

"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.

DECEMBER 6, 1924.

The Lessons of MacDonaldism

Speech of Comrade Zinoviev at the Opening of the Course of Instruction for Party Functionaries.

(Concluded from last Saturday)

The Coming Together of the English and Russian Proletariat.

It would have seemed as if the situation for us was most unfavorable. At the head of the English government the bourgeoisie had placed one of the most cunning leaders of the Second International and a hater of the Soviet Union. Before he came to be the head of the government, MacDonald had written in one of his articles on the international policy of the labor party that when he succeeded to power he would not permit any monkey tricks on the part of Soviet diplomats. In the same article he wrote that only through the firm and well-grounded position of the Second International, which had taken up the whole weight of the struggle against bolshevism in the period of its greatest strength, would it be possible to get rid of these injurious elements.

Regarded from this standpoint we were placed in a very unfavorably position. A furious campaign was conducted against us in which use was made of every possible "fact" in order to slander us. But a few months passed and what has been the result? In spite of everything there has been an approachment of the working class of our country with the working class of England. It is true that this was only a substitute for what could have been if we had an alliance of two real governments. But the workers of both countries understand one another. However moderate the trade unions may have been, however much they may have been bound by tradition, this approachment has undoubtedly taken place. When the politicians attempted at the last moment to wreck the treaty between Great Britain and the Soviet Union the English working class, as everyone knows, exerted pressure and compelled MacDonald to sign it.

It is well known that the adherents of MacDonald hate our trade unions. When, however, the representatives of the Russian trade unions appeared, the representatives of the English trade union movement, even the leaders, welcomed our delegates with an unexampled enthusiasm. We have heard of touching scenes, how old workers have accompanied our delegates to the station and given over to them various simple gifts as keepsakes. There were genuine and sincere scenes of fraternisation.

The English Working Class Has Grown Politically.

So moderate, so much inclined to opportunism as the English workers may be, they have nevertheless, after their manner, understood the fact that the labor party has become a governing party. They understand that if a labor government came into power, they would be able to exert pressure upon the rich, to compel them to disgorge some of their wealth in order to help the unemployment, that they will be able to proceed to nationalize the mines and railways, etc. They have retained their class instinct.

The English workers began to consider that they really must begin to take power into their own hands. However much MacDonald tried to twist and turn and to serve the bourgeoisie, the working class began to understand our workers. The present "labor" government is the government of his majesty, but the

bourgeoisie has been called to recognize us, that means therefore that we constitute a force. And the workers instinctively look round for allies, and they find them. Where? Of course in our country, in the Soviet Union. They are beginning seriously to think how it would be if they had a genuine workers' government.

This process has developed in the course of nine months. The Comintern had predicted it. However the heads might be inclined, whatever parliamentary combinations they played, there went on the objective process of the revolutionizing of the working class of England, of course only slowly up to now. And now when Lloyd George and Curzon perceive that the masses are beginning to speak of a real power of the workers, they decide that it is time to put an end to this game. MacDonald has been squeezed out by them like a lemon and the continuation of this game has become dangerous on account of the left tendencies of the masses.

The bourgeoisie said: enough of this fooling. They are not inclined to just over the question of who is to rule, and who is to be ruled. They have a very keen class instinct and are prepared to make every sacrifice for it. MacDonald in the Unaccustomed Role of an Impartial Witness on the Position of Affairs in the Soviet Union.

What will be the result of the struggle of the parties in the election campaign? What will be the attitude of the labor party? As we have said, MacDonald has no particular sympathy for us. He had his hand in the Georgian affair; as a leader of the Second International he considered it his chief task to prejudice the ideas of Communism in the eyes of the workers. In spite of that, in the present election campaign the leaders of the MacDonald labor party will be compelled to tell the truth regarding the Soviet Union, in other words, to make propaganda for the Soviet Union. They have no other course open to them. The relation of forces is such that the worst leaders of the Second International will tell at least some truths regarding the Soviet Union, the home of the Third International. Even the English bourgeois press makes pretty clear allusions to MacDonald's ambiguous position.

Something similar has occurred to our Russian mensheviks. Abramovitch and Zerettel recently gave a report at a sitting of the national administrative council of the independent labor party upon the "cruelties" in Georgia. At the end the question was put to them: Shall the treaty between the Soviet Union and Great Britain be confirmed or not? And the honorable Messrs Abramovitch and Zerettel replied: Of course it must be confirmed. The Russian mensheviks are in every respect dependent upon the leaders of the English labor party. They know that the latter cannot do otherwise than confirm the treaty because the masses so will it. Thus it is that we witness an interesting historical paradox, as the chief section of the Second International is compelled by the whole course of history to conduct the election campaign for the greater part in favor of signing the treaty. The events which are now developing confirm this.

Campbell Has Also to be Defended.

I will now deal with the Campbell affair, which was the occasion for the dissolution of parliament. This comrade, as editor of the weekly party paper, some time ago published an appeal to the English soldiers calling

on them to refuse to fire upon striking workers. For this he was arrested. In the meantime the English workers found it was only right that soldiers should not fire on striking workers. The MacDonald government was compelled to have him released, and withdrew the charge brought against him. This was the thing over which MacDonald tripped. The liberals and conservatives accused him of withdrawing the prosecution as a result of pressure. It now appears that MacDonald and Co. must prove to the working class that it was impossible to hold Campbell under arrest and bring him before the court.

MacDonald has been commanded by the bourgeoisie to persecute the Communists. He persecutes them. The day before his defeat he carried through a resolution for the expulsion of the Communists from the labor party. It is true it was only carried through by an insignificant majority, with 1,500,000 against 1,500,000 votes. MacDonald at the last moment performed this service for the bourgeoisie. But it was already too late. The English bourgeoisie said: it is not enough that you are prepared to persecute the Communists if the workers are not prepared to do so. Thus the Times in its issue of Oct. 5 declared:

"The difference in the size of the last of the preceding majorities is striking. The explanation is no doubt to be found in the fact that the Communists have strength in the trade unions, where they are exceedingly active and where they are entitled, by the payment of their trade union subscriptions, to all the rights and privileges of membership. They are more prominent in some unions than in others and have seats on the executive committees of several. The miners recently elected one who had been identified with Communism to fill the office of general secretary of their federation. It is evident from the figures that there was on the part of a large section of the conference an unwillingness to proscribe the Communists altogether. But the majority is large enough to settle the party's policy on the matter, and if yesterday's resolutions are observed there can be no Communists in next year's conference, no Communists posing as official labor candidates, and no Communists whatever in the local labor parties. But the resolutions make no difference to the status of Communists in the trade unions."

How the Elections Will Turn Out.

It is of course difficult to be a prophet, especially when dealing with a foreign country. As far as can be judged at present, I believe that MacDonald will hardly be returned to power, but this does not exclude the possibility that his party will be in a position to furnish ministers and for a long time to be a factor in government combinations. The English bourgeoisie has not driven out MacDonald in order immediately to let him return to power. We must not expect that in one form or another there will be a bloc of the conservative with the liberals. MacDonald will not obtain an absolute majority in parliament. He may perhaps obtain the relative majority. The workers of England are still behind him. He has not yet compromised himself with the workers as he has with the colonial peoples. According to English parliamentary procedure the party which possesses the relative majority forms the cabinet. But if the working class is raising its head, if the class danger arises, then of course

all parliamentary usage will be laid aside. On the other hand the English bourgeoisie fear the workers. If the workers were to obtain a great election victory, they would perhaps not venture to overthrow their government and would be compelled to recall MacDonald to power. What is more likely, however, is that the liberal party will be ground between the millstones of the conservative and labor party. We must expect an increase of votes by the conservatives and by the labor party. A portion of the liberals will go to the conservatives, a portion to the labor party. A section of the liberals have already gone to the labor party because they see that the labor party is carrying on their policy. It is possible that there will be set up a conservative government with the support of a certain wing of the liberals, or a labor party government, likewise with the support of the liberals. In either case the revolutionizing of the working class will proceed slowly but steadily forwards.

If MacDonald is defeated in the elections and Curzon is returned to power, there is no doubt that a movement will set in in the ranks of the English working class, for they will not put up with the conservatives so easily as they have before. For the desire for power has already been awakened and the self-confidence of the workers has been increased. For the first time in their history, the English working class have believed that their people are in power. A conservative government means the danger of a new war, increase of unemployment, a policy of blood and adventure and a capitalist offensive against the workers. But this will be a dangerous game, which will stir up the masses, revolutionize the workers, and prove the correctness of Communism.

If, however, MacDonald comes again into power, there will no longer be the same "labor government" as before. MacDonald himself will remain the same and will now even more before the bourgeoisie. But the workers will not be the same. They will be stronger, more resolute, because they will have seen that by an election victory they will have once more placed a labor government in office. In either case the revolutionizing of the workers will proceed slowly, but surely forwards.

It must not be supposed that in England there is a serious political crisis, and that the ground is giving way beneath the bourgeoisie. This is not the case. The English bourgeoisie is experienced, is rich, is still firmly rooted in the home country; and in addition possesses a great number of colonies, in which the national revolutionary emancipation movement is not yet strongly developed. In spite of this the first blows are falling, and in this respect the English mensheviks are working for us, as Vladimir Ilyich predicted at a time when there was no prospect of a "labor government." Our English brother party is advancing with the slogan: A real labor government with a fighting class program.

History is Working on Our Behalf.

One of the chief slogans of the labor party will obviously be the following: The whole treaty between the Soviet Union and Great Britain must be confirmed without alterations and deletions. Over a year ago Curzon sent us an ultimatum in which he threatened to crush us if we did not give back a fishing boat which was confiscated

(Continued on page 8)

Position and Prospects of Soviet Industry

(A speech by P. Bogdanov, chairman U. S. S. R. Supreme Economic Council, delivered end of August.)

THE industries of the U. S. S. R. have long since passed thru the period when the fear could be entertained that some economic disturbances, some particular shortcoming in one direction or another could bring about their collapse, partially or as a whole. So firm indeed is the foothold which has been gained, that it has become impossible to speak of the possibility of any sort of catastrophe. The sales crisis of a year ago proved a crucial test, which showed that, in a crisis, Soviet industry could exert a decisive influence by appropriate use of the resources which were acquired during the previous period of accumulation of working capital.

Our light industry has obtained an increasingly tenacious command of the market in proportion to the extent that it has adopted a correct policy for the reduction of prices. Depression exists now only in the realm of heavy industry, but even here the day is long since past when we were obliged to tremble at the threat of ruin in the Donets coal fields, or the oil fields. Now all that we have to consider is simply the adoption of proper plans and methods whereby the results secured can be strengthened and consolidated. The movement of the market in general confirms the fact that our industry is becoming established in a very favorable position.

Results During 1923-1924.
During the last half-year, apart from slight market fluctuations, continued progress has been achieved in every branch of it. This movement has not been checked even by the prospect of unfavorable harvest in some parts of the union. Evidently this industrial progress is deeply rooted in the possible development of our market. June and July are months when factories stop working, when repairs are done, when workers are on leave, but even these months register an increased production in every branch, naturally not a large increase, but amounting to 3.5 per cent to 10 per cent. In some cases there is even a fall by 5 per cent, but on the whole, the output for June exceeds to some extent that of May, in which the latter months the position was better than that of April and the foregoing months. **Effect of the Harvest on Industrial Sales.**

If we turn to the problem of selling our industrial products we have first of all to note these factors which obviously serve to mitigate the effect of the partial crop failure. The quantity of grain which will be thrown on the market in the course of the present year will not be above that of last year, but prices of corn at the present time are twice as high as they were in August, September, or October of last year. The extra value

Two Poems

Come out, workers of the world, to fight,
But not to fight nations!
Come out in a heavy, stamping, proletarian army;
Get out your last bayonets.
The phrases about peace are an empty Utopia
As long as the capitalists are not dealt with.
If not today, then tomorrow,
Death to the guilty—and doubly to the innocent.
Knock down the fat—dozens and scores of them,
Peace to peace, but
War to war!

—Vladimir Malakovski.

... Thirty millions were shot,
Hundreds of millions groan and weep;
But all this will seem a trifle
Next to the future war . . .
All the spines, flogged in prison camps,
All the limbs left upon operating tables,
All the wounds that ache in the fall,
All the clattering crutches,
All the screams of the gassed,
Let them all unite today in a shout:
Down with the war!
It shall not be! We don't want! We shall not permit!
Nations are not enemies of nations.
Nations are invented by the enemy of all.

—Vladimir Malakovski.

of the grain will enable our peasants to increase their purchase of manufactured goods. On the other hand, the bad harvest this year is concentrated in definite localities, and in the remaining parts of the union the rise of prices has not been as great as mentioned above.

Further, it should be noted that co-operative activity has definitely increased through the present year, and that many syndicates and trusts have been extending their branches to cover the whole of the union. This means that new sale areas have been created, especially in Siberia and a host of other places which hitherto have not been reached by our trading machinery.

Increased Sales in 1923-24.

I am not now dealing with the fact that our fundamental policy of an all-around reduction of prices and the approximation of the cost of commodities to the purchasing power of the peasants is an essential factor which will create new markets for us, and will make it possible for our industry to develop its manufacturing activity in spite of the partial failure of the crops. The figures of increased production for June and July fluctuate by some 5 to 10 per cent, but sales in these branches show always an absolute increase. It is true that the sales of the chief industrial associations give a rise approximately of not more than 10 per cent, still with regard to the commodities of state industry most in demand the rise

is considerably larger. The increased demand for textiles deserves special attention. Sales in this branch of industry have risen by 16 per cent. Some departments of the textile syndicate have increased their sales one and a half times, others have doubled their sales.

A considerable increase in sales is shown also by the food industry. The sugar industry, for example, has increased its June sales one and a half times, as compared with May, and the vegetable oil industry by 30 per cent. A particularly marked rise in sales is noticeable in the tobacco industry—the increase amounting to 105 per cent. Those who control this industry say that sales would have been even greater if a greater quantity of goods had been at their disposal.

It is only in regard to building materials that there is a definite hold up of prices. Lack of capital prevents big repair work from being undertaken. Things are quiet as regards building timber, corrugated iron, colors, cement, etc.

Thus, summarizing the position with regard to sales, we may say that as far as the essential branches of light industry are concerned, we have a perfectly steady state of things based on the definite demands of the market. In heavy industry, on the other hand, we are passing thru a rather critical situation in the nature of over-production.

The Heavy Industries.

The steps which the special com-

mission has taken to increase the sales of general fuel have led to certain improvements. Definite progress has been made in the direction of running railways and industry on the use of mineral fuel, and already the stocks of coal in the Donets region have been reduced. Stocks of oil are still very large, and in so far as oil competes with coal, the way out should be found in the foreign market.

The Metal Industry.

As regards the metallurgical industry, the question of increasing sales is a matter of considerable importance. While our light industry has advanced to 40 per cent of the pre-war level, while the textile industry, in accordance with the plan of development adopted by the supreme economic council, is reaching a figure of 50 to 60 per cent of pre-war production of cotton fabrics, the metal industry has remained backward, and still shows less than 20 per cent of the pre-war output.

The disproportion in industry is due to the high cost of our metal. The enlargement of the metallurgical market is bound up with the problem of price reduction. The calculation worked out by the special Dzerzhinsky committee announces that a price of 80 to 90 kopeks per pood of metal should be adopted. This is a big reduction in comparison with prevailing prices, and with its adoption we can expect that there will be a great move forward in the sale of metal. While the general market does not consume more than 20 per cent of the metal output, leaving all the rest to transport and building industry—yet, experience shows that the demands of the peasantry for articles of agricultural and domestic utility are very large. Every instance of cheapening metal should mean a larger metal market, which in turn should permit the starting of extra blast furnaces which in turn should lead to a further reduction of the price for metal.

The Organization of Industry.

Apart from the general estimate of the industrial situation here given, it is necessary to raise a few questions which play an essential part in our industry. With an industry, firmly based on a correct economic policy, it is necessary also to improve its organization, so that by the output of a cheap and good quality article it may solve the fundamental problem of capturing the market. T. E. Dzerzhinsky, president of the supreme economic council of the U. S. S. R., has stated the problem in its widest scope, viz.: "the reduction of the cost of production by rationalizing methods of manufacture, by lessening overhead charges, and by increasing the productivity of labor."

The rationalization of manufacturing methods is proceeding along two lines. On the one hand, we are introducing a number of organizational measures, we are improving accounting, we are improving the internal organization of separate workshops and of concerns as a whole. On the other hand, more complete workshop equipment and plant is being set up. It is obvious immediate results cannot be expected. The introduction of the scientific organization of labor in a workshop employing 1,000 workers requires a period of not less than two years for fully putting it into operation.

Conclusion.

We can conclude, therefore, that our industry is on the up-grade in spite of some adverse features. In regard to the supply of the market we can record a number of achievements, too much, of course, remains to be done. Our fundamental problem now, is not that of how to increase production, but how to strengthen the basis of our organization by adopting the most scientific methods of manufacture, by decreasing production costs and overhead charges and by increasing productivity.

THE RED SOLDIER'S MANUAL

By L. TROTSKY.
IV.

Courage, Duty, Truthfulness.

31. War is always a dangerous enterprise. The attitude of fear is courage, which means a readiness to meet in a manly way any danger whenever necessary. Only he is a true warrior who possesses fearlessness, courage, audacity, who does not hesitate to fight even a numerically superior enemy and who is ready to die for the common cause.

32. People are brave not only by birth. They can also learn to be brave. Courage can be developed thru education, thru examples of older, tried warriors and thru a clear understanding of the great tasks of the Red Army.

33. There should be developed in each military unit a sympathetic attitude towards the young, as yet undeveloped soldier, so as to give him encouragement, strengthen him and educate him. At the same time the opinion must treat with contempt the deliberate coward, egotist and rascal.

The coward deserves double contempt. Blinded by fear, the coward is unable to take wise measures of precaution during battle and perishes sooner than the brave soldier; at the same time he brings disorganization into the ranks and weakens them. The coward causes harm to the common cause, as well as to himself. His outrages are valueless and his death is honorless.

34. Individual courage must always combine with the feeling of duty. Upon your personal conduct may depend the fate of your company, and upon the fate of your company may depend the fate of your regiment. Let your courage be in harmony with the courage of your comrades. The common success should be the highest motive!

35. A slave works out of fear, but the free, enlightened soldier acts from a feeling of duty. The honest Red soldier will carry out the orders of his commanders and commissars without their watching him just as conclusively and accurately, as if he were a sight of them.

36. Truthfulness is inseparable

from courage, and the two virtues together are the distinctive characteristics of the conscientious soldier. Do not invent stories, do not exaggerate, do not lie. Tell exactly what happened. The high commander judges the military situation from the reports from below and gives his military orders accordingly. If the reports are false, the orders are wrong, and a wrong order will bring defeat. You are encouraged and even urged to deceive only the enemy. But who ever deceives his own comrades, thereby helps the enemy. Traitors must be weeded out! The truthfulness of the soldier will insure success to the army.

37. An invaluable means of educating the soldiers is a study of the past struggles of the Red Army and Red Navy, of their difficulties and dangers, of their heroisms, defeats, and victories. The commanders and commissars must know thoroughly the history of their regiments and make use of that living historic material for the education of the young Red Army soldiers.

(Fifth installment next Saturday.)

Learn the International IDO Language
16-page pamphlet giving outline of language, showing its superiority over Esperanto, etc., sent free.
The Workers Ido Federation
Room 8, 205 James St., N. S.
PITTSBURGH, PA.

The Discussion on Party Tasks

VARIOUS FORMS OF THE UNITED FRONT

By EARL R. BROWDER.

What is the united front? Strange and weird ideas are finding expression on this subject, and they do not all come from the ignorant and uninformed. For example, consider this gem from the thesis offered to the party by the minority of the C. E. C.:

"If we abandon the united front policy politically by abandoning the slogan 'For a Class Farmer-Labor Party. . . .'"

What does this mean? It means that our minority is revising the conception of the Communist International on the united front. We always thought, and the Comintern said, that the "farmer-labor party" slogan was one phase of the united front tactic; the minority says No!, the united front slogan is but a phase of the farmer-labor party. It would be easy to understand the statement if it said, "If we abandon the united front policy then we must abandon the farmer-labor slogan." That is a truism. But to say that by dropping one passing phase of the united front campaign, we thereby abandon the united front idea itself, is to betray a fundamental misconception of the united front. There is infinite variety in the application of the united front; it is not, most certainly, confined in the straight-jacket of farmer-laborism.

How is the United Front Applied Elsewhere?

Perhaps we have something to learn about the united front from other countries. What are the tactics of Communists in other countries? Do Communists everywhere stand for farmer-labor parties?

Only to ask the question is to expose the absurdity of it. Nowhere in the world do Communists make the united front mean "labor party" and nothing else. And only where the Communists are faced with established labor parties has the united front any connection at all with the term of "labor party." But the united front tactic in Germany, in France, and in Europe generally, seems to be quite effective without this "magic" slogan. They do not seem to miss the "labor party" in Germany.

How is the united front tactic applied? How is it crystallized into organized struggle? An example is seen at the Frankfurt conference called to resist the Ruhr invasion, a conference called by the German shop councils under the inspiration and leadership of the Communists, and uniting the workers from below for struggle on a specific and burning issue. Another example of an attempt of this nature, one which failed in its organizational phase but brought great gains of an educational nature, was the united front of the transport workers against war, against Fascism, and against the white terror, at the Berlin conference of 1923, between the Russian transport unions and the Amsterdam transport workers federation headed by Fimmen. Another application of the united front was the councils of action in England, to prevent the threatened war against Russia. Still another application of the united front is now being extensively applied throughout Europe and Asia, in the "Hands Off China" movement. Will our minority tell the Communists across the seas that, because they

have no slogans of "For a Farmer-Labor Party" they have therefore "abandoned the united front?"

Our Own United Front Experience.

But it is not necessary to go across the ocean to see various forms of the united front without a trace of farmer-labor party. In our own experience we have them. Our great defense campaign after the Michigan raids was a very successful application of the united front tactic, it was a political united front, and it was not only successful in its immediate aims but it also brought great political advantages to our party. Our campaign for relief of the Russian famine was another united front that mobilized great masses under our leadership, accomplished specific aims, and brought unmeasured political gains, with a success that was almost spectacular. Our campaign for the protection of the foreign-born workers was another very successful united front effort, adding greatly to the prestige of our party, widening our contacts, and bringing new circles of workers under our influence. In all of these, the most successful of our efforts in the line of the united front, there was nothing of a farmer-labor party, yet all were political in nature.

The campaigns above mentioned were successful. They achieved some measure of practical success, and all the gains that came out of them, were gains for the working class and for the Workers Party. Our farmer-labor campaign, however, although we succeeded by great effort in drawing political gains from it, was not such an unqualified success. The farmer-labor parties that we were instrumental in building, so we soon found in July, 1924, we had been building for LaFollette and not for the class struggle.

Why should that particular application of the united front, the labor party phase of it, which was the least successful in its practical and organizational aspects, be taken by the minority as the only form of the united front on the political field? Why do they ignore and belittle our other experiences in applying the political united front? It is because their case is so weak, their effort to breathe life into a dead slogan is so hopeless, they are so completely without concrete evidence of actual conditions that justify their slogan of "For a Farmer-Labor Party," that they are forced to muster as their only weapons the general arguments and authority for the united front and then, arbitrarily, assert that every argument for the united front is an argument for the labor party.

The minority is wrong. Their attempts to revise the theory of the united front are doomed to failure. The labor party movement as distinguished from both the W. P. on the one hand and the LaFollette movement on the other, is dead, but the united front tactic lives in all its multitude and variety of forms, all of them rich in political opportunity for the Communists of America once we have welded our party into a firm, homogeneous, monolithic party, realistically appraising the actual conditions of the class struggle, and participating in every battle of the workers on the basis of their immediate burning issues.

ON DISAPPOINTED COMMUNISTS

By MAX SHACHTMAN.

When the wide west was still young, towns used to spring up overnight, due to some sudden "strike" in gold or oil. These towns were called "hot-towns" because of the absence of women. Now, the men were rather a hard lot, and liked their whiskey, song, and women. The first two were there plenty; the last, not at all. But they were not to be halted by such a trifles. At the dance hall, certain men were chosen, for one reason or another, red bandana handkerchiefs wound around their sleeves, and they were thus transformed into "lady part-

ners." Of course, the men still remained men, but the not-quite-satisfactory illusion was created by the unhandkerchiefed men that they were dancing with women.

"Today" (as Comrade Engdahl would say), we are confronted with a somewhat similar situation in our own party. In their anxiety to establish a united front with the workers and poor farmers of this country, the comrades of the minority seem to have forgotten that the tactic of the farmer-labor party is merely a tactic, and not a principle for the Communist Party. A glance backward at the origin of

our farmer-labor party tactic shows us that we initiated it only on the basis of the fact that there existed a mass movement among the workers and poor farmers, a movement in which it was our duty to participate, to drive constantly towards a clearer class position, to seek to establish leadership over it. We did not develop this tactic in the form of a principle that it is the fundamental task of a Communist Party to create non-Communist Parties—and this must be clearly remembered.

Now, however, the fact is obvious that the farmer-labor party Jonah has been swallowed up by the LaFollette whale, and the Workers Party can hardly afford to be swallowed up in the process of becoming an emetic. The existent farmer-labor parties, all of them more or less LaFollette in ideology in their best days, have now become part and parcel of the Wisconsin Messiah's baggage. They have followed the siren call of the bourgeois leadership which seems to be headed in the direction of a third "progressive" party.

There is no mass demand at this time for a "class farmer-labor party"! But the comrades of the minority, who have committed the amazing mistake of elevating the tactic of the farmer-labor party to a Communist principle, and give everyone the impression that the united front manifests itself in America only in the form of the farmer-labor party, maintain that whether or not there is a mass demand for it, we, the Workers (Communist) Party want one, we need one, we cannot do without one—and by God, we're going to form one even if there is no one in it but ourselves! This is no exaggeration, since a prominent member of the minority plainly stated in the national committee of the Young Workers' League, that he was in favor of forming a farmer-labor party even if it contained only 5,000 workers.

And so this is what those comrades propose to do. We, the Communist Party, are to step out of our own ear, dress our sleeves with a red (or will it be a pink?) bandana, call ourselves a mass-class-farmer-labor party, unite with each other, and shout to the world that we have achieved the united front. We will then be able to hang out our shingle, and invite the masses of workers into our new ballroom so that they can get a dancing partner. "Come on in," we will say, "and you will not have to dance with us. You can dance with the 'mass farmer-labor party' over there. She is not so rough as we are; her step is gentler, her dancing program holds no difficulties in the way, and

she is far more mild and innocuous than you think we are. We know that you think we cannot dance, that we want to lead you in new-fangled steps, but surely there is no danger in dancing with that harmless 'mass farmer-labor party' sitting there and looking at you so invitingly. Just walk over; she's quite lonesome . . ."

Talk about your improper political dancing! Why, we would be running a political brothel!

These comrades are, if only objectively, disappointed Communists. They have no faith in the charms of the Communist Party, to continue the analogy. They think we are too un-ought to attract the masses; that we, as a Communist Party, are unable to assume the leadership of the working masses without the medium of a half-way-house (to mix the metaphor), a disguise, a piece of political mummery. They are disappointed with the failure of the Workers Party to maintain its leadership over those beautiful—albeit, unfortunately, non-existent—600,000 workers who were supposed to have been so cleverly maneuvered into the good old federated. They bemoan the loss of those workers who were supposed to flock to St. Paul, but instead ran to Cleveland.

And they, who are so anxious to belittle the vote polled by our own candidate, and perhaps secretly envy the juicy \$900,000 polled by LaFollette, probably wonder if we can't beat LaFollette at his own game. Instead of labelling capitalist politics "progressive" politics, they want to label the Communist Party "the mass farmer-labor party."

The writer has faith in the ability of the Communist Party of America, the Workers Party, to lead the masses of workers and poor farmers into struggles against the capitalist class on the basis of real, concrete, burning issues that confront them every day. I have confidence in the correctness of our program, in its ability to rally the masses to the banner of struggle at the call of the united front on the basis of daily demands. I believe that the comrades of the Central Executive Committee majority—and in turn, the overwhelming majority of the party—do not propose to tie red bandanas around our sleeves and call ourselves another party that will appear prettier to the workers, that will serve as a substitute for the Workers Party, or as a medium for seducing them into our movement. And I do not think that the rank and file of our party is as yet composed to tired radicals—or disappointed Communists.

LESSONS OF THE McDONALD MEETING

By MARTIN ABERN.

July 2nd! The farmer-labor party campaign is on! The first big gun after the June 17 convention in St. Paul nominated McDonald and Bouck is being fired at the first mass meeting in Chicago. The hall is packed, many standing. There is cheering and shouting; horns blowing; whistles screaming. For what? Presumably in support of the farmer-labor campaign. Very good, so far as that goes.

Workers Party Members Compose Farmer-Labor Audience.

But—the hall is packed with whom? By Workers Party members and a few close sympathizers. The meeting is held under the auspices of the farmer-labor campaign committee—but every member of the committee is also a member of the Workers Party because no one else would serve. And this huge demonstration, staged very effectively like a good theatrical performance or a circus, by the Workers Party and supported only by the Workers Party and its close sympathizers—had the result of promoting, not Communist principles, but farmer-laborism. Speeches? Speeches by farmer-labor candidates and by members of the Workers Party. Speeches, most of them weak, flabby, inane, filled with reformist-capitalist ideas; sickening stuff for Communists

to listen to in the name of a movement for independent political action by the workers. Speeches by Workers Party members—hardly distinguishable from the farmer-laborites. The real Communist guts and spirit were not there. All thru the evening the thousands of Communists, as a matter of discipline, made great applause—but there was no real enthusiasm for the mockery of class political action by the workers.

Covering the Lion with a Lamb's Cloak.

I am sure that every comrade in that meeting must have been appalled at the idea of continuing this stuff thru the period of a parliamentary campaign. It was not struggle and progress that was represented at this meeting; it was weakness. And this very first meeting was a concrete and singularly outstanding example, typical of the national situation, of what the movement for a farmer-labor party had, in fact, become—the Workers Party in disguise, kidding itself that it was outside of its skin. Worse than that, it was itself falling into the slough of confusion of the farmer-labor movement. "We attempted to save a farmer-labor soul which didn't exist and in the process we nearly lost our own Communist soul."

And meanwhile, where were the (Continued on next page.)

The Discussion on Party Tasks

LESSONS OF THE McDONALD MEETING

(Continued from page 3)

wide masses, swinging toward independent political action? They were attending meetings which to them were realizing their desire. They were at the LaFollette meetings. It is now as plain as daylight. Farmer-laborism and the mass sentiment, such as it was, for independent political action had disappeared as snowflakes in the sun, had been absorbed even at that hour by the petty-bourgeois, middle class movement led by LaFollette.

The thot is sickening that we might have gone on, deluding ourselves and poisoning our movement, after the masses of workers and poor farmers had gone, some sections to LaFollette and others to that apostle of "independent class political action," Cal Coolidge.

Already the facts were pressing for a change in policy by the Workers Party; the Chicago meeting indicated not life for the young farmer-labor movement but only a few stray sparks and flareups of a dying fire. It required only the additional experience of the Cleveland C. P. A. conference on July 4. After that it was plain to all who would see, that the sentiment and movement for a farmer-labor party had been almost entirely smothered or absorbed into the LaFollette movement. What remained of that movement was already organized in the Workers Party or closely allied with it.

United Front in Daily Struggles Led by the Workers Party.

The Central Executive Committee of the Workers Party, acting in accordance with the changed political conditions, on July 8 correctly declared that we must enter the campaign under the banner of the Workers Party in order to carry on a truly working-class independent political movement. Since the campaign was over, the C. E. C. has, in the election statement and the political thesis now

before the party, further developed the new political situation and logically and correctly, according to Communist principles, charted the course for our Workers Party. Both the campaign for organization and propaganda for a farmer-labor party must be left behind. Other forms of the united front, based upon the daily struggles—strikes, unemployment, shop committee agitation, general labor councils—must be found and employed. For the labor party is not a fetish; it was not for us a principle of organization or of the class struggle; it was merely a form of the united front which for the present is dead. We want no fake labor parties; no delusory united fronts; nothing which breaks down the morale and discipline of our own party; no united front with ourselves; no substitutes for the Workers Party. Instead, unity from below; unity with the workers thru participation in their everyday struggles, with the Workers Party as the center and leader of these struggles.

The Chicago farmer-labor meeting showed us quite early, in a startling and concrete form, two political facts of supreme importance: First, that the LaFollette blast had swept what ever sentiment there was (aside from the Workers Party) for a farmer-labor party into the hopeless middle class marsh. Second, that the malaria germs of that swamp were already beginning to work inside our own party, supplanting Communist principle with farmer-laborist opportunism. The healthy instinct of our party its sound Communist character at bottom, showed itself. We threw off this diseased disguise, emerged erect, and made a campaign that established our Communist integrity and strength. We can now be proud of the revolutionary banner of the Workers Party. And we can be glad that the farmer-labor meeting in Chicago on July 2, along with many other experiences, taught us some lessons.

WHO ARE THE FARMER-LABOR COMMUNISTS?

By C. E. RUTHERBERG.

It seems that we have come quickly to that stage in the party discussion in which epithets and name-calling is to be substituted for arguments on the basis of principles and facts. In two articles, one by Comrade Foster and one by Comrade Cannon, the Marxian group in our party, which wishes to continue to base the policies and tactics of our party upon an application of Marxism to the economic and political life of this country—in which we made our beginning under the influence of Comrade Pepper—is branded as "Farmer-Labor Communists."

Throwing stones, when one is living in a glass house, has always been regarded as a dangerous business, and in this instance it is the glass house of the Foster-Cannon group which their stone thrown at the minority of the central executive committee is bringing about their ears. If there is any "Farmer-Labor Communism" in our party it has its lodging in the minds of the members of the Foster-Cannon group. It has not only remained in the minds of this group, but it has manifested itself again and again in concrete proposals and in refusal to adopt other proposals.

The minority of the central executive committee in this discussion does not have to resort to epithets and name-calling. There is so much material at hand to show the lack of Communist clarity, their hesitations and vacillations in relation to the pursuit of truly Bolshevik policy, that name-calling and epithets would only weaken the damning evidence in a recitation of the facts.

Attitude Toward the Farmer-Labor Campaign.

The first fact; which shows the hypocrisy of the epithet "Farmer-Labor Communism" is the division

over the question of our attitude toward the farmer-labor party. This first appeared in the central executive committee in August, 1923. The Foster-Cannon group was opposed to the organization of the federated farmer-labor party. It was against the Workers Party following up the victory which it had won at the July 3, 1923, farmer-labor convention. It was for an all-embracing, all-inclusive farmer-labor party and against the organization of the left wing which had come under the influence of our party. This attitude, which was based on the conception that the organization of an all-embracing farmer-labor party, was a goal in itself and repudiated the viewpoint that the farmer-labor campaign was a maneuver for building, strengthening and establishing the leadership of the Workers Party. In contrast to this the Pepper-Ruthenberg group declared in the August, 1923, thesis that when the interest of the Workers Party come in conflict with the goal of organizing the all-embracing farmer-labor party of the Foster-Cannon dreams, that we must unhesitatingly sacrifice the farmer-labor party. It is not hard to decide which of these two viewpoints expressed what is included in the new epithet, "Farmer-Labor Communism." It was certainly not that of the present minority of the central executive committee, which in effect declared: If we can thru this situation build the Workers Party into a mass Communist party of a hundred thousand workers, we will follow the policy which will bring that result and say "to hell with your all-embracing farmer-labor party."

The Candidacy of LaFollette.

Fact number two, which the central executive committee minority submits in answer to the epithet, "Farmer-Labor Communism," has to do with

the attitude of the central executive committee of our party toward the candidacy of LaFollette. This question first arose in connection with the farmer-labor conference held in St. Paul, Nov. 15, 1923. It was this conference which was to issue the call for what later became the June 17 convention. On Nov. 13, 1923, there was a meeting of executive council of the central executive committee to outline the policy which was to guide our delegates to the Nov. 15 conference.

I quote the following from the minutes of that meeting:

St. Paul Farmer-Labor Conference.

Comrade Foster submitted the following motion:

"That if the conference takes up the question of candidates we shall support the nomination of LaFollette."

Comrade Ruthenberg submitted the following proposals: (There follow seven proposals to guide our representatives, among which is point 4): "That we propose that nominations be left to the convention (we are not for LaFollette, but if the convention nominates him we will not split on that account)."

The Foster motion was defeated by a vote two in favor and nine against and the Ruthenberg motion adopted.

I quote now from the minutes of the executive council of Nov. 20:

"Motion by Foster: That an effort be made to see that negotiations with LaFollette in regard to his candidacy be carried on by the labor party group in place of being left to the committee of 48 group."

Comrade Foster explained, in relation to his motion, that in 1920, when he was a member of the Fitzpatrick farmer-labor party, Fitzpatrick had made the mistake of permitting the committee of 48 to bring forward LaFollette as a candidate, in place of the labor group making him their candidate, and this error should not be repeated.

I admit, that with Comrade Foster, I made the error, connected by the Communist International, of being ready to make the third party alliance thru the farmer-labor party and if compelled, to accept the candidacy of LaFollette, but I submit that there is a difference between the acceptance of such a candidacy after a fight against it had been lost in order not to separate ourselves from the farmer-labor masses and the proposal of Comrade Foster that "we shall support the nomination of LaFollette" in the former-labor conference.

It is certainly unnecessary to ask the question which attitude represented "Farmer-Labor Communism?"

Fact number three has to do with Loreism. The thesis of the majority of the central executive committee is very aggressive in its attack on Loreism and the Two and a Half International tendency. One might wish that the same central executive committee majority has been as aggressive in its action against Loreism in our party. Unfortunately for our party its aggressiveness had developed merely a pre-party convention demonstration before the membership. In practice it has been the protector of Lore against the efforts of the minority to bring the Lore tendency into the light of day and root it out of our party. The question of Loreism was before the central executive committee at its meeting on March 18, 1924. Comrade Lore had written his editorial on the Fifth Anniversary of the Communist International, in which the policies of the Communist International were misrepresented. I moved at that meeting: "That the central executive committee issue a statement correcting Comrade Lore's editorial on the Communist International and his statements regarding Zinoviev." Comrade Pepper amended: "That we censure Comrade Lore and issue a statement."

A sub-committee consisting of Foster, Bittelman and Ruthenberg was elected to bring in a statement on the question. The sub-committee was unable to agree, Comrades Foster and Bittelman bringing in a proposal

to the effect "That the central executive committee objects to the erroneous statements in regard to the Communist International and instructs Comrade Lore to write an editorial correcting them." I stood on my original proposal that the central executive committee issue a statement against Comrade Lore's editorial. My motion and that of Comrade Pepper were defeated by the central executive committee majority and the Foster-Bittelman proposal adopted, the minority voting against it.

Thus the central executive committee saved Comrade Lore from censure and from denunciation by the central executive committee of the Two and a Half International tendency expressed in his editorial before the whole party. The story of other efforts made by the minority to compel the central executive committee to fight against Loreism—make more emphatic the above evidence that the central executive committee majority, which for election purposes thunders against Loreism, has been the protector of Loreism in our party.

The Controversy in the R. C. P.

The attitude of the Foster-Cannon group toward the controversy in the Russian Communist party last year is fact number four throwing some light on the question in which group in our party this tendency called "Farmer-Labor Communism" has its breeding place.

The issue in the Russian Communist Party was whether the party should retain its Old Guard Bolshevik leadership which had won the revolutionary struggle and maintained the victory of the proletarian revolution against all its enemies. In February, 1924, Comrade Pepper proposed that he write an article for the March Liberator endorsing the stand of the Old Guard Bolsheviks. Comrade Cannon objected. In the central executive committee meeting on March 18 Comrade Pepper moved: "That we endorse the Old Guard in the Russian Communist party." Comrade Foster submitted the following amendment: "In view of the fact that the controversy in the Russian Communist party has been decided by a conference the central executive committee is of the opinion that it is not called upon at this time to take a position on the merits of the controversy. The central executive committee will print in the party papers all the documents bearing on the debate and will encourage the members to study them and to discuss the question in the party papers. The central executive committee will condemn any attempt to make a factional issue of the matter in the American party."

Some weeks later, in reply to an appeal from the representative of our party in Moscow, that we send a cablegram to the convention of the Russian Communist party endorsing the position of the Old Guard Bolsheviks, I sent such a cable on my own responsibility, there being no opportunity to consult the central executive committee. It was not until Comrade Foster's return from Moscow that the majority of the central executive committee consented to the adoption of a resolution officially putting the party on record for the Old Guard Bolsheviks. Evidently Comrade Foster had learned while there that the Communist International did not look with favor on parties which refused to take a position on such a vital question as the controversy in the Russian Communist party.

Who Are the Farmer-Labor Communists?

On the basis of this record we hurl back into the teeth of the Foster-Cannon group the epithet, "Farmer-Labor Communist." Let the Foster-Cannon group stand up before the party and try to explain this consistent refusal to follow a Bolshevik policy as shown by this record of fact. Epithets directed against the group in the party which has consistently fought against their vacillations and compromises when faced with a question of following a Bolshevik line, will not cover up these facts from the record.

The Discussion on Party Tasks

SUFFERING FROM ELECTION SHOCK!

By J. POWELL

FROM numerous articles and statements, published in the DAILY WORKER during the last few weeks, it is evident that our leadership, that directed the recent party campaigns so splendidly, is beginning to break down. The first signs of weakening were displayed by Comrade Bittelman in his article: "Preparing for the Coming Struggles" (Oct. 25).

Regarding of the promising head-line, the article betrays a marked tendency to prepare us for nothing else but for abandonment of our United Front policy on the political field. Here are a few lines to illustrate how ridiculously simple the class struggle appears to be to our Comrade Bittelman:

"The masses will be driven to fight . . . They will create, if necessary, their own organs of struggle and will proceed to defend themselves . . . What will be the tasks of the Workers Party?—To assume leadership of these struggles . . ."

In other words: let the masses start to fight and create their own organs of struggle. Then we, of course, will assume the leadership.

The trouble with this formula is that the one who waits for somebody else to start something has a poor chance to become the leader of the affair . . . What part we will be able to play in the struggles of the masses tomorrow depends a great deal on what we are doing today.

Giving up the Leadership
On Nov. 7 the C. E. C. published a statement on election results. From this it was not quite clear whether discontinuation of our farmer-labor party policy was merely suggested or definitely ordered. A few days later a statement issued by the National Committee of the Trade Union Educational League completely dispersed the uncertainty and went even to the most extreme limit. A complete silence was maintained on one of the biggest problems that faces all labor unions and all labor conventions: the question of political action.

This question has been settled at El Paso according to Comper's wishes, but this does not mean that it will not come up before the local unions again and again. What shall the "Left Wing" do? The N. C. of T. U. E. L. finds it convenient to ignore this question. This means but one thing: They are giving up the leadership.

The new T. U. E. L. program has plenty of demands all the way down from amalgamation and nationalization to abolition of the Ku Klux Klan. Yet, it entirely overlooks the greatest need of the working class of this country: the necessity of a political party.

The C. E. C. election statement at least says that the Workers Party itself must be built up. The T. U. E. L. declaration gives up even this point, and does not even mention the Communist movement, as if this was of no concern at all to the "Left Wing of the Labor Movement!"

It certainly must have been some altogether imaginary syndicalistic left wing that those who are responsible for the abortive T. U. E. L. statement have had in their minds!

A Bolshevik Method—Only Up-Side Down

On Nov. 16th the C. E. C. announced that prevention of discussions on party problems in the party press will be permitted after Nov. 22nd. Yet, Comrade Bittelman was allowed to disregard the party program on Oct. 25th, and again misrepresent and knock it on Nov. 15th. The discussions on changes in the party program are open only since Nov. 22nd, yet, an important section of the program has already been discarded since Nov. 7th. This constitutes a direct violation of our constitution and the methods of procedure prescribed by the theses of the Third Congress of the Communist International. Even our

C. E. C. members must abide by the following Bolshevik rules:

1. When a discussion is not open in the party press, it is not open for all members.

2. Discussions shall precede decisions.

3. A controversial question of policy, directly or indirectly settled by the convention, shall remain in effect until the next convention (unless otherwise ruled by the C. I. or a special permission to make a change is obtained from the C. I.)

4. Just because a discussion period is open (or about to be opened) that does not give the C. E. C. or any member a right to disregard or annul any section of our program or constitution. During a discussion period, new policies only may be proposed, but not already forced into effect.

Disregard of these rules can only diminish the prestige of those who do it, cause undue friction everywhere, break down leadership and discipline, and bring the party a great harm.

Bolshevism Needed

I have before me the minutes of a D. C. meeting. These indicate in what confusion the party has been thrown thru the latest ilconsidered declarations. The members see that our program is being hastily discarded before the Convention meets. They protest. At the same time it is evident that they are not sure which policy is really in effect now: the one prescribed by the last convention and incorporated in our program, or the one initiated by the C. E. C. thru its "statements."

The C. E. C. is our supreme body between the party conventions. But it cannot disregard or overrule any decisions of the conventions. All attempts to the contrary are bound to break down the discipline of the party.

A strict discipline can be maintained only if our leading bodies strive to establish unconditional confidence of the membership. And no leading body can establish such confidence by abusing their authority.

Yes, let us Bolshevize the party. And let us not overlook the unfortunate fact that Bolshevization is needed at the top as well as at the bottom.

A Clean-Cut Declaration, Versus a Miserable Muddle

The party program gives the following reasons why we should make every effort to hasten the formation of a labor party:

"The mighty centralization of power of the government of the United States, which was brought about by the war, the offensive of the capitalist class, which resulted from the economic crises, make it necessary for the workers to defend themselves politically. The change in the wages of the skilled and unskilled workers have brought them nearer to the same conditions of life, the taking away of the privileges of the "aristocracy" of labor by the capitalist power, the assimilation of the foreign born, the organization of the alien workers as militant trade unionists, have for the first time in the history of the American labor movement produced a uniformity of the working class which makes possible the organization of a labor party."

And the C. E. C. in the election statement gives the following reasons why we should ignore the farmer-labor party movement:

"The demonstrated weakness of the LaFollette movement, as compared to the pre-election estimates of all sides, not only seriously retards the development of the so-called 'third party,' but also completely eliminates the immediate possibility of the growth of a mass farmer-labor party of industrial workers and poor farmers, distinct from the Workers Party. A general agitation campaign by the Workers Party under the slogan of 'For a Mass Farmer-Labor Party,' would not be profitable or successful. The policy of applying the united front tactic by

attempting to form a mass farmer-labor party of which the Workers Party would be a part, is not adaptable to the present period."

Now, let us compare and analyze the two declarations:

The C. E. C. does not say that they oppose a formation of a farmer-labor party. They only declare that such attempts are "not adaptable to the present period." It follows that they are for it in principle, but against it in practice. And this is a sign of opportunism.

Our program declares that the formation of a labor party is being made possible because of a complete centralization of power of government in the hands of capitalist class, and the relentless use of that power against the working class, on one side, and because of the growing uniformity of the working class (their wages, conditions of living, miseries, opportunities and interests), on the other side.

The C. E. C., on the contrary, does not touch the fundamental conditions (which by the way, elections cannot destroy). They tell us that the demonstrated weakness of the LaFollette movement makes a general agitation campaign for a farmer-labor party unprofitable. They talk as if the party had or was ready to base its policies on changing sentiments of middle class, instead of on solid economic and political foundations. Besides, they completely overlook the fact that our campaign for a farmer-labor party, and our election campaign (the piles of leaflets, the thousands of meetings) destroyed the LaFollette illusion in the minds of masses of voters and they stayed away from the polls. This is indicated by the election figures. In spite of the fact that all capitalist press made the greatest possible drive for a big vote, only 30 million of 60 million voters (Census Bureau estimate) took a part in the elections, while in 1916 more than 70 per cent voted.

The election statement says that the demonstrated weakness of the LaFollette movement completely eliminates the immediate possibility of the growth of a mass farmer-labor party. Suppose LaFollette movement was up to all "pre-election estimates."—Would that be a sure barometer for finding that there is enough pressure behind the "immediate possibility of the growth" of the kind of a farmer-labor party that our program stand for?

The Party Program Misrepresented

Besides absurdities, the paragraph quoted from the election statement also contains a condemnable misrepresentation of the party program. Our program entertains no illusions about an "immediate possibility" of the growth of a mass farmer-labor party. What the program says is absolutely beyond any possibility of such an opportunistic interpretation. The program says that we shall not ignore the already evident and oncoming trend for a formation of a farmer-labor party, and that it is our duty to see that a class farmer-labor party, of which we are a part, results from the farmer-labor movement. The program declares that:

"A real labor party cannot be formed without the labor unions and organizations of exploited farmers, tenant farmers and farm laborers must be included. The Workers Party will direct its propaganda and educational work to the end of arousing a mass sentiment of the labor party in the labor unions to secure the formation of such a party."

This paragraph ought to convince even the most suspicious opponents that no immediate formation of a mass farmer-labor party is neither expected nor recommended. How and by whom the mess about an immediate possibility of a mass farmer-labor party has been invented, our program is not responsible.

Facts About Our Farmer-Labor Party Policy

Whoever wants our policies to be

changed, must prove that they have been detrimental to the Communist movement or at least have had no value at all. Even those that want to discard our farmer-labor policy have continually claimed that the policy is most successful. Just before the election campaign the C. E. C. issued a program on "Our Immediate Work." The following is quoted from this excellent pamphlet:

"We have during this campaign advanced the cause of independent working class action and made the farmer-labor party an issue in the American labor movement. We can also say, without danger of the statement being challenged, that our party had made the greatest gains for itself through this campaign for the labor party. It is thru this farmer-labor party campaign that our party has established itself as a political force in the United States. It is thru this campaign that it has established its prestige and its leadership among the masses of workers and farmers. Nothing has contributed so much to develop our party from a sectarian group to a recognized political force in the life of the labor movement of this country than our maneuvers in relation to the farmer-labor party."

There can be no doubt that the above is absolutely true. But in view of this statement it is impossible to explain the secret twist of mind that has caused the majority of the C. E. C. now to insinuate to the contrary. Are they suffering from election shock?

A Promise of a Real Leader
In the same pamphlet the C. E. C. unanimously declares as follows:

"The campaign for a farmer-labor party was a correct estimation of the situation in the United States. It declares further that the campaign for the farmer-labor party must be continued and will be a major campaign of the party in the future."

This declaration in direct conformity with our program, inspired comrades everywhere for undivided support of the party work. Now its beneficial effect is being marred by the very comrades who volunteered to make the worthy declaration only two months ago. I do not want to be mean, but the question presses itself: Do they really base their declaration and promise on the illusion that all "pre-election estimates" of the strength of LaFollette will turn out to be correct?

Conclusions

The change of our farmer-labor policy has been initiated extremely unskillfully, and such methods shall never again be repeated by any responsible party body or member.

Occasional C. E. C. statements cannot do away with any party policy, expressly defined and adopted by a convention. Any attempt to the contrary is bound to throw the party in a confusion. We shall strive to avoid a repetition of any such attempt in the future.

The changes so far suggested are based on a complete ignorance or a wild misunderstanding of the party program. Comrade Bittelman and the majority members of the C. E. C. may do a valuable service to the party acquainting themselves more carefully with our program and constitution, and the Thesis of the Communist International.

There can be no talk of building up of the Workers Party if we will refuse to be with the masses on the political as well as on the economic field. Our program meets the requirements and shall, in general, remain in effect for the next year.

"It is easy, but not fruitful, to keep on preaching on the general principles of Communism, and then fall into the negative" attitude of common, place syndicalism when faced with concrete questions. Such practices only play into the hands of the yellow Amsterdam International."

This paragraph from the Theses of the Third Congress of the Communist International (Continued on Page 8.)

Lore and the Comintern

By Moissaye J. Olgin

FIRST ARTICLE.

The Moscow Decision—Accusations Against Comrade Lore—The Serrati Case—Serrati and Paul Levi.

In the theses of the Comintern on the American situation and the tasks of the Communist Party in America, there is contained the following paragraph:

"The Executive Committee of the Communist International calls the attention of the C. E. C. also to the dangerous tendencies signalled by the articles of Comrade Lore and some of his followers who, in their estimation of the problems of the Communist International, in their estimation of the labor government of England and of the events in Germany, are manifesting remnants of views of the Two-and-a-Half International. The C. E. C. must carry on an ideological campaign against such a tendency."

As one of those present at the discussions of the Executive Committee of the C. I. on the American question, the writer deems it his duty to give an account of the circumstances wherein the decision concerning Comrade Lore was adopted and of the meaning of that decision.

At the meetings of the E. C. C. I. where the American problem was discussed, there were three delegates from the U. S. representing three different points of view on the American situation. The members of the Executive Committee also held varying shades of opinion concerning the American party. But while the discussion was extended and very animated, while the clash of tendencies was at times quite sharp, especially among the American delegates, there was unanimity in the attitude towards the tendency which makes itself manifest in the writings of Comrade Lore. After more than three weeks' discussion, the American commission appointed by the Executive Committee of the Communist International adopted as a general basis for its decisions the memorandum on the American situation and the outline of the party's activities in the future, which were presented by Comrade Foster. (There was only one section in Comrade Foster's memorandum with which the commission disagreed.)

Paragraph 15 of Comrade Foster's outline read:

"The right wing and opportunist tendencies of the *Lore-Volkzeitung* group shall be censured and corrected by the Comintern."

One of the other two delegates practically withdrew his own memorandum in favor of Comrade Foster's (with the above exception), and as to the third delegate who was fundamentally opposed to Comrade Foster's memorandum and outline of activities he was pleased by the paragraph which proposed the censuring of Comrade Lore.

After mature deliberation, the American commission framed, and the Executive Committee of the Communist International adopted, a policy and a plan of work for our party. The theses on the American situation were adopted by the Executive Committee unanimously. The censuring of Comrade Lore and the declaration of the necessity to carry on an ideological campaign against the tendency represented by Comrade Lore is, thus, a unanimous decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. The decision was adopted before the Fifth Congress of the Communist International, but having been present at the sessions of the congress and believing I understood the spirit of the overwhelming majority of the congress delegates, the writer is quite certain that, as far as Comrade Lore is concerned, the congress the highest governing body of the Communist International, would have fully agreed with the Executive Committee.

What, then, were the points of contention against Comrade Lore? Let it be understood from the very start that the E. C. C. I. did not under estimate Comrade Lore as a Communist worker, as a man devoted to the class

struggle of the proletariat and as a comrade of long standing in the labor movement. Had the E. C. C. doubted his Communism, he would not have been tolerated in the International. But the Executive Committee said, there is a certain brand of Communism, a certain tendency in the Communist movement which is known as opportunist or centrist, a tendency which, while accepting the program and the tactical line of the Communist International, has not yet relinquished from its mind the image of another organization where discipline is less exacting, the revolutionary lines are less tightly drawn and the fight against the socialist reformers is less severe. This tendency is in a constant covert or overt opposition to the Communist International. It is suspicious of the decisions and policies of the Communist International; it chafes under the rule of international discipline, and it expects evil from what it terms the "lack of responsibility" on the part of "Moscow." To put it in brief, this tendency is against the Bolshevik character of the C. I. Such tendency, the Executive Committee said, is expressed:

- a. In Comrade Lore's support of Serrati against the Comintern;
- b. In Comrade Lore's support of Paul Levi against the Comintern;
- c. In Comrade Lore's siding with what he understood to be the Trotsky policy against the majority of the Russian Communist Party in the discussion of last year;
- d. In Comrade Lore's attitude towards the German revolution in the fall of 1923;
- e. In Comrade Lore's estimation of what the Communist International was and what, in his opinion, it should not have been in the first five years of its existence.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International took the position that if the same general tendency manifests itself in the writings of the same comrade in the course of four or more years under varying circumstances, if the comrade only seems to be waiting for an opportunity to express his opinion in opposition to the stand of the Communist International and if he persists in his opinions, never repudiating what he had erroneously defended before, then this comrade must certainly be termed a centrist. The Executive Committee, further maintains that the writings of a comrade form a good basis for judging his basic position. "Why should we not judge on the basis of articles, quotations and resolutions?" Comrade Zinoviev said in his concluding speech at the Fifth Congress. "These, quotations and articles exist just for the purpose that on their basis of course, not on this alone—we may judge." As nearly everyone of the comrades in the Executive Committee reads German fluently, it was possible for the Executive Committee to get first-hand information on the nature of Comrade Lore's writings and on the general character of the *Volkzeitung*, so that the decision cannot be attributed to "lack of information" on the part of Moscow, as is often claimed by C. I. opponents.

In order that those American comrades who do not remember the cases of Serrati, Paul Levi, etc., may clearly understand the Lore issue, it will be well to recall those startling moments in the history of our Communist International. The keynote to Comrade Lore's attitude was struck as early as September 29, 1920, in a *Volkzeitung* editorial entitled: "Let us not allow non-essentials to make us forget the basic problem." In this article which is directed against Hillquit, Comrade Lore wrote:

"We also think (like Hillquit) that Comrade Zinoviev should here and there be more careful (grossere Diskretion ausuben) especially in his instructions to foreign sister parties. And we also agree with Hillquit that it does not belong to the prime necessities to designate everyone who differs from us in opinions as a traitor."

In these casual remarks is contained the nucleus, or, rather, two nuclei, of what the C. I. considers centrism:

a dissatisfaction with the iron-clad discipline of the C. I., and a lenient attitude towards socialist reformists. This nucleus developed into a consistent *Volkzeitung* policy in relation to Serrati.

Serrati was a leader of the Italian socialist party which had joined the Communist International at its very inception. The Italian socialist party consisted of three wings: (1) the Turati-Modigliani group of a purely social-democratic nature (against "Maximalism," against "destructive policies," for work in parliaments, local communal bodies and economic organization in order to organize socialist society); (2) the Bordiga-Bombacci-Terracini-Graziadei group of Communists who unequivocally accepted the 21 points (i. e. conditions on which a party may join the C. I. as adopted at the Second Congress), who stood for straight revolutionary work, if need be illegally, also among the army and navy, and who demanded a clear split with the Turati-Modigliani mencheviki; (3) the Serrati-Baratono group which, while ostensibly accepting the program of the C. I. and its policies, refused to split with Turati and his followers.

Serrati had been a delegate to the Second Congress of the Communist International and a member of its presidium. The Second Congress had passed a resolution requesting the Italian socialist party to convene an extraordinary congress to split with the reformists, in order that the Italian party might become a real Communist Party, that is to say, capable of leading the workers in a revolutionary struggle.

Serrati refused to comply with the express wish of the Communist International Congress. Serrati committed a flagrant breach of Communist discipline, the more conspicuous by virtue of the prominent position he occupied in the party as leader and editor of the *Avanti*.

The international and the Italian situation must be remembered as the background of the Serrati crisis. The world in general was full of explosives. The revolutionary tide was running high all over Europe. The Communist International had just come into existence as a leader of the world revolutionary movement. The Second Congress was practically the first real international congress of Communist Parties. The Second Congress had to draw not only ideological but also organizational lines between Communists and reformists. Only with the adoption of the 21 points could the revolutionary wing of the working class be organized as Communist parties.

The urgent historic necessity of Communist leadership became glaringly evident with the treason of the Italian reformists in the September, 1920, revolutionary movement of the Italian workers. This great movement practically paralyzed the capitalist state (Prime Minister Giolitti afterwards confessed that the country had been at the mercy of the striking working masses who had occupied many hundreds of factories, mines, landed estates). The movement was frustrated and a reign of fascism made possible by the treason of the reformist leaders of the General Confederation of Labor, who did everything in their power to prevent the proletariat from seizing power ("The General Confederation of Labor in which I had full confidence," said later the capitalist premier, "showed that it deserved it.") The masses were betrayed to capitalist hangmen by the reformists of the Turati-Modigliani faction.

Even after this betrayal, Serrati refused to part ways with Turati and his comrades.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International repeatedly urged Serrati to purge the party of reformists. Serrati was adamant. While, he said at the Florence conference of his faction, "we are for the Third International and accept the 21 points of party centralism, we cannot sacrifice party unity." In other words, while nominally accepting the C. I. discipline, he openly broke it in practice.

Things came to a head at the Livorno congress, which opened on Dec. 29, 1920. Two days previous, a letter was sent by the E. C. C. I. to the Italian socialist party. The letter read in part: "Once more we deem it necessary to remind you, dear comrades, that the C. I. will have nothing to do with men belonging to the reformist group. We categorically declare to you that you have to choose between Serrati, D'Aragona and the Third International." At the Livorno congress, Serrati split the Italian socialist party, i. e. he split away from the Communists who were loyal to the C. I.

The Communist International was in an open conflict with Serrati over the elementary problem of Communist discipline. The Communists were agitated the world over. At that time Comrade Lore came out in defense of Serrati against the Communist International. An editorial in the *Volkzeitung* January 25, 1921, named "After Livorno," quotes the above letter of the Executive Committee, then proceeds:

"In this last letter to the Italian party, the Executive Committee of the Third International demands, as we see, the expulsion also of Serrati who played a leading role at the Second Congress of the Third International. If the Executive Committee was right in declaring that collaboration with members affiliated to the Amsterdam Trades Union International—which resolutely condemned the Bolsheviks at its London congress in September—was impossible: if it was perfectly justified in demanding the expulsion of Turati and D'Aragona, it put itself into the wrong by demanding the expulsion of Serrati. Serrati may be a hot-head and a bonehead, but nobody can dispute the fact that he is an honest revolutionary. Just as a little can be disputed that he did enormous things for the labor movement. By throwing Serrati into one heap with Turati and Co. . . . one has injured the revolutionary movement needlessly and, without ground."

Comrade Lore thus declared that the C. I. was wrong, that Serrati was right and that his merits in the revolutionary movement were his justification.

It may not be out of place to recall what Lenin had to say about Serrati. In an article, "False Speeches on Freedom," published in the "Communist International," December, 1920, he wrote: "Serrati, Baratono, Zanoni, Flacci, Jacomo, have already proven with absolute clearness and beyond any dispute that they are fundamentally wrong, that their political line (refusing to part ways with the reformists, M. J. O.) is basically wrong." "In such circumstances and at such a moment the (Italian) party will become a hundred times stronger, not weaker, if the mencheviki will leave it."

"Such a propaganda as is now being conducted by the Milano edition of the *Avanti* under Serrati's editorship, does not educate the workers for the revolution, on the contrary, it brings demoralization into their ranks."

"Do not speak of freedom and equality in general, Comrade Nobs (a Swiss left socialist, editor of the Zurich 'Volkrecht,' M. Q. J.) and Comrade Serrati! Speak of freedom not to carry out the decisions of the Comintern concerning the unconditional duty to break with the opportunists and 'centrists' (who do not fail to undermine, do not fail to sabotage the proletarian dictatorship). Speak of equality of opportunists and centrists with Communists. Such freedom and such equality we cannot recognize for the Communist International."

At the Third Congress of the Communist International, in his speech on the Italian problem, July 28, 1921, Lenin was even more outspoken. Turning to Lazzari, Lenin said: "By such speeches as you and Serrati held here, the revolution is not being prepared, it is being disorganized." Later: "Serrati's policy was a misfortune for Italy."

All other leaders of the Comintern condemned the action of Serrati as destructive. The only international

(Continued on page 8)

LIFE ON A NIPPON ISLAND

By Nishimura Yoshio

WHERE the beautiful Mt. Fuji Yama dips her clear snow-clad outline in the blue of the Pacific ocean, there rises an island covered with lavish green foliage surrounded by unriling ocean waves.

The islanders call it Mikura Jima, or the Treasure Island, and the island is worthy of its name. You can walk from one end of the island to the other in less than one hour; about four miles in diameter, it is situated at the farthest south of the Izu, the seven island group, which belongs to the jurisdiction of the province of Tokyo.

When modern industry invaded Treasure Island, the islanders were able to respond to its call without destroying primitive Communism and thereby enjoying its beauty and happiness from the vague past to this era of capitalistic anarchy which prevails thruout the civilized nations. About 600 years ago, they were told that they have one more treasure in addition to fish, fruits, and roots of plants. The Mikura boxwood with plenty moisture and good athletic exercise against tropical tempest, has fine grain for comb material, from which Japanese girls contrive hair ornaments.

The people do not have to pay taxes to the village community. Instead, they receive what they need and to day each family of the island population would own well over 20,000 yen if the properties of the boxwood industry were divided among the villagers.

Sometime ago Baron Iwasaki, one of the richest men in Japan, proposed to pay 500,000 yen for the boxwood, and in reply, he was ridiculed in the native way by a flat denial. Buy off our treasure? Never! You may propose that nonsense stuff the day before yesterday (the day which will never come).

During the Tokugawa clan government, the island was visited only

twice in a year—spring and fall. The day the ship arrives was fixed as a holiday, and the old custom still prevails.

When people hear that boys and

girls above 15 years of age are bound to work in the Mikura Jima, it is certain one who dislikes Communism will express disapproval of this custom. But go easy with it. The boys

only have to work 40 days in a year. Do you think if you were told to play, study or do whatever you prefer thruout the year, except for 40 days, that this would be bad? The boys in the Treasure Island engage in fishing industry only. This is a custom adopted from the remote past, and 40 days of fishing season in the summer time, is more than enough to supply the whole population of the land. That is so because they do not have any people called capitalists who swallow more than they can produce.

The boxwood industry being comparatively new to the island, girls are entrusted to take care of the forest health service—picking off undesirable plants which may happen to grow by the boxwood. The wood is cut once in a year.

Youth has all its freedom of romance in the Treasure Island. When tropical night steals in and spreads tender shadows over the field, you will find the triumph of youth in the home where good-natured parents smile at the paper screen which keeps all privacy beyond.

When the group of youths head their fishing boat toward the volcanic island in the setting sun, the brave ocean riders with immense joy, sing: "One glance from rolling waves, You look like devil shaped; Oh, the Mikura! The Treasure Island, Your real treasure is love."

Also the girls, spinning cotton in the warm rainy day with the primitive tools, which sounds like Be-e-e sing: "Who is knocking? That sounds like his way; Ta-ta-ta-ta (sounds) Oh you aren't. "You are mischievous westerly wind, But Be-e-e How lonely I am That sound is tormenting my youth, Be-e-e."

There is no prostitution, no robbery, no capitalists and there is no poor men thruout the island.

THE SOVIET TRADE UNIONS AT THE SIXTH ALL-RUSSIAN TRADE UNION CONGRESS

The report made by Comrade Dogadov, secretary of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions, at the Sixth Trade Union Congress on November 12, gives the following picture of the present status and work of the trade unions of the U. S. S. R.

The first notable thing is the increase of the trade union membership. Two years ago, at the time of the Fifth Congress, the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions had an affiliated membership of 4,547,000; now at the Sixth Congress, the membership has reached 6,060,000. This membership comprises 62 per cent of manual workers and 38 per cent of brain and office workers. The per cent of women members has decreased since the Fifth Congress from 28 to 24 per cent, the number of young workers has been lowered from 3.7 per cent to 3.1 per cent. However, this was not due to an actual decrease of women and young members, but to the greater rate of increase of male members. There are only 391,000 workers who are not members of the trade unions, thus making up 8 per cent of unorganized workers in Soviet Russia. The unorganized belong chiefly to trades in which the work is largely seasonal.

There are 35,000 shop committees thruout the U. S. S. R. The shop and local committees have

120,000 elected members, of whom about 50,000 are free to devote their entire time to trade union activities.

The financial situation of the trade unions has greatly improved since the Fifth Congress. Beginning with October 1, 1924, the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions has been managing its affairs without deficit. While during the Fifth Congress only 11 out of the 23 Central Committees had a stable financial basis, now practically all of them, with the exception of two or three balance their budget without a deficit, while a number of them have quite substantial savings.

As regards wages, two periods have been noted since the Fifth Congress. The first lasting up to the beginning of 1923, was a period of an intensive growth of wages. The second period which is still continuing, was a period of retarded growth of wages. On the whole, wages thruout industry have increased since the Fifth Congress by an average of 63 per cent. Taking individual industries, we now have the following wage level: 56.6 per cent of pre-war in the metal industry, 91.7 per cent in the textiles, 52.2 per cent in mining, 89.2 per cent in the chemical industry; the average wages thruout the U. S. S. R. are equal to 75 per cent of the pre-war wages.

An Interview With Saklatvala

By Carl Brannin

THE recent election of S. Saklatvala, member of the British Communist Party and also of the British labor party to parliament by the voters of the Battersea (London) district is a smashing answer to the charge of labor party officials that Communists cannot function constructively in the labor party and trade union movement, and should be denied membership in the British labor party.

As a member of the Clerks' and Administrative Workers' Union, and their delegate to the labor party branch of St. Pancras (London), Saklatvala has for many years taken an active part in the labor movement as an educational propagandist. Before joining the Communist Party he was a member of the Independent labor party. In the parliament preceding that of the MacDonald government, he was the lone Communist member. After one term's absence he now comes back as the lone Communist member.

He comes back to parliament now because 15,000 working men and women in Battersea believe in his integrity. In his ability as a fighter, and in the principles of work-in-class government for which he stands. These 15,000 workers—not more than 30 of whom are members of the Communist Party (his own figures) have confidence in Saklatvala in spite of the deluge of prejudice and abuse which is levelled against Communists by national labor party officials and the Tory press. He was the overwhelming choice of the Battersea labor party branch as their parliamentary candidate, and the national labor party conference had to accept him. His constructive ability in the labor movement is further attested by the invitations which come to him every week to address branch labor party gatherings in different parts of England.

In an interview with Saklatvala a short time after the election I had an opportunity to learn something of

his attitude toward the problems confronting the British workers under the new Tory government.

"MY attitude in parliament toward the labor party," he said, "will depend very largely upon the position of the labor party group toward the big domestic and imperialist problems now facing the country. If such men as George Lansbury, Maxton and others like them are to be kept in the back benches instead of being placed in the front as leaders, I shall certainly raise my voice as the opposition. This can only mean that the labor party has completely recanted its former position as to reparations, Egypt, India, military and naval expenditures and imperialism generally. If the labor party begins to follow in the foot steps of its past eight months in office with men like MacDonald in the lead, a vigorous effort must be made to arouse the rank and file against this. It cannot continue this reactionary course and live as a strong instrument of working class expression."

I had heard Saklatvala on several occasions during the elections and knew him as a convincing dynamic speaker taking his stand on the basis of the class struggle and meeting such questions as the Russian treaty, unemployment, and British imperialism as a revolutionary internationalist. As he outlined his position in our talk the same vehemence of gesture and facial expression came forth to give emphasis to his intense feeling on the subject. He continued:

EVER since the Bolshevik revolution the British workers have found inspiration in the progress of their Russian comrades in the building of a new society. The labor party officials have never reflected the real depth of this sentiment in their attitude toward Russia. They proposed the Russian treaty as a commercial matter all the time declaring their abhorrence of the Bolshevik government and Communism. There was no real

working class appeal for international solidarity. Naturally this was bound to create a psychology among many British workers which allowed them to be stamped by the false Zinoviev letter. MacDonald bungled his end of the matter and it cost the labor party working class votes. While labor polled a million more votes this time than at the previous election, it must be remembered that there were 85 more parliamentary candidates in the field, which gave many an opportunity to vote labor who had never had it before. I am convinced that had MacDonald and the leaders acted with decision and courage on the various issues of the campaign, even with their bad record in office, we would not have lost the seats we did and probably would have gained."

THAT labor's participation in parliamentary action must lead to the acceptance of the Communist position was a point which Saklatvala said should be emphasized repeatedly. The policy of the labor party in fishing for middle-class and liberal votes—refusing to discuss the capital levy in one session, the Russian treaty in a second—prohibition even in a third, etc., could only make for confusion and defeat of the real purpose of working class political action. Already the lure of place and preferment in government and public life was making itself felt as the political wing of labor was being over-emphasized to the weakening of the industrial wing. The workers were being told they must get along amicably with their employers—there were no real differences which could not be settled between them without strikes and disruption. There were men in the labor party—high up in its councils—preaching this doctrine of class-collaboration in their desire for "recognition by business people as constructive labor leaders" worthy of high office.

SAKLATVALA'S parting word was, "Labor must learn to be absolutely honest with itself. It blames its reac-

tionary officialdom for lack of progress and applauds a radical program but when the issue is drawn and the choice lies between the old crowd and a new militant leadership too often it hangs back and refuses to make the break. There is no half-way ground. You are either right or left. Labor must be honest and choose the left."

A HINDU by birth, Saklatvala is married to an Englishwoman and has a family of five children. He is about 45 years of age.

The Walden Book Shop
307 Plymouth Court
(Between State and Dearborn
Just South of Jackson)
CHICAGO

BOOKS FOR THINKERS
SCIENCE, LITERATURE
ECONOMICS, HISTORY.
Any Book in Print at One.
Jimmie Higgins Book Shop
127 University Place
NEW YORK CITY
A Workers Party Book Shop

1632 S. Trumbull Ave.
Phone Rockwell 5050
MORDECAI SHULMAN
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
701 Association Building
19 S. La Salle Street CHICAGO
Dearborn 2657 Central 4945-4947

WHEN YOU BUY
GET AN "AD"

The Lessons of MacDonaldism

(Continued from Page 1.)

In our waters, if we would not pay indemnity for two spies whom we had put into prison. Over a year has passed and England, that powerful country, has passed thru a political crisis. The elections will follow and the labor party, which is the governing party, goes into the fight, with the slogan: The whole treaty with the Soviet Union without deletions. You see how history is working for us.

Our comrades sometimes say that the world revolution is proceeding too slowly and question whether the Comintern is not responsible for the slow rate of advance. I am ready to admit that the revolutionizing of the West could proceed more rapidly. In fact the Comintern could and ought to work more energetically. But comrades, one can say without hesitation that if you take the period of nine months which has just elapsed, we can hardly complain of slowness. In these nine months we have witnessed how the Second International has succeeded to the government in a number of countries and, under symptoms of the revolutionizing of the workers, have been turned out again.

The Democratic-Pacifist Era Is Only a Historical Episode.

It has been said of late that an epoch or era of democratic pacifism had arrived: in England, a menshevik government; in France a government of the "left bloc," actively supported by socialists; in Denmark a social democratic government; in Belgium a labor government is expected any day; in Jugoslavia the Davidovic cabinet, etc. In one word, an epoch of democratic pacifism. Some comrades jumped to the conclusion that this will retard the proletarian world revolution for years; that a prolonged peaceful period of capitalism has set in and that therefore a change of tactics is necessary. If we faithfully describe the events which are proceeding in Europe we must say, and the Fifth World Congress has said, that the bourgeoisie is attempting by means of the mensheviks to introduce a new sort of government because they can no longer govern with the old methods of terror and brutality. They were compelled to don the mask of pacifism and of democracy, and for the second time after the war to invite representatives of the Second International to take the reins of government. The Fifth Congress of the Comintern had, as a result of an analysis of the situation which had arisen, come to the conclusion that this epoch will not last long, that it is a masquerade of the bourgeoisie and is not a sign of its strength but of its weakness.

Every change of epoch—from fascism to pacifism, from democracy to white dictatorship and vice versa—shakes the foundation of the bourgeois world. The democratic pacifist era will pass by and the revolution will come. And it is our task to expose those who disguise themselves; to tear off the masks and to remain uncompromising Bolsheviks to the end. Hence the slogan: Bolshevizing our parties!

What do we see now? If MacDonald has to go and Lloyd and Curzon take his place, where then will the notorious democratic-pacifist era be? There will be nothing left of it.

The Position of Herriot Is No Better. In the France of Herriot, pacifism is likewise fading away before it has reached full bloom. We have just had a visit from Marty. He has told us of the feeling prevailing in France. There is no longer any magic in the idea of the left bloc, which a few months ago quite turned the heads of the population. During the election campaign Herriot, in order to gain the votes of the civil servants, promised them an increase of salary of 150 francs a month. Now he is at the head of the government and the position of the civil servants has not improved. The electors remember this promise and say: Now you are in the government, therefore pay up this 1,800 francs. This figure of 1,800 francs

is now the most popular slogan. Just imagine how a mere trifle such as an increase of salaries to 1,800 francs can shake the whole left bloc, with Herriot and the whole democratic-pacifist era.

This is an interesting historical episode. The underlying class antagonisms are growing more acute. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat are facing one another in sharply divided fronts.

We Have No Cause to Be Despondent.

The course of events is not so tardy as it seems. If you consider the events before the war, there did not occur in the course of 10 years so many important events as now occur in the course of 10 days. In England in the main stronghold of capitalism, the most important party of the Second International, in response to the pressure of their own workers, will "shed blood" for us the Bolsheviks. How has this unexpected circumstance arisen? In the last resort the course of events is not determined by our clever "diplomacy," but by such simple facts as the course of the class struggle, upon which is based Marxism, Leninism and the Comintern. The course of history determines that the working class of England, with a rich upper strata, with a strong labor aristocracy, regardless of the prejudices against Bolshevism, perceives and feels the correctness of our standpoint and cannot be deceived by Georgian fairy tales.

A differentiation has set in in the English working class, and this is a world-historical event. Marx once said that a revolution without England would only be a storm in a tea cup. For the world power of England rests upon India, Egypt, etc.

What shall we wish as a result of the approaching elections? We desire from the bottom of our hearts a victory for MacDonald. MacDonald recently announced before the whole world that he is no Communist. Love's labor lost! Who could charge MacDonald with having anything in common with Communism? We know this quite well, and in spite of it we wholeheartedly wish MacDonald a victory in the elections and desire that he will enjoy his victory not only for nine months, but for eighteen or more months. But we confess that we will not weep if he suffers a defeat. In either case the English labor movement will go forward.

The Popularity of the Soviet Union Among the Workers of the West Is Growing.

Never before were our Soviets so popular in the eyes of the working masses—even of the reformist workers—as at present. In the years 1920-22, the years of hunger and disaster, the idea of the Soviet power was not so attractive among this section of the workers. But now all workers know, even the reformist workers, that our cause is advancing. They say: Even if wages with you are lower we see that things with you are on the up-grade, but with us in Europe they are on the down-grade. It is now perfectly clear that in one or two years the question of workers' efficiency, say for instance, in the Kolonna factory, will be of international importance. The workers of the whole world will pass judgment upon us. Comrade Fimmen when he was in Moscow related the following interesting episode: He had received a letter from the chairman of the reformist seamen's union of a certain country. This individual was a hopeless reformist and a hater of Moscow. And this trade union leader had received a pamphlet published by our seamen's union, which contained particulars as to the conditions of work and terms of engagement of seamen in the Soviet Union. He read this brochure and now writes to Fimmen: I have read the particulars regarding the conditions of work of the seamen in the Soviet Union; if these are true, it means that we have been shamefully deceived.

You see what enormous propagandist importance is possessed by such a minor thing as the working day in the socialist republic. Workers always

remain workers, even if they are reformists. When they were told that with us starvation, and cannibalism prevailed, and that the workers are living in slavery, etc., these reformist workers did not understand the Russian revolution. But now when they see the reverse side of the medal—that the workers are free, that the efficiency of labor is increasing, that the situation is improving—then the Soviet power and its ideas become the greatest propagandist force in the whole world, and begin to sound like a tocsin as they never sounded before.

We have every reason to be satisfied with the experience of the last nine months. We will, of course, follow the election campaign in England with the greatest interest. It is said

of us that we are sending Communist agitators there. "Wise" bourgeois gentry of the type of Hughes claim that I have a hundred agitators up my sleeve whom I can dispatch to any desired country. I am sorry to say I am not endowed with such a capacity. We hope that even the leaders of the labor party, while agitating for themselves, will be compelled to tell the truth regarding the Soviet Union. And the working class of England will see that our Soviet Union will point out the way to the whole world, for the truth is on our side. For through the whole world it is not the ideas of petty bourgeois, menshevik, "constructive" pseudo-socialism which are proceeding to victory, but the ideas of Leninism.

MUSIC -- By Alfred V. Frankenstein

"Madame Butterfly," a masquerade party in three acts, set to music by Giacomo Puccini, was given by the Chicago Civic opera company last Monday night. It was a bit more than just a performance of the opera. It was a sort of memorial ceremony, for the composer had been scarcely forty-eight hours dead when the curtain went up on this opera, which is, next to "La Boheme," his most popular work.

A criticism of "Butterfly" is a criticism of Puccini, for obvious reasons. Altho "Tosca" is probably a greater piece, "Butterfly" represents a norm of Puccini's achievement. Fully a third of it padding, obvious, trite, simply thrown in. The rest is some of the most inspired and lovely lyrical melody in musical literature. There is always a wiping of eyes in the audience at the conclusion of the aria, "One Day He'll Come," at the beginning of the second act, there is generally a commingling of tears and applause at the final curtain. Most of them have heard the opera time and again, and yet there is always the same effect. Which means, Puccini was a success, both artistically and financially. He never startles us, he never makes wonder at his novelty of invention, but he can make us weep.

As to the performance of Monday night, the best work was done by a tiny little lady whose name was not on the program. At any rate she played the part of Madame Butterfly's baby, and she was the first child I have ever seen take the part without looking something like a kewpie doll.

Edith Mason was very fine in the same part. She did not look her role, at least not as aptly as other singers look the part, which is not her fault, but in her acting and singing she was the deluded little Japan-

ese girl. Charles Hackett, as Pinkerton, had one of the queerest roles in opera. Pinkerton is a disolute and reprehensible sort of cuss, but his part in the opera makes him a highly idealized villain. Hackett sang the party adequately, but Pinkerton is not a very great tenor role.

The smaller parts, such as the servant Suzuki, played by Flora Perini, the American consul Sharpless, which Giacomo Rimini sang, and the marriage broker, as Ludovico Oliviero portrayed him, were all excellent, and contributed to the making of the frame and background for Miss Mason's lead.

Costumes and scenery suggested a would-be Japanese tea house on Sheridan road rather than real Japan. The main reason for that is that even though you give a man a William Z. Foster haircut (I've got to retaliate somehow for his referring to the LaFollette movement as a "Frankenstein") and dress him up in a kimono, he won't look very Japanese if his features and build are those of Rome.

Lore and the Comintern

(Continued from page 6)

I've known Communist who supported Serrati was Paul Levi of shameful memory, the man who later found a resting place in the arms of the German social-democrats. Comrade Lore called Paul Levi to witness the correctness of his (Lore's) attitude towards Serrati. On February 19, 1921, the Volkszeitung reprinted from the "Rote Fahne" an article by Paul Levi, praising the Serrati group beyond words and expressing hope that the Communist International would keep them. A footnote of the editor to the article reads:

"It gives us vivid satisfaction that Comrade Dr. Paul Levi, author of this article, takes a position towards the Italian congress and particularly, towards the Serrati group which is perfectly identical with the position of the Volkszeitung as expressed in our editorial three weeks ago."

Comrade Lore thus links himself with Paul Levi. We shall see that this relationship was destined to become more pronounced later.

(Second article will be published in next issue of this supplement.)

SUFFERING FROM ELECTION SHOCK!

(Continued from page 5)

International fits our case to the point. This very negative attitude can be clearly seen in the latest statements of the C. E. C. T. U. E. L. and Y. W. L., and Comrade Bittelmann's articles. By refusing to recognize the crying need for a political unity of proletarians, who are slowly, but surely forced to look for political weapons, and as yet are far from being able to understand a necessity for a Communist Party, we will only play into the hands of our yellows. And, if the T. U. E. L. statement reflects the new C. E. C. policy correctly, then they are already on "common place syndicalist" grounds. But they shall not remain there!

CHICAGO SOCIETY FOR TECH. AID TO RUSSIA CELEBRATES TONIGHT

The Chicago Society for Technical Aid to Soviet Russia will celebrate its fifth anniversary on Saturday, Dec. 6, at 8 p. m. in the assembly hall of the Soviet School, 1902 W. Division St., Chicago. Russian labor organizations are invited to send their representatives to the celebration. An interesting program is being prepared.

Another group of the agricultural commune "Red Ray" of the Chicago Society for Technical Aid to Soviet Russia will leave for Odessa this Saturday at midnight. A farewell will be given to them at this affair.

All supporters of the work of the society are urged to be present to give these "pioneers" a good sendoff.

The affair promises to be a lively one as the orchestra of the Y. W. L. will play a prominent role in the program and the dancing that will follow. The three Sholly dancing children in Russian costumes will participate in the program. Many other interesting numbers. Come! Admission only 35 cents.