial*. Subscription (combined magazine) \$2.00 per year. 1113 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago.

MOST of the events of history—the big, transforming phenomena which swing the human world to new orbits—passed by without their real significance being known to masses of men of the time, even to those whose lives were most affected, and even to those most active in bringing about the change. The masses of men when tumbled about by the mighty phenomena of revolution, are likely not to know or even suspect the real cause, tho' it comes from within themselves, and are likely to attribute it to some unknown "superhuman" power, as tho' the world were an ant-hill suddenly disturbed by some outer agency. The real significance, the essence, the cause of great upheavals are lost in a maze of misinterpretations based upon fetishes and feeble theories of a dead and gone past, or a dying present. Only in generations later are the real historical essences painstakingly dug up by men freed of the ideology of the dead order.

Hardly more than the dreamy peasant girl, Joan of Arc, did the French Dauphin or his military or political leaders understand the meaning of the then revolutionary nationalism whose active agents they were in clearing away the feudal separatism and making France a political unit. Covered with the molasses of idealism were the bourgeois revolutions of England, America, and France; and their meaning hidden until later interpreted by the new materialist philosophers.

But Now a Change.

But in these modern times of proletarian revolution—led and governed by materialist philosophy—will the biggest events ever breaking upon the world be hidden again in the fog of past conceptions? Will the Russian revolution, which is only the first of a whole series in a world-revolution, will it, can it be understood by any great numbers of those who live today?

We have the bourgeois interpretations of the Russian revolution—a crazy make, an hysterical application of petty shop-keepers' conceptions of "good" and "evil," of big bankers' conceptions of "normalcy," and of Grand Dukes' conceptions of "civilization." A smothering avalanche of such "interpretations" of the present revolutionary epoch has, of course, fallen upon the masses from on high; it has submerged a great part of the masses. To the petty shop-keeper the Russian Revolution is due to "bad men" whose motives are the same as the motives of a petty shop-keeper himself when he gets drunk, or when he falls into temptation to beat his wife or to burn down his shop in order to collect the insurance.

Then we have the "revolutionary" idealistic interpretations of those fond persons, usually now in middle life, who ten or twenty years ago pictured themselves as one day standing on the barricades fighting for "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" with out realizing that this is but an idealistic version of the business slogan of free mercantile pursuits. Or the more timid section of the same school, who saw themselves voting in the "new day."

But the proletarian revolution of this time differs from all that have preceded, in not a few respects. It is more than any other a conscious revolution—a revolution the leading participants of which understand the real significance of what they are doing, understand the place in history of their performance. In this instance the need is not to cover up the essence of the revolution with the molasses of idealistic terms—not to conceal its meaning from the masses

of the Russian Communist Party. Perhaps so, but it reads to us as a condensed but monumental classic.

"What is a Party?"

Zinoviev's simple discussion of "What is a Party?" will come as a revelation to many who have been using that word with a looseness which has carried them around in a circle. To learn what sort of an instrument—class instrument—a political party is, and to learn thereby the character of the mighty sword that was forged by Lenin and his associates, is to clear up many foggy questions now before the American comrades. Zinoviev gives the bourgeois definition of a "party," and he gives the proletarian revolutionary version of the same thing—and between reading the two the reader sees many formerly obscure phenomena falling into a clear and definite place. The author makes unmistakable the process of the development of the Bolshevik wing of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party into that which was eventually to be the instrument of leadership of the Russian revolutionary working class.

Curiously enuf, Zinoviev, the Bolshevik, the fighter against the older school of Russian "Narodniki" (populists), and against the "Marxian" vulgarizers of Marxism, finds time and patience to give even these their share of credit. Many who had the habit, common in America, of idealizing the old "Narodniki," and who were somewhat bewildered by the sudden falling of their heroes, will find here a sympathetic appreciation of the work of the old, once-heretic school—an appreciation mingled with an explanation that blasts away the question of the ludicrously debased role of their present-day successors.

The book is the history of an ideological struggle in the midst of, and in connection with, the events which it had to deal. We who in the young American Communist party have floundered and fought our way thru so many ideological combats (already so numerous for a party so young), will find a peculiar satisfaction and benefit in this. The book is not merely a record of happenings—"on this date we did so-and-so, on that date such and such happened"—no, there is the political explanation of all that happened. Not only the objective history, but also the subjective history—the study of the unswerving devotion to the revolutionary principles, as well as the doubts, waverings, convictions, back-slidings and recoveries. In the long and illuminating story of the disputes that arose in the Russian socialist movement, and later in the Bolshevik section of it, not only is every point of view clearly given, but how that point of view came about is also explained in a way that makes the reader feel as tho' some great novelist were probing the psychological depths of these men of history. That's probably not fair to the author, who is anything but a writer of romance—but this scientific handling of history is done so well, with such a fine appreciation of human psychology, that the tinnest tale of a Tolstoid could not be more intriguing to the reader.

Not even are the mishaps of the Russian Bolsheviks with the Tsar's police lacking in this book—and after all, this, too, is of political importance. (We who, much to the mirth of some of our yellow socialist friends, were arrested at our 1922 convention, will find reassurance as well as interest in the similar events in the life of our older sister party of Russia.)

The description of the manner in which the Bolsheviks early in their history took up the question of "Terror," and the answer they gave to the question, is as good as a classic essay on the subject. The Marxian revolutionists who were afterward to apply the Terror as a mass weapon against the enemy class, did not fall into the primitive childishness of the romantic and ineffective individual-

ists. But early they forged in their party ideology the weapon of mass terror, administered by the hand of an organized proletarian state, that was destined to break the resistance of a defeated bourgeoisie and to save a proletarian revolution.

"Hegemony of the Proletariat."

So, too, was early developed the key question of the "Hegemony of the Proletariat,"—the question on which the petty bourgeois socialist fractions were sure to break and show their real class in'ards, as soon as they struck it. Here, in the question as to which class would take the hegemony, the dominance over the revolutionary period, of course the leader Lenin rose to the height of his greatness; here, the raising of this question added Bolshevism to crystallized itself. The many petty bourgeois currents of "socialism," forming in fact one consistent stream, beat in vain against the rock of Lenin. "Legal Marxism"—another question, or another phase of the same question of petty bourgeois conception of proletarian revolution, came in turn into conflict with the revolutionary Marxism of Lenin.

In a rather reminiscent style, Zinoviev describes the development of Peter Struve—the evolution of a traitor. This and other recitals connected with the names of famous historical figures, gives the book a certain biographical color that is entrancing. The early role of the Jewish comrades, in laying the cornerstone of the party, and the story of the "Bund" are there.

Those of us who remember the period of dispute in the American socialist party about "direct action" will get a peculiar thrill out of the account of the discussion and disputes about the more accurately phrased Russian party questions of the "general strike," "armed insurrection" and "arming of the workers."

Closely related to the question of the "Role of the Proletariat in the Revolution" and that of the "Hegemony of the Proletariat" and "Legal Marxism" came the question of "Economism"—another phase under which the petty bourgeois ideology arose to battle. The leading of the revolution by the proletariat, the taking over of power by the proletariat, the dictatorship of the proletariat, being barred from correct procedure of course the rest followed logically. This "Economism" was a movement, historically of a breed with menshevism, to confine the demands of the revolutionary proletarian movement to "economic" demands—demands for economic betterment—a movement which attempted to take upon itself the glory of getting closer to the masses, and which went so far as to raise the question of abstaining from the slogan "Down with the Autocracy," to avoid frightening the working masses. Against it the Leninites gave successful battle.

"Professional Revolutionists."

Also the question of "professional revolutionists" played in its turn a significant part in the wedding of the Bolshevik party. "Professional revolutionists"! It sounds like a scornful epithet, and it was, at first. But it was a challenge accepted by the Leninists. With the fearlessness in facing facts which characterized him, Lenin showed that exactly that—the organization of "professional revolutionists" was required. Many Americans need to read this.

A singular appreciation of just what a political party program means to a revolutionary party is obtained here, and it is particularly timely at this time when the Communist International is expending large energies upon the formulation of a program for all Communist parties—for the single world-party which we are. It's a far cry from the shallow conception of a program as a hastily-thrown-together document of a day, to the sight of an enormous world organization put into deliberate motion for the purpose of producing a single document! But you begin to under-

(Continued on page 6)

The Rock-Bottom Foundation

(The Russian Working Class and Its Fight)

By Moissay

ON May 1, 1924, the number of Russian adult Communists was 680 thousand. The number of young Communists, between the ages of 18 and 25, was 570 thousand. The army of Russian Communists thus counted one and a quarter million. Since then the number has grown.

The total membership of the Russian labor unions is five million, embracing all persons engaged in a useful occupation. If we were to discount a million and a half office workers employed in the state machinery and co-operative organizations, most of whom are no less devoted to the new order than many other groups of workers, there would remain three million and a half proletarians engaged in factories, mines, mills, in the transportation system, partly in the forests, partly as hired laborers on the land.

Those five million organized men and women, especially the three and a half million manual workers, form the foundation of the new order. The one and a quarter million Communists is the cement that keeps them together. Communism is the motive power that lends their work both aim and direction.

"Masters" and "Slaves"?

It is quite obvious at a glance that there can be no "domination" of the working class by the Communist "rulers" as the social patriotic liars would have us believe. "Domination" implies a small group commanding large masses. There can be no domination of one and a quarter million over five million people. Where each third or fourth member of the working class is a Communist, the Communists merge in the masses, especially under conditions where each proletarian can join the party any minute and thus become a "ruler." The doors of the party open with great difficulty before an intellectual, a son of the bourgeoisie. But the doors of the party are wide open before a worker, a proletarian of the factories and mills. Each one is free to become one of the chosen. Each one may do the work of administration.

No Definite Line Between the Party and the Working Class.

The truth is that it is almost impossible to draw a line between the Communists and the rest of the workers. The working class is animated by the same ideas as the Communists. The working class lends a sympathetic and attentive ear to the advice of the Communists. Among the so-called non-partisan workers there are many who understand their revolution and class interests no less clearly than the Communists. If numbers of workers do not belong to the Communist party this is due to causes that have nothing to do with conviction: some are in bad health, others are overburdened, still others are, some, possessed of requisite abilities, some, recently arrived from the countryside, have not yet sufficiently adapted themselves to urban life, others are handicapped by family conditions, still others think that the interests of the workers will be sufficiently guarded even without their participation. It is not easy to be a Communist. Communist duties are severe. Communist activities are varied. The Communist party gets hold of all of a man's time, all his abilities, all his attention, all his strength, health, life. Not everyone can, therefore, become a member of the Communist party. The workers themselves distinguish as to who should and who should not be a member of the Communist party. In the practical day-by-day work, however, it is impossible to find the line where the Communist party ends and the working class at large begins. The sessions of the Communist shop nucleus (local group) are being attended not only by Communists but by non-partisan workers as well. The discussions of the nucleus are being

participated in by all present, Communists and non-Communists alike. Meetings called by the nucleus are being frequented by all the workers of the plant. The life of the Communist party is of absorbing interest to large masses of workers. Whenever the party calls, whenever a demonstration of readiness to fight or actual sacrifices are required, the bulk of the working class responds.

Proletarian Dictatorship.

This major part of the working class is the rock-bottom foundation of the Soviet Republic. This mass of workers is carrying thru the proletarian dictatorship.

The white guards with their socialist satellites would make the world believe that the Russian worker is a boob, a stupid beast of burden, a stunned, ignorant creature on whose back the Zinovievs and Kamenevs do their rousing, hammering its head with the mallet of dictatorial power. The white guards with their socialist Abramovitch crew appeal to world capitalism to free the Russian working class from the Communist bandits. The fact is that the white guards would have long been victorious if the Russian working class were the dupes they depict it. Proletarian dictatorship would not last a day if the rank and file workers of the Soviet Republic would not understand the meaning and the significance of the proletarian revolution, if they would not see the road that leads to a bright future.

The rank and file workers of the Soviet Republic understand a lot more than all the professional "friends of labor," all "radical" bourgeois editors and even those honest philanthropists who deplore the "lamentable fate" of the Russian workers. The rank and file worker is fully alive to the fact that he has made a revolution, that it has been a victorious revolution, that the revolution broke the backbone of capitalism, that he has seized the entire economic apparatus so that what may be produced for the welfare of all, and that only this road will lead him to ultimate liberation.

The rank and file worker is no angelic creature, no bloodless dreamer. The rank and file worker is a human being with all human weaknesses and passions. He would certainly like to lead a peaceful, comfortable existence. He understands no less than his socialist, well-wishers that clean clothes and large rooms are preferred to rags and cramped quarters. But he understands also that were he to follow the lead of the menshevik counter-revolutionaries he would not only have no hope of clean clothes and decent quarters, but he would be mercilessly shackled by the bourgeois, his lifeblood would be so thoroughly squeezed out of his body that the very idea of a secure future for him and his kind would appear utterly preposterous.

Down with the Capitalists!

The rank and file Russian worker does not want the capitalists. He has driven them out of his land, and he will never permit them to get into power. In times of stress, under the pressure of a severe economic crisis, the private trader was in 1921 allowed to do business. The nepman came into being. But he is looked upon by the worker as a temporary evil. The Russian worker has not admitted the nepman either into the big industrial establishments, nor into the mines, nor into the oil fields, nor into the railroad business, nor into the business of foreign trade. The Russian worker tolerates the private businessman in the retail more than in the wholesale trade because the state economic apparatus has not yet created the agencies that are necessary to reach the mass consumers especially in the village. The rights of the nepman, how-

ever, are not allowed to be extended. If the last congress of the Russian Communist party decided to start a struggle of competition against the nepman, this was in accord with the wish of the working class. If the nepman's freedom of movement will further be restricted in the not far future, so will be the command of the working class. The rank and file Russian worker wants no bosses, no businessmen, no fat panaches, no individuals living on others' work, on capital, on profits.

Slow Patient Work.

The rank and file Russian worker knows that one cannot get everything at once. The Russian worker is fully aware of the fact that the Russian factories are inferior in equipment to the factories of the capitalist countries, that in point of technical knowledge and efficiency the Russian worker is far behind his Western brother, that there will be much experimenting, much hard labor, much trying and blundering and correcting errors and starting anew before Russian industrial work reaches a high level. The Russian worker knows that his industrial apparatus is weak, undeveloped, unwieldy, absorbing over-much energy. But he knows also that it is his own apparatus, secured in fierce bloody battles after years of struggle. The Russian worker says to himself that a weak economic apparatus in the hands of the working class is better than a strong economic apparatus in the hands of the bourgeoisie. A weak economic apparatus can be improved, can be perfected, can be made to serve the best interests of the working class. A capitalist apparatus, however technically efficient, is ever and ever a means of oppressing the working class. This elemental truth, which is Chinese to the average bourgeois economist, has become ingrained in the mind of the worker thru the very practice of his daily life.

Responsibility Before the Country.

The rank and file Russian worker is conscious of his responsibility for both the political and economic advance of the country. His behavior therefore, is that of a wise husbandman who will not consume all of a year's crop, but leave a part for seeds, a part for the cultivation of new fields and a part for a rainy day. The Russian worker knows that it would not be economical to pay out to the workers in the form of wages all the wealth produced by their labor. The Russian working class is the supreme power, it can take as much as it pleases. It is aware, however, that economy is imperative at present. Equipment is to be improved, capital is to be accumulated, productivity of labor is to be increased, the output of commodities is to be made to grow. The working class exploits itself in the present in order that its life may be better tomorrow and ever after. The working class allots itself a smaller wage than the pre-war standard in order that it may be possible to improve and enlarge the factories, the mills, the railroads, the entire economic life. If there are some workmen who do not understand this economic foresight and are therefore dissatisfied, the others bring them enlightenment. A work of education is being conducted among them so that they may realize that this policy is only conducted in their own class interests. And if the mensheviks attempt to utilize this ignorance of a small section of the workers to arouse them against the existing order, the workers will hit hard and without mercy. Sacrifices.

The rank and file Russian worker knows how to make sacrifices for his proletarian order. A few days before the present writer departed from Moscow, Kamenev, the economic spokesman of the R. C. P. delivered

a speech before an assemblage of responsible Communist workers. Reviewing the economic situation, the speaker stressed the idea that in consequence of bad crops in a section of the Volga region and the additional burden thus put on the state budget, it was incumbent upon the workers to increase the productivity of labor: i. e. to work more intensively, to produce more than they produced in a unit of time, which meant additional expenditure of energy on the part of the workers. Kamenev's message was carried by the responsible Communists all over Moscow factories and mills. Workmen's meetings were called everywhere, facts and figures were put before the audiences, the entire mechanism of the economic life was laid bare; the situation of agriculture, the currency problem, the exchange of commodities between village and town, the role of cheap goods, the system of foreign trade. The demand of the hour was explained to the workers in unequivocal language. What was their response? Did they revolt? Did they go on strike? Nonsense! There is nobody to revolt against, since the carriers of the message were themselves in the main part manual workers, factory hands who were to be affected by an increase in the productivity of labor no less than their fellow workers. There is no sense in striking since the workers know full well that the surplus created by increased productivity of their labor will not be appropriated by private owners but will serve to satisfy the needs of the state.

Five or six years ago the Russian worker shed his blood defending his proletarian revolution against inner foes and world imperialism. Four years ago he ate dry bread and drank "carrot tea" without sugar in his stubborn fight for the October conquests. Now his situation is incomparably more advantageous: he has shaped his life more comfortably, he has removed the grossest manifestations of poverty, he feeds and clothes himself more or less decently, the outlook is encouraging, the future bodes well for the proletarian country.—the more reason for the rank and file worker to stand ready to suffer temporary privation if such be the supreme command of the defense of proletarian power.

The Workman and the Peasant.

The rank and file worker is drawing the poorer peasant into the work of building a new life. There is no basic contradiction between the interests of the workers and the interests of the poorer peasants. It is good for the worker when the peasant produces more and better agricultural products, but this is also to the interest of the peasant. It is to the peasants' benefit when the industrial establishments produce more and better manufactured goods to satisfy

A. RYABOVA



Delegate to the last Russian Party Congress.

their wants, but this the workers. Both the peasants are a lot, a class that is pretty wiped out, capitalists who have both are against the rich peasant, an eraship of the mass. The peasant cannot the working class. not be opposed to the His peasant may of his mind may where conceptions, but he him the lessons



Central Executive

drives him towards in common with our more advanced are have already engaged new life. The best ants follow the loc class. The working way. The working elsewhere, fulfill. The working class wants to overcome production and to nomic forms. This helps the peasants against the peasant working class has with the peasants ferent ways. The ers and peasants is no euphonic phrase reality, a living, between the worker. The peasant lends political activity of because he realizes, present order can make liberation. many-sided aid rural

of the Russian Soviet Republic

(in the Proletarian Dictatorship)

J. Olgin

is also good for the workers and peasants. The land has been taken away from the village exploiter, and the workers and peasants are against the village exploiter, and the workers and peasants are against the village exploiter, and the workers and peasants are against the village exploiter.

Against Luxuries. The rank and file worker is accustomed to scanty living. The rank and file worker looks askance at those who revel in a luxurious life. The rank and file worker exercises the most relentless control over the officials of his state, the leaders of his party, the functionaries of his institutions. The workers' control gives no quarter, especially to peo-

measure. When he deals with his own kind he makes proletarian out of living, proletarian severity, proletarian simplicity the law and the standard. With the amassing of wealth, with the raising of the level of general well being, everybody will lead a more comfortable and more refined existence. For the time being the demand of the worker is that there be no marked difference between the standard of living of the highest Communist leader and that of the average worker. The worker stands for equality as far as it can be realized in everyday life. This proletarian psychology has put a stamp on the Soviet Republic as a whole, on all its classes. It has already become bad tone in Soviet Russia to shine in resplendent attire, in jewels, in luxurious habitations. This proletarian public opinion is in itself a powerful check on all those weak elements who would be inclined to misuse their official position for personal profit.

Collective Activities.

The rank and file Russian worker is a collective being, a member of a social unit. All his life is spent in co-operation with fellow workers. In his factory he is an integral part of an industrial organization. In his labor union he is part of a collective whole. In the Communist party he feels a soldier of a well-disciplined army. In his political activities he always appears hand in hand with workers' and peasants' masses. In cultural life he is never confined to himself, he is never centered upon his individual self-sufficiency, he is always working in co-operation with his comrades. The club, the singing group, the lecture, the reading circle, the dramatic organization, the mass performances, the sport field, the street manifestations, everything is shared with others, everywhere the worker expresses himself as part of a social organization. The political activities of the working class—Soviet elections, Soviet work, party work, union work—are mass functions, creative efforts for the benefit of the class, of the proletarian state, of the proletarian future. The rank and file Russian worker knows that he himself must do the political work, he himself in co-ordination and conjunction with the rest of his class. Therefore he scoffs at a system where a "citizen" casts his vote once in two years and rests inert the remaining time. Therefore the Russian worker fails to understand a system of "democracy" where politics is the specialty of professional politicians while the masses have no share in the entire work of legislation, administration, judiciary, diplomacy, in shaping the budget and managing the other economic activities of the country. The rank and file Russian worker has had a taste

of real democracy where not the ballot is the expression of self-government but the practical day-by-day political work. Therefore the Russian worker knows something that is hidden from the patented jurists,—that the Soviet system is as much superior to formal bourgeois democracy as socialism is superior to bourgeois exploitation. The Russian worker is not a legal "spec," he does not split hairs over the finest judicial definitions. He knows the value of his proletarian order from his own practice. This order is the reverse of individualistic: one does not say, "I," one says, "We"—economic, political and cultural work is done on a collectivist basis.

Organization.

The Russian worker is thoroughly organized. The Russian worker has passed through a powerful school of social work. The Russian worker never looks upon a meeting as upon a picnic, never thinks of a conference as a "good time." The Russian worker has an earnest attitude towards his problems and duties. In Russia, non-attendance of committee meetings, of party school lectures, of union sessions, is an unusual occurrence. In Russia, highfalutin grey speeches are almost unknown. In a business-like, practical, prosaic manner does the Russian proletarian functionary deliver his oration. Seriously, patiently and attentively does the audience listen, to it may be tired after a day's work. Not even the term "speech" is now current in the Russian political practice; instead the words "lecture" or "report" are commonly used. Every lecture and report must contain an array of facts which could be jotted down in a notebook and retold to others. The Russian worker has learned to listen, to comprehend, to judge, to decide. The Russian worker has learned to remain silent where the problem is clear to him or where others have made the necessary remarks. The Russian worker has learned to untangle the most complicated problems and to find solutions. The Russian worker seems to be continually preoccupied with immediate practical questions of state interest; he seems so restrained; cool, unconcerned; back of this absorption in the pressing immediate work, however, there is a tremendous endurance, an iron-clad will, a readiness to guard the October Revolution to the very last breath.

Ruthless Toward Foes.

The rank and file Russian worker is severe towards himself and severe towards his foes. The Russian worker has no use for kid gloves. He has never cut intellectual capers. He does not coat bitter facts with a saliva of sweetish words. The Russian worker has an adequate name for every fact and a proper valuation for every action. The Russian worker does not claim to have introduced universal equality; he bluntly and brazenly declares that what he has introduced is proletarian dictatorship, i. e., a system where the working class and part of the peasants dominate all other classes and groups. The Russian worker declares in the frankest and most outspoken fashion that the aim of the proletarian dictatorship is to uproot, exterminate and annihilate all exploiting groups and classes. If anybody appears in the name of abstract "justice," the worker will say that it is a supreme act of proletarian justice to abandon exploitation together with the exploiting classes. If anybody shields himself with the claim of "equality," the worker will say that there can be no equality between the workingman and the nepean since the workingman is the creator of all and the nepean is a pest. And if anybody complains of "oppression,"

the worker will say that this is his vowed aim,—to oppress his class enemies and to continue his oppression until they disappear from the face of the earth. If a bourgeois watchdog of an Abramovitch wags his tail and spits out a question as to why, then, the workers are dissatisfied when they are being oppressed by the capitalists, the Russian worker would answer: "Stop your stinky blubbering! We know that the aim of your question is the defense of capitalism. We, the workers, have nothing to do with 'eternal justice.' We are fighters in the class struggle. When we are being oppressed, we kick, we fight, we revolt, knowing that we are right, that we have produced all the wealth of the world, that we are being robbed of the fruit of our labor and that without us humanity cannot exist. Now that we have acquired power we shall exterminate the bourgeoisie because it is useless, because it interferes with the program of mankind, because it is a parasite and because the future will witness a society devoid of class divisions. You menheviks have pity with the bourgeoisie, you demand equality and justice for the parasite class; we, the workers, understand you full well and we send you to the devil together with your masters."

The Russian worker is relentless in self-discipline and merciless towards his foe. He is not sentimental. He is a man of iron. He has created a police and a secret service, an army and a judiciary to protect his power. When the white guards and the black socialists, equipped with the money of the imperialist governments and blessed by international capitalism, start fomenting revolts and upheavals in the Soviet Republic, the working class hits hard, hits ruthlessly so the plotters may forget to try again.

This is what the Soviet Republic is based on; this is the guarantee of its future.

Long live U. S. S. R!
Long live Proletarian Dictatorship!

MAN AND WOMAN

By Robin Dunbar.

In the upper bourgeois circles, man is known by his success; i. e., his ability to exploit a great number of slaves. Woman is recognized there by her ability to fasten herself parasitically on a successful man, and to cling there tenaciously. Illustrations: Henry Ford and any of the Vanderbilt women or the Goulds, or Mr. and Mrs. Hearst.

In the middle bourgeois strata, man is known by his talents; i. e., his power to extract money from the higher bourgeoisie. Woman is famous there for the same thing plus her ability to exploit her sex attraction. Examples: Nicholas Murray Butler and Peggy Joyce; Albert Fall and Evelyn Nesbit.

In the lower or bohemian bourgeois class man is known by his knack of knocking the success out of the next higher class, for instance, Rudolph Valentino, Fatty Arbuckle, Cal Coolidge. Woman precisely for the same thing plus her knack of selling her sex favors; Mabel Norman and the movie stars, actresses, and demi-monde of ill-repute like Castle, Thaw, et al.

Among the militant sections of the working class, the unions, the Communists and the revolutionists, man is known by his ability to organize his class to fight the bourgeoisie; Lenin, Foster, Zinoviev. Woman here becomes prominent partly as a fighter and partly as the supporter and protector of those who fight. Examples: Krupskaya, Luxemburg, Zetkin.

THE CAMPAIGN FUND CAMPAIGN! Two hundred and fifty major campaign rallies if you'll help finance them.

HEADQUARTERS



Executive Committee, Russian Communist Party

collective labor peasants. The peasantry in building the working class shows the peasant task. The peasant methods of new economic working class in their fight. The interested itself a thousand different work no mere theory. It is a historic thing unity beyond the peasant support to the working class that only the thief his will be quick and by the prole-

MICHAEL GOLODNY



A Proletarian Poet.

BEDACHT AND BROWDER START PARTY CLASSES IN MARXISM.

If you are a Marxist—or want to become a Marxist—you will be interested in the class in Advanced Marxism which the Chicago Local of the Workers Party is conducting this fall. The first session of the class will be held on Sunday, Oct. 12, at the Workers Lyceum, 2733 Hirsch Blvd., at 10:30 a. m.

An examination will be given at the first session of the class, so that prospective students who are uncertain of their standing may learn whether they should join a class in advanced or another in elementary Marxism. The test will consist of twenty-five questions on Marxian theory, and candidates for the advanced class are expected to be able to answer at least two-thirds of them correctly.

Another class, for those who are beginning their studies of Marxism, is to be given under the direction of Earl R. Browder, editor of the Workers Monthly. Comrade Browder's class will be held every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock, at 2633 Hirsch

Blvd. The first meeting of the class will be held on October 15.

In addition to these courses, Comrade Manuel Gomez will conduct a class in "Imperialism, the Final Stage of Capitalism," on Sunday afternoons, beginning October 26. The course in the history of the American Communist movement, which will be conducted by Comrade James P. Cannon, is to begin on November 11.

The tuition fee is \$1.50 for each course, and 75 cents extra for each additional course.

Fire from the Red Volcano

(Continued from page 3)

stand the purpose of a revolutionary program,—you learn that it is not only a document—as you pursue the history of the Communist movement.

All thru the work, Zinoviev pays a certain delicate deference to the once mighty leader of proletarian revolutionary theory, Plekhanov. Plekhanov, once a Bolshevik and for a time a battler at the side of Lenin for the revolutionary Marxian cause, against petty-bourgeois opportunism, Plekhanov is remembered tenderly for his earlier services, and for his later desertion he is—explained.

War and Revolution.

Zinoviev carries his account thru the Japanese war and the clashes with the mensheviks over the question of the socialist attitude toward that war. Then into the revolution of 1905 and 1906—the "Dress Rehearsal" thru which the Bolsheviks learned so well the parts they were to play in the grand opening of 1917. Altho there is not as much recital of the actual happenings of that tremendous time as the thrifty American Bolsheviks would like to have Comrade Zinoviev give us, nevertheless that which is given is put in such a setting as to give it brilliant clarity of meaning. And after all, Zinoviev is writing the history of the party and not of the revolution, if the two can be distinguished.

And after the crushing of the 1905 revolution, during the terrible period of reaction, despair and consequent wild aberrations, we find again the clash between the steadfast Marxian revolutionists and the petty-bourgeois minded reformists, taking this time the form of the question "1847 or 1849," meaning the question of whether the period ahead was a period of long and peaceful capitalist development or one of a lull between revolutionary outbreaks. And

what a tremendous help this is, to understand the present similar dispute! And during the depression of revolutionary hope came the pressure for unity which resulted in reuniting with the mensheviks—and further clashes all of which are as the acted out for the purpose of teaching us of this day what Bolshevism is.

The "Liquidators."

There was the rise of the "Liquidators"—what a curse the use of this term was to the American party!—but here in the history of the Russian party we learn just what Liquidators really were—and that is something different from the thing which was mislabeled that name in America. But read it from Zinoviev's pen, not mine.

This history does not purport to go into the detail of the world war and the 1917 revolution, but only gives a few sharp, clear pictures of the beginnings of the crystallization of the revolutionary left wing of socialism, the Zimmerwald conference, the work of Lenin in Switzerland, with which the stage was set for the coming of the final revolutionary world-organization, the Communist International.

The work closes with some exceedingly interesting historical documents and very appropriately with "The Bolsheviks and the Hegemony of the Proletariat," by Zinoviev.

The first installment of this epoch-marking work will undoubtedly arouse a keen interest among the Workers Party membership, and especially at this time, when, as I say, we have before us the stern job of making this a truly Bolshevik party, to do which we must know what a Bolshevik party is.

Building Bolsheviks—the D. W. B. U.

Help the Paterson Silk Strikers

Show your solidarity with the 10,000 silk strikers.

Help them to win their just demands.

Help to defeat the injunction.

Give at once as much as you can to keep up the splendid spirit and solidarity of the Paterson silk strikers in this struggle.

WORKERS PARTY RELIEF COMMITTEE
FOR THE PATERSON SILK STRIKERS.
S. Zimmerman, Secretary-Treasurer.

Send your donations to the Workers Party Relief Committee for the Paterson Silk Strikers, Room 8, 208 East 12th Street, New York City.

BULLETIN NO. 2.

OF THE

WORKERS MONTHLY

Combining
The Liberator, Labor Herald and
Soviet Russia Pictorial

"Seven Years of Workers' Rule"

By Moissaye J. Olgin.

well-known revolutionist and writer, who has just returned from Russia, will be one of the leading articles in the November issue of The Workers Monthly.

Olgin's writings about Russia and the revolution have won him high praise thruout the world. His best known books, "The Soul of the Russian Revolution" and "Guide to Russian Literature," are not alone authoritative but are also written with such skill and excellent literary style as to place Olgin in the front ranks of American writers.

Moissaye J. Olgin will be one of the regular contributors to THE WORKERS MONTHLY.

The opening announcement of the amalgamation of three established magazines into one great Labor journal, carried with it the news of the serial publication of "The History of the Russian Communist Party," by Gregory Zinoviev in the

First Number to be Issued NOVEMBER 1st

These important contributions point to the high standard of articles to be maintained by the new leader in the field of American Labor journals.

Your subscription will insure you its receipt every month.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Single copy 25 cents

\$2.00 for one year \$1.25 for six months

THE WORKERS MONTHLY

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF

THE WORKERS PARTY AND THE TRADE UNION
EDUCATIONAL LEAGUE.

EDITED BY EARL R. BROWDER.

USE THIS BLANK

THE WORKERS MONTHLY
1113 W. Washington Blvd. Chicago, Illinois

For the enclosed \$..... send me THE WORKERS
MONTHLY for..... months.

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY STATE

The Shop Nucleus and the Branch

By Martin Abern

In reorganizing the Workers Party from its present territorial branch foundation to the work shop or shop nucleus basis, one of the big problems to solve is the relation of the shop nucleus to the branch. The relations between them will not be of a single or everlasting type.

We have to consider:
1. The relations of the shop nucleus to the present territorial branch, and
2. The relation of the shop nucleus to the shop nucleus branch, or the branch composed of shop nuclei.

The former is the big transitional problem; the latter takes up the relations between the shop nucleus and the branch when the party has been more or less completely reorganized, and somewhat definite relationships and activity have thereby developed.

In America, it must be said, the problem of the shop nuclei organization is more difficult than in other countries, due chiefly to the existence of the many language organizations or federations in our party. The only other country which really approaches America in this particular difficulty is Czechoslovakia. But even there, after many attempts to side-step and evade the reorganization of the party into shop nuclei, the Czechoslovak Communist party is (the Young Communist League of Czechoslovakia already has) now proceeding to organize shop nuclei.

Shop Nuclei Will Aid Work Among Foreign Workers

We must face the issue of the language branch and try to find means of reorganizing the entire Workers Party on the shop nuclei basis, at the same time not hurting the Communist propaganda among the foreign language speaking workers. On the contrary, that must and will be extended when the shop nuclei work is really started and understood. It is very likely that many other practical suggestions and methods will be evolved in making and experimenting with the change and work. However, to begin with, some forms of relation must be set up.

First, Organize the Shop Nucleus.
Assume that a shop nucleus has been formed from a branch or a number of English and language territorial branches. What shall be the connection, then, of the members of the shop nucleus toward their former English or language branch? (Here the relationship to the language branch is mainly considered; the English branch question is much easier of solution). In the shop nucleus, as mentioned in previous articles, the member pays his dues, carries on the economic and political work, and has full power as a party member, that is, with voice and vote on all matters.

The shop nucleus member, however, is not removed entirely from his territorial (or old style) branch. He still remains a member of his former English or language territorial branch.

To be realistic in reorganizing the Workers Party, the most feasible method, at present, is to have the members of the shop nucleus remain also members of their former territorial branches.

What shall be the powers and duties of the member of the shop nucleus in his territorial branch? Does he have the full powers of a party member in the territorial branch? To give him also full powers in the territorial branch would mean that he has more rights than a party member who as yet does not belong to a shop nucleus but only to a branch. It would give him two votes, one in the shop nucleus and one in the territorial branch, on all matters. Therefore, in his territorial branch, the shop nucleus member should be given a voice only on all matters, but not a vote.

The question arises: What about the activity of a shop nucleus member in his territorial branch? Is he responsible in any way to it? Shall he be active in it? Yes; naturally. If the members of the shop nucleus were to lose all contact, during the transition period, with the language territorial branch, then, in all probability, the language branch activities would cease before the shop nuclei are prop-

erly established. It would be very difficult to carry on propaganda work among the foreign workers. This is especially so because the shop nucleus members are, in most instances, the comrades who were most active in their language branches.

Shop Nucleus Work Effective Because Planned

The shop nucleus meetings will, with few exceptions, (perhaps in some places among the needle trades) be carried on in English. Yet that does not and cannot do away with language propaganda work in the work shop. Members of the shop nucleus, who speak foreign languages, can carry on work in the shop in the languages that the workers understand. For example, in a large shop, clothing, textile, machine, etc., if there are workers employed who speak Italian, Russian, South Slav, Jewish, Lithuanian, English, etc., and if the shop nucleus has comrades speaking these languages, it is expected that each comrade does some part of his shop nucleus work in other languages in order to reach the other workers with our propaganda, literature, etc. Instead of interfering with the work of the foreign-speaking comrades, helps to broaden and extend their activities. This is plainly so, because the WORK OF THE SHOP NUCLEUS FOR EVERY ACTIVITY IN THE SHOP IS PLANNED AND THEN CARRIED OUT. Since the fundamental problem of the language member in the shop nucleus is the matter of continuing language propaganda activity among the foreign workers, we can already see that the language work will continue and increase in the shop nucleus. We should, however, see what technical or organizational ties there will be between the shop nucleus members and the language territorial branch in the transition period. As a measure, the following is possible.

Shop Nucleus Member Continues Work in Language Territorial Branch

The shop nucleus member, as pointed out before, has full powers in his shop nucleus and carries on his main activities there. In the language territorial branch, he is subject to carrying on propaganda work assigned to him, such as raising funds for the language press, educational activity, etc. All the members of the shop nucleus must regularly and continuously participate in the work of the territorial branch; visit its meetings; work in the educational groups, classes, and carry thru the various tasks of the branch. A transitional relationship in thus actively entered into between the shop nucleus and the language or English territorial branch. Participating, as he does, in the territorial branch, while primarily active in the shop nucleus, the matter of the powers of shop nucleus members in the territorial branch must be settled. The following, on the basis of activities of the members, can be satisfactory to all.

The shop nucleus member shall have voice and vote on all Federation or organizational matters, that is, on press, internal Federation problems, such as means of conducting the work among the foreign workers. But the shop nucleus member has voice only in the territorial branch on Party political matters, such as the right to send delegates to higher bodies, the C. C. C. conventions, political issues in the Party and so on. Those latter and other rights he has in the shop nucleus. It can be said, then, inversely, that the Federation or language branch still has power over the shop nucleus member on Federation matters, but not on direct Party organizational and political matters.

It follows too, that even as there are active relations between the members of the shop nucleus with the branch, there is need also of committee relations between the shop nucleus and the branch in order to outline and co-ordinate the work. A few points which are accepted are:

1. The shop nucleus, during the transition period, is subordinated to the existing (old style) territorial branch;

2. The shop nucleus executive committee meets regularly with the territorial branch executive committee;

3. The shop nucleus members participate in the arrangements and work of the branch;

4. There shall be representatives of the shop nucleus on the branch (old style) executive committee and vice versa. This necessary for working purposes, even though the shop nucleus members are already attached to various branches. Every effort and chance must be given to the shop nucleus members to influence the work in the territorial branch. Other transition steps will be found, but carrying out these will help toward that end.

Funds Available for Propaganda Among Foreign Workers

On the matter of finances the shop nucleus secretary collects the dues from the members, keeps a record of those members who belong to a language branch and reports same to the higher bodies. The national office takes care that the federations are reimbursed. This is in order not to hinder language propaganda activity. However, this is not a permanent situation. It is only put forward as a temporary, transitional remedy. In another article the matter of the kind of language activity and organization which will remain during and after the shop nuclei form of organization is established can be taken up.

AUTOMATISM IN EDUCATION

(Continued from Page 2.)

do we manage so successfully to weed out non-conformists—that is, persons who can, and do, think for themselves—and to weed in meek conformists? The answer is amazingly simple. No matter what excellence a candidate may attain in the written examination; no matter what excellence he may achieve in the oral test (as far as knowledge can epitomize excellence); no matter how deep and sincere his love of teaching; we reserve the precious right to mar his destiny and his natural ambition, if we find his personality "deficient."

Inasmuch as personality is as various as changing, as indeterminate a concept as goodness or wickedness itself, we arrogate to ourselves a marvelous prerogative; as a court of last resort (plaintiff, judge and jury, sitting like a holy trinity), we interpret personality arbitrarily to fit in with our ideal of the meek conformist.

Hence (within the limits of examiner's omniscience) we weed out unconventional persons, unique individuals, eccentric thinkers, frank talkers, dissentients in general; and we weed in quietists, kow-towers, conventionally dressed and conventionally mannered and conventionally subordinate personauties. We make mistakes, to be sure. However, we can easily rectify our misjudgments by later and recurrent checks upon "personality." If a lion in sheep's garb is hunted down, or a thinker in gentleman's dress, it is easy to out-

him by marking his personality down.

The constant aim throughout is to reduce our vast educational system to a smooth-working mechanism. Obedience, quietism, conventionality, agreement, are the guarantors of "efficiency."

Automatism in education (the greatest mechanical efficiency with the least human friction) is the ideal. The personality test is the imminent threat to out non-conformists. Why marvel that the educational system of America turns out countless "educated" persons whose one ambition in life is to advance not one step farther than their socially myopic "superior"?

Education deliberately hampers originality—deliberately!

A great secret transpires. The examiner, who is coerced by his position of super-dignity to assume the pose of omniscience and to play the clairvoyant to a credulous public (he is supposed to read your soul or personality within seven minutes or so, depending upon his vision), is really in no need of ample knowledge or wisdom or insight.

His mask is shockingly simple. He must be of all sweet accord with his superior, and prove his loyalty by weeding out non-conformists. That task is not onerous. Thinking is minimal; obedience maximal. The machine works beautifully.

Building Bolsheviks—the D. W. B. U.



THE WORLD'S
GREATEST TONIC
for lowered vitality

makes your blood tingle with joy the minute you taste it. Take a wine glass full of

LIPSEY'S

BITTERS

before meals and note the improvement of your health in a few days. Order a bottle by coupon below.

LIPSEY PRODUCTS CO., Dept. 31,
1133 Foster Ave., Chicago, Ill.

Gentlemen:
Send me in plain wrapper one (1) large bottle of LIPSEY'S BITTERS. I will pay postman \$1.35 on arrival. If I am not satisfied after trying a few glasses, I may return unused portion and you will refund my money.

Name _____
Street and No. _____
R. F. D. No. _____ Box _____
Town _____ State _____

Money Back Guarantee



The United States and Great Britain

(Continued from page 1)

siderably in size. When the English write with apprehension of the enormous strength of the American navy, the American naval experts inevitably retort: "Why, did we not build up our navy for sole purpose of defending your islands from the German submarines?" This, you see, is the reason why America built up her navy. Of course, incidentally that navy may serve other purposes, too.

Why, then, did the United States call that Washington conference? Not because they could not build their warships fast enough, or because they could not make their liners big enough. No, America has no competition in that field. The main question was that of trained men—power. It is impossible to create over night a well-trained, well-disciplined navy personnel. That requires time. And therein lies the cause why the issue of a ten years' breathing spell was raised at the Washington conference. While insisting upon a limitation program in the construction of new liners, American military-naval publications made it known to the world that if that program was not accepted, America could show that she can turn out warships as speedily and efficiently as she can bake her celebrated pies. To this the leading English military-naval magazine answered approximately thus: "Why all these threats? We are always ready for a peaceful agreement." This is something new in the psychology of official England. England is fast learning to submit to America and the most she is demanding of her is politeness and good manners. Good manners. That is the maximum of what the European bourgeoisie may expect in the future from American capitalism.

In this struggle between England and the United States the former has only one alternative: to retreat, to compromise. That is the price English capital has to pay for the privilege of sharing in a measure the fortunes of American capital. Thus is being produced a certain semblance of a coalition of Anglo-Saxon capital. England is thus able to save her face at the same time securing a goodly share of the spoils. But whatever England is getting she must pay for it by retreating before the onward march of American capital. And while politically the world position of America is growing stronger, that of England is becoming weaker and weaker.

Only recently England had to give up her plan to fortify Singapore. Singapore is the most strategic point between the Indian ocean and the Pacific. It is the most important base for English politics in the Far East. But these politics in the Pacific, England can pursue either in alliance with Japan against America or with America against Japan. A choice which was very difficult for McDonald to make. Hence his decision to give up the plan of fortifying Singapore regardless of the fact that large sums of money have already been assigned for that purpose. Of course, this is not yet the last word in the imperialist policy of Great Britain. The matter may be reconsidered later. For the present, however, it means that England has begun to recede from an independent policy of action on the Pacific.

And who, do you think, has ordered (you ordered) England to sever her alliance with Japan? Of course, America. This demand was a virtual ultimatum to England, and England obeyed. So far England is retreating and retreating. But does it mean that England will continue this policy of retreat and that the possibility of war between England and the United States is excluded? Not by any means. On the contrary: Thru her present policy, England is getting only into greater and more difficult contradictions in her relations with the United States. Under the disguise of co-operation there are being accumulated contradictions between England and the United States of an unusually explosive nature. War between the two countries is not only a probability, but seems inevitable. It can hardly be expected that England

will peacefully turn over her empire to America and serenely retreat to a secondary position in world affairs. The psychological moment will arrive when England will be forced to mobilize all her forces and make an attempt at armed resistance. But in an open struggle, too, all the chances seem to be on the side of America.

England is an island. America is also an island in a way, but a good deal larger. England is depending almost entirely upon other countries for her daily existence. America, on the other hand, has everything that is necessary for life and for the waging of war within her own borders. England has colonies in all the seas, and America will be "liberating" them. In case of war with England, America will immediately appeal to the millions of Hindus to rise in revolt against the British yoke and to defend their unalienable national rights. In the same way she will arouse Egypt and Ireland. There are many to be liberated from the yoke of British imperialism. Just as America has at present attired herself in the cloak of pacifism in order to sap the vitality out of Europe, she will in the coming war with England, appear on the arena as the great savior of the oppressed peoples of the colonies.

Old grandmother-history is serving as an oracle to American capital supplying it with ready made "humanitarian" slogans for every one of its intended robberies. With regard to China, America's policy is that of the "open door." Japan wishes to dismember China, to subjugate by force of arms certain Chinese provinces, because Japan needs the iron, coal and oil in which those provinces abound. Japan can neither live nor engage in war without iron, coal and oil. These are the three outstanding disadvantages in her struggle with the United States. She is therefore, trying to secure for herself the mineral wealth of China by means of conquest. But altruistic America says, "No, we want an open door in China." America pursues a similar policy with regard to navigation. She wants "freedom of the seas." But what does "freedom of the seas" mean in reality? It means this: "You, English fleet, move out of my way, please." And the "open door" in China means this: "You, little Jap, step aside and let me in." The whole affair is one of economic loot and plunder. It is only due to the specific development of the United States that this brutal business of American imperialism takes on the appearance of pacifism.

Of course, England too, has some important advantages resulting from the specific character of her historic development. England has mighty, fortified naval bases all over the world which America lacks. America, however, will be able to overcome this difficulty. She can build up and develop bases of her own or else seize them by force from England. It must also be remembered that England's sea bases, because they are intimately connected with her colonies, can therefore, be easily attacked. America will find allies and friends all over the world—the strongest always finds friends and thus be able to establish the necessary bases.

Already now America is gaining the confidence of Canada and Australia by championing the "interests" of the white race against the yellow race, thereby justifying her claim to supremacy on the sea. We shall not be a bit surprised, if in her next move, which may take place in the very near future, America will make a pious declaration that after all, the yellow people, too, are created in the image and likeness of God and, consequently, they possess an unalienable right to substitute English sovereignty by American economic rule.

The position of America in case of war with England would be that of a sure winner. America would from the very first day call upon the Hindus, Egyptians and other colonial nations to rise in revolt against English oppression supplying them at the same time with arms and ammunition and giving them general assistance. England will have to think ten times before she decides upon war. But without war England will have to retreat step by step before the pres-

sure of American capital. For the conduct of war the English bourgeoisie needs the Lloyd Georges and Churchills, for a policy of retreat without battle the MacDonalds can be made use of.

The above picture of the relations between the United States and England, with a few changes and on a slightly smaller scale, could also stand for the relations between the United States and Japan. A miniature size of the same picture will show the relations between the United States and France and other secondary European governments. While Europe is busy quarrelling about some bits of land and strips of territory, such as Alsace-Lorraine, Ruhr, the Saar Basin, Silesia, etc., America is making plans to put all of Europe on a ration. Unlike England, America does not intend to establish in Europe an American army and an American administration. America will "allow" the people of

Europe to maintain at their own expense reformist, pacifist, powerless governments composed of social-democrats, liberals and other petty-bourgeois parties, and the people will have to be grateful to America for a time at least, that she has not robbed them entirely of their "independence." Such are the plans of American capital and such is the program upon which the Second International is being re-established.

Русская Вечеринка

Russian Vecheerinka, performance and dance will be given by the Society for Technical Aid to Soviet Russia, Saturday, Oct. 18, at 8 p. m., at the Soviet School, 1902 W. Division St. A good time is promised to all. Are you coming?

FOLKETS HUS

2733 Hirsch Boulevard

FOLKETS HUS BAZAAR STARTS TONIGHT, Saturday, October 11, and Sunday, October 12, beginning 3 p. m. Program and dance both days.

Amalgamated Food Workers

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS

81 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

THIS IS OUR



EMBLEM

An Industrial Organization For All Workers in the Food Industry

Stir the Shops!

The very best place to carry on a working class campaign is in the shops and factories where the workers gather to earn their living. It is there that minds are open to the measures, parties and candidates that stand for concrete solutions of the problems of bread and butter facing the working class. It is in the shops that the workers will see most clearly, for example, the difference between Foster, the union organizer and fighter for the workers, and LaFollette, the lawyer and fighter for the middle class. (Editorial Daily Worker.)

THE ABOVE "HITS THE NAIL" on the head. Nothing could be added to that. It's up to you reader, to do everything physically possible to place

THESE PAMPHLETS

in the hands of the workers who work together with in shops and factories. Sell them everywhere. Now is the time.

The LaFollette Illusion—

As revealed in an Analysis of the Political Role of Senator LaFollette, by Jay Lovestone. Single copy.....15c

Parties, and Issues in the Election Campaign—

By Alexander Bittelmann. Questions and answers, how the different parties view the conditions affecting the working class. It's a gem. No worker should go to the polls this year without first reading this pamphlet.....10c

Unemployment—

Why It Occurs and How to Fight It, by Earl R. Browder. This pamphlet deals with the most important issue before the workers today.....5c
In lots of 5 or more at 35 per cent discount. Place your orders at once.

LITERATURE DEPARTMENT

Workers Party of America

1113 Washington Blvd.

Chicago, Ill.