

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

SPECIAL MAGAZINE SUPPLEMENT
THE DAILY WORKER

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

January 3, 1925.

Sixth All-Russian Trade Union Congress

Comrade Zinoviev's Speech. Delivered at the Sixth All-Russian Trade Union Congress.

COMRADES, all of us are still under the impression of the celebration of the seventh anniversary of our revolution. One naturally recalls some of the events at the beginning of the revolution, particularly the first All-Russian Trade Union Congress held between January 7-14, 1918, which too, I addressed on behalf of the central committee of our party. Everybody was then drunk with the recent victory. But at the same time all the delegates of the congress were full of alarm and uncertainty as to the next day. At the congress itself we had to struggle against the mensheviks and social revolutionists who were still holding some important positions in our trade union movement.

One naturally feels like contrasting the present situation with that of the past. Of the alarm, uncertainty, and fear for the next day not a trace is left. The trade union movement of our country, which has passed through several difficult stages during these years, has finally entered on a wide road, has finally assumed its proper place in the system of organizations effecting the proletarian dictatorship, has completely finished with the hesitation of menshevik and social revolutionary character, has grown and matured to an unusual degree. If we compare the present situation not only with that of the first congress, but even with the situation at the fifth congress, which took place two years ago, we see confident and comparatively rapid progress. At the fifth congress we were all pleased to assert that our state industries were producing 25-27 per cent of the pre-war amount. We noted this as the first relatively important success. Now at the sixth congress, our state industries have reached 50 per cent and in some places have even moved beyond this limit. For the first time at the thirteenth congress of our party we were able to state that it was time to think of leaving the pre-war level behind.

At the fifth congress the wage question was one of the most troubling questions. The mensheviks and their sympathizers were moving about and around this question on tiptoe, hoping that the trade union movement of our country would be tripped up on this question. This is still a very delicate question; two years ago it stood out very sharply. Our trade union movement has marched past these difficulties in a large measure, and has overcome the fundamental obstacles. Our formula at the fifth congress was slow, but sure and steady raises of wages. During the past two years the trade unions have worked in line with this formula, and now the entire mass organized in trade unions can see that it did not remain merely on paper.

The autumn of 1924 was the first autumn in our history without any economic conflicts even of a local nature. This is of tremendous significance to the destinies of our country, and it is one of the fundamental and most significant proofs that the trade unions have worked well, that the party directing the Communist activities of the trade unions was following the true course. Since February, 1923, the trade unions have changed to voluntary membership. The party and the non-partisan trade unionists have put into this campaign all the energy and all the enthusiasm that was necessary for a solution of these problems.

I heard some statements to the effect that the present congress is not face to face with any serious questions of principle. This is both true and untrue. There are no serious questions of principle in the sense that we do not have to discuss anew

the role and importance of the trade unions. The place of our trade unions in history has been fixed and verified by the experience and collective wisdom of the advanced section of the working class. But this does not in the least mean that the present congress is not faced with a large number of extremely important questions of principle. I shall take the liberty of touching upon some of them.

I think that the most important of these questions is primarily the question of international unity in the trade union movement. This question is most intimately inter-linked with the present international situation, and vitally affects the working class of our country. We have all of us become convinced, during the last few years, that international matters cannot be considered as luxuries, third courses, as questions that ought to interest only the heads. Not a bit. Every rank and file worker sees that the international labor movement has entered such a stage that where the events taking place in one country most vitally affect the interests and struggle of the workers of the other countries. That is why to us the international unity of the trade union movement is not a desert or a question within the jurisdiction only of the leading heads. No! This is one of the fundamental questions most closely related to the everyday problems of the workers' life and to the basic questions of the trade union struggle.

What we are going through now is the beginning of a new phase of world bourgeois reaction. Only very recently the fifth congress of the Comintern produced an exact photographic picture of the period that has been dubbed as the "democratic-pacifist era." MacDonald was in power in England, Herriot in France; Vandervelde was expected to assume power in Belgium, and Davidovitch in Jugoslavia. Similar changes appeared to be imminent in a number of other countries. The Comintern was right when it stated that that was the beginning of a certain democratic pacifist wave. However, the fifth congress did not stop there, but prophesied that this "era" is nothing but a historic masquerade of the bourgeoisie that stakes its money one day on the social democrats and the next day on the fascists, with equal success. Some of us were tripped up by this "democratic-pacifist era," taking it for something genuine and imagining that we would have to change the tactic of the international labor movement. Now the facts have decidedly overthrown their point of view.

What has taken place during the last few days is the beginning of a new wave, this time not of pacifism, not of democracy, but of the blackest bourgeois reaction. If only several months ago the bourgeoisie was playing pink, it has now again changed to black. The victory of the black hundred republican party in America headed by Coolidge, the victory of the black hundred conservative Tories in England, headed by Baldwin, represent the beginning of a new chapter of the blackest world reaction. There is not the least doubt that we will see similar things taking place in other countries as well in the nearest future. One need not be a prophet to foresee that Herriot's star in France is already setting and things will happen this way: either he himself will turn black (laughter) which is quite possible, or some black little fellow will be moved to his place. The first is more probable.

We see similar processes in the small states. There are a number of countries representing the vassals of the big capitalist powers. They want

to be in everything like their masters. Especially characteristic in this respect is Jugo-Slavia. You remember that as soon as the democratic-pacifist wave was victorious in France and England, it was reflected in Jugo-Slavia by the advent of the more or less democratic Davidovitch ministry. Now the reverse is true. The bosses had hardly come to power, hardly put their stake upon black, when a black hundred government, headed by Paschich, appeared in Jugo-Slavia. We observe the same in a number of the central European states which live by the reflection of the big imperialist powers.

We are thus facing the beginning of a new phase of world politics, of the darkest imperialist reaction. Yesterday the capitalists put their stake upon the social democrats and mensheviks, today they are again staking upon the blacks, which will not prevent them, of course, from staking again upon pink-yellow or yellow-pink, or some similar color (laughter). This shows the serious instability of the capitalist regime. It is no longer what it used to be before the war, when one and the same capitalist party ruled for decades, and when what is now considered a storm in a tea cup, a change of liberals by conservatives, or vice versa, was considered an event of tremendous moment.

The characteristic feature of the present phase consists of the fact that the bourgeoisie of the most respectable countries, such as England, are forced to rule by such extremes; today they stake upon pink, tomorrow upon yellow; today they admit to power mensheviks, almost workers, tomorrow the most inveterate Tories. This, doubtless, is a symptom of degeneration, of the instability of the capitalist system. All these changes in policy do not of course, pass with impunity to the bourgeoisie, the outwardly things appear rather smooth. See how "easily" MacDonald was superseded by Baldwin. At 4 p. m. MacDonald was invited to Buckingham Palace and he personally announced to the king that now that the elections are taking place he resigns. The king said: "Alright, your resignation is accepted." (Laughter) At 5 p. m. Baldwin was invited and asked whether he would not agree to form a new government. He kindly agreed. "Alright, I'll form a new government." (Laughter).

The change of government passed painlessly for the bourgeoisie, but among the people all these perturbations pass very far from painlessly or tracelessly. The workers took it all very seriously, and have developed a real appetite for power. We see how the English workers behaved during the election campaign. True, they have not yet got used to Russian methods (applause), but I hope they will get used to them (applause). However, they behaved, to tell the truth, not quite like gentlemen as is the custom in England; at some meetings the workers were putting their fists before the lords, expressing quite an unambiguous desire to make some corrections in their physiognomies. (Applause, laughter). This is something new in British history, and it shows that not only in the election campaigns are the broad working masses becoming imbued with strong passions, and that among them events do not pass off so smoothly as in Buckingham Palace.

The richest bourgeoisie in the world, that of Great Britain, finds it impossible to rule any longer by the old methods. Our business, the business of the leaders of the working class, is to watch these episodes, to watch how the bourgeoisie passed

from one extreme to another, and to take corresponding measures.

The diplomats of the Second International have often tried to stir up distrust for the Russian trade unions and for our party. They ask why do the Russian Communists and trade unions all of a sudden evince a desire for the unity of the world trade union movement. Comrades, I think that were there even no other reasons, the one that I have mentioned at least exists. The new phase of the blackest world reaction is a sufficient reason why every honest working class militant should say that under this situation international unity of the trade union movement is as necessary as the air that we breathe. If from America and England, from these mighty imperialist countries, a new eruption of reactionary lava is bursting forth, if there the masks have been removed, if the masquerade with the "labor government" has come to an end, and black clouds are directly moving upon us, is it not natural that the advanced elements of the working class respond to it, first of all by a hearty, fiery desire to unite the entire world proletariat on a minimum program, in order to have a united international trade union movement and be prepared to put up the united front against the world bourgeois reaction? The riddle is easily solved. For us the tactic of the world labor movement is determined first of all by the class struggle. We did not for a moment believe in democratic-pacifism, that has become a favorite in some circles. In the midst of this "era" we said: "Comrades, see they are presenting you with a cake, only in order to replace it with a whip. They show you pink today, but tomorrow they will show you the blackest reaction." We know that this democratic pacifism is a brief episode, we know that the bourgeoisie would show its teeth, and this has now taken place. And now, our militant cry to all the honest workers, irrespective of views and tendencies, to all the devoted sons of our class, is: Let us unite, in order to fight this black reaction, to meet this pressure, to break the black line, to deal a blow into the heart of the enemy, and to make the greatest strides along the path which in our opinion would unite the workers of the world. (Applause). This is our answer to the question why we are so powerfully stressing the slogan of international labor unity, that has so unequivocally been formulated by the Comintern and by the recent congress of the R. I. L. U. I hope that it will meet with the same mighty response at your congress, as was evoked from the best workers of the entire world (applause).

It appears to me that the biggest obstacle in the way of international unity is represented by the social democratic leaders of the German trade unions, the most inveterate trade union bureaucrats of Germany. In them lies the chief obstacle. Of course, there are plenty of secondary obstacles. M. Jouhaux is not one whit better than the German bureaucrats; still the main group that knows just what it is doing, that knows for what object it is splitting the international trade union movement, that does not act blindly, but pursues deliberately the tactic of the bourgeoisie, are the leaders of the German trade unions. And we address the British workers in the first place, in order that they might know that if any one prevents international unity, that if anyone represents the chief obstacle, it is the German social democrats, the bureaucrats of the German labor movement, who are ready to do anything and everything

(Continued on page 8)

Shop Committee Movement in the Needle Trades

By JOSEPH ZACK.

THE deeper we get into work amongst the masses of the proletariat, the more able are we to perceive the shortcomings of former methods and forms of organization. We are now entering upon the most important phase of transforming our organizations from social-democratic forms, inherited from social democracy and developed in the era of capitalist expansion and social reformism, into those fit for the era of decay of the capitalist system, our era, where capitalism cannot any longer give the reforms and concessions it could easily give during its period of health, and whence as a result the workers can maintain their standards and progress only thru merciless sharp class struggle.

This sharpening of the struggle, which is the breath and life of our movement, needs new forms of organization and mobilization of the proletariat en masse just as it requires different tactics. Hence, the need of a party based on factory nuclei, and industrial organizations based on shop committees, which is in line to fit the proletariat organizationally for the seizure of power and the overthrow of capitalism.

The world's trade union bureaucracy have long ago realized the meaning of rank and file organization of workers to their fortunes and future. It is no wonder that whenever the workers made an attempt in that direction it is bitterly fought by the bureaucracy. It arose in various forms in a number of countries and under different names, such as shop stewards, shop delegates, factory councils, Betriebsrate, et. It was as a rule an attempt by the rank and file to hit at their exploiters, to defend themselves over the heads and despite the reactionary leadership. It arose as a spontaneous resistance to the class collaboration and selling out tactics of labor's business men, and not having a firm, clear force like the Communist Party behind it, decentralized and undisciplined as it usually was, it was overcome or petered out. Nevertheless, it was the natural form of organization of resistance against the bureaucracy and the exploiters, organized at the place of work. Amongst the labor organizations in the United States, the needle trades witnessed probably the greatest agitation and experience along this line. And the militants of the needle industry have undoubtedly developed the clearest conception of this form of organization, altho they conceived of it mainly as a union reform affair and not as a means to organize the unorganized. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia, which had a tremendous effect upon the needle workers, gave the shop delegate movement in the needle trades a tremendous impetus. The biggest local of the I. L. G. W. U., the old Waist and Dress-makers' Local 25 with 22,000 members, actually attempted to put it into practice (shop delegate system) and participation at the shop delegates' council meetings and enthusiasm ran high. This shop delegates' council, which was sanctioned by the officials under pressure as an advisory body, naturally assumed more and more power for itself so that the bureaucrats forced their dissolution with the present president, M. Sigman, as the executioner. The agitation for the shop delegates' system (which advocated organization in the shop in the form of a shop committee and shop delegates from all shops to form a central body of the trade to manage the union) continued unabated until the T. U. E. L. took the field, when the capturing of executive boards and local offices became the main objective in the first flush of victories. A mild form of shop organization, such as shop chairmen, occasional shop chairmen meetings, price committees, etc., has been officially practiced in the needle trades for many years. The bureaucrats were, however, careful not to let it go beyond that. The program of the Needle Trades Section

of the T. U. E. L. adopted three years ago gives an interesting picture as to how the unions' management could be conducted under the shop delegate form of organization and why it is necessary and advantageous from a union point of view. It gives a precise and simple idea as to how a centralized union can function with a shop committee system as its basis.

"The sharpening of the struggle between the workers and the employers necessitates a much broader participation, a more intense activity on the part of the masses in behalf of the union. With the present small number of active members it is not only difficult to maintain what we have, but well nigh impossible to make progress for the future. The number of conscious active workers must be increased many times the present number. This can, however, not be accomplished without reforming considerably the present bureaucratic system of management and leadership of our organizations. This system must give way to one that will make mass interest and mass activity on the part of our membership possible. The structure, the internal machinery of our unions must be changed to establish the broadest contact with the masses in the shops. We must strive by all means in our power to eliminate all the artificial devices set up by the present bureaucratic system for the purpose of breaking and counteracting the will of the membership.

"In order to accomplish this, our form of organization must be changed so as to make the shop the basic unit of our unions. The present form of our organization of local unions as the basic unit has definitely outlived its effectiveness, and cannot longer serve the purposes of militant unionism.

Remnants of Craft Divisions.

"The craft local as a basic unit of organization may have served a useful purpose when the unions were first organized and the membership small, it may have filled the need at the time when craft unionism was the dominant form of organization in the needle industry. Now it is a remnant of the days that shall never come back, days when craft locals were autonomous with power to negotiate wages and working conditions, separate and irrespective of the other locals in the trade.

"Our industry has outgrown this stage long ago. And our unions have been forced to abandon the old divisions into innumerable powerless craft locals when making agreements with the employers. Changed conditions in the industry has made it necessary to act along trade lines instead of craft, the result was the creation of joint boards which act for all the workers in the trade. The creation of these joint boards, however, has deprived the locals of many of their powers and made them more dependent upon the higher bureaucracy. The membership in the locals being far removed thru the innumerable subdivisions, craft locals, sections, etc., from the present main body of the union, the joint board, and hence unable to directly influence it, is little interested in the impotent quibbles that take place at the local union meetings. The result is an irrepressible lack of interest in the affairs of the union. Usually a local can boast of no better attendance than 5 to 10 per cent of its membership. To the average worker today, the union is an unwieldy machine far removed from his daily life in the shops. He considers it as merely an office where he pays compulsory weekly dues, the interests of the shop appear to him separate and distinct from the interests of the union. Due to these state of affairs within our own organizations it has become possible for the paid officers to usurp much power. In order to establish a closer bond between the shop and the union, to arouse the initiative and individual activity of the rank and file in behalf of the union, to enable the workers to have a more direct influence upon the affairs of the union, to abolish the fruitless organizational

craft divisions and do away with the numerous useless craft locals, to truly make effective the principle of 'one shop, one union' the militants will fight for the introduction of the shop delegate system.

What is the Shop Delegates System?

"The shop delegate system will do away gradually with the craft local as the basic unit of organization and substitute in its stead the shop. The workers in the shop being then the basic unit of the organization of the union will then take up all matters pertaining to the union at their regular shop meetings, and thru their delegates to the shop delegates council will be able to bring their wishes directly to the assembled delegates of all the other shops in the trade. The shop delegates' council elected on a proportional basis representing all the workers in the shops of that trade will have full power over all questions of the trade and the management of all union affairs in the trade, acting for all the workers in the trade. The workers in the shops thru their delegates will have the possibility to directly influence and to be represented in this important union body, instead as now being forced to accept the rulings of unrepresentative and often manipulated joint boards which they have no means to influence nor to participate in its deliberations. The executive board and its officers elected by the shop delegates' council will run the machinery of the union, receiving dues, complaints, handle business agents, etc., under the direct supervision of the shop delegates' council.

"Delegates to national conventions of the unions will be elected on a proportional basis by delegates from the shops elected for that purpose, and convening in a city convention of a trade. This simple machinery will not only arouse the interest of the thousands of workers in union affairs but will enable the workers to exert a greater and a more direct control over the affairs of the union. It is a reform that will invigorate our unions and make them more efficient bodies in dealing with the problems faced by the workers in the shops."

We in the needle trades perceived even then that were we placed tomorrow into complete control of the bureaucratic apparatus of the unions as constituted, the first thing we would have to do is to bring about amalgamation at the bottom, in the shops, thru shop committees, and thru them to abolish bureaucratic machinery completely and create one from the bottom up that is fit for the modern struggle in modern industry. If amalgamation from the top would be effected tomorrow with the present bureaucratic apparatus remaining at the bottom, it would be a structure built upon sand. The machinery of the labor lieutenants of capitalism conceived by the needs of the past, maintained for the purpose of choking the fighting spirit, of putting a damper on the class struggle, of faking and manipulating the masses much the same as other bourgeois "democratic" methods, cannot serve the purpose of militant struggle against exploitation.

The shop delegate system, as above indicated, proposes a method of shop organization by each craft or division of a factory proportionately electing its representatives to a committee of the shop (factory), shop committee, Betriebsrate, to represent the workers in all affairs in the shop, as well as in the general shop delegate body controlling the union (shop delegates' council). It proposes to substitute completely the present bureaucratic apparatus of union management and control, which so wonderfully serves the purposes of the bourgeois union bureaucracy, and which, while appearing democratic, like bourgeois democracy can easily enough at any time be legally or illegally transformed into a dictatorship over the workers, as experience has already amply demonstrated, and substitute for it a rank and file system from the bottom.

To us in the United States, where

the little that is organized is in the dead grip of the blackest bureaucracy on earth, ideologically bankrupt, organizationally stagnant, and in the process of decay, the problem of organizing the many millions of unorganized is our major problem, this we can only solve if we have a machinery at our disposal not dependent upon the whims and dictates of the bureaucracy, a machinery effective in the places of work. Therefore, the problem of shop committees in unorganized territory or industries is of primary concern to us. Moreover, our policy of entrenchment in the existing unions has reached a degree where its further progress depends upon an even much stronger entrenchment in the factories, mills and unions. We have shown results in agitation, but now, at the pain of stagnation, we must have a machinery under our influence in unorganized and organized industries that will make it possible to press forward to leadership in economic struggles, strikes, etc., linking our efforts and organization in unorganized as well as organized trades in a new, direct, and even more powerful effort on the economic field to break the stagnation and reactionary leadership in the American labor movement. I am firmly convinced that it can be done. If with such a handful of party members (not more than 10 per cent of the party membership even now) participating in our union work we could create, under the auspices of the T. U. E. L., such results, how much can we do by putting all our members in unorganized industries to the task with the whole party and T. U. E. L. strength behind it on the basis of the shop nuclei. It goes without saying that the party shop nuclei must be the heart and basis of the shop committee movement in the unorganized as well as organized industries. Shop nuclei and shop committees go hand in hand, one without the other is unthinkable. Therefore, the problem of shop committees hinges upon the reorganization of the party on the basis of shop nuclei.

It is neither necessary nor advisable to go into details as to how the shop committee machinery should be linked up or function. Suffice it to say at this time that it is practically the same problem as the one to be solved by the shop nuclei, which will be the basis and parallel to it. The form of organization will have to be adjusted in each case to the peculiarities of the industry and methods of production, but in all industries, including the building trades as well as railroads, the shop committee system can be applied effectively. Most of the committees, especially in the unorganized industries must in the preparatory stages of their activity do their work semi-secretly until the situation is ripe in each instance either for strikes, organization campaigns, etc.

For the needle trades industry, where our movement at present is infected by puny local union politics ad nauseum, the shop committee movement will revive and regain its old militancy as soon as the party gets into action along these lines.

Let me say in conclusion, that shop committees are the road to the organization of the unorganized, the most effective weapon against the bureaucracy—it marks the transition from a policy of propaganda to one of action. It is amalgamation from the bottom. It is the weapon for direct action, class struggle, and victory. That's the meaning of shop committees.

When you buy, get an "Ad" for the DAILY WORKER.

Build the DAILY WORKER!

Help Insure
THE
DAILY WORKER
for 1925!

The Discussion on Party Tasks

GITLOW IS NOT A LIAR

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

I AM not going to call Gitlow a liar. Why? Because the case of the majority does not need to resort to "proof" of this kind. Poor Gitlow is perfectly welcome to the use of all the epithets he can lay his hands on. They will avail him little. Our membership is already beginning to open their eyes to the menace of "farmer-labor Communism." The party will not be fooled into a policy of opportunism. And no amount of mudslinging and billingsgate will deter us one iota from telling the party exactly what we think of our farmer-laborites.

What Happened at the Hungarian Convention?

Gitlow says Bittelman plainly lied about what happened at the Hungarian convention. A serious charge— isn't it?—expressed in rather strong language. But what was it that happened at the Hungarian convention? The Hungarian convention accepted the position of the minority. This is what I reported to the C. E. C. on the Hungarian convention. It is a lie? No, of course not. Gitlow will be the last man in the world to deny it. Then, what else did I say? I said that by accepting the position of our farmer-laboristic minority, the Hungarian convention proved that it is in captivity by the farmer-labor ideas. I said that the Hungarian convention was so obsessed with farmer-laborism that it could not imagine the further development of our movement without this slogan.

This is what actually took place. Does Gitlow disprove it? Of course not. How could he? To disprove this would mean to deny the fact that the Hungarian convention accepted the minority position. All I said in my published report was that by accepting Comrade Gitlow's "Communism" the Hungarian convention went wrong. It went opportunistic. The fact that Gitlow "captured" the convention means that the convention was captured by farmer-laborism. Isn't that so? And that was all I said.

Quite naturally this does not please Gitlow. But, then, permit me to ask a question: Is it my duty to please Gitlow, or to tell the party the truth?

My Second "Lie".

In my report to the C. E. C., I said that in order to disprove my charge of opportunism Gitlow asked the Hungarian convention to examine the personnel of the majority and minority. He attempted to prove that because some of the leaders of the minority, at one time or another, went to jail for their activities in the movement, therefore, they are not opportunists.

Gitlow calls this a lie. And how does he prove it? Read the following portion of his article:

"What I said was in answer to the charge that the majority calls the minority liquidators. In reference to this I asked the delegates to examine the personnel of the minority and their service in the Communist movement to determine whether or not the minority is made up of comrades who want to liquidate the Communist Party. I pointed out that the minority was composed of members who had been active in the left wing of the socialist party and in the organization of the Communist Party of the country. I stated further that these comrades had fought for the party, defended it in all kinds of situations, and had gone to jail for it. These are facts. Bittelman and the whole majority cannot deny them. As a further example let us take Comrade Ruthenberg. Comrade Ruthenberg is of the minority. The majority brands him as a liquidator. Yet, after having spent three years in prison for the Communist Party he is again, as a result of the Bridgeman trials, facing a ten year sentence for his loyalty to the party."

Did you read the above carefully? What is its meaning? It is this: Because the minority were active in the left-wing, because they were active in the organization of the Communist Party, and, finally, because they had gone to jail, therefore they cannot be charged with opportunism and liquidation.

Now, comrades, what do you think of that? I address myself now particularly to those of you who have seen jails, the exile, the torture, and have looked death into the face not once but many times,—what do you think of this sort of an argument? I ask our Russian comrades, the Polish, Jewish, Lithuanian, Letts, and all those who received their revolutionary baptism not in the socialist party of Hillquit and Berger, not in the state legislature at Albany, N. Y., but in the revolutionary struggles of the proletariat of Russia between the years of 1903 and 1911—what do you think of a Communist who undertakes to defend his policies by reference to his jail record and to the sacrifices that he brought for the movement? Did Lenin do it? Did you ever hear such arguments from Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev, etc?

Why, my dear Gitlow, if it is a matter of jail records, we can give you all you want, only we want to be sure that you will honor jail records under the czar as highly as you honor some jail records under President Wilson. Also that you will give us credit for exile into the "cold" portions of Russia, and for participation in armed struggles against czarism, and its agents. And mind you, we were doing all this as proletarians, as workingmen, as members of the Social-Democratic Labor Party of Russia, of which, Lenin, Stalin, and Kamenev were members and leaders.

The reason it never occurred to us to refer to our jail records as proof of the correctness of our policy, is because we do not believe in this kind of bunk, which is cheap self-advertisement, and smacks of the methods of bourgeois salesmanship. We thought we were members of a Communist Party and not traveling salesmen to advertise chewing gum.

My Third "Lie".

I reported Gitlow as saying, in substance, that because the Russian Communist Party initiated the movement for and participated the building of Soviets, although the Soviets were non-partisan, non-Communist political organizations, therefore, the American Communist Party may also initiate a movement for and participate in the building of . . . a farmer-labor party which is also a non-partisan, non-Communist, political organization.

Gitlow does not like the way I reported his argument at this point. He dislikes it so much that he calls it a lie, and he proceeds to tell, in his own words, what he really said. Read it:

"The above is a complete falsification of what I said. When the political secretary of a Communist Party resorts to such deliberate methods of misrepresentation in the furtherance of factionalism, the party is bound to suffer severely. Now what did I say on the question of Soviets? I said that the Russian Communist Party participated in the Soviets even though the Soviets were not Communist bodies and even though they were not integral parts of the Bolshevik Party. That did not stop the Russian Bolshevik party from raising the slogan of all power to the Soviets thereby through the revolutionary struggle that ensued making the Soviets the instruments of state power and the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. I used this argument to counteract the sectarian poison that is being injected into our party by the majority that maintains that only through

its own organization can the party wage a Communist political struggle, and that it is opportunism for the party to wage political struggles thru the instrumentally of other organizations. The farmer-labor party I therefore contended could be made an instrument of our political struggle even though it is not a Communist body."

The comrades will pardon me for imposing upon their patience with these long quotations from Gitlow. But it can't be helped. The interests of the party demand that we all know that because the Russian Party participated in Soviets, therefore, the American party must participate in the farmer-labor movement. This is the new Marxism and Communism of our farmer-laboristic minority. I am leaving aside, for the moment, the fact that it is not the question now of participating in but of initiating and creating a farmer-labor party. Gitlow has either entirely misunderstood the discussion, or he is consciously twisting the issue when he represents the thing as though it were a question of our party participating in a movement that already exists. There is no such thing. The question is: Shall the Workers Party create a substitute for itself in the shape of a farmer-labor party? This is the issue.

I am willing to assume that Gitlow did not understand what our controversy was all about. He may have sincerely believed that the whole fight is about participating in an already existing movement. That's why he has written the above lines to the effect that since the Russian Party

participated in Soviets, the Workers Party may participate in a farmer-labor party. He is pitifully wrong, just the same. But where is my "lie"?

As to Factionalism.

Some day there will be written the history of our party, and then we shall know which faction or tendency in our movement contributed most to the development of our party. We may be compelled to begin writing history much sooner than would be necessary otherwise. If the salesmen of the minority (a la Gitlow) will continue the way they started, we may find it advisable and for the good of the party to start writing history immediately. But one fact must be established right here. It is the fact that never in the history of our party did a minority opposition defy so flagrantly and brazenly the fundamentals of organization of the Comintern, as did the present minority. The caucus is everything, the party is nothing—this is the motto of the present minority.

But we shall leave this aside for the moment. We want the party first to realize the menacing nature of the policies of the minority, and then we will speak in more detail about their practices of organization. Our main task now is to have the party repudiate definitely and completely the right-wing farmer-labor opportunism of the minority. In pursuing this task, we shall speak to the party as plainly and frankly as is possible, and will leave to the minority all the privileges and all the rights of advertising their virtues and of calling us names.

MINORITY DID NOT PROVE THEIR CASE

By MORRIS KUSHINSKY

THE nearer the discussion of our party's immediate tasks approaches its conclusion, the more it becomes evident that the minority has a very poor case in justification of their proposed policy. Of all the arguments advanced by the minority all through the discussion none were of any strikingly convincing nature.

In my opinion the minority has still got to prove that there is NOW in existence a mass sentiment on the part of the American workers for a farmer-labor party. Those of us who are actively engaged in the everyday work of the American labor unions, know the facts that point to the contrary.

As a matter of fact we see that ever since the presidential election the issue of a labor party, as far as the majority of the labor movement is concerned is dead and buried. Those elements in the labor unions who demonstrated any kind of a sentiment for independent political action, and who were willing to do anything in order to put this sentiment into action, are now either altogether indifferent to the issue or satisfied with their conviction that what was accomplished by the LaFollette movement was all that they wanted.

For us to come out now in the labor unions with the slogan, "For a farmer-labor party" would mean at best talking to stone walls.

On the other hand we must not forget that ever since the Bridgeman arrest and the consequent discussions in the capitalist press of what the Communist Party was and our appeals to the American workers for the defence of those arrested, brought about a situation whereby many thousands of American workers became very much interested in knowing what the Communists really stood for.

Then again in the last pre-election campaign, hundreds of thousands of American workers listened with great interest to our speakers who came out on the streets and in halls explaining the true meaning of Communism and its objects. Also, in the last campaign, as the politicians of the capitalist parties and of the La-

Follette movement besieged the labor unions for their endorsement and support of their candidates, we, the Communists, have learned the means of effectively combatting this custom, and have gained a great deal in the way of showing to great masses of workers that the Communists are the only real friends of the working class. In short, the late developments in the American labor movement and the activity of our comrades therein have removed many barriers which were in the way of our propagation of the class struggle from a Communist point of view and to show to the workers that the only political party worthy of their support is the Workers (Communist) Party.

Now, after all the experience we have gained and after the many hardships we have overcome, for us to come again before the American workers and try to raise the slogan of a farmer-labor party, would amount to as much as to try to inject new life into a dead corpse. At the same time, to talk now to the American workers, of a mysterious "class farmer-labor party," would mean to be "hiding behind the bush" for the simple reason that we might just as well and with just as much advantage come right out clearly and unhesitatingly with the propaganda for the Workers (Communist) Party.

To my mind the proposed policy of the minority means retreat from gained positions. It means retreat that is not warranted by actual conditions in the labor movement at the present time. This proposed tactic of the minority if accepted would mean a step backward that would create a situation whereby we would have to play a hide and seek game. This would not mean a retreat whereby we could strengthen our position for a new attack upon our enemy, but one that would tend to destroy our gained influence and prestige in the labor movement. This is an out and out un-Leninist, un-Bolshevik tactic.

In conclusion let me say that we, the Communists, active in the labor movement, have greater and more important tasks to perform than to force upon the American workers

(Continued on page 4)

The Discussion on Party Tasks

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM A RANK AND FILER FOR MAJORITY THESIS

By ETHEL SHOR

WHAT did Lenin say about slogans? He said that slogans are to be used only to mobilize large masses of workers, or call them to action—not simply slogan for slogan's sake.

The minority fail to prove that there is a demand for a labor party apart and distinct from the LaFollette movement, and when they cannot prove that, on what argument do they fall back—they say "if there is no sentiment for a farmer-labor party we must create one; we must build a farmer-labor party"—and they quote the C. I.'s instructions to the British Communist Party that they should join the British labor party.

We advocated a labor party for the past two and one half years not because we thought the labor party to be a necessary, preliminary step for the workers, but because such sentiment existed, and it was our duty to participate in that movement of the workers. This is the reason the C. I. instructed the British Communists to seek admission in the British labor party. The comrades have yet to prove that the labor party is an inevitable step the workers will have to go through.

The comrades of the minority say "the labor party will disillusion the workers the sooner." Yes, but must we build such an instrument? According to this, we should propagate and fight for WAR for surely war disillusions the workers more than any number of labor parties.

The minority says "No, we will not build a farmer-labor party now, but simply advocate it, talk about it, pleasantly and nicely" but what do their articles read (Askennuzie, Dec. 17)—"we will propagate for one actively, make it the center of our campaigns, unemployment, union activities, etc. Make it the MAJOR issue around which will center all our party activities."

Consistency—that is one of the jewels the minority does not possess.

The minority makes the labor party the only means of political action for the workers. I would like to ask the minority since when are strikes, especially those which bring the work-

MINORITY DID NOT PROVE THEIR CASE

(Continued from page 3)

dead issues such as the one, "For a labor party." We can not afford to waste our energy and hard earned money for the organization of bogus farmer-labor parties just in order to give activity and excitement to some of our good comrades of the minority who have otherwise nothing to do with their time. Instead of this let us make a real effort to build our Workers (Communist) Party. Let us raise the real live slogans that will put our party in the forefront as the leader of, and fighter for, the interests of the working masses. Let us build the united front of the rank and file on the slogans of unemployment, child labor, organization of the unorganized, recognition of Soviet Russia, opposition to class collaboration on the part of the trade union bureaucracy, etc., etc.

Great numbers of American workers are ready to listen to us and as we develop these campaigns, still greater masses will rally around our slogans and by carrying on a militant fight for them we will gain the leadership of these masses and finally achieve the goal of making the Workers (Communist) Party the mass Communist Party of the American working class and thus lead them into the revolutionary class struggle for the final battle to capture all power for the workers.

ers into the direct conflict with the capitalist state (injunctions, etc.), not political struggles. Truly, they are the "Marxists"!!

The minority asks us how and where have the conditions changed. The subjective conditions have changed and they admit that in their thesis when they admit the "temporary" strength of LaFollette. Two years ago the sentiment of the masses was not clear, not crystalized, either for a revolutionary mass class farmer-labor party, mass class farmer-labor party, class farmer labor party, simply farmer-labor party, or the LaFollette movement. Their interest in political action was aroused by the fact of the coming elections, bringing their customary illusion of a change being brought by the ballot. Now this sentiment is crystalized, has its haven in the LaFollette movement. The masses have not yet been disillusioned by LaFollette. Whether the disillusionment stream will turn into a farmer labor party movement is yet a question. We will then consider it. But if that will be, the turn it will take is yet questionable. Yes, we must be the vanguard of the proletariat, but let us use reason and sense. Know where and how to apply it. We have only a certain amount of party energy and funds and must use them to the very best advantage. Not shouting for shouting's sake. Let us not make the words "vanguard of the proletariat" a fetish to be applied hit or miss. Otherwise, we should at all times in little local strikes, elections, etc. preach only the dictatorship and the Soviets. This is running ahead still further.

Comrade Siminoff renders a huge cry (December 17)—a pre-LaFollette man came to him with the terrible plaint—he (the LaFollette man) is disgusted with LaFollette, only a labor party will smash the capitalist machine. Surely, if I were Comrade Simonoff, I would know what to answer. When a person speaks of smashing the capitalist machine, he is material for the Workers Party and does not have to go thru another disillusionment and get disgusted with all political parties.

The comrades want a mass Communist Party. So do I. All agree on this point. But what is the quicker and more effective means. For example—in the United Council of Working Class Women after working and organizing (and contributing) collections for the Paterson strikers, is it better to take one person aside and whisper, "shy, shy—I am also a Communist, I also help the Paterson strikers," or the Workers Party as an organization helped the Paterson strikers? We have no desire to be modest violets.

As to Comrade Lore, if anyone has added prestige to Comrade Lore it has been the minority. What did the C. I. say? Kick him out or fight ideologically? The C. I. said—fight him ideologically. . . . The way the minority have fought Comrade Lore, however, and the issues they have fought him on have made him appear as a martyr before the comrades. Talk to the rank and filers, and what do they say. "Yes, I admit Comrade Lore is wrong on many things, but he is being persecuted, attacked in petty and forced situations. He has been treated unfairly." The fight should be waged ideologically, take the wind out of Lore's sails, by making him admit his mistakes thereby breaking his false prestige.

Comrade Jakira and the comrades of the minority say: "We, the Marxists!! therefore, we are right!!!" To me, merely a rank and filer, the test of a Communist is not one who has only "studied" Marx and can recite him by rote, but one who participates

ILLUSIONS OR REALITY?

By JACK PROKOP,
Eastern Organizer Czecho-Slovak
Federation.

AFTER both sides, the majority and the minority of the C. E. C. had presented their arguments as to the chief tasks, timely slogans, and immediate necessary operations, let us examine the nature of the tasks, the timeliness of the slogans, and the necessity of their operations. As Communists, we must deal in this examination only with facts, real things, that is, objective and subjective conditions, which alone serve as the determining factors in analysis of a situation. Thus objectively examining, we find that:

1. The federated farmer-labor party was a forcible amputation from the "real trend toward a third party" and therefore dissolved under the breath of LaFollette.

2. The majority of the C. E. C. has been seduced by the minority to exaggerate and misrepresent the strength of the F. L. movement before the membership of the W. P.

3. Besides the "trend for a third party" there is among the farmers neither a tendency to oppose its organization or under-rate its effectiveness, nor the much sought tendency for a farmer-labor party, all mythical proofs to the contrary having been exparated under the x-rays of Foster's and Manley's illumination.

4. The trend to organization and growth of the third party is insured by the actions of the C. P. P. A., and all its affiliated organizations of craft and industrial unions, as well as the debris from the F. L. and co-operative movements of the farmers, whom LaFollette alone is able to "stick together" and lead, altho to disillusionment.

5. When in the past year or two, two million bankrupt farmers left and dispersed in the cities and industrial centers, it was not a proof of an impending crisis and revolt and re-orientation of the farmers' political conception and policy (outside the trend for a third party) but on the contrary, it was a proof of an unparalleled elasticity of the capitalist system in the U. S. A. and its enormous capacity to absorb (temporarily at least) the victim of its exploitation and dump them in other spheres . . . disarmed. Disarmed, because they ceased to be a factor in the farmers' movement the moment they emigrated into the cities. The possibilities for the bankrupt farmers to earn their living in the cities, and further, the alleviation (altho small) which the remaining farmers felt thru the disappearance of 2,000,000 competitors, rather dampened than intensified the (imaginary) revolutionary tendency of the farmers, at the same time restoring to a great extent . . . faith in institutions of existing order, restoring faith in their improvement, by the policies of LaFollette and his program for the third party.

Altho it would be folly, for Communists, who base their calculations of directives and policies on fundamental laws of history, economics, politics and sociology . . . to believe that capitalists will stop the expropriation of farmers, and their forcible emigration into cities, or to believe in the much blazened Foolidge or Coolidge prosperity, unless a market is found on the moon, Venus or Mars, the fact remains that, during this period of artificial prosperity accompanied by the "election shock" and its resulting confusion among the farmers (and workers), and before the effects of "the crisis to come" can be appreciably felt, a slogan . . . "for a farmer-labor party" would be

in the struggles of the workers, leads them in accordance with the theory of Marx. He should be one who can shape policies in line with Marxian truth. Otherwise, we should invite Hillquit in America and Kautsky in Germany to lead us, for surely they have "studied" Marx, perhaps much more than some of the minority.

like a cry in the wilderness, without any effect.

Throwing aside all past mistakes of the majority, out of which the minority wants to draw capital for its "superior mistakes" we come to the

Recapitulation.

There being no immediate tendency or demand for a farmer-labor party, among the farmers or industrial workers . . . but there being "a political orphanage of the LaFollette clique" concrete organizations (C. P. P. A.) and tendencies for the creation of a third party . . . the slogan for a farmer-labor party is neither timely nor necessary, but rather injurious, constituting nothing but a waste of valuable energy, and the chief task of the party logically must be the strengthening and expansion of the party in all its units and all its institutions, thru education of its membership and sympathizers, thru propaganda and organization in the shops, unions, fraternal organizations, etc., of the workers and farmers, in order to prove there our ability "to lead" our willingness to work. The ability to lead is not proven by the creation of untimely slogans, imaginary parties, or by the changes of names of parties or other imitations of the labor fakers, not even by efforts of faking the fakers by "superior imitations" or conferences with them, as our great Napoleons from the minority imagine. On the contrary. The ability to lead will be demonstrated only and solely in the "real fighting units of the working class" such as the shops, factories, mines, union locals, international unions, fraternal organizations unemployed councils, etc., in their daily struggle for work, wages, control of locals, unions, fight for their political affiliations and representation, etc., etc., and the mustering out and incorporation of ripe elements into the Workers Party.

Only this sort of "ability to lead" and not the "Napoleonic ability" of the minority that dwelleth high in the clouds, and enable us to fight exclusively the prospective third party and gradually destroy the illusions created in the minds of the farmers and workers about improving institutions of capitalist order and deriving benefit from it. Only this sort of ability to lead will rectify the psychology of the poor, mislead farmers and workers, and bring them into the fold of the only "one proletarian class party" in the U. S. A.—the Workers Party.

The insignificant nucleus, which the minority pretends we have, will serve the purpose equally, and group itself around and be directed by a weekly "Farmers' Critical Review" edited by us, and given away if necessary. It will still cost us less than all the proposed empty maneuvers and save us from the reputation of "very unstable policies." The C. I. reversed the slogan on time, and wisely so.

In the U. S. A. the development of political consciousness of the masses is marching thru the third party. The heterogeneous element composing it, the adversity of their various interests, is the best guarantee for a re-division and reclassification of its elements. Then our harvest will begin in full measure. As soon as our campaign-predictions of crisis will begin to materialize we will repeat (what we should have said): "After Coolidge—the deluge!" and quit LaFollette's farcical deceptive banner; join the class-party with sickle and hammer.

The Walden Book Shop

307 Plymouth Court

(Between State and Dearborn
Just South of Jackson)

CHICAGO

The Discussion on Party Tasks

A Marxian Book and Its Un-Marxian Critics

By MAX BEDACHT.

THE ideological and political bankruptcy of the majority of the central executive committee was crowned by the "great sensation" it had prepared for the membership meetings. This C. E. C. majority was not satisfied with its unenviable record of poverty of ideas set up in the party discussion and poorly covered with threadbare slogans of liquidators, opportunists, et. Our C. E. C. majority insisted to set up another record—a record of demagoguery.

I once watched a prosecutor in a capitalist court walking up and down before the jury trying to incite the jury against us Communists, before the bar, by waving a red flag before their eyes, by throwing it on the floor, by jumping on it and by other such convincing arguments against the Communists.

Expert Demagogues at Work.

Our central executive committee majority seems to have gone to school to that gentleman, Comrade Foster, who pulled the same trick in the Chicago general membership last Sunday. But his performance was even surpassed by Cannon in New York. But then Cannon is unsurpassable when it comes to such "arguments."

A book made its appearance at these membership meetings. This book was denounced; it was flung around in well feigned disgust; it was condemned as menshevism incarnate. And all this comedy was enacted to get a verdict against the author of the book—not on the book itself, because hardly a line was read out of the book, but on the question now at issue before the party.

The book is "The Government—Strikebreaker" and its author is Jay Lovestone.

If anything were needed to show that our majority does not give a damn about our party and is interested solely and exclusively in the central executive committee majority this latest "sensation" would supply proof.

A few facts about the book will suffice to show up the majority and to condemn it for what it is: a group of unprincipled demagogues or a group of totally un-Marxian Marxians.

Foster-Lore Group Loses Its Head.

The subject, plan and the very method of the book as well as the author were suggested by Comrade Brooks, the representative of the Comintern at the Bridgeman convention of the Communist Party of America. The book was written at a time when the Workers Party, altho already a few months old, still had not overcome the handicap of the primogeniture of its older brother, the C. P. of A. Only about six months later at the time when this book was published, in May, 1923, the Workers Party began to function formally as the Communist Party and what is more important began to function as a political party.

What was the purpose of the book? Was it to be a history of the Workers Party? No. Was it to be a history of the achievements of the Workers Party? No. Was it to be a propaganda book pure and simple for the Workers Party? No. Great strikes had taken place in the years just past. The steel workers, the miners, the railroad workers, the textile workers had gone thru mass struggles against their exploiters.

During the war compulsory arbitration by government agency was established, ostensibly as a measure of war against Germany. But now, in the post-war struggles of the workers, this war measure, "against Germany," was shown up in its true character as a war measure against the workers. The official leadership of the organized workers in most cases made itself rather an instrument of this so-called government arbitration, instead of leading the workers into struggles against this fraud.

Here was a chance for the revolu-

tionists; to show up the character and role of the government as an agency of capitalism and the capitalists; to show the close connection, yea, even the identity of government and "big business"; to fight the contention of Gompersism of "our" government as something above classes.

This could be done only by a truly Marxian analysis of all the facts connected with the struggles of the past year. To give such an analysis on the basis of the facts was the task of the writer. The book represents the accomplishment of that task.

What the C. I. Says of "The Government—Strikebreaker."

Referring to this book and other publications of the Workers Party written mainly by Comrades Lovestone and Pepper, the executive committee of the Communist International in its report to the Fifth Congress declares: "The party has also issued Marxist literature, not only on general Communist questions but also on concrete conditions of America, and thus they made good that which the social-democrats of the Second International neglected to do for decades."

The book is a Marxian one. It breathes Marxism in its analytical method as well as in its revolutionary conclusions.

To be sure—our central executive committee does not know that. It does not and cannot recognize Marxian methods. As "true" believers they can only worship before the shrine of unmistakable phrases. If Marxism does not present itself to them in these phrases then our central executive committee majority finds itself compelled to disown it.

And why should it not?

Samples of Foster's Communism.

Comrade Foster, the leader of the majority, wrote only two years before "The Government—Strikebreaker" was published: "Apparently it is thru the old unions that the workers will eventually achieve industrial freedom." To this gem of "Marxism" we could add an indefinite number of others out of the same book, "The Great Steel Strike and Its Lessons." For instance, on page 260: "In what I have called the left wing of the movement there are large and ever-increasing numbers of workers and sympathizers who refuse to face the prospect of a society forever based upon the wage system. They demand an organization that is making for its abolition and the substitution therefore of a system of industrial justice. IF THEY WERE TO LOOK SHARPLY THEY WOULD SEE THAT THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT IS TRAVELING FASTER THAN ANY OTHER BODY TOWARD THE END THEY WISH TO REACH." (Our emphasis.)

Yes, the chief arbiter of pure Communism of 1924 was so much a stranger to Marxism, to Communism in 1920 that he seems entitled to a pardon for not recognizing Marx except in his beard. The comrade who could write only four years ago, that "the big question is whether or not they (the trade unions) will be able to develop enough power to stop this exploitation altogether. As for me, I am convinced that they will," should be a little more careful in his judgment about the Marxian qualities of other writers. His "Marxism," rank industrialism, can be traced in his writings down to this very day. Why then should a comrade who displayed such misconceptions of the character of the proletarian revolution, nearly three years after the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, be able today to find any trace of Marxism in the "Government—Strikebreaker?"

Foster Refutes Foster.

But our arbiters of pure Communism have detected the shortcomings of "The Government—Strikebreaker" only since the toga of the saviors of the Workers Party fell upon their shoulders. Before this critical moment arrived they appreciated "The

Government—Strikebreaker." COMRADE FOSTER WROTE IN THE ISSUE OF THE LABOR HERALD OF JULY 1923: "HERE IS A BOOK WHICH FILLS A GAP IN THE LITERATURE OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT. DEALING ENTIRELY WITH THE AMERICAN QUESTION, IT TAKES UP PHASE AFTER PHASE, THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN THE WORKERS AND THEIR EXPLOITERS. THE TOO FAMILIAR STYLE OF PAMPHLETEERING. CONSISTING OF GENERALIZATIONS AND SENTIMENTALITIES IS ENTIRELY ABSENT IN LOVESTONE'S WORK. CONCISELY, AND STEP BY STEP, HE HAS BUILT UP HIS ARGUMENT AND EXPOSITION FROM OFFICIAL DOCUMENT AND AUTHORITATIVE STATEMENTS. NO POINT IS LEFT UNSUPPORTED BY CITATION TO ORIGINAL SOURCES, AND THE WHOLE IS BROUGHT TOGETHER INTO THE MOST COMPLETE PICTURE YET DRAWN OF THE GOVERNMENT IN ITS CLASSIC ROLE OF STRIKEBREAKER. LOVESTONE HAS MADE A PERMANENT CONTRIBUTION TO THE LIBRARY OF THE STUDENT OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT."

Dunne and Olgin Answer Cannon.

Comrade Dunne, another one of the present day guardians of Marxism against the danger of opportunism, wrote about the book: "I am very much pleased with 'The Government—Strikebreaker,' and consider it a distinctive contribution to American labor literature."

And Comrade Olgin, a late addition to the army of fighters of pure Communism against right wing deviations, wrote about the book: "It is a review of the class struggle of the American proletariat for the last three years. It is a cross cut thru the class composition of American society and exposition of the government's role in the momentous social conflicts. . . . The book, as a whole, may serve for the workers as an excellent weapon and this is the main thing. It is a reliable book. It is an American book. It is a book astir with the problems of today. AND IT IS A COMMUNIST BOOK IN THE BEST SENSE OF THE WORD. THERE HAVE BEEN NO SUCH BOOKS IN THE WORKING CLASS LITERATURE IN THIS COUNTRY. LOVESTONE OUGHT TO BE COMMENDED FOR WRITING AND THE WORKERS PARTY FOR PUBLISHING 'THE GOVERNMENT—STRIKEBREAKER.' No English reading worker should fail to acquire the book and study it thoroly."

A Marxian Book.

The book deals with the great post-war struggles of labor in the United States. In many of its portions it deals with events of periods in which the Workers Party had no physical

existence as yet. In the whole period treated in the book the Workers Party had no political existence, while the Communist Party led an underground existence.

The book opens to the proletarian reader an understanding of the connections between the boss he is striking against and the policeman who prevents him from picketing.

But, say our arbiters of Marxism, where is Marx, M-A-R-X?

The book opens to the proletarian reader the revolutionary perspectives of the class struggle

But, say our guardians of pure Communism, where is Communism, C-o-m-m-u-n-i-s-m?

The book instills the proletarian reader with a clear concept of the oppressive functions of the capitalist state and of the necessity of organizing and fighting against the state.

But, say our "Bolshevized" majority, where is Bolshevism, B-o-l-s-h-e-v-i-s-m?

Profintern Translates Lovestone Book.

The Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow translated the book for publication in Soviet Russia.

But, say our new converts to revolutionary political action, what does the Profintern know about Communism? Just think of it, the poor and misled Profintern even asked the chief arbiter of pure Communism in America, Comrade Foster, to write a preface to the Russian edition Judging by Comrade Foster's willingness to comply with instructions from higher units of our international party we presume that he complied with this request, and wrote a Communist preface to the Russian edition of Lovestone's "non-Communist book."

Cannon's Sudden Conversion to Communism.

Eighteen months have passed since the Workers Party has published this book. Only praise was heard from the members of the central executive committee majority about the book. The Communist International read the book. The Profintern read it and ordered its translation into Russian. The book was reviewed favorably in numerous publications of the Communist International. No fundamental criticism was made anywhere. Only now since our present central executive committee majority was condemned by fate to "save" Communism and incidentally to save its own hide has this majority discovered its revolutionary Marxian soul.

Only in this moment of desperation has it mustered enough courage to throw all caution to the winds and reveal itself as a group of pseudo-Marxian charlatans, trying to retain control of the party by the cheapest demagoguery that has ever disgraced the activities of any group within any Communist Party anywhere in the world.

A MAJOR QUESTION OF COMMUNIST STRATEGY—A MENACE OF DEFEATISM

By SAMUEL SKLAROFF

THE present majority have up-to-date furnished no convincing proof that the movement for independent political action is dead. Their idea of proof is constant repetition of a few stereotyped phrases which, when analyzed in the light of actual conditions are revealed as total absurdities.

The idea that LaFollette has swallowed the farmer-labor movement belongs to the same class of pseudo-history exemplified by the story of the whale swallowing Jonah. Just as there are many people credulous enough to swallow both Jonah and the whale, so, unfortunately, there are many comrades unreflecting enough to swallow without examination this latest bit of majority pseudo-history.

A Burning Issue Before The Workers

If the LaFollette crowd have swallowed the farmer-labor movement, neither the swallows nor the swallowed, at the present writing, appear to know it.

Even Morris Hilquit, the leader of the defunct S. P., seems to know better than that. In an article on "Let Us Use Our Opportunity," in the New Leader of Dec. 20, he writes the following:—"The LaFollette campaign was a sort of partnership between the C. P. P. A. and the National LaFollette Club. This later group served as a cloak for many elements, who, for various reasons were for LaFollette for president.

"Now that partnership is all off. The coming convention will be held under the rules of representation as provided in the constitution of the C. P. P. A."

Under these rules all the unions in the country will soon be invited to send delegates to the convention to be held in Chicago on Feb. 25, 1925, for the purpose of establishing a third party. National, state and local central bodies will be entitled to representation.

(Continued on page 6)

The Discussion on Party Tasks

A MAJOR QUESTION OF COMMUNIST STRATEGY—A MENACE OF DEFEATISM

(Continued from page 5)

This issue of independent political action which is declared "dead" by the present majority will soon be discussed by every labor union from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Arctic to the Gulf.

Relying on Demagogy

It is admitted by both the minority and majority that our farmer-labor policy for the past two and a half years was SUBSTANTIALLY correct. It has more than any other single factor contributed to the growth of our party. It has placed the Workers Party on the political map of America.

And now the majority of the C. E. C. pose before the membership as the party builders. With characteristic demagogy they proclaim that while they want to build the Workers Party the other group propose to build something else.

At this point I want to ask: What did they think they were doing by means of the farmer-labor slogan for the past two years and a half? Building the Workers Party or something else? Their present arguments would seem to indicate that they had in view something else which did not materialize.

Let us put the burning question before our party in this manner:—If our manoeuvres on the united political front have in the past brought to the Workers Party certain indubitable gains, gains which if continued would put it on the road to becoming a mass Communist Party, cannot these gains be continued in the future by a correct application of the same policy modified only in so far as to meet changing conditions?

Let us analyze the situation correctly.

The Present Situation

The LaFollette campaign did not as yet produce a third party. It was conducted by an election alliance which is now dissolved. This alliance consisted of many different and divergent elements. Shall we now by raising appropriate slogans emphasize these differences and sharpen these divergencies, or ignore the whole thing?

In the last election campaign there were in the LaFollette camp hundreds

of thousands of workers because they labored under the illusion that it represented the beginning of a party of exploited industrial and agricultural workers. These masses are now fast becoming disillusioned. The action of the El Paso convention of the A. F. of L. abandoning the experiment of independent political action is an attempt to lead the masses back to the fold of the old parties. This will be resented by hundreds of thousands of workers who, while they are not yet ready for Communism, are definitely turning away from capitalism.

What We Must Do

Shall we adopt a purist attitude and tell these masses that we will have nothing to do with them until they accept the complete Communist program? Or shall we hasten this process of disillusionment, separate the potential revolutionists among the masses from reactionary leadership, and while advocating independent political action at the same time lay the foundation of a powerful mass Communist Party in America?

The present majority refuses squarely to meet these issues. They raise instead many other irrelevant and inconsequent issues, and prate volubly about the united front from below and above while showing no Marxian understanding of the united front at all.

Would not a campaign to establish a class farmer-labor party, (even if its sole immediate achievement may be only the formation of a left farmer-labor bloc within the general movement) involve the application of the united front from below by an appeal to the rank and file of the labor unions against the opposition of the reactionary officialdom?

But the majority of the C. E. C. propose a policy of folding hands, A POLICY OF DEFEAT AND SURRENDER WITHOUT A STRUGGLE, and dare to pose before the membership as a Communist leadership!

As against purist dogmatism the minority proposes a vigorous campaign along both the political and industrial united fronts. As against a policy leading to sectarianism—the building of a mass Communist Party in this country.

ALL POWER TO THE MINORITY

By PAT H. TOOHEY.

FROM the writings of the C. E. C. majority follows the impression is left that there is no sentiment for a farmer-labor party. Altho not a theoretician, not being able to quote Marx and others, I certainly can see the political childishness of this. Might I ask if it is our function, as Communists, the revolutionary vanguard of the exploited masses to sit idly by and wait for the workers to raise hell over some issue or another and then we, as the hero of old, step in, take the leadship and—etc., etc.

Was this the policy pursued by our party on the foreign exception laws? Was there widespread agitation and sentiment against this bill, or did our party take the initiative and create the sentiment and agitation? Why agitate for a "labor congress" (brain child of the majority hash-slingers). Why drop the F. L. for it? Was there any great amount of sentiment in 1922, as much as in 1924? What caused this tremendous sentiment which existed, as the majority would tell us, up to June of this year? Was it brought about by the ceaseless agitation of our party? Did this sentiment exist when the policy was first adopted, or did the party have to crystallize a germ, to mould that sentiment? If so, then it has been very profitable for the party. But when the majority tells us there is no sentiment for this slogan one is forcibly reminded of the fool who stood by a river bank waiting until

the water flowed away before trying to cross.

Sentiment for a farmer-labor party exists in Washington county today. To Comrade Blankenstein I would say, go among the workers, associate with them, talk with them, stay among them, suffer with them, work with them, and then you certainly will be in a position to write, or to speak authoritatively of the "sentiments" and the "pulse" and the "political tendencies" of the working class. That cannot be done by holding down a swivel chair daily in Pittsburgh.

What C. E. C. Told Us.

The LaFollette movement, or boom, was at its height when the C. E. C. drafted the program of action, or a manifesto dealing with the immediate tasks of the party. Our majority leaders, apparently, did not discover what they now claim annihilation of the farmer-labor party by the LaFollette movement, until recently, for in this program of action, adopted unanimously by the C. E. C., we find the following:

"In June, 1922, our party declared in a manifesto dealing with the application of the united front policy in the United States, that the problem of the united front politically was the problem of the formation of a labor party. Since that time the party has carried on a consistent united front campaign with the end in view of uniting those workers and farmers who were ready to break with the capitalist parties in a mass farmer-labor party with which the Workers

Party would be affiliated. This campaign has been the major political campaign of our party.

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

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

Why the Sudden "Discovery"?

This was presented to the membership late in July. The LaFollette boom was at its height. Our central executive committee adopted the complete program unanimously. When did the majority discover the basis for their present position? Comrade Foster in an article some time since said the

fact that the farmer-labor party was dead came to him while sitting in the gallery of the July conference for progressive political action. Then, why the unanimous decision on the program of action? Where did this tremendous sentiment disappear in such a short space of time?

Alas! Poor Bittelman.

And Comrade Bittelman, majority standpatter, has this to say later in the campaign: "Shall the workers and poor farmers have a political party of their own, a farmer labor party?" Answering for the Workers Party, Comrade Bittelman says, "Yes, by all means. Without a party of their own, politics for the workers becomes a farce. It means helping other classes—big, medium and small capital—to fasten ever tighter their grip over the working masses. If the small capitalists and rich farmers want their own party, let them go to it. But the workers and poor farmers have no business in such a combination. They have their own interests to defend, which are antagonistic to the interests of all capitalist groups, big, medium, and little. Therefore, let us have a farmer-labor party." (Pamphlet: "Parties and Issues in the Election Campaign.")

The minority thesis is a correct Communist thesis. To repudiate the farmer-labor party slogan at this time means that we will drink from the cup of sectarianism, and the aftermath is obvious: political isolation and oblivion. ALL POWER TO THE MINORITY!

THEY ARE MAKING IT UNANIMOUS

By ISRAEL AMTER.

WITH less than 5,000,000 votes conceded to LaFollette and Wheeler, the most important fact that the election returns teach us is that there is no labor party in sight. The American Federation of Labor, in their annual convention at El Paso, Texas, have read aright the verdict of the American workers and farmers, and make haste to announce their opposition to a labor party and to reaffirm their time-worn policy of non-partisan political action, or, as sometimes otherwise stated, 'no politics in the union.'

"Another fact from which we should draw a lesson is that the farmer-labor party is dead. It sang its swang-song in the recent election.

"Indeed, such a 'labor party' would have no use other than to do that which the LaFollette supporters so plainly sought to do during the 1924 campaign, i. e., swallow it up, absorb its organization ability, and kill its educational value and its political prestige with the working class."

How familiar these words sound! In the majority thesis, in the numerous articles by Comrades Foster, Dunne, Browder, Cannon and Bittelman, they have been repeated over and over again. They should at least be accepted as truisms, when our Bolsheviks assert them with such assurance.

But strange as it may appear, the above paragraphs were not written either by Foster, Dunne, Browder, Cannon or Bittelman. No, others with as little perception, with as little understanding of Marxian-Leninistic methods, voice the same sentiments.

No, comrades, the above does not come from the brain of Foster, Dunne, Browder, Cannon or Bittelman. They emanate from the brain of a socialist, Emil Herman, who sings the same song of woe as the majority of the central executive committee, in the issue of the New Leader, the socialist party organ, of Dec. 20.

They are making it unanimous—from Keating to Herman to Foster. But what did Zinoviev say in the Presidium of the Communist International? "I believe that if we study everything we will say that, in the year 1924, things are not so elementary that we . . . cannot propagate the idea of an independent labor

party. We must dare to put forth this idea and it must be realized, namely, a separate labor party. It is our main duty to set this in motion. . . . We are at the beginning of a mass labor movement which will be independent—the idea of an independent labor party will be realized. Our task consists in starting an independent movement."

Well, it is Herman against Zinoviev. We of the minority have more faith in the understanding of Zinoviev.

Ten Splendid CARTOONS

By

ART YOUNG
ADOLPH DEHN
WM. CROPPER
FRED ELLIS
HAY BALES

Are only a part of the very best issue that has yet appeared—the January number of

The Workers Monthly

HAVE YOU RECEIVED YOUR POLICY BOOK?

DO YOU NEED ANOTHER?

Write Alfred Wagenknecht, Campaign Director, 1113 W. Washington Blvd. INSURE THE DAILY WORKER FOR 1925!

BOOKS FOR THINKERS

SCIENCE, LITERATURE
ECONOMICS, HISTORY.

Any Book in Print at Once.

Jimmie Higgins Book Shop
127 University Place
NEW YORK CITY
A Workers Party Book Shop

"Ide for Workers" (Textbook in German or Russian).....50c

"An Elementary Grammar" (In English).....15c

The Workers' Ide Federation
Room 5, 205 James St., N. S.,
PITTSBURGH, PA.

Is Unity of the International Trade Union Movement Possible?

By A. LOZOVSKY

THAT unity is a very beautiful thing and therefore desirable is not disputed for a moment by the bitterest disrupters. We are not faced with the question of unity "in general," or of unity in "principle" or of unity in a very remote future, but with the question whether at the present time, in view of the actual international situation, of the existence of divided, parallel organizations, etc. it is possible to attain unity and how it is to be brought about.

We must remark at the outset that the split does not exist in every country. In many countries the followers of the R. I. L. U. are within the organizations affiliated to Amsterdam. In these countries the followers of the R. I. L. U. and the followers of the Amsterdam International are organizationally united. On the other hand there are a number of countries where parallel organizations exist, and finally, a fairly large number of countries, the trade union movements of which are wholly affiliated to the Red International of Labor Unions.

What obstacles stand in the way of unity? These obstacles can be divided into two groups: 1. Organizational; 2. political obstacles. The existence of parallel organizations inevitably leads to organizational conservatism and to the effort to retain at all costs the existing forms of organizations. The reformist trade union movement clings with great tenacity to the old traditions and only adapts itself very painfully to the new forms of the class struggle. In the reformist trade union movement the narrow craft interests come before the interests of the workers of the country as a whole and the interests of the fatherland come before the interests of the international proletariat. It would, however, be a mistake to assume that organizational conservatism is only confined to the reformists. There are revolutionary workers who suffer from organizational conservatism and believe that it is best to follow the old road, not to make any sharp turns, not to unite the workers of different tendencies, as this could destroy the organizational structure.

The organizational obstacles are, of course, of secondary importance in

comparison with the political obstacles. Many comrades ask: "Can we unite with the reformists when they are even against the class struggle?" These comrades desire to lay down conditions regarding unity (break with the bourgeois coalition, fight against the Dawes plan, etc.) To demand from the reformists that they abandon the coalition with the bourgeoisie is to demand the impossible. To make unity dependent upon this implies a breach of unity, for the abandonment of the coalition with the bourgeoisie means the end of reformism.

On the other hand, the most bitter opponents of unity on the side of the reformists submit their conditions to the left wing of the trade union movement. This specially applies to the "Vorwaerts," the organ of the German social-fascists. The "Vorwaerts" spits poison and gall against unity. It is of course in favor of unity, but desires that the Communists shall not organize any nuclei, that they shall not incite the workers against the leaders of the trade union movement, that they shall not "calumniate," but faithfully carry out the policy of the black hundred which is conducted by the German social-democracy along with the German General Federation of Trade Unions. In this respect the "Vorwaerts" fully reflects the view regarding unity which exists in the right wing of the Amsterdam International.

The meaning of all this talk over this theme is that they turn to us and say: "Become reformists and then we shall unite with you!" This astute solution of the problem of unity is typical of the Second International, which leads, ideologically and politically, the reactionary portion of the Amsterdam International. It must be said that all this kind of talk is mere waste of time. The Communists have not the least reason for transforming themselves into reformist corpses, and whoever believes that the Communists will deviate even a hair's breadth from their principles in arriving at unity does not understand anything of Communism or of the problem of unity.

If, however, the reformists maintain their position and the Communists their, then the unity of the trade union movement is impossible!—the

reader will say. No, his would be a thoroughly erroneous conclusion. In fact we do not submit demands to the reformists in order that they shall become Communists, and we do not propose to the reformists that they shall occupy themselves with the futile task of debolshevizing the Bolsheviks. The revolutionary trade unions of all countries which are in the R. I. L. U. propose, in full agreement with the Communist International, a way which is acceptable to the most bitter opponents of Communism in the Amsterdam International, if they only adopt a somewhat conscientious attitude regarding the interests of the working class.

"We will not submit conditions to one another" says the R. I. L. U. "We will convene a conference of representatives of both Internationals, we will jointly decide the time and place of the International Unity Congress, at which the organizations affiliated to the R. I. L. U. and to the Amsterdam International, as well as those trade union organizations which are outside both Internationals, shall be represented. We will discuss at the international congress the concrete tasks of the struggle against the capitalist offensive and against the fascist reaction. At this congress we will create the United Trade Union International.

Whoever has the majority at this congress will carry through their resolutions and will have the majority on the executive body. The constitution of the new international will be in accordance with the standpoint of the majority. At this unity congress the Red International of Labor Unions and the Amsterdam International will declare that they dissolve their organizations and enter into the United International. We Communists and revolutionary workers of all countries declare through the Communist International and the R. I. L. U. that if we find ourselves in a minority, that we shall remain in the new international and submit to the discipline of the movement, whilst we shall carry on our fight for influence among the masses. If the opponents of Communism make a similar declaration the question will be quite clear.

Let the masses of workers pronounce judgment as to whose tactics—those of the Communists or those of

the reformists—are more consistent with the interests of the working class. We are not afraid of bringing our tactics before the court of the many millions of proletarians. May the opponents of Communism come forward in an equally open manner as the followers of the R. I. L. U. do and will continue to do.

We ask, what is there in the proposal which can be unacceptable for an honest proletarian, no matter to what tendency he may belong? If the leaders of the Amsterdam International are convinced that they have behind them the overwhelming majority, why are they afraid to attend a congress of this sort? The majority will be with them, and the will of the majority of the congress will decide the political line of the United International. Everything is clear regarding this proposal. We propose to those who everywhere make a great cry over their democratic principles, the most democratic way conceivable for uniting the divided international trade union movement. Meanwhile however, the opponents of the R. I. L. U. do not desire this proletarian-democratic solution of the question and hide their fear of proletarian democracy by means of the great outcry over the craftiness of the Communists.

To mobilize the masses for unity is the most important task at the present moment. The majority of the leaders of the Amsterdam International believe that they will be able to evade this problem and to patch up the growing fissure in their own ranks which is consequent upon the inexorable radicalization of the working masses. If the Amsterdam International does not meet the wish of the majority of its own members it will simply collapse and unity will be restored over the heads of the present leaders. This is the reason why we, although we are quite aware of the enormous difficulties which are lying in our path, reply to the question, whether the unity of the international trade union movement is possible: yes, it is possible and inevitable. Together with the leaders or without the leaders, the divided international trade union movement will in any event be welded together into a powerful anti-capitalist bloc.

THE PARTY DISCUSSION CONTINUED

COMRADE RUTHENBERG'S ESTIMATES

By ARNE SWABECK.

In yesterday's issue of the DAILY WORKER, under the caption "The results of the first membership meetings," Comrade Ruthenberg has the following to say:

"Another factor which entered into the results last Sunday was the eleventh hour change in the rules covering the meetings, which denied members not attached to the city central committees in the cities in which the meetings were held the right to vote. This rule, disfranchising the party members from nearby cities was made in order to cut down the strength of the minority, particularly in the Chicago meetings. In Chicago even the members living in Pullman, which is industrially and geographically a part of Chicago, who were overwhelmingly for the minority position, were denied the right to vote in the Chicago membership meeting. The votes of the Pullman comrades alone would have changed the result in the Chicago meeting."

This may look quite convincing on paper, but what are the actual facts?

First, the central executive committee confining the vote at each meeting to the members actually attached to the respective city central committees seems to have been a very appropriate one, at least as far as the Chicago meeting was concerned, in order to avoid duplication of the Pullman membership vote which already on December 26 recorded itself 38 to 5 for the minority position. Secondly, it will be noted that this vote, already previously recorded in the DAILY WORKER, gives the lie to the contention of disfranchising of party mem-

bers. Thirdly, although Pullman is industrially and geographically a part of Chicago our membership there has for the last two years functioned thru their own separate C. C. C.

The Chicago party membership is overwhelmingly for the majority position and the vote recorded at the membership meeting of 399 to 362 is by no means an accurate proportion. Out of eight English branches with a total membership of 244 the minority has been able to carry one of the smaller branches while the number of the total who have expressed themselves for the minority position amounts to 46.—Quite significant. Isn't it?

Of the total number of language federation branches, the Italian, Lettish, Lithuanian and South Slavic were practically unanimous for the minority, some of their bureaus having been extremely active in lining up the membership even to the extent of furnishing loads of resolutions favoring that position to their branches. In most of these branches it has not been possible to gain admittance for a majority representative during the party discussion, in others little or no discussion took place as it seems they were too preoccupied in preparing to bring out all members for the membership meeting to record their vote and these particular branches were represented about 100 per cent. The minority vote was furnished almost wholly by these four big blocks. The other language federation branches except a small Hungarian branch are overwhelmingly for the majority position but they did not attend the meeting quite so well.

NEW YORK WORKERS' SCHOOL

Class in "A B C of Communism" at Workers' School.

In response to the demand for more classes in the "A B C of Communism," the Workers' School in New York City now offers such a course at its own headquarters, 208 E. 12th street.

The classes will be conducted by Comrade J. C. Oblans, for many years an active party worker, and will meet every Thursday night, from 8 to 10 p. m.

The first session will be held Thursday, Jan. 8. Comrades in lower Manhattan particularly are urged to register and to get sympathizers also to enroll.

Educational Directors Meet Monday, Jan. 19.

A special meeting of branch educational directors will be held on Monday, Jan. 19, at the headquarters of the Workers' School, 208 E. 12th street, New York City, at 8 p. m.

Branches which have not yet elected their educational director should do so at once, and send name and address to the secretary of the Workers' School.

All educational directors should take careful note of the date, Jan. 19, and make no other arrangements for that evening.

LIEBKNECHT MEMORIAL AND DAILY WORKER JUBILEE

ON Sunday, Jan. 11, the New York district of the Workers Party and the Young Workers League will join in an afternoon and evening affair at New Star Casino, Park Ave. and 107th St. The afternoon program will be under the special auspices of the Young Workers League in memory of the revolutionary hero, Karl Liebknecht. In the evening the first anniversary of the DAILY WORKER will be celebrated with a concert and dance. A joint ticket is issued at 50c which admits to either affair and is good for both if 25c extra is paid at the door.

Sixth All-Russian Trade Union Congress

(Continued from page 1)

to prevent the working class from uniting.

Germany is shortly to go thru the reichstag elections. Black reaction is impending there. Following America and England, the conservative groups are marching to power there too, and the social democrats must, of course, know this. What do they do, how did they build up their front? In what direction is it faced in this election campaign? Against the blacks? Nothing of the sort; they are building their entire front against the reds, against the Communist workers. They are helping the bourgeoisie to enact slavery elections. They have thrown practically the entire staff of the Communist Party into jail. The entire cream, the heads of the German workers, have been taken off with their aid. They are preparing for black reaction. Like the flunkies that they are, they are serving the bourgeoisie the best heads of the German workers, the German Communists. These leaders of the German trade union movement are busy spitting the international labor movement, or to be more exact, preventing it from establishing unity.

The workers of a number of countries have reformist prejudices, and do not understand our aims; we still see among them an honest class intuition which does not find at once the true path, but which desires to find this path. Such a situation exists in England, for instance. In Germany things are quite different. There, during the last 25 years, the bourgeoisie has trained, welded, bred and fostered a staff of social democrats, beginning with Noske and ending with the trade unionist Dissman, a staff of dignitaries, ready at any moment to betray the working class. The German bourgeoisie has taken decades to train them, to destroy and disorganize the labor movement and serve as splitters in it. It is this group more than any other that stands in the way. There are comrades who frequently ask how do you think will international unity of the trade union movement ever be established? Give us an answer. My answer is as follows: In my opinion unity will doubtlessly be established and I think that international labor unity will be established in a relatively short time. I think that not more than a year or two will pass before it is actually established (applause). I think, comrades, that the seventh congress of our trade unions will be held after unity will have been established (applause), in spite of all the obstacles put up by our enemies.

We have patience and strong nerves (applause). We must have perseverance, we must know, comrades, that in fighting for the unity of the world trade union movement we are at the foreposts of the world revolution, and that everything that is perfidious and dishonest in the international labor movement, everything that is iniquitous and hateful of the red flag, is grouped against us in order to prevent the unity, to break the ranks before they are thoroughly welded.

Let us be frank. We have a number of differences with the British trade union movement. They do not adhere to a Marxian platform, they have various prejudices, but we see there something different from the bourgeois-trained yellow social democracy, and we think that the experiment recently carried out in England will be very useful to many and many a worker. It cannot but be useful to the British workers. What did we have in England during the course of years and decades? We had there invariably two bourgeois parties taking each others' place in the government of the country. This was a two-party system, conservatives and liberals. After the war the historic scene was mounted by the labor party representing a mass force, the paying ample tribute to reformism, and still remaining under its charm. Now we have a three party system—conservatives, liberals and labor. What did the experiment of the MacDonald system lead to? Undoubtedly, to the imminent destruc-

tion of liberalism. Liberalism has already been ground up between the two millstones, and will shortly be absorbed by conservatism and labor. Henceforth two big parties will fight for power; on the one side the bourgeoisie, on the other the labor reformists; the third is only appearing on the horizon. It is the Communist Party, which will doubtless eventually unite the best elements of the British labor movement. (Applause).

We were told that the MacDonald experiment would lead to a softening of the class struggle. The reverse was the case. It led to a sharpening of the class struggle in England. They wanted to go thru one door, but strayed into another (applause). Therein lies their misfortune. They wanted to show the world how they put an end to the class struggle, how almost painlessly the bourgeois corn can be cut, so that the bourgeoisie would not feel it. But the result was a class struggle intensified to an unusual degree. Of course, a differentiation in the British labor movement is now inevitable and unavoidable, and MacDonald and his friends will not be able to escape this. Do they think that this show with the notorious Zinoviev letter will pass without any injury to them? (Laughter, applause). Comrades, personally we have no reasons to resent this incident (laughter). Just the contrary, we have grounds to be well satisfied with this incident, because MacDonald and Co. gave quite an unusual advertisement to the Communist International. Many thousands of workers in England do not know the meaning of a nucleus in the army, navy or even in the factory. Our press there is weak. Now thanks to this letter, even tho it is forged, they all learned the meaning of a nucleus (laughter, applause). So that, comrades, we are not moved by any resentment against their forgery. We have become perfectly used to forgeries, but what a rag MacDonald has made of himself in all this affair. Wherein lay the crux of this matter? MacDonald tried to sit on both sides of the fence. He knew that thousands of workers in England were sympathizing with the Soviet Union, and he therefore, conducted his election campaign in favor of a union with us; but then after all, he is a menshevik, and a leader of the Second International. He knew that it is inconvenient to sit on one chair, and he must sit between two chairs (laughter). He therefore, decided to secure the sympathies also of those who were against the Soviet Union; this way it would be safer (laughter). He therefore, made use of the forged letter. You know what pitiful blabbing he used to justify himself. He himself admitted that he knew about this letter ever since October 10th. His game fell thru entirely. I heard from a number of comrades well acquainted with life in England and with MacDonald's moods that this incident of the alleged letter cost the labor party perhaps a million votes. If we were to take this million from the conservatives and add it to the labor party, we would have a difference of two millions, that might have decided the election. That is what the typical pitiful shameful policy of MacDonald has led to, and I hope that it cannot fail to arouse the protest of the masses of British trade unionists.

They could not even end this affair with a dignified front. MacDonald appointed a commission. The commission said that it had no time to finish. MacDonald then resigned without waiting for the commission to complete its work and so they all finished by stating that no one saw the original of the letter but that they saw only a copy composed by some unknown person. One of the papers, I think it was "The Times," was sharp witted enough to subsequently write: "It makes no difference whether the letter is a forgery or not, it is no secret that Zinoviev is an enemy of the British nation" (laughter). No, dear gentleman, it is we who are the genuine friends of the British people, of the British toilers and working class. In our opinion the enemies of the British people are Baldwin and Co. Of course, there are some among them who do not know which camp

to choose, labor or the bourgeoisie. We are deeply convinced that in the British trade unions and labor party a strong protest is developing in this connection.

You know that we have proposed to the general council of the British trade unions to investigate whether this letter was written by us or not. I hope that the comrades who have come here from England have brought us some answer to this question, and will give us their opinion. They are not bound by any formalities and they should tell the British working class how it is being doped. They must tell the truth and nothing but the truth. This is a splendid lesson to the British on the essence of democracy and of the freedom of press. We are being reproved for having no freedom of press. For the "Times" and the bourgeoisie we have no freedom of press and will have none (applause).

The history of this letter is a classic example of the alleged freedom of press in the capitalist countries. A few days before the elections, a crude forgery is let loose upon the world in order to frighten all the Henry Dubbs, the entire swamp, and persuade it to vote in favor of reaction. They do not leave time for a denial and even if they do so, they do it at the last moment, when everything has been prepared and the ballots issued. The entire press utilizes their freedom to fool the people in a most shameless manner, and later when the cabinet has been formed and the power passes into the hands of the blackest of the black hundreds, they say after all, it is of little importance, perhaps it was a forged document (laughter). Is not this a most obvious example of how the freedom of press, the hundreds of newspapers with circulations of many millions, the printeries and everything else, serve the bourgeoisie?

We say to the British people: "Yes, we are barbarians, we have a cruel dictatorship, you will make it much softer" (applause, laughter). We wish you, from our very heart, that you exploit your bourgeoisie in such a way that no one would notice it, and that the bourgeoisie would think it pleasant (applause). But remember the lesson received by your country. Does it not show that the bourgeoisie must be deprived of the freedom of press, by which it dopes the masses, dopes the working class, dopes the toilers? And remember, this takes place in England, and not in some remote country. Is it not clear to everyone that such a freedom of press is only a weapon in the hands of the bourgeoisie against the working class? That is why this incident is of no mean significance, and I think that it will be a good lesson to the British workers. What has taken place should be useful to them.

The British labor party has already gained a million and a quarter new votes, the appetite for power among the British workers has been aroused

and the new black hundred government will strengthen it. The day will yet come in England when a labor government will again be in power, but it will be a different labor government from that we have seen now (laughter). True, it will not be a Soviet, Communist government, but only a transitional one, but it will not be a labor government that takes offices from the British king and feel glad about it, offices that we call "housekeepers' offices," the office of counting the shirts of the British king. Yes, the offices of manager of the king's kitchen, MacDonald appointed the prominent leaders of the British labor movement. It is time to put an end to this (applause).

The British workers deserved a much better fate than to count the kings' underwear. They deserve to have a true labor government, a true labor power, instead of an "ersatz" labor government. Of course, not after the Russian example, we do not in the least lay claims to this. Please have your English examples (applause).

Thus, comrades our congress is faced with the question of international labor unity in a situation that is extremely interesting and peculiar. For the last several months we have seen a practically complete change of scenery on the world arena. The pink-yellow color has been replaced by black; the class forces are reorganizing and most serious changes are taking place within the working class. Many of the Amsterdam leaders feel that they have no tomorrow, no future.

The international labor movement is making its way towards unity, and we are saying to the entire world: On our side the workers of the world will meet with sincere proletarian support, with a sincere desire of the workers to join their ranks. We do not for a moment abandon our views (no one will ask us to do that), we have celebrated the seventh anniversary of a truly labor instead of a royal revolution. We have been and are today true pupils of Lenin, members of the Communist International. We firmly adhere to our positions. The workers of the world will come to us. And remaining at our fighting posts, without any diplomacy, we extend a helping hand to the organized trade union movement of the world and say: "Let us unite on elementary principles, on the A. B. C. of the struggle against the bourgeoisie that is advancing with such unheard of insolence and unanimously." We must unite against this threat, and we are confident that all those who were against us will now agree with us. Yes, without fear of being mistaken, we say: "The time will come when, in spite of everything we shall form a united international of trade unions, and the British workers will not be among the last of those who together with us will map out the course of final emancipation and freedom for the workers of the world." (Stormy applause.) (Continued next Sat.)

THE WORKERS MONTHLY FOR JANUARY

THE WORKERS MONTHLY has started the New Year right by surpassing any of the other three numbers, excellent though they were. The DAILY WORKER plant deserves compliments for the superior workmanship displayed in its typographical makeup, and the contents are interesting and instructive.

The leading article is by Alexander Bittelman on "Lenin, Leader and Comrade." It is an easily read and easily understood article; plenty of meat and paucity of empty phraseology.

"Lenin is not dead" begins Bittelman. He then proceeds to prove that Lenin lives in the hearts of the class conscious workers of the world and that Lenin leads the world revolution today thru his teachings and the organization he fashioned. Hundreds of books have been written about Lenin since his death, thousands more will be written.

There is a keen analysis of the American Federation of Labor convention by William Z. Foster, an article by Anna Louise Strong, entitled

"At the 'Red October' Candy Factory." There is another installment of the "History of the Russian Communist Party," by Gregory Zinoviev. "Notes on Shop Nuclei," by Martin Abern, a joint article by William Z. Foster and William F. Dunne, on "The A. F. of L. and Trade Union Unity," and several other articles, besides an excellent short story woven around the struggle in the coal mines.

Fred Ellis, the noted revolutionary artist, has two good cartoons. There are amusing and effective caricatures on the bourgeoisie by Art Young and pictures of life in Soviet Russia.

This number of the Workers Monthly is the "best yet." The article on Lenin will give Communists an appetite for more material on the life of the world's greatest revolutionist and the articles by Foster and Dunne on the trade union movement should strengthen the knowledge of the union militants and assist them in fighting the revolutionaries.

The Workers Monthly sells for 25 cents a copy. Subscription price is \$2.00 a year.