



THE PROLETARIAN



LABOR AWAKENS

Labor Awakens

Slowly, but surely, Labor awakens. After centuries of prostration, painfully but with gathering strength Labor breaks its chains and struggles to its knees.

Today the chains that bind Labor are invisible but they are no less real than if they were rivetted with iron. We of the working class are many in numbers and our muscles are strong. Our power is irresistible if we but learn to use it. But we are all held in bondage by the ignorance and superstition of our fellows. Our masters with their henchmen rest in ease and security on our backs and they will remain there as long as the chains are secure and strong.

Happily for the human race, the chains are rusting through and even some of the masters themselves—the more far-seeing among them—see their danger and cry the alarm.

Seven years ago it seemed that the movement of Labor had been checked and its progress crushed forever. Armor was girded on and weapons thrust in our hands. The intolerable burden of War was bound on our shoulders. But out of that four years of horror has come the first great achievement of the century. From the ashes of the blackest reaction has arisen the hope and inspiration of the world. Where formerly ruled the knout and the gallows; Siberia for Labor, today stands the Workers' Republic, the Proletarian State, the rule of Labor and whosoever does not labor has no share in that rule. The Neva has risen. The slave of yesterday is the master of destiny today. Who will say there is not ironic justice therein?

And yet this is only a promise of what tomorrow must be. The task is only begun. Labor has but struggled to its knees. We have begun to break the chains. We must rise to our feet. The structure of capitalism must be razed to the earth so that room may be made for the new order. A final society will one day be reared in its place, a society that shall know no classes, where each shall labor for good of all and none be denied, where the instruments of class rulership shall be but hateful memories and man shall at last stand Free and Liberated under Communism.

Reply to Albert Bell

Member C. E. C., U. C. P.

From different cities and states I have received copies of a letter of almost 700 words. It is signed "Albert Bell, member C. E. C., U. C. P."

The first two sentences of the second paragraph read as follows: "It is not true that I said we might put up candidates on the Republican or Democratic tickets, or the ticket of any other party. I cannot imagine what Keracher can have interpreted in this way, and shall ask him personally to make the correction."

The letter is dated, "March 23, 1921." I am writing this April 20th and A. B. has not approached me personally, or otherwise. If he is the same comrade who came to where I room, a few months ago, then he knows where I am to be found. When he then approached me, it was to request me to join the U. C. P. assuring me if I did so that there would be a paid official position for me. I rejected his attempt to bribe me into joining, pointing out that my disagreement with their position was their inability to live up to

the parliamentary requirements of the Third International, however much they might be able to comply with the other requirements.

He argued that members of the U. C. P. might "run on the existing tickets." I ridiculed such a notion. Now he says "It is not true." He also argued that in some States their candidates could be nominated on the "Independent" ticket.

I objected on the grounds that it would not only be an absurd position to put a Communist in but calculated to lead to **further confusion**.

A. B. does not seem to have a very high regard for the truth when he states: "He (Keracher) now seems frantic because so many members of the Proletarian Party have already joined the U. C. P., including some of their National Executive Committee." I am quite positive that no members have left the Proletarian Party lately and am certain that no members of our N. E. C. have joined their ranks. Some time after the Party was organized last year some, mostly very young comrades, dropped out. The growth of the Party, through the starting of new locals has more than compensated for the few who left last year.

I am at present conducting study classes in Chicago, speaking at public meetings and so forth, and have enquired about the circulation of this letter here, but fail to find any.

The concluding paragraph reads thus: "When comrade Keracher recognizes the necessity of underground organization form, and is willing to accept the 21 points without reservations he will undoubtedly make a valuable worker. Until then we can expect him to do his best to confuse the issue, and comrades should be on their guard against confusionist tactics." A. B. knows that I publicly defend the 21 points. Therefore do "recognize the necessity of the underground organization form." What I oppose is making a humbug and a farce of it, as in this instance. His proposal to run candidates for congress disguised as something other than Communists is proof that he has not recovered from his S. P. confusion yet.

He may have changed his brand of confusion but he still retains the same petty-Bourgeois methods of using his "thinking" organ.

However, when comrades holding such ideas can still remain members of the C. E. C. of that Party which for the time being may be the best that the Communist International has found in the U. S. A., it is proof of the intellectual plight of the movement in this country and the need for sound proletarian education.

JOHN KERACHER.

The Proletarian

Published Monthly at
550 Michigan Avenue
Detroit, Michigan

The Proletarian is the official paper of the Proletarian Party of America.

Subscription one dollar fifty a year; single copies twenty cents. Rates to dealers on application.

No advertising matter accepted.
Make checks and money orders payable to The Proletarian.



THE PROLETARIAN

Vol. III

MAY, 1921

No. 6

May Day

By John Keracher

Once a year, on the worker's own day, the first of May, or "May Day" as it is fondly called, the laboring masses down tools and march in line to the fields and meadows or to the public squares and assembly halls to demonstrate their class-solidarity. To pledge faith with their kind and draw inspiration for coming conflicts.

Although "International Labor Day" is of comparatively recent origin, developed out of the workers' international movement, the day itself has a historic past. For many ages it was a workers' day.

During the Feudal period it was the "gladdest day of all the year, the maddest, merriest day." The Swains and their Lassies, the Husbandmen and their families, betook themselves to the fields at sunrise, to indulge in the time-honored custom of bathing their faces in the dew of the spring grass. Then they would march to the woods to cut down the blossom from the hawthorn-may. With this Mayflower the girls made garlands and the young men and boys twisted the leaves into arches. Gaily decorated with spring flowers they marched back in triumphal procession to the villages. The strong men bore upon their shoulders a long, slim, tree-trunk fresh cut from the forest and decorated with garlands of flowers and gaily colored ribbons.

The parade usually headed for the Village Green where the tree was set upright in a hole already prepared for it. This was the May-pole around which the younger folks danced and sang their merry songs. After the ceremony of crowning with flowers some village belle as "Queen of the May," the villagers frolicked on the Green till sundown.

For the young and strong, contests of speed and strength was the order of the day, while the older folks danced to the tunes of the piper, the fiddler, or other rustic musician.

The forerunners of the present capitalists class, typified, for instance, by the "Puritans" of England, fought the "pagan holiday" with its "heathenish custom of jumping and leaping around a pole." Many other holidays, or holy days, that the serfs and peasantry were granted by their aristocratic masters while the Catholic church held sway, were abolished with the reformation.

Capitalism hasn't time for many holidays. Especially is this true of America where the workless days have been reduced to a minimum (excepting those that cannot be provided with work, "the industrial reserve-army"). The many "Holy," "Feast," or "Saint's" Days have been abolished and replaced by a few national holidays, upon which the people are expected to commemorate, not christian saints, but the "great men" of the capitalist era, or the great events that have contributed so much to the establishment of the present great fortunes.

On the fourth of July, "Independence" is celebrated. Then there is Lincoln's, and Washington's, birthday. These are the new "Holy Days" and the

new national "Saints" to be commemorated by the patriotic worshippers. "Decoration Day" commemorates those who died that the present order of things, with its pelf and poverty, might live. It fosters and keeps alive, that poison of the proletariat, patriotism with its narrow national pride. Then there is "Emancipation Day," celebrated by the colored worker to commemorate his "rise" from chattel slavery to "free wage-labor." His rise to a position where he can be no longer sold outright upon the block to the highest bidder, but has the "liberty" to sell his labor-power to the highest bidder upon an "equal" footing with the white wage-slave. Or the "freedom" to accept as low a wage as anyone, and the "freedom" to starve if he can't find a master, for such are the privileges of "free labor."

Ah, but there is "Labor Day" in the month of September! You will say: "What is the matter with that?" A symbol of "National-Labor" as against "International Labor Day." A day that is not wrested from the exploiting class by the laborers as is the case with May Day, but a holiday conferred upon the workers by a "benevolent" master class. A token of appreciation of the respectfulness, docility, and servility to capitalism of the American workers.

May Day is a militant day, not a day of National-consciousness but of class-consciousness: A day upon which the rebellious wage-slave marches with his kind, conscious that the world resounds to the tread of proletarian feet, that millions of his fellow workers in every land are doing just exactly as he is.

It is the workers' own day, the annual milestone at which they stop to look back over the long up-hill road, to commemorate their martyrs, their Liebknechts and Luxemburghs, their Jean Juares and Frank Littles, and the countless thousands of obscure heroes that laid down their lives on the battle-fields of the Class-war. It is a day of vigorous protest on behalf of the fellow workers now lying behind stone walls and iron bars, the victims of war-time venom and class-tyranny.

May Day this year, in spite of losses and disappointments, finds the world's workers in a stronger position than ever before. The enemies of the first Workers' Republic, Soviet Russia, have been crushed or swept from the land. Soviet Republics have been established in Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. Treaties have been signed between Soviet territories and Turkey, Persia, Afghanistan, and other eastern lands; peace established with Poland and the Baltic countries; trade relations established with England and many other countries. The year's progress since last May Day will stimulate the conscious workers to a more vigorous prosecution of the struggle.

In Germany, Italy, Spain, and elsewhere the masses have shown their metals. They have shaken the foundations of thrones and bourgeois republics alike. Even in conservative England the spirit of revolt is abroad in the land.

This May Day sees a new alignment of forces,

militant and mighty, breaking with old concepts, repudiating yellow "internationalism" and Amsterdam "trade unionism." An alignment with the Communist International and a steady trend towards the Red

Trade Union International of Moscow. That is what we see this May Day, not a mere holiday, not the peaceful merry day of the past, but the stern International Day of Class Revolt.

America's Reply to Soviet Russia

By Ern Reen

Why did the American government refuse to lift the blockade of Soviet Russia? Because it still has the power to do that.

The mere existence of a socialist republic is a menace to the capitalist world. The American exploiting class understands it, and it will continue its efforts to strangle proletarian Russia until some superior force stops it.

Such a superior force is the class-consciousness of the American working class, which alone can change the character of Secretary Hughes' replies to the workers of Russia.

Indeed, Hughes' reply to Russia was disappointing to many. Bourgeois liberals, sentimental radicals, and a certain brand of socialists, entertained great expectations that our democratic government would finally acknowledge its error and stretch its fraternal hand to the workers of Russia. They indefatigably issued declarations, sent petitions, and gave advices to the president. Their hopes ran high the last weeks before the new president entered the White House. Many great deeds were expected of him. He would make peace, he would solve the unemployment problem, he would release the political prisoners, and recognize Soviet Russia. The treaty England signed with Soviet Russia gave a special impetus to the liberal's hopes: The new president certainly would follow the glorious example of its, also democratic, ally.

Just one thing had been forgotten: The new president represents the same class as the old president. He is to carry out the will of the ruling class of America, and not to worry about the wishes of the liberals.

England's example, though of no effect on our new administration, is of some value to us, for it displays the real dynamic forces of society. The analysis of last year's events in England reveals the truth that it has been not a new president and kind intentions of the ruling class, that loosened the grip of the blockade of Soviet Russia. Nay, they were the resolute actions of the British workers, that, together with the very acute necessity for foreign markets felt by British industry, swung the gates for trade with Russia open, in spite of the resistance of a certain portion of the capitalist class.

The first efforts of the Soviet government to establish peace were met with the contempt and hostility of the English ruling class. Together with France, democratic Poland, and freedom-loving white guards of various creeds and races, England has been actively engaged in spreading death and misery among the workers of Russia. England's soldiers were murdering peaceful people in Archangel, destroying oil-wells in the Caucasus, executing communists wherever they captured them, guarding the Polish war supplies in Danzig. By all evidences, England intended to continue this noble work; it was ready to enter into an open war with Soviet Russia. Then the workers of

England intervened. Mass meetings were called throughout, demonstrations were held, transportation workers held up the war materials sent against Russia. A Committee to Resist the War was organized; it urged the workers not to undertake any service against Russia, not to make munitions, and to resist military preparations. A joint committee of various labor organizations met on August 9th, 1920, in the House of Parliament and "warned the government that the whole industrial power of the organized workers will be used to defeat this war....." Four days later a special Trade Union Congress on Russia met at Westminster and demanded peace with Russia. J. H. Thomas, the president of the International Federation of Trades, declared: "Our action means a challenge to the whole constitution of the country....."

The frightened ruling class hastened to reply through Lloyd George a few days later in the House of Commons: "..... the policy of the government in regard to Russia would appear to differ in no way from that enunciated at the Labor Conference....."

The English capitalists found themselves forced to open negotiations with the Soviet representatives. Under the cover of these negotiations they continued, however, their reactionary activities. Labor interfered again. Angered by the trickery of the government, the workers raised loud protests. Again red flags floated during demonstrations; every unemployed meeting ended with cheers for the proletarian State in Russia; resolutions called for drastic actions against the government. Often the agitation of the workers resulted in conflicts with the police. So, on October 18th, 1920, twenty-seven persons were injured in a clash with police during an unemployed parade, displaying red flags. Everywhere throughout the country the workers demanded that the hostilities against their comrades in Russia be immediately stopped. They used no gentle language, either. On November 7th, during a demonstration held at Albert Hall, London, one of the speakers, C. L. Malone, remarked amidst wild cheers: "We are out to change the present constitution, and if it is necessary to save bloodshed and to save atrocities, we shall have to use lamp-posts. What are a few Churchills or a few Curzons on lamp-posts compared with the massacre of thousands of Indians in Amritsar?....." The meeting finally carried out the resolution that "unless the British government completely raised the blockade, abstained from all interference in Russia, established full trade relations, and recognized the Soviet Government by a specified date, the Council of Action would call for a national 'down tool' policy."

At the same time the situation in Ireland and India was becoming more and more acute. The continuous uprisings in the colonies, the civil war which involved new colonies every day, and complete breaking

(Continued on Page 16)

Another S. P. "Left Wing" Develops

By H. M. Wicks

The latest arrival in the field of the numerous groups in the United States pretending to adhere to the principles of the Third (Communist) International is a group in the Socialist Party of America, calling itself "The Committee for the Third International." The active workers in this group have long been associated with the Socialist Party and have consistently supported its reactionary policy, until within the past year.

This Committee has issued a curious magazine called "The Workers' Council," which reminds one of some of the propaganda issued by the Cleveland, Ohio, branch of the "left-wing" of 1917-1919; again one is reminded of the "November Bolsheviks" of inglorious memory who constituted the New York branch of the old "left-wing." This new "left-wing," like the old one, is endeavoring to capture the decrepit Socialist Party through indiscriminate use of the slogans and terminology of the Bolsheviks of Russia, without expending the necessary mental exertion which would enable it to understand the significance of the revolution itself. This new aggregation, like the old one, seizes upon a few formulas that have a definite place in the revolutionary movement, and continually repeat them without any attempt to place them in their historical setting. The new left-wingers have all their lives played the game of compromise, of reformistic opportunism, of social quackery; to call them utopians is to good naturedly compliment them. **Muddlehead** is the only word in the language that adequately and concisely describes the molecular movement in their cranial apparatus. During the period of revolt within the ranks of the Socialist Party (1917-1919) the individuals whose names appear on the new publication masqueraded as sympathizers with Bolshevism, while using every weapon at their command to basely attack and besmirch the one group in the United States that was carrying on an intelligent revolutionary propaganda—the Marxian group. When whole blocks of the membership of the Socialist Party were expelled by the bureaucratic national executive committee, when this gang of incompetent dictators refused to turn over the affairs of the party to their duly elected successors, when this same gang used the police force of the city of Chicago to evict its opponents from a convention to which they were elected, Mr. J. Louis Engdahl, the most prominent figure in "The Committee for the Third International" used his position as editor of the Chicago Socialist to villify the groups who were making at least a pretense of conforming to the principles of international socialism. Like all the reformists, utopians and just ordinary politicians, the Marxian group was their target for the most vitriolic assaults; but, then, as now, they could not be induced to engage in a debate with our group on any question confronting the proletariat of the world.

A communication, appearing in "The Workers' Council" and signed by Engdahl and one Steven Birchler, of Newark, N. J., declares that the twenty-one points are not a hindrance toward Socialist Party affiliation, but then they hastily add: "All discussions as to its applicability in the United States at the pres-

ent time should be carried on within the International, not from without." There seems to be a doubt in the minds of the committee as to whether the twenty-one articles do apply to the United States, but they are willing to accept them now, while not agreeing fully with them, and then endeavor to change them later. If any other interpretation can be placed upon that assertion I would like to know what it is. The next sentence is somewhat more illuminating and we there discern the motive for the expressed desire for affiliation: "The party should and must **if it is to survive as a revolutionary working class organization** give its whole hearted support to the Third International. * * *" (emphasis mine.)

We now see why this committee desires affiliation of the party with the Third International; it is a question of apparently changing front or perishing and in order to save the party organization they are willing to endorse the twenty-one articles and endeavor to change them by "boring from within" the International. However, the implication in the sentence just quoted is that the Socialist Party was once a revolutionary working class organization, which is erroneous to say the least. The Socialist Party of America never was, is not now and never will be a revolutionary organization; it has seldom, if ever, been responsible for a single piece of Marxist literature being published in its entire existence. It is simply a machine through which politicians of the type of Stedman, Berger, Hillquit & Co., mask their deception and betrayal of the workers. Even at the moment Engdahl was writing articles for the organ of his committee he was, and is now, serving on a publication committee that is endeavoring to start another yellow daily paper in the city of Chicago. All labor unions and other working class organizations are being circularized by this inglorious combination of political skates in order to inveigle the gullible workers into supporting this latest project of unscrupulous adventurers. It has been a sufficient length of time since the workers had their pockets stripped to support the late unlamented "Chicago Daily Socialist" so now they are to be again systematically trimmed by Stedman, Frankle, Engdahl & Co. I suppose Mr. Engdahl will have the audacity to assert that the daily when launched will be an organ of the Third International! The labor unions are asked to contribute to a one-hundred-thousand dollar fund before the paper is launched and they kindly requested the union of which I am a member (Typographical Union No. 16) to contribute one thousand dollars. The politicians sent a speaker to the meeting to misrepresent their purpose, but I am happy to record the fact that I blocked the donation by exposing the Socialist Party for what it is and at the same time giving my fellow workers a lesson in revolutionary theory and practice. It is too bad Mr. Engdahl couldn't have been there; he would have had an opportunity to write some more scurrilous attacks upon the Marxists of the United States as he did in 1919-20.

That "The Workers' Council" is an organ of a section of the Socialist Party cannot for a moment be

questioned when one turns to the so-called editorials and reads them. The editor says:

"The Workers' Council * * * will endeavor to become the expression of revolutionary Socialism, as it was conceived by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in the Communist Manifesto of 1847 * * *"

Then follows a gem that permits us to accurately measure the Marxism of these miserable pretenders. The second article in the magazine is captioned, "A Place in the Sun," and deals with President Harding's inaugural speech and attempts to compare Harding to Woodrow Wilson. Says this new apostle (?) of the Third International:

"Whatever our opinion may be of the gentleman who now occupies the White House, it must be admitted that he, unlike his weakly vacillating predecessor, leaves no one in doubt as to his position. He is the servant of the imperialist interest of America and does not care who knows it. He is determined upon an aggressive foreign policy that will establish the American capitalist class firmly as a factor in the world market."

After a page of verbosity and what passes among the yokels, who follow the standard of the Socialist Party, for sarcasm, in an endeavor to prove the above assertion, the article concludes:

"In short, the United States, in a single week, has openly broken with its traditional policy of aloofness in international affairs. The administration has steered the ship of state into a course that can have but one ultimate outcome, new international difficulties and new wars, without pretending to consult congress, the recognized expression of the will of the people. * * *"

No Marxist would ever be guilty of such a complete abandonment of the scientific method of interpreting current history, for as an exhibition of appalling ignorance the two quotations surpass anything that has come to my notice for quite some time. The declaration that Mr. Harding leaves no one in doubt as to his position and the reference to Mr. Wilson as "weakly vacillating" is really comical! As to Mr. Wilson I am sure no one would accuse him of vacillation, unless it be the superficial observer who never gets beneath the merest froth on the surface of the tumultuous sea of history. To the average Socialist Party member and to the average romanticist in the labor movement Mr. Wilson may have appeared vacillating and even hypocritical, but to the Marxist, who observes the underlying motives that prompt social action the course of Mr. Wilson was brutally, but in a way, admirably consistent. Never for one moment did he waver in his set course as the representative of American imperialism; when Europe was plunged into the war Mr. Wilson admonished us to "remain neutral in thought as well as in deed," which was at that time to the interest of American capitalism; when England blockaded Germany Mr. Wilson protested, in the interest of American capitalism; then England assured Mr. Wilson it was a necessary war measure, but that the Allies would absorb all the commodities the American capitalists could supply, the objections to the blockade were tabled, which was also in the interest of American capitalism; when German victory threatened the enormous loans of Morgan & Co., further action was taken by Mr. Wilson, still the consistent servant of American capitalism. To the superficial observer Mr. Wilson reversed himself between 1914

and 1917; to the Marxist he stood steadfast as the consistent representative of American imperialism. When he went to Versailles, he still held to his course, when he endorsed the League of Nations and insisted that the Treaty of Peace be incorporated therein, he served the same interests as at the opening of the conflict. That his illness removed him from the field of activity before his term expired is no evidence of vacillation; but even that illness did not impair his sense of responsibility to those he represented. He vetoed the Lodge resolution for a separate peace with Germany, for its passage would have endangered the finance capitalists who had billions of dollars invested in the Allied cause. The interests of the finance capitalists of America and the Allied powers, being identical as against the interests of all the rest of Europe, the material basis existed for the destruction of national boundaries as far as capitalism is concerned, so the United States then abandoned its aloofness, which had before been its "traditional policy."

Opposed to the interests of the finance capitalists was the large group of manufacturing capitalists, who maintained that the United States must get back to its policy of isolation in world affairs and attend strictly to the affairs of this nation, which, to them, constituted the manufacture of commodities for the world market. Whereas the Democratic party and Mr. Wilson represented the finance capitalists (imperialists) the Republican party represented the same class it has always represented since its inception, the manufacturing class. While the imperialists of the world were squabbling over the partitioning of the world, the manufacturers were demanding an immediate settlement of the diplomatic conflict and resumption of trade with any nation that desired American commodities. The entire conflict between the Republican and the Democratic party was based upon the question of acceptance or rejection of the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles. The exponents of isolation won the day, the League and the Treaty were repudiated, the imperialists were rebuked and as Mr. Harding said in his inaugural speech: "In a deliberate questioning of a change in national policy, where internationality was to supercede nationality, we turned to a referendum of the American people. There was ample discussion and there is a republic mandate of manifest understanding." Again he said, "America can be a party to no permanent military alliance, it can enter into no political commitments, nor assume any economic obligations which will subject our decisions to any other than our own authority." There in plain words is the assertion that there is no abandonment of the old established policy of isolation. This attitude is mistaken by the confused editors of the "left-wing" publication as an "aggressive foreign policy that will establish the American capitalist class firmly as a factor in the world market." The question arises: **What part of the capitalist class is referred to?** The finance capitalists are established in the world market, but they need a vigorous spokesman of international imperialism to guard their interests; a spokesman such as they had in Mr. Wilson. The manufacturing capitalist has suffered at the hands of the finance capitalist during the imperialistic conflict and he will have no more of internationalism, so he demands "hands off European affairs" in order that channels may be opened to him through which he can dispose of his manufactured product.

Mr. Harding now finds himself in office and pressure being brought to bear upon him by the finance capitalists, so he is between two horns of a dilemma—either repudiate the manufacturing capitalists whose interests served him in his campaign or incur the hostility of the finance capitalists. Not wishing to do either he endeavors to straddle the issue, an attitude that can be maintained only a very short time. That he will eventually be forced, by the inexorable conditions, to support the imperialists against the manufacturers cannot be doubted, but the indisputable fact remains that he does not, as yet, serve the interests of the finance capitalists on the stage of world imperialism.

Of course, it is quite simple to repeat the monotonous and brainless dirge of the pseudo-revolutionists: "There is absolutely no difference between the Republican and Democratic parties." It doesn't require any brains to reiterate such a dogmatic formula, whereas an attempt to analyze the fundamental difference between political parties requires a degree of mental application that would incur cerebral disaster in the anatomy of a Socialist party member.

There is nothing in the entire publication of the "Committee for the Third International," that is a product of the editors, to distinguish it in any way from the standard Socialist Party publications. One statement from another article, "The Bitter Lesson," on page four of "The Workers' Council" deserves to be quoted for the amusement it will furnish one familiar with Marxian economics. Says this hybrid:

"Taxes are sky high. The war must be paid for. It must be paid for out of production for there is no

other way. Either profits must be sacrificed or the workers must be sacrificed. Since the profit mongers are the lords of industry the worker must pay."

It seems almost inconceivable that one connected with the radical movement in any capacity could create such drivel, but the above is an actual quotation from this "left-wing" comic supplement of the Chicago Socialist, published in New York; possibly in New York it serves as the funny section of the New York Call.

The writer of the above quotation evidently imagines that if there had been no war the workers would have secured a larger share of the products of industry, that is, that part that the cruel (?) capitalists will now force them to sacrifice in order that the taxes incident to the expenses of the war may be paid.

Just what this new organ of "revolutionary propaganda" is endeavoring to accomplish is not quite clear. Perhaps it is the result of the machinations of the "underground" romanticists, who solicit every variety of reformists, anarcho-syndicalists and even avowed anarchists for their membership as a means of augmenting their depleted ranks. Possibly Mr. Engdahl and his associates are preparing to play the mole and burrow in the ground in the vain and futile hope of undermining capitalist society, while the Marxists, whom they hold in contempt, will continue working in harmony with the traditions of scientific socialism and the principles of the Communist International, preparing the way for the triumph of the working class in the United States; an eventuality the confusionists in the labor movement will not be able to recognize when it arises before them.

Progress and Revolution

On hearing the word "Revolution," the average man immediately pictures in his mind scenes of the most heinous kind. Barricaded streets, drunken mobs, assassins bayonets and burning buildings are conjured up in his imagination. He sees women being outraged, and senseless blood-letting, at the mere mention of the word. In connection with this, the popular misconception is to the effect that periodically the Human Race goes off on a spree, and starts a revolution by shooting things up. These orgies are attributed to degeneration and depravity overcoming whole sections of the human race at different times.

Approached from this angle, no knowledge can be obtained as to the underlying causes for such apparently inhuman deeds. In fact, to the uninformed, contemplation of the subject is provocative of mental agitation bordering on distraction.

Since the pages of history are replete with the records of revolutions and revolts, let us analyze the subject briefly and see whether or not revolutions are the inevitable outgrowth of an evolving human society.

For our present purpose, we define revolution as such a change in the structure of any society whereby the dominating power passes from one class to another class in that society.

Society has not always been constituted as at

present. In its primitive beginnings it was not divided into classes. All members were placed on an equal footing. Hunting grounds were held in common. The activities of the individuals consisted in producing the things which satisfied their immediate wants—food, clothing and shelter. Then, as now, the production of the necessities of life constituted the chief form of activity of society. The particular method by which these necessities are produced, at any given time, determines the social and political institutions of that period. This political superstructure must be in harmony with the mode of production, if the former, the economic base, is to be allowed free development.

In the course of time, quietly, almost imperceptibly, changes take place in the mode of production. An accumulation of such changes produces the situation where the mode of production is out of harmony with the mode of appropriation of the product. A violent conflict is here engendered. The mode of production, for its unhampered and further development, demands a change in the method of appropriation which the ruling class maintains in accordance with its interests. A revolutionary crisis is the grand culmination. It becomes imperative on the part of the subject class, or classes, to seize the power of state and mould new institutions which will permit of the further expansion of the productive forces. In other

words, revolution is the inevitable outcome as history shows.

A number of centuries ago, Feudalism was in power in Europe. It was based upon the ownership of land which was tilled by serfs for the benefit of the lords. Within this system, the forerunners of the present-day capitalists grew up, the manufacturing class. This class, the bourgeoisie, became quite powerful and challenged the supremacy of the feudal nobility, who tried to maintain their system of production and appropriation as an overriding law. The capitalist class was then revolutionary. It sought, and succeeded, to overthrow the feudal lords with their antiquated system; in some instances, violently. This accomplished, the capitalist reared his own State machinery and became the master of society.

Under the capitalist system great things have been achieved. During its rule, the productivity of labor has been greatly increased through the introduction and perfection of machinery. However, this system contains a fundamental contradiction, which asserts itself in periodical crises. Industry is shut down and productive forces go to waste because markets are glutted. The contradiction of social production by millions of workers, who on the average receive barely enough to subsist on, and the individual appropriation of the product by a relatively small group of capitalists is responsible for this state of affairs. These periodical crises are recurring ever more frequently. At these times the working class, the proletariat, unable to find employment, is confronted with starvation. With every industrial panic the situation becomes ever more revolutionary. What shall the workers do? Stand by and meekly starve? Is that the lesson history teaches? Or shall they exercise their revolutionary prerogative?

The capitalist class, in its day, exercised its revolutionary spirit against the feudal lords who would not abdicate when their system cramped and shackled the industrial process. The feudal State resisted the encroachments of the newly risen class. They attempted to hold back the progressive economic development. Violent battles were fought, especially in France, over the question as to who should dominate society, the feudal lords or the capitalist class, who were then progressive and revolutionary.

Today, however, after a few centuries of unbridled sway, the capitalist class is conservative. Every attempt on the part of the workers to better their conditions is met with the strongest opposition. Recall the great steel strike. Take the example of the present British Miners Strike where the British Army is being mobilized for use against the strikers. As long as the workers organize only for bettering their working conditions and the raising of wages and do not become too insistent in their demands, the capitalists tolerate this somewhat. When they organize for the capture of state power, for the control of society in their own interest, they commit "the unpardonable sin." Recall the massacre of the heroic communards after the fall of the Commune in 1871. The capitalist class of France demonstrated its capacity for bloodletting during that historic outrage. Witness the blockading of Soviet Russia since November, 1917, in an infamous attempt to starve the Russian people into capitulation. Why? Because they are guilty of the "crime" of establishing a workers' government in Russia.

To what can we attribute the cause of such deeds

and actions? Man has learned his lessons only through bitter experience. After ages of time spent in a simple life under savagery and barbarism, we find that a small group of individuals have taken possession of all of the earth that is worth owning. The balance of society can only obtain an existence on the terms dictated by the few who own and rule. If their system does not ensure a livelihood for the many who are slaves, the few who rule insist that they have a right to continue to rule and back it up by the power of their State. Is there anything of depravity and degeneracy in the action taken by the enslaved masses, when they assert themselves collectively, to secure the things which satisfy their physical wants? When the few who own the earth are unable to direct things longer, without inviting disaster for the many, a social upheaval takes place.

Irrespective of our wishes, the facts of history show that, in general, the human race has only acted when necessity impelled it. It is so today. In this day of tottering thrones, the sleeping giant, the working class, out of sheer desperation, as a result of unbearable conditions, will rise and proclaim a new day.

This, however, is a stupendous task. The workers must be prepared to meet this intelligently. History, if it teaches us anything, shows that whenever a class was overthrown it immediately made attempts to get back into power; it fomented counter-revolutions. The class that had just gained the ascendancy had to meet this in no uncertain terms or go under. As examples, we may cite the unsuccessful revolt under Kornilov in Russia, and the massacre of the Finnish workers' government under Mannerheim. Also the abortive attempts to overthrow the Soviet under Denekin, Yudenitch, Kolchak, and lastly Wrangel.

In face of these facts, what can you expect in the impending crisis? The capitalist class is alert and conscious of its interests. All the powers of State are at its command ready for use against us. The struggle must be carried on to a finish. The experiences of the past teach us that all subject classes, whenever they wanted something done to better their conditions, have had to do it themselves. In other words, they had to accomplish their own emancipation. This is true of the working class more than ever. If they cannot do the job they are not fit to do it. The task before them is to get together, if progress is to continue, and take the earth "and the fulness thereof."

E. J. M.

DO YOU KNOW?

That out of every one hundred average healthy men, twenty-five years of age, sixty-four will reach the age of sixty-five years and of these—

One Will Be Rich.

Four Will Be Well-to-do.

Five Will Be Earning Their Own Living.

Fourty-four Will Be Dependant Upon Friends or Charity.

The new democratic peacetime United States Army will keep you out of the fourth class and probably put you into the first or second.—**From a Recruiting Circular.**

Famous Words of Famous Parties.

"American section of the Communist International."

International Notes

By John Keracher

Asia Minor The inner conflicts of the "League of Nations" have worked out greatly to the advantage of Turkey in Asia. France, hostile to the restoration of the Greek Monarchy, has come to a settlement with the Turkish Nationalists and evacuated Cilicia. Mustapha Kemal was enabled thereby to move his troops from that front and use them against the Greeks who were advancing in the direction of Angora. In fact, the Greeks under the moral support of England had penetrated so far into Asia Minor that they jeopardized their whole military position.

The Turks who had been steadily falling back before the Greek advance, suddenly launched a counter-offensive in the vicinity of Eshi-Shehr. This strategy proved to be a staggering blow for the Greeks who lost thousands of their men and field-guns, and in fact were so completely defeated that they are now back to the positions they occupied about a year ago. Latest reports assert that the Turks have now surrounded Brusa which is close to the Sea of Marmora, thus bringing the Nationalists close to Constantinople.

The Sultan, who is but the puppet of England, has appealed to Kemal to recognize his "Government." The Greeks are rushing in reinforcements to try stem the rout of their Northern Army. In the southern part of Asia Minor the French are steadily withdrawing troops and have ceded a strip of Syria to England so that the latter can connect Palestine with Mesopotamia by rail. It is said that Britain plans a railway from India to the Mediterranean taking in part of the route over which the famous Berlin to Bagdad Railroad was to have operated. If the Turks succeed in driving out the Greeks entirely, we can look for stormy times in Greece. Already the new premier, Gounaris, is proposing to establish Martial Law, showing that they fear the temper of the masses.

Georgia At the beginning of the nineteenth century Georgia came under the yoke of Imperial Russia. For many years the attitude of the Georgians had been strong anti-Czar, much like Finland in that respect.

With the overthrow of Czardom in 1917 they established an independent State, but still affiliated with Russia. After the fall of Kerensky, Georgia together with Armenia and Azerbaijan formed the Trans-Caucasian Republic, but Germany, through the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, had it turned over to her ally, Turkey. Then Georgia again proclaimed independence and started to fight the Turks. After the fall of the Central Powers her independence was recognized by The Entente and a neutral zone established between them and Armenia.

Lately, Georgia has had a parliamentary government with 102 Social-Democrats out of 130 representatives. The fact that it had this form of government is no doubt the reason why it has been the last of the Caucasian States to adopt the Soviet form. Although Armenia and Azerbaijan got in ahead of Georgia, it has at last abolished its "Democratic" Government and swung in line with the other Soviet Republics.

The events that led to the overthrow of Bourgeois Government was conditioned upon the aggressive policy of preventing or hampering shipments of food supplies from Russia into Armenia and their occupation of the neutral zone between these two countries. There is now an established and unbroken contact with Asiatic Turkey, the present controlling power of which is working in harmony with Soviet Russia and is now crushing back the Greeks and hammering its way towards Constantinople. With Georgia in the Soviet column, this link completes the chain of Soviet Republics connecting Russia, through the Caucasus, with Asia Minor.

England On April 1st, the British miners downed tools in a nation-wide strike to resist the attempt of the mine owners to force down wages to a pre-war level. To insure a continuous output of coal during the War, the government entered into an arrangement with the miners and the operators which guaranteed to the miners something in the nature of a standard wage. Now with a huge army of jobless workers on hand the British capitalists are preparing to force from organized labor all the gains made during the last few years. The refusal of the Lloyd George Government to continue the arrangement brought about the strike, which as soon as called took on a strong political character.

The Triple Alliance, a working agreement which had been entered into before the war between the miners, railroad workers, and transport workers, was held in abeyance during the war, now threatened to tie up all British industry.

Early last winter, the miners, by threat to strike, gained an advance in wages. At the same time, the master class caused to be passed an "Emergency Law" giving the administration the power to put the country on a war basis in case of future strikes of a like nature. This new law was immediately taken advantage of, and huge forces, for both land and air service, commissioned for action in different parts of the country. Leading newspapers and politicians talked about the country being on the brink of civil war, that the Empire was facing disaster, etc.

The labor "leaders" were clearly afraid of their own huge forces, which modern industrial conditions has called into being. They hastened to find a middle ground of settlement, or some other means of heading-off the impending conflict. A feature of the miners strike was their refusal to man the pumps and keep the mines from flooding. This, Lloyd George made the most of and threatened the labor politicians, Henderson and company, with an appeal to the country through a general election, also holding out against any negotiations for a settlement until the miners would concede the manning of the pumps. So anxious were the labor politicians to avoid the conflict and the "threatened election" alike, that they succeeded in getting the miners organization to concede the point. This first victory won, Lloyd George calmly informed the laborites that while the plans of the mine operators were not in every way just, etc., still the miners would

have to go back to payment of wages on the district basis, according to the profitable or unprofitable nature of the different mines, and rejected completely what he called "pooling of profits" to pay a certain standard of wages. What really happened at these round table conferences at Downing Street we do not know, but the wily little Welshman addressed the labor leaders to the effect that he felt that the men he was negotiating with were not the men with whom he was dealing.

The labor leaders, thoroughly frightened at the

possibility of an open conflict between capital and labor, temporized and put back from time to time the date of the joint general strike, finally succeeded in breaking apart the Triple Alliance of labor, leaving the miners to go it alone in their strike.

What the ultimate outcome of this betrayal will be, it is hard to tell. Will the split between these great unions be a deep and lasting one, or will the workers rise to the occasion and jointly eliminate their reactionary leaders?

Critics of Communism

By Murray Murphy

Communism at present has three classes of critics: the pure and simple Capitalists, the simple Liberals, and the pure Ultra-Marxians. The first find their medium for expression in the newspapers, the second in the liberal magazines, and the third in certain obscure periodicals, or perhaps only in the privacy of rocking-chair discussion clubs. It is interesting to note their several objections to Sovietism, and, if one has time, to honor them with some brief consideration.

Lies and Bullheadedness

Capitalist critics have devoted the cream of their intellectual ability either to inventing incredible lies about Soviet Russia or to sheer abuse of her ideals and her leaders. The "nationalization of women" story, the fabrication of atrocities by the "Red Terror," the silly epithets directed against Lenin and Trotsky, the tirades about "world civilization" and "modern culture" being in danger of complete extinction, etc., etc.—all these are commonplaces of today's "news," familiar to every reader of the daily press.

It does not require a knowledge of the facts to inspire a reader with contempt for these ravings; it needs only a modicum of intelligence. From where do such outbursts come? Partly from capitalist inability to conceive a social system that could get along without them; partly from mad rage that an enemy whom they have treated with contempt has itself contemptuously tossed them into the discard.

Although easy enough to explain capitalist criticism, it is, at first thought, hard to understand "liberal" opposition to Communist Russia. A number of us have been puzzled and not a little confused by reading the generalities and covert sneers of those liberals who visit Russia and "impartially" tell what they saw. Making a great show of sympathy with "Bolshevik ideals," and assuming an air of truthfulness, they concede that, although "According to hearsay—the injection of the People's Army and the proletariat into the dwellings of the former bourgeoisie" had introduced "the teeming life of the trenches and slums" so that the buildings became uninhabitable, as remarked in an article in the current number of *The Atlantic Monthly*, yet "interiors coming under my personal observation were reasonably clean——." But while offering these faint praises they make insinuations about the "constant dread" in which the bourgeoisie live, and relate insignificant details in a manner

to suggest extreme sordidness or inefficiency on the part of the Soviet authorities.

When is a Majority Not a Majority?

Probably the most noticeable single plaint running through this liberal criticism is about the loss of "democracy." The Bolsheviks were a minority, we are told, and still are a minority. They are holding the great Russian people in unwilling subjection. How can any good come out of such a "dictatorship"?

Marx, who originated the phrase, "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," also pointed out that the proletarian revolution, unlike previous revolutions, is the act of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority. Now how is one to know when there is a majority? Surely the proletariat, as a class, is in the majority. But democracy demands that the majority be an audible majority, a majority of voters.

If we go back of words to consider their meanings, we may generally clarify our ideas a great deal. What is meant by "majority"?

A majority means more than half of the people. But experience and history show that "more than half" of the people either take no interest in political questions or simply do the will of those who happen to be in power. In other words, there is always a considerable section of people who are politically inert. On which side shall we count these people? "Democracy" counts the great mass of the politically inert in Russia as though they were actively engaged in the support of the old regime! The fact of the matter is, those who actively strove for Communism were a much greater number than the small clique whom they overthrew,—a fact which ought not now to require proof, in view of the outcome. At least this much can be said of the Bolsheviks at the time of their accession to power, even though the membership and sympathizers of the Communist Party did not together number a majority of the total population. They could at any rate muster a number of votes that would be much nearer a majority than that of any other faction.

Now if those who actively supported the Bolsheviks were numerically greater than those who supported their combined opponents, can we not say they had a majority of the politically active? And what, pray, is a majority, if it is not a majority of the politically active? The politically inert cannot be counted either way. To be sure, it is highly desirable that all the

(Continued on Page 14)

Mary Opens the Factories

A Farce in Thirty-one Pages and a Prologue

After the death and subsequent putrefaction of the Second International the voice of the reformer was hushed in the land. In Europe he gave way to the "pure and simple" social patriot (well, perhaps not pure, but at least simple). In America, the Paradise of the labor fakir, the zealous enthusiast and the half-taught economist, reform makes its reappearance with a r-r-revolutionary gesture. But the road through the ballot-box is no longer advocated. Time was when the voter was urged to go to the polls and approve of "government ownership," old-age insurance, unemployment insurance or Socialist (?) politicians who, if elected, would see that the workingman's "rights" were respected and that "justice" be guaranteed to Labor. All that is old fashioned. The upsurging proletariat demands more virile fare. Its potentialities are to be realized in another direction.

The Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America demand "a special fund for the payment of unemployment wages.....wages from the industry to the workers....." John Fitzpatrick of the Chicago Federation of Labor, "is inaugurating a campaign for a shorter workday for every man on the job so that men without jobs will be required in industry." In England "the Labor conference held in London the latter part of January, demanded that the British government take immediate steps to provide for the support of the unemployed and underemployed, etc....."

Mary Marcy has written a pamphlet entitled "Open the Factories." The above quotations are from that publication. Mrs. Marcy does not endorse these reforms in so many words. However, she states, that the British and German governments are paying out unemployment benefits and that in "free America" only workers are allowed to starve beside overstuffed storerooms. All of the above being grouped under the heading, "What Shall We Do About It?" The inference is plain from the text that Mrs. Marcy considers the examples as good ones to follow. If she does not mean to endorse them she should lose no opportunity to make the correct position clear. Any young student of Marxian economics with but meagre knowledge would know enough to point out the futility of advocating these measures. What business has the class-conscious worker supporting palliatives for Capitalism? The only hope for mankind lies on the road to Revolution. Do we travel that road when we seek to provide security and comfort for the worker under **Capitalism?**

Overproduction, industrial depression, unemployment; full warehouses and empty stomachs are inevitable under Capitalism. "Doubling the wages" would not mean "Good Times" for the whole working class. To take the author's own mathematics—if the workers receive a wage amounting to one-fifth the value of their product and should the wage be doubled, the workers could still buy but two-fifths. Obviously, that would not keep "the wheels of **all industry**" revolving, as she asserts.

Economic depressions come because commodities have been produced faster than the world's market could absorb them. Production can not go forward

again and full employment be restored until new markets are found or new economic relations established. With modern machinery, the working class can create so much wealth so rapidly that the home market under capitalism can keep only a fraction of the workers fully employed. In the face of this situation the capitalist is as helpless as the worker. The system has its inexorable natural laws to which the capitalist must conform. He cannot go on producing goods unless the goods are being turned into money. When the existing markets fail he can only do his best to find new ones.

The statement, "Nothing on earth stands in the way of the comfort and happiness, jobs and plenty for every willing man and woman in America except the insatiable greed of the industrial autocrats and the criminal negligence of the politicians and the people themselves," appears on page 6. The statement is untrue. The one thing that does stand in the way is the thing that she does not even mention—the **Capitalist system itself.**

Industrial autocrats, like political autocrats, are figureheads, or at the most, but group-captains who hold their power through the suffrage and support of their groups. It makes little difference whether it is the Tzar of all the Russias or Guggenheim. Only so long as he serves as the symbol, as their mouth-piece, only so long as he directs his activities in conformity with the interests of the group does he hold power. The groups change in personnel, they grow and dwindle and the astute leader must so shape his course as to conform to the shifting interests of the greatest, most powerful group. The most conspicuously successful group-leader in the bourgeois world today is Lloyd-George. The success who became a failure is Wilson, another is Clemenceau. Each of these last failed to judge correctly the changing interests of his backers and was discredited and cast aside. Hereditary figureheads function the same. Had the German Kaiser failed to conform to the interests of the group for which he was allowed to pose he would have been eclipsed by another, just as his father and grandfather were by Bismark.

Mrs. Marcy's argument that the misery of the workers is due to the greed of industrial and political autocrats is childish prattle. It is not the greed and selfishness of individual men or groups that stand in the way of the comfort and happiness of the world. **It is Capitalism itself that stands in the way.** No revolutionist should lose sight of that fact a minute. No revolutionist worthy the name would neglect the least opportunity to bring that fact home to the workers and when the author attributes the evils of Capitalism to the "insatiable greed of industrial autocrats" she is deceiving the working class and preparing their minds for reform doctrine.

Mary Marcy does not understand capitalist production nor the circulation of commodities. We recommend the three volumes of "Capital," by Karl Marx. Look up the chapters on Circulation! Capitalist production cannot go on unless the products are converted into money and the money turned back to the capitalist so that he can continue the process of purchas-

ing labor power which, applied to the means of production, creates new commodities which must be turned into money and so on in an endless cycle. As soon as this cycle is interrupted the process breaks down and we have an industrial depression. This is the fundamental law of Capitalism, and production nowadays can function only through that process. Greed or benevolence have very little to do with it. The famous benevolence of Mr. Ford, glorified by Allan Benson, is a case in point. Though we are assured that Henry has "no bristles on his back" he had to lay the boys off without pay just the same, when the market for Flivvers sagged. As long as Capitalism exists, the capitalist, as well as the worker, is the creature of the system and can no more defy its laws than can the aviator ignore the law of gravity.

Mary Marcy demands that the mills and mines be opened and every man and woman be given work or food, clothing and shelter. (Sounds like LaFollette.)

We, The Proletarian Party, demand the overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of Socialism. We won't get it—now, but neither will Mary get what she wants. But our demands will be fulfilled some day and until they are Mary's demand will be idle chatter.

On page 20 our author relates the attempt made by the Italian workers in 1920 to operate industries themselves. She attributes their failure to the fact that the raw materials and access to the markets were in the hands of the capitalists, who, of course, refused to co-operate with the workers. At the time this affair took place the Italian government was in a very shaky condition. Had the government resisted the workers, by force of arms, the fight would have been immediately shifted to its proper field—the struggle for control of the state. The workers lost because they did not have the control of the state, whose armed power is necessary to protect the interests of the workers and compel the co-operation of the capitalists. Even though the workers had won the political power and could not hold it, the lesson would have been a valuable one. It was just such a lesson that the capitalists did not want the working class to learn, so they offered little resistance but practiced sabotage. During the early days of the Bolshevik revolution, the Russian capitalists sabotaged **but the workers had control of the state with its armed forces.** The bayonet very soon broke down the capitalist sabotage.

Through the whole work runs the argument for the seizure of industry by the workers but nothing is said about the conquest of political power. If there is one Socialist tactical principle that has been thoroughly vindicated by the history of the November Revolution, it is the proletarian conquest of political power. In the early days of the revolution, the bayonets of the Red Guard defended the workers' government against counter-revolution and protected the re-organization of Russia's economic life. Later on, it was the Red Army that defended Russia from onslaught from without. Today, the Red Army, the instrument of the proletarian state stands guard against invasion from without and counter-revolutionary intrigue within.

Curiously enough, Mrs. Marcy annihilates her own argument by two short paragraphs, the one on page 28 wherein the admission is made that the foreign

market (Russian in this case) is necessary to the complete functioning of production in predominately industrial countries. The second paragraph is on page 29—"the czar and his nobles were overthrown, without a struggle, because of their incapacity to provide the necessaries of life for the people."

The truth of this paragraph is indisputable and further, it contradicts everything the author speaks for in the book. The Czar's state was overthrown because it could no longer function. The test of modern large scale war was too severe for a state fitted for a different age and a different role.

All other existing capitalist governments are stronger but they too have entered the period of age and decrepitude. Capitalism has periodical breakdowns which grow more frequent and intense as time goes on. The more complex society grows, the more the system demonstrates its colossal weaknesses. Nothing alienates the worker's support of Capitalism as much as these periods of intense distress. Should we then, as revolutionists, advocate or support measures that are calculated to strengthen the failing forces of Capitalism? Measures that would, if successful, restore the worker's confidence in his master's system? By no means! We should never weary of exposing Capitalism's crumbling foundations. We should lose no opportunity to show the workers its inevitable complete collapse, to explain Socialism and what we must do to prepare the way. We must not advocate the repair of the capitalist machine; we must ruthlessly attack every such labor mis-leader as Mary Marcy who tries to fasten reform doctrines on the labor movement. Not to bolster up Capitalism, but to thrust the knife of criticism deep into its vitals is our mission.

BREIT.

Wages I.

We have heard much concerning the vast increase in wages during the war period; so much so that we have become well-nigh convinced that we could have been very prosperous if only we had been sufficiently thrifty. Nevertheless, at the present time, after only two or three months of an industrial crisis, we find thousands of workers facing starvation; and soup kitchens have to be brought into use again: Charity begins its work of saving numbers of workers from a condition which, if allowed to continue, would render them unfit for carrying on production when the owners of mill, mine, and factory desire them to do so. If we have been getting fabulous wages, we should be able to stand a couple of weeks rest without starving ourselves, and yet we cannot. Something must be wrong somewhere. Perhaps an analysis of what wages really are would help us to understand our present situation a little better, and thereby prevent a recurrence of our sufferings of today.

Wages can be classified under three heads: (1) Nominal, (2) Real, (3) Relative; i.e., (1) the actual money paid to the worker, (2) the amount of commodities that can be bought with that money, and (3) the amount of wealth received by the worker in relation to the total wealth produced.

The modern worker gets his living by selling his energy—his life force—day by day or week by week to the owner of the means of wealth production, (raw

materials, mills, mines, factories, etc.), and receives in exchange a certain sum of money. The amount of money has undoubtedly increased considerably since pre-war times. The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics issues monthly bulletins, and in the report for October, 1920, we find a list giving the increase in money wages over the period from July, 1913, to August, 1920, in 23 of the principal cities of the country; which shows for 19 representative occupations an average increase of 92½%. This looks well; the nominal wage has increased a good deal, but we must realize that money of itself is little use to us—a million dollars in a desert or in the ground would not bring many comforts; we could neither eat it nor clothe ourselves very well with it. We must exchange it for those things that we need every day to keep us alive and fit, and right here comes the rub, for this same booklet shows that the price of the necessities of life—briefly summed up as food, clothing and shelter—has risen by 116½% during the same period. In other words, if \$4.00 were sufficient to purchase the daily requirements for an average family in 1913, the same family would require \$8.66 in 1920, but they receive on the showing of this Government report only \$7.70. Thus, although we receive more money, yet when we come to exchange it for things we need we find ourselves worse off—the real wage has dropped by 24%, and this in spite of great union activities and when conditions were most favorable to the worker, by virtue of the fact that commodities were needed to keep the war going on and to rebuild the shattered nations after the war. Therefore, the worker with a job did not have to face the competition of the unemployed such as he does today.

The relative wage may be a little harder to understand owing to the lack of available statistics, but a brief survey of the process of production in modern society may help us.

When a capitalist starts the manufacture of commodities, he proceeds to expend a sum of money in buying land and building a factory or renting one ready-built. He next purchases raw materials, machinery and accessories. It should be obvious to the average worker, after a little thought, that no amount of "organizing capacity," "directive ability," or "superior(?) mental powers" will make that raw material and machinery produce goods needed by the world, clothing, shoes, pork and beans, or houses. Nothing can be done until labor is applied to them. Our capitalist must go to the labor market and buy the energy of brain and muscle which we must sell if we are to live. When the worker has been brought into the factory and set to work upon the machinery and raw material, then wealth is produced in abundance.

We have it on the authority of Carrol D. Wright of the Department of Labor that as far back as 1910 the worker of that day produced on an average four times more than he could ever buy back, and every worker knows that since that date much more organization of industry has taken place and many new machines have been introduced to still further increase productivity, while efficiency systems and speeding-up methods are improved all the time.

If we take a look at society, we find a vast number, such as policemen, soldiers and sailors, parsons and politicians, domestic flunkies, and many others, who produce none of the necessities of life, but who yet live well; and upon the worker rests the burden of feeding and clothing them. During the war, we had

also to support a large army in the field and another large army producing guns and instruments of destruction. Thus it can be seen that the relative wage constantly tends to drop lower and lower; the worker receives less and less of the total amount of wealth produced, while the capitalist receives a constantly increasing portion, until the late Andrew Carnegie could leave an estate valued at 23¼ million dollars, after making gifts during his lifetime of over 350 million dollars. It follows then that the lowering of real and relative wages makes the worker's condition steadily decline when compared with the amount of wealth he produces. Is there a remedy?

II.

We have already said that the worker sells his labor-power, and that it is bought in the market like every other thing needed by the capitalists at the cheapest possible price consistent with the quality desired. The workers on the other hand wish to obtain the highest possible price, and they struggle one with another, either as individuals, or, in modern times, as labor unions and employers' associations. Sometimes the workers may get the best in the struggle and wages may go up, but more frequently the employers win and wages go down; that is, real wages, which are the most important. The reason for this is to be found in the conditions governing the sale of commodities—labor-power the same as any other.

The value of any commodity is determined by the amount of labor-time it is necessary for society to expend in its production, which in the case of labor-power means the amount of social labor used in the production of those things necessary to sustain the laborer. This is the governing factor in determining wages, which are the price of the commodity labor-power. We do not, however, mean by this that the worker always receives exactly sufficient to reproduce his energy; such is not the case. Wages sometimes go above value, sometimes below. It is only by looking over the whole of the working-class and taking those periods of high wages, and the periods of low wages that we arrive at the fact that wages on an average are just sufficient to reproduce our energy.

Why are things sometimes cheap, sometimes dear? Why are wages sometimes high, sometimes low? What do we mean by the terms "cheap" and "dear"? By using the words cheap or dear, we are consciously, or unconsciously measuring their price according to their value. In other words, though value determines the price at which commodities will exchange, we find that commodities usually sell **above or below** value at any given time. However, the successive rise and fall in prices balance one another and the result is that the price of commodities is equal to their value viewed over a period of time.

If there is a new market opened up in some part of the world which requires a large amount of such things as saws, axes, and other tools, perhaps to clear the forests, or agricultural implements to till the soil, the price of those things will rise. Ships will be needed to carry them to the new market, which means that the material used in the construction of ships will rise in price; and so on, through a whole series of commodities. These prices will for a time represent more than the value of the things sold and we say they have become **dear**. In the course of time, the needs of the new market may be satisfied, but manufacturers continue to produce tools and agricultural im-

plements, and unless there is a great shortage in the home market (which rarely happens in modern times) prices will begin to fall again and will continue to fall until they go below value, and we say these commodities are **cheap** again. This is the law of supply and demand which causes the rise and fall in the price of commodities. Whenever the demand is greater than the supply, then prices rise; when supply is larger than demand, then prices fall.

As an illustration of recent date, the late war can be cited. Here we had a condition wherein almost all commodities were in great demand. Europe was an armed camp which had to be supplied with guns, ammunition, poison gas, clothing, food-stuffs, etc. In addition, the use of so many men for the purpose of killing each other, instead of producing life's necessities, made the demands of the home market exceed the available supply; and as we well know, prices rose very high. After the attempt at peace and the breaking up of the Great War into fifteen or twenty little ones, the demand has gradually fallen until now we have an over-supply of almost everything, and we find prices dropping again.

How does this law of supply and demand work with wages? In exactly the same way. Whenever industry is booming, from whatever cause, there is a great demand for workers and the price of their commodity rises. Now, when the markets are crowded with commodities which cannot be sold, the supply of labor-power is much greater than the demand, and our wages fall. This will be the case so long as we work for wages, no matter how we organize. It may be argued that we can organize so that we will not have to accept a reduction, even though there are many unemployed; but the fact is that an empty stomach has no respect for "principles" and when we or our dependents begin to starve we are compelled to accept the best terms even though the best terms may be far below that which we need to properly sustain life.

Any union, no matter how formed, is unable to raise wages above the value of labor-power and keep them above for any length of time in face of a falling demand for labor-power. Even at the best of times, the worker is handicapped. Whenever wages get very high, the owners of mill, mine, and factory introduce new machinery and more perfect methods of production, thereby getting a larger mass of commodities from the workers, which means a glut in the market all the sooner and a drop in wages.

All this does not mean that the workers should not organize into unions. If they did not, their standard of living would probably be much lower than at present. Combining into unions assists the workers to take advantage of any increased demand for labor-power; it helps them to force better conditions of labor than would otherwise be their lot, and the very struggle that unions have to engage in, will ultimately point the moral of the insufficiency of wrangling over wages and hours while leaving vital things untouched. The workers will find that strive as they may, their material conditions will not permanently improve; but on the contrary will tend to get worse, until they abolish the commodity nature of labor-power and end the wages system.

This is the remedy for our present sufferings. We can abolish the wages system only when we take over the means of wealth production, factories, steamships, railroads and mines, and operate them for use instead of profit.

Critics of Communism

(Continued from Page 10)

population be politically conscious and interested in events, but, as for that, two facts must be borne in mind: first, the fact that at present there is no such thing as an actual, conscious, active majority of the **whole population**; and, second, the further fact that capitalist "democracy"—so-called—is about the last form of society that would develop popular intelligence and interest to such a degree. On the other hand, Soviet Russia is rapidly carrying on a thorough program of popular education, and arousing the whole working populace to an understanding of their social interests and duties. Soon—perhaps already—a majority vote in Russia will be the only **real** majority the world has ever known.

The "democratic" objections to Communism on the part of our self-styled "Liberals" is not, however, so very difficult to fathom, if one remembers that they are, after all, really capitalists like the first, but of a different breed. They have something else to lose besides their chains, so they prefer to move slowly; reform, if necessary, but revolution?—Never!

Here lies their interest in such social changes as they feel a desire to endorse. They will endorse Guild Socialism, as a writer in the March North American Review does, or any other pale concession to proletarian demands, only because it is "the most powerful antidote against Bolshevism." Indeed, if I understand this writer correctly, democracy is opposed to what he calls "the folly of deifying the proletariat."

How About The Super-Marxists?

But although we can understand, when we stop to think, why "liberals" are so contemptuous of the proletariat, it is truly hard to get our bearings when we are set upon by sneering "Marxists" (so they call themselves) who quote reams of "Socialist philosophy" to us and haughtily denounce the "super-opportunists," explaining that they do not care to affiliate with such a band of anarchists and near-anarchists as are associated in the Third International! No, they will remain in their pink tea clubs or do-nothing parties and keep their doctrines unspotted from the world. They are the "Ultra-Marxists," those of whom Lenin says that they make of Marxism a platitude and a defense of the ruling class. To them it means nothing that a new society is in process of birth; they have forgotten—so doctrinaire are they—that Marx said, "Workers of the World, **Unite**." Wrapped up in their books and self-separated from the active struggle, they cannot understand the need for new and living tactics in this crucial period,—tactics which they call opportunism and compromise!

Of all the enemies of Communism the Ultra-Marxists may not be deserving of most hatred, but they are certainly to be despised. In the histories of the future, which men shall be most condemned, the Hardings and Lloyd Georges and Clemenceaus, or the Hillquits and Longuets and Kautskys? Ah, I fear the Super-Marxists will fare hardest in that day?

* * * *

An advertisement in current newspapers: "Wanted—Three men, must weigh two hundred pounds, at \$6.00 per day."

Three cents per pound. That's cheaper than liver!

U. C. P. Minority Action

"The Communist," No. 16, official organ of the United Communist Party of America, has "honored" us with another attack. The writer of the article, S. G., whoever he may be, argues quite skillfully and puts forth "evidence" that would be quite overwhelming but for the fact that his whole argument rests upon false premises.

He starts with the assertion that the Proletarian Party "dare not incorporate into its code—the Revolution." We don't quite understand what he means by **code**, but it is quite apparent that his quarrel with us rises from the fact that we emphasize **majority action** and point out the danger of **minority action**.

Then he "carries on" to the effect that "The Proletarian Party is, in reality, **no party**. It is merely a school for teaching economics, history, and philosophylacking an understanding and a will to Revolution," etc., etc.

If these were the real opinions of S. G. and his Comrades they would pass us by in silent contempt. Or have they tried to ignore us and found that method wanting?

"The Proletarian Party abjures the Revolution if it is not a **majority** Revolution..... If the great mass of the workers is not **consciously** on the side of the Communists, the revolution must be postponed." He follows this with a vision of the future, in which he and his brave Comrades are leading a revolution while the Proletarian Party is hiding itself.

Now why have we so consistently pointed out the fallacy of **minority action**? Because of the strong drift (especially was this true about Sept., 1919) towards that position by "leading Communists," many of whom propagated the idea that all that was required was a "**resolute minority**," thus leading to the belief that the majority did not count; that it did not matter whether the vast majority of the population was interested in the revolution or not.

Why do all authorities **abjure a minority revolution**? Is it because it is "immoral," "undemocratic," and so forth? No! It is because the majority is required to insure success. If the great masses themselves do not break with the present order of things, then the seizure of power by a minority, no matter how much of "**a will to revolution**" it may have, will only result in a blood-bath for a section of the working class; the loss to the cause of the most courageous section of the workers and the breaking of the revolutionary spirit of many more. That is why minority action, such as propagated in the article referred to, is dangerous to the working class' cause.

Again from a tactical standpoint the **advocacy** of minority action is playing right into the hands of the anti-Communists who claim that it is not a movement in the interest of the majority, but a "tyrannical minority forcing its will upon the majority of the people." This tactical viewpoint cannot be brushed aside as it is played up by politicians to catch the minds of the American masses with their Bourgeois moral concepts of "fair play," "rule of the people," etc.

Can the Dictatorship of the Proletariat be **established and maintained** against the will of the majority in any country? In his now famous work, "The Pro-

letarian Revolution," Lenin gives a table of figures to show how from a mere 13 per cent minority in the Soviets in June, 1917, the Bolsheviks steadily increased and became the majority. They had 51 per cent at the time the Revolution took place and 66 per cent in July, 1918. He adds: "A glance at these figures will show why the defense of the Constituent Assembly and the talk (of Kautsky among other people) that the Bolsheviks have not behind them a majority of the population is met in Russia with laughter."

If the majority was necessary in Russia (where capitalism was weak) to **conquer and maintain political power**, then it must be even more necessary where capitalism is centralized and powerful.

In his arguments for minority action, S. G. writes as follows: "Furthermore, it is impossible to reach and convert the **great mass** of the workers. Their minds are controlled by the corrupt capitalist press; their education takes place primarily in capitalist institutions; the capitalist State has the power to close the doors of any proletarian school. This precludes the possibility of reaching and turning to Communism the **mass** of the workers."

The power of the press, the education of capitalist institutions, and the capitalist State, seem, to S. G., to be endowed with infallibility like the God of the Bible.

If this power holds the masses in the manner described, then how is he with his resolute minority going to lead the masses to victory? He puts himself, by such an argument, into the position of the old woman who said: "It is too cold for snow, but it won't get any warmer until we have had some."

The school that the proletariat, as a class, get its education in has no doors that the capitalist class can close. If, however, his remark is intended to imply that the Proletarian Party thinks the working class can be emancipated through reading books alone, then he is only kidding himself.

The young comrade (for he surely must be young) will have to learn that **our first and very real job is "reaching and turning to Communism the mass of the workers."**

Engels tells us that "**the period of sudden onslaughts, of revolutions carried out by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past.**" Yet this hero, S. G., is just advocating this very thing. If that is the position of the U. C. P., and it must be if the editorial department passes upon such articles, then the intelligent workers will do well to beware of such nonsense.

Lenin says, in his "Soviets at Work," "**The first problem of any rising party consists in convincing the majority of the population that its program and policies are correct.**" Then he goes on to say that "the second problem of our party was the suppression of the resistance of the exploiters."

It is plainly evident that the U. C. P., still suffering from "left sickness," is too impatient to go through with the first problem of **convincing the masses of the American population**. They want to start the second problem before the first is completed. **The immediate task before us is to overcome the influence of**

the press; the educational institutions, and every other sinister influence of Capitalism.

Every noteworthy theoretician of Communism from Marx to Lenin emphasizes the need for convincing the majority. If any further quotation is necessary to convince this subject of "infantile sickness" we may quote the "Communist Manifesto," of 1848, which says: "The Proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority."

So sure is this boy that the day of revolution is here that he asserts: "The day of theorizing on the necessity of the Revolution is past." This is like the argument about "parliament being outlived." In this country "the day of theorizing on the necessity of Revolution is past" for a very small percentage of the working class. The vast majority of the workers are still steeped in capitalist ideology and not at all convinced of the need for the momentous change that they themselves must bring about.

The comrade quotes section (3) of the conditions of admission to the Third International to substantiate his argument. "The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering a phase of civil war." Evidently he has got an exaggerated notion of this statement and thinks a Civil War is raging here. That "gauge of the maturity of the working class," as Engels calls universal suffrage, showed in the last election that the "Barometer" had not reached "boiling point;" it was, from a revolutionary point of view, much closer to freezing point. The comrade, in fact, is suffering from the belief that the masses are ready (quoting his own words) to "break forth in that dynamic, over-powering onslaught on the capitalist State that predicates the fall of the capitalist power!"

He might be right when he argues that capitalist institutions "preclude the possibility of reaching and turning to Communism the mass of the workers," but not according to the opinion of Marx, Engels, Lenin, or any other reliable authority on this point, of winning to our side the majority.

As for the Theses of the Third International and the 21 points, the Proletarian Party stands squarely upon the position laid down therein, but not this U. C. P. interpretation as per S. G.

We would like to ask, in conclusion, if the rank and file of the U. C. P. endorses minority action, or, has the membership one opinion and the "Leaders" another? Let us have no quibbling in this matter. **Is it the official position of the U. C. P. that the mass of the workers cannot be turned to Communism?**

America's Reply

(Continued from Page 4)

down of the capitalist society as a result of the world war, made the voice of the proletariat still louder and its actions of greater concern to the government. It was under these conditions that Lord Curzon, in his note to Tchitcherin of January 7th, 1921, announced: ".....His Majesty's government expresses the hope that the Soviet Government will empower Mr. Krassin to sign the Trade Agreement after his return....."

Such were the circumstances which forced "His Majesty's Government" to sign the Trade Treaty with

Soviet Russia on March 25th. Every step towards peace with Soviet Russia the British government took because of the powerful pressure on the part of the conscious workers. No doubt, the English capitalists have no more love for the Russian workers than the American capitalists. The difference is in the amount of respect they have for the class-consciousness of their workers, and that depends entirely on the workers.

True, the English capitalists were also interested in the Russian market: The American capitalists, on the other hand, are more able to get along without the Russian market. This means that the pressure exerted by the American workers to compel their master class to cease hostilities against Soviet Russia must be still more energetic and resolute. To expect that the capitalist class will yield to any sentimental appeals is too stupid even for the liberals. England's example has proven once more that the workers must take every step in the bitter struggle. It is the fear of the working class, and not the love for it, that persuades the ruling class to yield to the demands of the workers, and every ruling class will try all means before yielding.

How the capitalist class fears the consciousness of the workers is illustrated by the Kronstadt "revolution." The Allied governments knew that the workers of America hoped that the new administration would lift the blockade against Soviet Russia. They feared even those vague hopes. An excuse had to be found for Hughes' reply, and a revolt, properly dated to coincide with the change of administration in America, has been organized in Kronstadt by several reactionary officers and a few misled sailors. In spite of the very active role played in the revolt by the American Red Cross and French officers, it proved a complete failure. It is significant that the papers in France published reports about the uprising in Kronstadt several days before it really took place. Of course the American government knew that all those reports were false. Of course it knew that the few officers who started it were agents of the Allied governments, and it also knew that the rebellion had no chances whatsoever to succeed. Interesting is the fact that at the time when our papers were filled with fantastic stories about the Bolsheviki losing power, England and Poland signed treaties with Soviet Russia. They surely would not have done that if even a small fraction of those stories was true. But those stories were not spread for the truth in them, they were spread so that the bourgeois papers, acting as mouthpieces of the government, could tell the workers: "How can we enter into relations with the Bolsheviki, if every victory of their armies results only in a new popular revolt against them?" And so long as the workers believe them, so long our ruling class can have a free hand in fighting the workers of Russia. The Kronstadt excuse only proves how any action on the part of the working class is feared. It must be prevented by any means, and as long as the workers limit themselves to hoping and wishing, they are easily fooled. Hopes and wishes never gave the workers anything; the only way to get anything from the capitalist class is to **demand** it and **take** it.