

"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 10, 1925.

# Bolshevism or Trotskyism? By G. Zinoviev

Some Facts Regarding Brest and the First Party Conference After October.

The Differences of Opinion in October and My Mistake at That Time.

TO replace Leninism by Trotskyism, that is the task which Comrade Trotsky has set out to accomplish. In this respect he had already in 1922, in his book "1905," attempted "to attain something by allusions." So long as Comrade Lenin held the threads in his hand, Comrade Trotsky decided not to undertake a direct attack. Comrade Trotsky has now obviously decided that "the moment has arrived." According to all the rules of strategy, before one strikes the decisive blow, one must prepare the way by artillery fire. The attack upon the so-called right wing of Bolshevism is intended as a smokescreen, particularly regarding the October failures of the writer of these lines.

It is an actual fact that at the beginning of November, 1917, I committed a great error. This error was freely admitted by me and made good in the course of a few days. As, however, these days were not ordinary days but very fateful days, as this was a time of extreme tension the error was highly dangerous.

In any event I will not minimize the extent of this error.

It was precisely because of the extraordinary tension of these times that Vladimir Ilyitch so energetically opposed our error. All these extremely draconic punitive measures, which he at that time proposed against us, all the passionate chastising which he inflicted, were of course thoroughly justified. In the shortest time after these events, some weeks afterward, at the commencement of the disputes over the Brest peace, Vladimir Ilyitch, as the whole C. C. and all the leading circles of the party are aware, regarded these differences of opinion as completely liquidated.

In his speech on "Trotskyism or Leninism," Comrade Stalin very rightly remarks that in the September-October period as a result of a number of circumstances, the revolution endeavored to carry out every step under the form of defence. This was to be understood after all the shilly shallying connected with the Kornilov period. I, who at that time, was living illegally, fell a victim to my failure precisely owing to this peculiarity of that phase of October.

When Comrade Lenin reverted to our error, three years after it had been committed, he wrote as follows:

"Immediately before the October revolution, and soon afterwards, a number of excellent Communists in Russia committed errors, of which one does not like to be reminded. Why not? Because it is not right except on a special occasion, to refer to such errors, which have been completely made good. They showed hesitations in the period in question in that they feared that the Bolsheviks would isolate themselves and undertake too great a risk in holding aloof too much from a certain section of the mensheviks and of the social revolutionaries. The conflict went so far that the comrades in question, as a demonstration, resigned from all responsible posts, both in the party and in the Soviets, to the greatest joy of the enemies of the social revolution. The matter led to the most bitter polemics in the press on the part of the C. C. of our party against those who had resigned. And after some weeks, at the most after some months, all these comrades perceived their

errors and returned to their responsible posts in the party and the Soviets." (Lenin, Collected Works, Volume XVII, Page 373.)

Comrade Lenin makes no reference whatever to a "right" wing.

For myself, I endeavored more than once, before the party and before the whole Comintern, to deal with my error. I spoke of it, for example at the opening of the Fourth World Congress of the Comintern, which took place on the fourth anniversary of October, as follows:

"Allow me to say a word regarding a personal matter. It seems to me that I, particularly now on the fourth anniversary of the revolution, am called upon to say that which I am about to say. You are aware comrades that five years ago I, along with some other comrades, made a great mistake, which, as I believe, was the greatest mistake I have ever made in my life. At that time I failed to estimate correctly the whole counter-revolutionary nature of the mensheviks. Therein lies the nature of our mistake before October, 1917. Although we had fought against the mensheviks for over ten years, nevertheless, I, as well as many other comrades, could not at the decisive moment get rid of the idea that the mensheviks and social revolutionaries, although they were only the right fraction and the right wing, nevertheless formed a portion of the working class. As a matter of fact they were and are the 'left,' extremely skillful, pliable and therefore especially dangerous wing of the international bourgeoisie. I therefore believe, comrades, that it is our duty to remind all our comrades . . . etc."

I spoke of our error in the most widely circulated book from my pen, in the "History of the Russian Communist Party," and on numerous earlier occasions.

To consider the writer of these lines as belonging to the "right wing" of the Bolsheviks, is simply absurd. The whole of the Bolshevik party is aware that I, working hand in hand with Comrade Lenin in the course of nearly 20 years, never once had even a sharp difference of opinion with him, except in the one case mentioned. The epoch of the years 1914-1917, from the commencement of the imperialist war up to the commencement of the proletarian revolution in our country, was a not unimportant epoch. Precisely in these years there took place the decisive regrouping in the camp of the international labor movement. The books "Socialism and War" (1915) and "Against the Stream" are sufficient witness that during that time I in no way came forward as representative of a right wing of bolshevism.

At the April conference of 1917, the importance of which Comrade Trotsky misrepresents, I had not the smallest difference of opinion with Comrade Lenin. In the dispute between Comrade Trotsky on the one side and comrades Kamenev, Nogin and Rykov on the other side, I was wholly on the side of Comrade Lenin, as was to be seen from a number of my reports and speeches at the April conference. The whole dispute was naturally confined within the limits of bolshevism—as Comrade Lenin and the party regarded it—and only under the pen of Comrade Trotsky does it assume the form of a struggle of a "right wing" against the party.

Not the least differences of opinion occurred between myself and Comrade Lenin during and after the July days. We had the opportunity to test this at our leisure in the course of several weeks as long as I lived together with Vladimir Ilyitch in hiding. The first

difference of opinion was noticed by me at the beginning of October, after the liquidation of the Kornilov period, after the article of Comrade Lenin "On Compromises." (In this article Lenin proposes, under certain conditions, an agreement with the mensheviks and the social revolutionaries.) My error consisted in the fact that I endeavored to continue the line of the article "On Compromises" some days later. In all only a few days, but the days at that time counted as months.

In the famous sitting of the Central Committee of the 10th of October, at which the revolt was decided on, and at which for the first time differences of opinion regarding the time to be fixed for the revolt and as to judging the prospects in the Constitutional Assembly arose between me and Kamenev on the one side and the rest of the members of the C. C. on the other side, the first political bureau of the C. C. for the leadership of the revolt was created. The seven following comrades were elected to this political bureau: Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Stalin, Sokolnikov and Bubnov. In the no less important joint meeting of the Central Committee and a number of Petrograd functionaries on the 16th of October, after the debates between Comrade Lenin and ourselves, 19 votes were cast for the motion of Comrade Lenin in its final form; 2 were against and 4 neutral; while my motion was introduced by Comrade Volodarsky as an amendment to the motion of Comrade Lenin. My amendment read that "in the next five days before meeting our comrades and before discussion we must not arrange any revolt." My written motion, which was submitted to the vote at this meeting, read: "Without postponing the measures for investigation and preparation, it is decided that no action be permitted before consultation with the bolshevik section of the Soviet congress."

It was at this time that Comrade Lenin wrote his famous articles against us. I continued to work diligently for the Pravda. When the action was finally decided on, in order to silence the exaggerated rumours which had appeared in the press regarding our differences I wrote a short letter to the editor which was published by the central organ with a comment of the editor that the dispute was ended and that in essentials we were and remained of one mind. ("Pravda," 21st November, 1917.)

The unsigned leading article which appeared in our central organ "Rabotshi Put" (The Path of the Workers), which appeared in place of Pravda, on the day of the revolt October 25, was written by me. The second article was likewise written by me and was signed by me. In this last article we read:

"It is a great task which confronts the second Soviet congress. The events of history are followed each other with breathless speed. The final hour is approaching. The least further hesitation brings the danger of immediate collapse. . . ."

"The last hopes for a peaceful solution of the crisis are past. The last peaceful hopes which—I must confess—up to the last days were cherished by the writer of these lines have been dispelled by facts."

"All Power to the Soviets.—It is here that everything is being concentrated at the present historical moment."

In the number of our central organ "Rabotshi Put" which appeared on October 26, a short report was published of my first speech after the period of illegality in the sitting of the Petrograd Soviet of October 25, the day of the revolt. Here we read as

follows:

The Speech of Zinoviev.

"Comrades, we are now in the period of revolt. I believe however that no doubt can exist regarding the outcome of the revolt—we shall be victorious!"

"I am convinced that the overwhelming portion of the peasantry will come over to our side as soon as they become acquainted with our proposals regarding the land question."

"Long live the social revolution which is now beginning. Long live the Petrograd working class who still achieve the final victory!"

"Today we have paid our debt to the international proletariat and delivered a terrible blow to the war, a blow at the breast of all imperialists, the greatest blow at the breast of the hangman Wilhelm."

"Down with the war: Long live international peace!"

Sharp differences arose in our circle again in the first days of November (according to old calendar) at the moment when the right social revolutionists and mensheviks were already shattered and when it was the question whether we would not succeed in bringing over the left social revolutionists and the best section of the mensheviks to the side of the Soviet power. In these days I had to take part with other comrades in the famous negotiations with the then existing organization of the railwaymen. These negotiations led to a complete agreement of the central committee of our party with the then central executive committee of the workers' and peasants' councils. These differences lasted actually from two to three days, but during this time they were exceedingly heated.

On the 2nd of November, 1917, the central committee of our party, in the presence of Comrade Lenin, adopted a resolution which, among other things, stated:

"The central committee confirms that, without having excluded anybody from the Second Soviet Congress it is even now fully prepared to note the return of the Soviet members who have resigned (as is known the right social revolutionists and the mensheviks withdrew from the Second Soviet Congress) and to recognize the coalition with those who have withdrawn from the Soviets, that therefore the assertions that the Bolsheviks will not share power with anybody are absolutely devoid of all foundation."

"The central committee confirms that on the day of the formation of the present government, a few hours before its formation, it invited to its session three representatives of the left social revolutionists and formally invited them to participate in the government. The refusal of the left social revolutionists, even tho it was only limited to a certain time and subject to certain conditions, places on them the full responsibility for the agreement not being arrived at."—(Pravda, No. 130 v. 4-17 Nov., 1917.)

This paragraph of the resolution, which was doubtless written by Comrade Lenin, must be specially noted by the reader in order the better to understand that which follows:

In the Pravda (the central organ of our party was on the 30th of October again named the Pravda), we read in No. 139 of Nov. 4 the following extract from my speech which I delivered at the session of the central executive committee of the social revolutionists and of the social democrats on Nov. 2, 1917:

"In the name of the central committee of the Russian social-democratic labor party (at that time our  
(Continued on page 6)

# Sixth All-Russian Trade Union Congress

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

(Concluded from last Saturday)

## Relations Between Workers and Peasants.

Here too we are not faced with the necessity of adopting new theses. That which is fundamental remains the same as it was drawn up by the hand of Lenin, but there is something new in the political and economic situation that you, the leaders of the organized working class of our country must consider first of all. Comrade Lenin taught our party and the comrades working in the trade union movement that he is not a Bolshevik who thinks of the workers only, but he is a Bolshevik who thinks of the entire country and feels himself to be the giant of the revolution, the leader, its basic force. Here at the congress we have to take a decision not on the tasks of the labor policy in general, but of the tasks of the labor policy in a peasant country, and you will have to map out your fundamental policy not as merely as trade union policy but as the policy of the working class in a peasant country. Only then will the question be solved in a truly Bolshevik instead of lifeless manner.

Our congress should map out the basic principles of this policy, remembering that we are effecting a dictatorship in a country predominantly peasant. It would have been the worst kind of craft unionism, were our trade union workers to consider these questions from a purely "workers'" point of view. You would get a workers' point of view in quotes, and since the working class governs the country, since it is holding the dictatorship in a peasant country, it must effect a wise dictatorship, it must effect such a dictatorship that would be accepted by the overwhelming majority of the peasants, it must act as the master of the entire country, and not think as a craft unionist defending his own craft. Therein lies the fundamental difference between Leninism, Bolshevism and craft unionism. We are members of trade unions, i. e., of the organizations of our trade, but we are not trade unionists in the sense that we stand for our craft only, we are not mensheviks in politics, we are members of trade unions, but we are Bolsheviks, we feel ourselves a class holding supreme power, we must feel ourselves a class pursuing its policy in a peasant country, and here our congress finds itself in a situation that is new to some extent.

## "Jealousy" of the Workers.

We observe a certain kind of jealousy of the workers on the part of the peasants, something that we did not observe before or that was observable in quite a different form. In some places we even have mutual jealousy on the part of some backward groups of workers towards the peasants. However, this feeling is particularly dangerous among the peasants, and it crops up sometimes, being based upon the class division in the village; it is displayed by the rich peasants who are interested in stirring up hatred for the workers among the peasants.

We have in our country two classes, or perhaps two classes plus an appendix, a fraction. This appendix consists of the remnants of the old bourgeoisie, of the embryonic new city bourgeoisie, of a part of the bourgeois intelligencia, who hate us organically. Of course, this semi-class is discontented, it is jealous of the workers and of the Soviet power, but they are of no danger. We do not have to worry about them. They will wait as long as necessary.

The difficulties do not lie here, but in the inter-relationships of the two main classes, the working class and the peasantry. Here the least friction of one degree might give us a big deflection, and here you must keep your eyes wide open. We must remember this sentiment of the peasantry.

## Trade Unionism and the Bolshevik

### Attitude Towards the Village.

We must stop short every trade

unionist who looks down upon the village, who thinks he is not concerned with the village. It is a narrow trade unionist who does not understand that we are located on the border between two classes and that we have decided upon a world historic task, both in our own country and on a world scale. Therefore, comrades, we have no right to evade this question. There is, of course, something in the sentiment of a part of the peasantry which we cannot concede under any circumstances. No doubt there are peasants who think that the eight-hour day is a luxury; "I work 16 hours during harvest time—they think—why should the worker work only eight hours?" Can we make any concession on this question? Under no circumstances can we do so. There are questions in which we can not give in to the prejudices of the peasants, for they are only prejudices, and the peasantry must grow up and understand that the eight-hour day is the basis of the workers' economy and promotes the welfare of the country, including also the peasants' welfare. There are a number of questions on which the workers can not and should not, under any circumstances, give way to the prejudices of the backward peasantry and there can be no question of giving in on this matter.

However, there is a group of questions arousing the just discontent of the peasants, over which we must do some thinking. The first question is that of prices. Now, frequently, separate groups of peasants say: "We give bread to the workers at pre-war prices; tell us, when will you give us city products at pre-war prices?" To-day only separate groups of peasants are saying these things, tomorrow the entire peasantry may be saying them. This is a question which cannot and should not be evaded by the Sixth Trade Union Congress, it is a question that stood in the center of the attention at the plenary meeting of the central committee of our party the other day, and which should engage the attention of such an important congress as is yours. You cannot back out of it. This one is not a prejudice of the peasants.

Of course we must explain to the peasant why the question of prices is not so easily solved, why the war and the blockade ruined the city economy more than the village (all this can and should be said by us) but it must be remembered that this question is knocking at the door, and we cannot disregard it. It will return to us in its varied form. The peasant will put this question before us, and I think that it will be useless for us to hide our heads, we must clearly see that which is new in our political and economic fields, and remember that not much time is allowed us in this question. Already at the Eleventh Congress of our party Vladimir Ilitch told us about it. It is necessary to use all the forces of the workers and of the party, of the trade unions and of the managing boards to push this question ahead to find a satisfactory answer to it, to show the peasants that we really want to meet their demands. Of course, the solution of this question will require a certain amount of time.

The question of land improvement in the village also requires much time. However, there are questions that can be solved much quicker, and this depends entirely upon us.

## What Sort of a Soviet Apparatus Does the Village Need?

We must set up in the village a real Soviet power, an honest cultural sober Soviet power without graft, without moonshine, a power such as we now have in the principal centers of the labor movement. We did not have an easy time even in establishing it in these principal centers. You remember how, two or three years ago, we had to stop our meetings by apologizing to the workers for the fact that all sorts of outcasts and adventurers wormed themselves into our

party and the Soviet institutions. In the city the apparatus has been put more or less into order, and that only more or less. In the village we have not even accomplished this.

Recall, for instance, the Demovko trial. Malinovsky was killed near Nicolaev, only 50 versts from the big labor center. The incident may appear to be only of a local nature, but it reflected a very sad fact. We cannot pass by it with an easy heart. Remember, comrades, we are still lacking a safe transmission belt, an inexpensive, sober, honest Soviet machinery in the villages.

Can the Trade Union Congress help this? Very much so, just as during the first trade union congresses, along with the current work, along with the trade union work there stood such serious questions as the organization of the civil war, just so must we here, together with the questions of current trade union interests, remember the fundamental question which is of general political importance; how to help the village to set up an honest, sober, cultural inexpensive Soviet apparatus for which one would not have to blush.

## The Trade Unions in the Village Must Strengthen Their Work.

We spoke about this at the Thirteenth Congress of our party. We were all surprised to hear that we have more than a million trade unionists in the village, and I even think that this will be just as new to you as it was to us at the Thirteenth Congress. The educational workers have 211,000 workers in the village, the land and forest workers 196,000, the sugar workers, 177,000; the miners, 100,000, etc., etc., altogether, in excess of a million trade union members in the village. Comrades, let us confess, do these village trade unionists work as they should? Have you thought seriously about this, as party and trade union members. No, we have not. But this was in the past. Now with the new development in the village, this million trade union members should move from the realm of shadows, papers and diagrams into the realm of realities.

Most serious attention to this question! The Thirteenth Congress adopted a well thought out decision on this matter. We must consider it as a problem, such as it is—it is the key to every position.

The Baldwins in themselves do not worry us very much. When we speak of the phase of world reaction, we know that the U. S. S. R. is not directly threatened by this world reaction; that it threatens the workers in those countries where it is beginning to reign. The world reaction cannot afford us very powerfully. And this question of which I spoke, the question of jealousy of the discontent of the peasants with the workers, is a serious matter which the trade union congress should consider precisely because we are not sectionalists. Here is a trade union congress of Bolsheviks, of Comrade Lenin's pupils, there are no narrow sectionalists here, but men who know how to fight effectively for the needs of the working class, who know how to be revolutionary Bolsheviks, who are worthy members of the class/enforcing the hegemony of the working class, thus far only one-sixth part of the globe, but let us hope that the borders will shortly extend.

## Productivity of Labor the Pivot of Our Policy.

The question of the relationship between labor and the peasantry leads us to the question of labor productivity. This is a most important problem, with a political aspect. We consider a raise of the productivity of labor as a most important question of international, economic and internal significance. The workers can say without exaggeration that the productivity of labor in any particular branch of industry, Baku or the Don Basin is of international importance to us, and has a tremendous agitational significance to the workers of all other countries. It is not only a direct factor in increasing our wealth, but it is one of the bridges connecting us with the peasantry, and one

of the answers which we must give to their expressions of discontent. It is the only chance of giving the peasant goods at a reasonable price, and it is the only chance of raising the workers' wages.

It is time to put an end to the situation when we had "the union between the workers and the peasants" only on placards. This union should be effected in practice, concretely. This union cannot be only a cultural union, as we thought for some time, but it must be a cultural and economic union, because the question of economy, of prices, is the fundamental one.

## The Life and Sufferings of a Bolt.

The campaign for higher productivity of labor is at its height, already some positive aspects of this campaign are noticeable, but there are also some negative aspects. Among the negative aspects is the rigmarole and noise about labor productivity. The workers quite properly nicknamed this prattology. There was a lot of noise and buzzing without business-like advice and things were represented in such a way as if the whole business depends upon the workers alone. This is untrue, the productivity of labor depends only partially upon the workers. One little document, a workers' note handed down at the non-party conference shows also another aspect. A certain non-party worker reported on productivity of labor as follows: I will write you—he said—a history of the life and sufferings of one bolt.

"A bolt dropped out of a machine, a bolt 1½ or 2 inches long, its price is only 1½ kopecks. In order to receive the production foreman must write: At Roller No. so and so, please have a new bolt fixed, then you must go to the engineer to have this signed, then to the mechanical engineer who will send you to the repair shop. The order has been received, and you must now write out a request. The request is written in three copies and must be signed by the production foreman, who is not always on the spot, as the plant is two versts in circumference, must be found, for he is a busy man and has other sections under him, and in order to find him you must walk about the plant. Finally you find him, and he signs the paper. You must then go to the engineer and then to the storehouse, at the storehouse you find that there are no such bolts, but that there are 3-inch bolts. You take the bolt, cut it short and fix it in its place. Sometime it happens this way: You come to the storehouse; you don't find what you want, and you go to the 'main warehouse,' the rubbish heap near Ekaterin's Park. You'll dig in there until you find something. This is happening at Leningrad in the Triangle factory, which cannot be classed as among the worst." Is it the workers' fault if he cannot raise his productivity under such conditions? Of course not. This is only one example and their number could be greatly multiplied.

## The Administration and the Unions Should Be Equally Interested and Responsible for Productivity of Labor.

Productivity of labor cannot be created merely by personal intensity. Here 50 per cent depends upon the state, the management upon all of us. But the other 50 per cent depends upon the workers. This should be plainly told the workers that the other 50 per cent depends upon them. Some time ago you and we demanded together the eight-hour day from the bourgeoisie, the czar and company. Now we have a workers' government, and all of us ask you for an eight-hour day, a real honest, sober eight-hour day, which we do not yet have. In many places much less time is worked.

Thus, comrades, it is wrong to put the question of who is to raise productivity, the administration or the trade unions, "we" or "you." Under such a situation we shall perish, for we shall never raise the productivity but merely intensify the conflict with the peasantry. We must all raise pro-

(Continued on page 7)

# Communist Youth of World Pay Tribute to Karl Liebknecht

By JOHN WILLIAMSON.

SIX years ago the working class of the world was watching with intense interest the revolutionary struggles of the German working class to establish the Soviet republic. Revolutionary fervor ran high. The working masses were awakening to a realization of their power and were beginning to assert it. The workers of Germany, tho poorly organized, were struggling against the well-armed and disciplined forces of the government.

In this revolt who were the leaders? Who was it that issued the stirring manifestos and proclamations?

The Spartacus League of Germany, headed by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

This attempt of the workers to overthrow the capitalist republic was drowned in blood. The leaders, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were foully murdered by the armed forces of the government under the direct supervision of the social-democrats who were in power.

The blood of these great working class leaders together with that of thousands of other militant workers stains the hands of the German socialists. These leaders had dedicated their lives to the struggles of the workers against the capitalist state and had suffered many times in the prisons of Germany. It was left to the yellow social democrats to commit the crime of murdering our leaders while engaged in the valiant struggle to establish a workers' government.

\*\*\*

Karl Liebknecht was well-known for his continual struggle against the German plutocracy. Born at a time when his illustrious father, Wilhelm Liebknecht, was serving time in jail for socialist agitation, Karl early became interested in the revolutionary movement. Early in his activities he realized the importance of organizing the socialist youth since he had become convinced of the sterility of the old line socialists and their non-revolutionary attitude. He was instrumental in calling the first International Socialist Youth Congress in Stuttgart in 1907, which assumed a revolutionary position in opposition to the reformist struggles of the party. During the world war Liebknecht's name was on the lips of every honest revolutionist. In the midst of the betrayal of the workers' movement by practically every leading world figure in the socialist movement it was Liebknecht's voice which rang thruout the world in defiance of the world war. As a result of his stirring appeal to the workers of Germany on May Day, 1916, Liebknecht was imprisoned until 1918 when he again assumed the leadership and rallied the masses against the continued betrayal of the social-democrats. It was in this struggle that he met his untimely death—murdered—shot in the back—he died in the struggle.

\*\*\*

With the same thought of Liebknecht come his constant ally and co-worker, Rosa Luxemburg. Known for years for her constant struggle against the opportunism of the leaders of the Second International, she also was banished in 1915 for her agitation against the capitalist slaughter. Early in life she was noted for her leading part in organizing the Polish revolutionary party, and giving it a definite and clear-cut Marxian program. She wrote article after article, book after book, exposing the reformist nature of the entire leadership of the Second International. She became a thorn in the sides of both the German bourgeoisie and their socialist lackeys. On the same night that Liebknecht was murdered, Luxemburg was stabbed in the back by a group of army officers under whose care she was being transported. While suffering from the first blows, the rest of the cowardly beasts struck and shot her till she was a mass of bloody flesh. Thus ended the career of Red Rosa—murdered under the socialist reign of terror against working class leaders.

While the German working class suffered temporary defeat in 1919, the

Communist Party of Germany has forged ahead and today rallies around its red standard the masses of Germany. The socialist lackeys still continue to crush the Communists and today thousands of our German comrades lie in jail under the guard of socialist watchdogs. However, the German working class has been slowly disillusioned and realizes today that only the Communist Party is the party of the masses—the party of struggle—the party of Communism.

January 15 has been dedicated by the Young Communist International as a day upon which the Communist youth of all lands mobilize the working class youth for struggle against their exploiters and to advance the struggle for working class power. The Communist youth of all lands carry on the struggle where Liebknecht left

off. We must not only mourn our departed leaders. We must utilize International Liebknecht Day as an occasion to mobilize the masses of working class youth.

Thruout America the Young Workers' League has issued the call to action. In America where the youth are subjected to the most subtle propaganda, thru the most scientific means of dissemination, in favor of capitalism, the Young Workers League calls upon the working class youth to rally around its standard on the following issues:

- Abolition of child labor.
- Maintenance by the state of all school children of workers under sixteen years of age.
- Six-hour day, five-day week for all youth labor with full pay.
- Against capitalist wars and militarism.

Against the enslavement of German workers thru the Dawes' plan.

For a workers' republic.  
Young workers of America, rally to the standard of the Young Workers' League of America. Joint with us in our struggles against the capitalist class and their hirelings. Let us be determined that Liebknecht and Luxemburg did not die in vain. We must conduct the struggle with ten times more vigor, with a determination that in our final struggle we will be victorious. The spirit of Liebknecht lives on. It is imbedded in every young revolutionist the world over.

Long live Communist Party of Germany.

Long live the Young Communist International.

Long live the world leader of the revolutionary working class, the Communist International!

## OUR COMMUNIST MARTYRS



KARL LIEBKNECHT

Murdered by German White Guards, January 15, 1919.



ROSA LUXEMBURG

## Letters From Moscow - By Anna Porter

MOSCOW, Nov. 8.—(By Mail.)—My farewell to Moscow was a spectacular one and thrilling—something like a million comrades turned out and demonstrated for me—or so it seemed, for I lingered over Nov. 7, the day of days in Red Russia—the anniversary of the October revolution.

For days beforehand, truck loads of green garlands rattled down the cobbled streets, and the fire ladders carried them to the top of every official building, looping them over the whole facade—the Comintern, the Moscow Soviet, the Dom Soyuz or Central Labor Council House, and the Soviet doms. Every building in town carried its share of decoration, even to the Nep hotels. And among the ropes of evergreen, hung banners of red and gold, fluttered scarlet flags, flaunted mottoed bunting—almost screamed the color and glitter of the revolutionary day. Over all, rested the queerest flaking of the first snow, caught in the green, leaving untouched the red.

Without a permit or membership in an organization, no one might enter the Red Square today, so I bethought me of an organization which was careless in its censorship, to which I might be said to belong by virtue of my presence in Moscow. At 9:30 a. m. I took my place in the ranks of the English-speaking section of the Immigrants' Club. Above us advanced a cartoon of the Dawes plan, with unflattering portraits—before us a red banner announced us as "Anglo-

Saxon Communists." Near me marched Gertrude Haessler and little Ruth Kennell, just from Kuzbas, and Anna Louise Strong—"immigrants" all. About half of us were Jews and as each contingent arrived, they were greeted with the friendly jeer, "Hurrah for the Anglo-Saxons!" and they evidently enjoyed the joke as well as anyone. The one who walked by me said, "Only workers can enter the Red Square today." "And Communists," I added. "All Communists," was the quick and proud reply, "are workers!" No one had censored me and I might have been a "counter" and carried bombs in my pocket. These revolutionists are growing careless! Nevertheless, again and again, the eagle-eyed marshal of our division prevented some by-stander from the crowded sidewalks from falling craftily into line.

Most of the Americans are voluntary exiles, but many others—practically all the French—are political refugees. The French section marched just behind us, arrogantly proclaiming on their bunting, "The bourgeoisie recognize us, but we do not recognize the bourgeoisie." Back of them the Italians were marching to the measure of their "Alar—ma! Alar—ma! Alarma, Communisti!" on the bugle tones. And under the slogan, "Hands Off China!" marched the students of the Far Eastern University. Looking forward and backward we could see no end to the lines moving steadily on in rhythmic advance under the red banners of the revolution. Even the "Oktyabrati!"

were out—truck loads of the wee ones born since Red October, and lines and lines of the little "Leninists," striding valiantly, and ranks and ranks of the Communist youth tramping sturdily, and workers—men and women—and the soldiers of the Red Army, all under the red banners of the revolution.

Into the Red Square we marched—over the frost of white that nattered its cobbles, and past the tribune of the mausoleum where Trotsky stood above his sleeping comrade to see our ranks go by. Very grim he looked and motionless, with hand at cap, while the crowd, not a whit awed, spelled out his name and shouted as each division passed. Very determined, too, and soldierly, and I think he saw us, in his mind, marching on and on, west and still west, until our ranks had doubled, tripled, swelled a hundred fold, and our feet were stayed by the Atlantic breakers. That, at least, is what

*Your Policy must Be  
—Buy a Policy—*

"I do for Workers" (Textbook in German or Russian).....50c  
"An Elementary Grammar" (In English).....15c  
The Workers' Ido Federation  
Room 5, 805 James St., N. S.,  
PITTSBURGH, PA.

# Fake Child Labor Programs

By KARL REEVE

THE WORKERS PARTY demands that the emaciated anti-child labor amendment to the federal constitution now before state legislatures for ratification by supplement by full governmental maintenance of all school children of workers and poor farmers. The trade union bureaucrats and liberal anti-child labor organizations who are pretending to be against child labor, are on the other hand interpreting the amendment so as to make it altogether useless.

John H. Walker president of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, in his annual report to the state convention in Peoria on Sept. 8, practically assures the employers that they need not fear that this amendment, even if ratified by 36 states, will abolish child labor. "The enemies of this legislation are trying to prevent the different states from ratifying this measure by making it appear that, if ratified, it becomes an operating part of the constitution and, that congress will likely pass a law prohibiting any young person from working at anything until they are eighteen years of age," says Walker. "THIS SORT OF ARGUMENT IS PURELY DEMAGOGY. IT IS THE RANKEST KIND OF MISREPRESENTATION. The eighteen year provision included in the amendment enables congress and the legislatures of the different states

to enact legislation THAT WOULD REQUIRE THAT A PERSON UNDER EIGHTEEN YEARS OF AGE WHO MAY BE WORKING BUT WHO IS BELOW THE STANDARD IN EDUCATION THAT WOULD FIT HIM PROPERLY TO BECOME AN AMERICAN CITIZEN, DEVOTED A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF TIME IN SCHOOL OR IN SOME OTHER WAY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING A SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND TO MAKE THEM FIT FOR AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP."

Walker, in other words, is for the child labor amendment because it does not abolish child labor, and considers any interpretation of the amendment to imply that it does abolish child labor as "rank misrepresentation." The amendment is useless enough as it stands. It provides that "congress shall have the power to limit, regulate and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age," but does not definitely curb child labor in any way.

The National Child Labor Committee, an organization of liberal, petty bourgeois and capitalistic organizations, has pushed the so-called child labor amendment more than any other body. But this conglomerate organization, including side by side with the women's welfare clubs, such capitalistic bodies as the American

Legion, is equally as careful in pointing out that the amendment might as well be ratified as it doesn't mean anything anyway. This body interprets the amendment to mean that child labor on the farms is by no means affected.

Owen R. Lovejoy, the petty bourgeois spokesman for the child labor committee, asks,—"Will congress attempt to regulate employment of children on farms? The National Child Labor Committee believes not. The National Child Labor Committee includes in its organization citizens of every state who are known to be leaders in child labor reform and YET ARE DEFINITELY AVERSE TO ANY SUCH EXERCISE OF FEDERAL POWER. THE ATTEMPT TO LEGISLATE AGAINST EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN ON FARMS WOULD LIKEWISE BE OPOSED, WE BELIEVE BY THE NATIONAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, THE NATIONAL GRANGE AND SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS."

Lovejoy's statement, made officially for the child labor committee, is all the more amazing when it is recalled that the overwhelming majority of child laborers are employed on the farms. The U. S. census figures for 1920 show that of 1,060,858 children between the ages of ten and fifteen inclusive, who work for a living in

the United States, 647,309, are employed in agricultural pursuits. In other words, the child labor committee, at the start interprets the already futile child labor amendment to mean that 61 per cent of all children working in the country must continue at work.

The Workers (Communist) Party, on the other hand, takes the lead and calls for a united front of all workers and poor farmers in America against child labor everywhere. The Workers Party demands the, passage of laws, not only abolishing child labor, but providing for full governmental maintenance of all school children of workers and poor farmers. The Communists call on the workers to enforce, thru their organized power, the relief of the suffering child workers of America.

Coolidge has refused to work for the passage of even the futile child labor amendment. The A. F. of L. bureaucrats are laying down in the fight against child labor. The liberal and petty bourgeois child labor committees are accepting the interpretation of child labor laws laid down by the manufacturers associations and the capitalistic supreme courts.

The Workers (Communist) Party is the only organization which bands the working class together for a relentless fight to overthrow child labor and capitalist control of industry.

## MUSIC - LITERATURE - DRAMA

By ALFRED V. FRANKENSTEIN

"LA BOHEME," the operatic paradise of all sentimentalists, was given its last performance by the Chicago Civic Opera company at the Auditorium last tuesday night.

The music of "Boheme" is, on the whole, too good to account for the opera's popularity. The explanation of the appeal of this Puccini opus is in the plot.

The story is familiar to all who go to opera. The four Bohemians, Rudolph the poet, Marcel the painter, Schaunard the musician and Colline the philosopher, live together in an attic in Paris. Their neighbor, Mimi, comes to borrow a light for a candle from Rudolph. Love at first sight.

In the second act the four friends and Mimi dine at an open air cafe. Musetta, an old flame of Marcel, appears with an ancient lover. Marcel and Musetta patch things up and the six principals make a hurried exit leaving the basso bouffe to pay the bills.

While the curtain is down between the second and third acts Mimi and Rudolph have a fight. They meet at the gates of Paris in the beginning of the third act and are reconciled. Marcel and Musetta quarrel again in the same act.

In the last act, Mimi dies of TB. Colline pawns his coat to save her, but she dies anyway, leaving the five other principals scattered about the stage in various attitudes of sorrow and despair.

The appeal in this plot is that deep down in the makeup of anyone artist enough to enjoy opera lies the desire, either suppressed or unfulfilled in the majority of cases, to live the bohemian life. The bohemian life is the completely individualistic one. Your bohemian is free of all the compulsory contacts and observances of ordinary men. You never have heard of a family of bohemians living together, have you? Whether or not a real bohemian exists on this planet is quite another argument.

Puccini's score for "Boheme" is much better than those of "Madame Butterfly" or "The Girl of the Golden West," but not so brilliant as that of "Tosca." "Boheme" contains fewer set arias and duets than most of Puccini's other works. "Butterfly" and "Tosca" are two character operas. "Boheme" is divided between six principals.

The cast was splendid in each part. Edith Mason is not so sylph like as a good Mimi should be to look the part, but she can sing it in 100 percent fashion. Gladys Swarthout was a good

singing, convincing and attractive Musetta.

Of the four bohemians two were played by some of the best singing actors in the company, Deside Defrere as Schaunard and Virgilio Lazzari as that prodigious Italian bass, as Colline. Mr. Hackett's Rudolph was a little cold, perhaps because Hackett has not been in good health lately. Mr. Rimini sang Marcel.

That man Puccini had an astounding fund of sentimental tunes. "Boheme" keeps constantly this side of the vulgar. It takes an artist to write a tune that might be vulgar and isn't. Musetta's waltz song at the end of the second act and Colline's farewell to his coat in the last act are two of Puccini's greatest melodies.

The eleventh week of the Chicago Civic Opera company's season brings an interesting repertoire, with a number of extra matinees and special performances.

On Sunday afternoon at 2 o'clock, the second performance of Louise will be sung with Garden, Claessens, Anseu, Baklanoff, with Polacco conducting.

Monday night, Samson and Delilah will be given a second performance with Homer, making her last appearance this season. The artists assist-

ing her will be Marshall, Formichi, Oukraiskey, Miles, Elisius, Milar, Nemeroff, Shermont and Corps de Ballet. Conductor, Polacco.

Tuesday night, Tales of Hoffmann will be given for the second time with Macbeth, Forrai, Anseu, Schwarz. Conductor Lauwers.

The Wednesday matinee will be a special performance of Otello with Raisa, Perini, Marshall and Schwarz. Mornazoni will conduct.

Wednesday night, Martha will be sung for the first time with Mason, Perini, Schipa and Lazzari. Mornazoni again conducting.

Thursday night, the Jongleur de Notre Dame will be given its second presentation with Garden, Cotreuil, Kipniss. Polacco conducting.

Friday night the first performance of Boris Godunoff will be given with Van Gordon, Cortis and Chaliapin. Polacco again conducting.

The Saturday matinee will be L'Amore Dei Tre Re, The Love of Three Kings, with Garden, Anseu, Baklanoff and Lazzari, with Polacco in the pit.

Saturday night, Hansel and Gretel, at popular prices, with Orens, Derzbach, Lenska, Swarthout, Westen and Beck, followed by the Ballet Divertissement, with Frank St. Leger conducting.

## THE LITTLE DEVIL IS GOING TO GET — ?

THE Shop Nucleus of the DAILY WORKER has granted a special privilege to the little red printers' devil in the shop. On Monday night at the FIRST DAILY WORKER birthday party at Imperial Hall they will allow him (at the danger of arrest of course) to "associate with" Communist printers. But his social debut must be made with proper decorum (not full dress) or the printers insist he will be a poor little devil at the next nucleus meeting.

This is party because there is work to be done that night. A newspaper will be made up and the whole DAILY WORKER staff will participate in this novel stunt that will break all established Robert's rules of order. There will be other novelties, as all will admit when they hear that no party discussion will be allowed. And woe to the poor suckers who attempt it—for Steve Rubicki and his Cheka will be on the job.

As a free supper will be served, no points of order will be considered. But it will be a classy meal the committee assures us.

The Flaming Youth orchestra of the

Y. W. L. will donate their tinkling tintinabulations to secure a lively movement on the dance floor. And there will be vocal and piano solos by Margerite Lewis whose work will some day make her city-agent-husband the better-half of a famous woman.

There are other novel stunts in store for those who will spend fifty cents to attend the party of our daily—and they will get other things beside a free meal to take home with them.

Comrades Natalie Gomez, and the well known sisters, Gussie Kruse and Emma Blechschmidt form the committee whom you will have to thank for the evening's jollity, and they are arranging a treat that will make DAILY WORKER parties a by-word in the movement.

Your Policy Must Be  
— Buy a Policy —

## GREAT WORKERS PARTY CONCERT AND DANCE ON TOMORROW, SUNDAY

This Sunday, Jan. 11, the Russian and Ukrainian branches of the Workers Party will give a concert and dance at Schoenhoffen Hall, corner Milwaukee and Ashland Aves. Half of the proceeds will go for the Russian Communist daily, "Novy Mir." The concert promises to be an interesting one. The Ukrainian workers' chorus, a mandolin orchestra, singers from the Russian grand opera, classic dancing and other numbers will be on the program. Russian and American dancing will follow the concert. Beginning at 4 p. m.

Comrades from all nationalities are invited to enjoy a good time and help a good cause.

### CHICAGO, ATTENTION!

All friendly organizations, T. U. E. L. groups, party branches, language federations and Y. W. L. branches! Arrangements have been made for the following major city affairs. Do not arrange conflicting affairs on these days:

Karl Liebknecht Celebration—Sunday, January 11, Northwest Hall, corner North and Western Aves. Auspices Y. W. L., Local Chicago.

Lenin memorial meeting—Wednesday, Jan. 21, Ashland Auditorium, Van Buren and Ashland. Workers Party, Local Chicago.

The Red Revel—Saturday, Feb. 28, West End Women's Club Hall.

"The Beauty and the Bolshevik" and "Russia in Overalls," greatest motion picture program, auspices of the DAILY WORKER and the International Workers' Aid, co-operation of Workers Party and Labor Defense, Ashland Auditorium, Thursday, Feb. 5, continuous show 7 to 11, admission 50c, 7,000 attendance expected, come early.

## PITTSBURGH, PA. DR. RASNICK DENTIST

Rendering Expert Dental Service for 20 Years.

645 SMITHFIELD ST., Near 7th Ave. 1627 CENTER AVE., Cor. Arthur St.

## LEARN ESPERANTO

The International Language

The following booklets are received free:

Esperanto for All, grammar and vocabulary.

Esperanto and its Critics, by Prof. Collinson.

WORKERS' ESPERANTO ASSN., 525 7th St., Rockford, Ill.

# "Gompers, A Philosophic Anarchist"

A Reply to Yanofsky, Editor of Justice.

By A RANK AND FILER.

According to Mr. Yanofsky's statement in Justice of Dec. 19, Gompers "derived his strength from the working mass, reflecting in his policies their ideas, aspirations and state of mind." Before going any further I asked myself, "What is the policy of the A. F. of L.?" I tried to analyze its "contribution" to the welfare of humanity and the workers in particular. My conclusions are that the A. F. of L. with the great labor leader, Samuel Gompers, in whom, according to Yanofsky's opinion, "The workers have lost a real example of a labor leader," was nothing but a hindrance to the emancipation of the workers.

As to the question, "what the policy of the A. F. of L. is?" one can answer at once, "The obtaining of increasing wages and reduction in the hours of labor." But this is more of an abstract phrase than a practical aim and even if it were a practical policy, has it any real value? No! On the contrary. It is a disadvantage to those who produce all the wealth we have, that is, "they" have, they who control the tools of production and in return give the workers just enough to keep "soul and body" together in the form known as wages. It was Gompers with the rest of his clique who was throwing sand into the eyes of the workers, to prevent them from seeing whither they were led. Gompers, the great "philosophic anar-

chist," thruout his entire career was lulling the workers to peaceful sleep and content with the famous song, "A fair day's wage for a fair day's work."

In my opinion Gompers and the rest of the officials of the A. F. of L., the highest as well as the lowest, were traitors to the workers and were a menace to society as a whole. Yanofsky says, among other things, "With his life-work Gompers has immortalized his name in the history of our struggle." Yes, Mr. Yanofsky, you are right, but let me tell you how he has "immortalized his" great "name." Gompers was a faithful servant to the capitalist class but not to the workers. It is partly due to him that the latter are today enslaved and chained. It was Gompers who knew how to tighten that chain around the neck of labor.

Was your "philosophic anarchist" a labor leader, Mr. Yanofsky? Yes, but only insofar as to "lead" labor into such channels as would be of greatest benefit and profit to the employing class. Gompers' function was always to keep labor at the lowest possible point of economic and political consciousness. His death means a great loss to the master class he served. As sick as he was he went to Mexico, his nurse accompanying him.

But you know, Mr. Yanofsky, as I do, that it was not for the benefit of labor that he went there. It was for the class who recently lost in him a valuable ally. The capitalist class of the United States ordered him to accomplish a task which was very difficult for him to accomplish and "the

great labor leader," whom in the columns of Justice you have so highly praised, helped with all in his power to carry the victorious banner of Wall Street into Mexico.

The American ruling class is mourning the loss of their lackey who to the very last minute maneuvered in the ranks of labor to please his masters. The sand, Mr. Yanofsky, you try to throw into the eyes of the workers by means of your pen is scattered by the wind. You are dealing today with a new type of a reader of Justice, one who rebels at empty phrases and searches for concrete facts, for these facts stare him in the face.

Can an HONEST labor leader in his lifetime accumulate \$30,000 and after his death be buried in a Sleepy Hollow cemetery between Rockefeller and Carnegie? It is clear even to a child and to workers especially that Gompers, your "philosophic anarchist," who, according to your statement, was such "a passionate lover of liberty," lived and died for capitalism, for, were it otherwise, he would not have had the honor of being buried among those who forged gold out of the flesh and blood of the working class.

You confess that years ago you condemned Gompers as a reactionary, as one who was holding back the forces of social revolution in America. But this, Mr. Yanofsky, was at the time when you were the editor of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme, when you occupied a little room in a basement of an East Broadway tenement where it was cold, dark and dreary. But today as the editor of Justice, sitting in a swivel chair in the building of the I. L. G.

W. U. where it is quite comfortable for officials who are nothing else but tools and screws for the capitalist machine—today, you are singing a different song. Today you see Gompers as "the idol, the lover of liberty, a person of sterling honesty and as a philosophic anarchist." Mr. Yanofsky, your work is in vain. Labor all over the world is awakening and soon will say to you and your associates of Gompersism: "Gentlemen, I defy you! For my power is growing stronger daily. In vain you are trying to curb my will. From now on you will no longer succeed."

I am sure that deep in your heart, Mr. Yanofsky, you know it very well that all labor fakers and corrupt union officials will have to make room for the rank and file who are capable to control industry and manage their own affairs.

In your eulogy of Gompers you go so far as to say that, "we in the labor movement shall feel orphaned because of his departure." Some of the autocratic officials may feel that way but surely none of the rank and file members share this sentiment. I as one of them feel that my estimation is correct and take the liberty of telling it to you.

With wrath and indignation will the tombstone and say, "Here lies one who betrayed our ancestors, it was partly due to him that they were plundered, outraged and disinherited." Their cry of protest will shake the world, a protest which will raise the battle cry, "Down with all sorts of prostitution." All sorts, including pen prostitutes.

## Views of Our Readers on Many Subjects

The DAILY WORKER and the Negro Workers.

To the DAILY WORKER:—It is imperative that Negroes read, subscribe to and support our Communist daily newspaper, the DAILY WORKER. By so doing they will be helping themselves and also aiding our paper. Negro workers suffer from discriminations, petty police interferences, mob violences, which white workers do not suffer from. Therefore, Negro workers have extra difficulties to face on the account of the color of their skins. The Negro newspapers in general, some more boldly than others, constantly and doggedly fight against lynchings, burnings, segregation, Jim Crowism, unwarranted police interference and other discriminations.

As Communists we recognize the fact that the capitalist newspapers and other agencies are the ones behind the scenes constantly fomenting and stirring up anti-Negro prejudices. The capitalist legislative bodies pass and put into effect discriminatory measures against Negroes. We are convinced that the only way to completely eliminate the evil conditions under which Negroes suffer, is to destroy the capitalist system bag and baggage.

The stupid and ignorant white workers, imbued with their unfounded prejudices against all Negroes, as a result of this anti-Negro propaganda, composed the mobs who attack Negroes, and believe the vicious lies disseminated by the capitalist agencies against Negroes to be true. Many white workers even join the anti-Negro organization, the Ku Klux Klan. These white workers are badly in need of enlightenment on the Negro.

Our Communist paper, the DAILY WORKER, in order to enlighten these white workers and at the same time obtain Negro subscribers and readers, must constantly contain editorials and news articles on the Negro. In this way the anti-Negro propaganda of the capitalist newspapers will be counteracted. Already the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily News have ceased front paging and head lining crimes committed or alleged to have been committed by Negroes, as a result of the merciless expose of their policy thru the columns of the DAILY WORKER and several Negro news-

papers, by one of our Negro party members.

We know of a white girl, who said that she was afraid to come into the Negro district. No doubt that she had read these stories in the capitalist newspapers, of how Negro men kidnapped white girls, took them to some house in the "black belt" and there assaulted them and had other Negroes to do likewise, and believe the lies to be true. This shows to what extent the capitalist papers will go in Negro baiting.

We hope that the DAILY WORKER in the future will realize the significance of constantly publishing editorials and articles on the Negro, and will answer thru its columns the attacks made on the Negro by the capitalist newspapers and other agencies. By so doing, Negroes will come to learn that our Communist paper is truly a champion of the Negro workers as well as the white workers.

Yours Fraternally,

Edward L. Doty,  
Robert J. Bowman,  
Norval H. Allen,

Members of the South Side branch of the Workers (Communist) Party.

Gunmen in Demand.

Morgantown, W. Va.

Editor of the DAILY WORKER:—Yes, Gompersism must be killed as dead as Gompers is. The rank and file in and out of the unions have no confidence in Gompersism. The old dy-nasty must be dethroned. Keep up your drive at the A. F. of L. leadership as having proved their unworthiness on many fronts. Judas was a gentleman compared to them. Their finish is near at hand, unless they are endowed by an Eastman a Duke, or a Rockefeller, which would be properly in line with their methods of crushing the workers.

The boom is on here in full blast. Machine guns are in heavy demand by the open shoppers. There is not so much unemployment as one would suppose after seeing the starving miners around here. In fact, anyone who is willing to shoulder a gun and shoot down workers on demand is sure of getting a job. Such wonderful prosperity must be beautiful to behold by the stock market crowd and our money kings. And so it goes from Maine to California.

But Arthur Brisbane, the self-appointed schoolmaster of the world in his flights of imagination bids us be calm as things will be better in a few million years. It must be nice to be intelligent and civilized like Arthur Brisbane and his scientific friends—the blind slaves of capitalism. But I fondly hope they will soon relieve the most of us of our stomachs as we have little use for them in these times of high prices, low wages and unemployment.

(Signed) Henry Dondery, Morgantown, W. Va.

To the DAILY WORKER:—I have been employed by an owner of several greenhouses here, and everything went as well as might be expected when employed by a miser of a small capitalist, until this most reactionary employer of mine found out by opening my mail that I subscribe to the DAILY WORKER.

Since then I have been humiliated in the most treacherous manner conceivable: my room searched while I was gone; all sorts of petty "jokes" (as I heard the boss call them), from setting carpet tacks into my bed clothes to setting an alarm ringing at my door while I was asleep after having fired five boilers all night. Orders were given me as if I were on board a convict ship, the last of which was a command to work days in the greenhouse after a sixteen-hour night firing shift. It was impossible to drop off to sleep for a minute on this job because the boss insisted that the temperature be kept fluctuating within two degrees, almost an impossibility with his small boilers and in bad condition.

This last command I positively refused to obey and asked for my wages. He refused to pay until he had found a man in my place.

This is nothing new. Neither is the fact that the rest of the workers working here are not class conscious and think that by sticking with the boss they will be better off. It only means that we must work harder to reach them.

Wishing you the very best results in your Insurance Drive.

Fraternally yours,

LOUIS BOMAN,  
Baldwinville, Mass.

Letter to Pravda.

Editor, Pravda, Moscow,  
Union of Soviet Republics.  
Dear Sir:—

Russia is to be CONGRATULATED in suppressing Christianity and ALL religions.

They are ALL bad.

Last Christmas the christians had a BIG celebration and stole my chickens and other things.

Then when I complained to the authorities threatened me with \$5,000.00 fine and five years imprisonment, for asking that I be protected in accordance with the laws of this so-called republic.

Emma Goldman may think it harder in Russia than in America, but I assure the people of the Union of Soviet Republics that such is not the case.

Were I master of the great Russian language, and young and healthy, I would at once throw in my lot with the people of the Union of the Soviet Republics, for in Russia alone is liberty.

It is only a myth in America, and no one ever got any justice in any court here.

Today, the bleeding laborers are looking to Moscow, and not to Washington, for their salvation.

We are looking to Communism, and NOT christianity for our relief, and we are looking BECAUSE christianity has failed, and been proved as the foulest system of graft the world has ever known.

Yours for the Third International,  
B. YORKSTONE HOGG.

"In Memoriam—Lenin" to be shown Jan. 15 at Gartner's Theater.

**RUBBER STAMPS AND SEALS**

IN ENGLISH AND IN ALL FOREIGN LANGUAGES

INK, PADS, DATERS, RUBBER TYPE, ETC.

**NOBLER STAMP & SEAL CO.**

524 So. Dearborn Street  
Chicago  
Phone Wabash 6680

MAIL ORDERS PROMPTLY ATTENDED TO

# Bolshevism or Trotskyism?

(Continued from page 1)

party was not yet a Communist Party), I declare that the comrades of the social-revolutionists (it was the question of the left social-revolutionists whom the central committee of our party, with Comrade Lenin at the head, tried at that time to induce to participate in the first Soviet government) should not have started to criticize us Bolsheviks while events were taking place in the streets of Moscow regarding which our Moscow delegates have reported today. (At this time the struggle for the Soviet power was still going on in Moscow.) On this occasion we remind the comrades of the social-revolutionists that before we published the composition of our government we called upon them to take part in the government, but they declared that they would take part in the work of the government, but for the time being would not enter the government."

At the session of the Petrograd Soviet of Nov. 3, 1917, the writer stated:

"Comrades:—There are among us comrades from the red army, soldiers and sailors, who in a few hours will hasten to the aid of our Moscow comrades and brothers. (Loud and prolonged applause.) The revolutionary military committee wished two days ago to send help, but met with obstacles precisely from those quarters from which one could only have expected support. I speak here of some leading circles of the railway employees, who in these hours so fateful for the revolution have adopted a 'neutral' attitude. In these terrible hours, however, one cannot be 'neither hot nor cold'—I do not wish to speak too sharply, but you yourselves will understand, comrades, how the future will judge these facts.

"Just recently a transport of troops to Moscow was held up. When the leaders of the railway workers' union were asked how they could act in this manner, they replied: We have also held up transports from the other side.

"We must appeal to the lower sections of the railwaymen and explain to them what 'neutrality' means under present conditions. I do not doubt that 99 per cent of the lower sections of the railway employees and workers will side with the fighting soldiers and workers. A whole number of central committees are sitting on the fence. Unfortunately, among these is the central committee of the railway workers. No one could have foreseen that the leading organ of the railway workers would preserve 'neutrality' whilst workers and soldiers were fighting on the barricades. This state of affairs must be ended. The railway proletariat must stand like one man on the side of the fighting workers and soldiers, they must help them to break the resistance of the bourgeoisie and of the landowners. . . .

"Greetings to the comrades who are hastening to the help of the revolutionaries in Moscow (long and stormy applause). Now we are giving back to Moscow what it gave the revolution in 1905. At that time the Moscow proletariat began the revolt, and delivered the first blow against despotism. We are happy we are now able to help, that we now have the possibility of throwing our victorious troops on the Moscow front.

"Long live the comrades proceeding to Moscow—all Russia is watching them."

On the evening of the 3rd of November and on the morning of the 4th, our negotiations with the left social-revolutionists and with that conference which had invited the leaders of the railway workers' union, arrived at the most critical stage. At this moment we committed the greatest errors. The famous declaration of some comrades, among them myself, in the central committee of the Bolsheviks and the council of people's commissaries (regarding the resignation of our responsible posts owing to the obstinacy of our central committee) was signed on Nov. 4, 1917, and on Nov. 7, 1917, my "Letter to

the Comrades" was published in the Pravda (No. 183). In this letter we said: (I quote the most important part).

"The central committee of the All-Russian Soviet Congress placed in the foreground a definite plan of agreement (the resolution of Nov. 3), which I fully agree with, as it demands the immediate recognition of the decrees regarding the land, peace, workers' control, and the recognition of the Soviet power.

"In reply to the resolution of the central executive committee, the mensheviks submitted a number of preconditions. The central executive committee, as it did not wish to place any difficulties in the way, adopted a resolution proposed by us which removed the hindrances in the way of these negotiations.

"In spite of this the other side would not make any concessions to the central executive committee. The conditions submitted by the latter were rejected by the mensheviks and the social-revolutionists. The attempt to arrive at an agreement was consistently carried out in spite of all obstacles; it led, however, to no result. It is now evident that the mensheviks and the social-revolutionists did not want an understanding and only sought for a pretext to wreck it.

"Now all the workers and soldiers will know who bears the responsibility for the wrecking of the agreement. Now—I am convinced—also the left social-revolutionists will throw the blame for the wrecking of the understanding upon the mensheviks and for refusing to enter into our government.

"In the present state of affairs I adhere to the proposition of the comrades and withdraw my declaration regarding resignation from the central committee.

"I appeal to my immediate comrades. Comrades, we made a great sacrifice when we openly raised a protest against the majority of our central committee and demanded the agreement. This agreement, however, was rejected by the other side. We are living in a serious, responsible time. It is our duty to warn the party of errors. But we remain with the party, we prefer to commit errors along with the millions of workers and soldiers and to die with them than to stand aside from them at this decisive historical moment.

"There will and shall be no split in our party."

Since Nov. 8 I participated as previously in the work of our central committee. On Nov. 9 I spoke in its name at the All-Russian Peasants' Congress, and on the 10th of November at the session of the Petrograd Soviet. Here I said that we would recognize the constituent assembly, "if the constituent assembly would give expression to the actual will of the workers, soldiers and peasants."

Naturally, now after seven years, it seems monstrous to every member of our party how one could deceive himself with regard to the real forces of the leaders of the railwaymen and those alleged internationalists from the camp of the social-revolutionists and mensheviks grouped round the railway leaders. Of course, in order to understand the situation one must place one's self in the position obtaining at the time. It was not until six months after the October revolt that it became evident that the left social-revolutionists had also become a counter-revolutionary force. In October, 1917, however, they were expressly invited by Comrade Lenin and our central committee to participate in our first Soviet government, as they were then connected with a large section of the peasants and with a portion of the workers. In fact, even the negotiations with the leaders of the railwaymen's union were, as the reader has seen, conducted with the approval of the central committee.

The result of the exposure of the mensheviks and of the social-revolutionists on the occasion of the railway workers' conference was, that the left social-revolutionists, whom

Comrade Lenin had formerly in vain called upon to participate in the Soviet government, now entered into it; altho some days before the social-revolutionists had the intention even to resign for the central executive committee, which under the conditions then existing would have meant a severe blow for the Bolsheviks and would have hindered the winning of the peasantry.

In the Pravda of Nov. 4 we read:

"The fraction of the left social-revolutionists in the central executive committee submitted an ultimative declaration regarding the necessity of drawing up of a platform in the name of the central executive committee. The central executive committee agreed to this demand and in the name of the central executive committee a platform was drawn up."

It was just the rejection of this platform by the mensheviks and the social-revolutionists at the conference convened by the railway leaders which led to the change in the tactics of the left social-revolutionists in favor of the Soviet power.

At this time there was published in the Pravda a number of resolutions from the most important factories in which we find the following.

"Whilst we regard the agreement of the socialist parties as desirable, we workers declare that the agreement can only be reached on the basis of the following conditions . . ." (These conditions were practically the same as our representatives had submitted to the railway men's conference.)

In our attitude during these days there was again reflected the hesitation of these workers—in this respect our error was not a personal, not an accidental error.

Now, seven years afterwards, do not the words in the resolution of our central committee that "the assertion that the Bolsheviks would not share power with anybody is devoid of all foundation" sound monstrous from our present standpoint? And yet these words were written down by Comrade Lenin on Nov. 3, 1917, and approved by our central committee. Everyone who reflects over these facts, everyone who remembers that the left social-revolutionists at that time represented an important section of the peasants, everyone who reflects at all over the conditions at that time, will understand the extent and the character of our error. It was a great, but nevertheless not a "social-democratic" error.

We, of course, do not say that in order to prove that our error was a small one. We stood outside of the central committee of the party only for three days—from Nov. 4 to 7. In spite of this, this error, as we already said at the opening session of the Fourth World Congress of the Comintern, was the greatest error we made in our life. The only thing we wish to prove here is that it is not correct to draw from this error the conclusion that there existed a "right wing" in Bolshevism.

Every one who experienced those historical days knows that these differences, how much they strained the relations of such near comrades and friends, left no bitter feeling behind. Everybody adopted a sincere attitude towards the errors of the others, without attempting to "make use of" these errors for "diplomatic," fractionist purposes. Everybody understood that only the exceptional moment led to exceptional means of solving differences, which arose like a whirlwind but which, like a whirlwind, soon calmed down without causing great damage.

These differences were swept away by the avalanche of fresh events—they remained isolated with the leading circles of the party. A few days passed and the error was admitted by those who had committed it and the general staff of the party and the whole party could proceed to the solution of actual tasks. These differences have left behind such little traces in the party that at the first party conference (VII) which took place after the October revolt (which dealt

already with the question of the Brest peace), nobody mentioned a single word regarding these differences.

Nobody reproached us regarding this error, altho it so happened that I, on behalf of the central committee, had to fight energetically against Comrade Trotsky and the "left"\*) and it is clear that the party, under the fresh impression of the differences, would have attacked the guilty ones if they had estimated this guilt as Comrade Trotsky does now.

Comrade Trotsky now says in the "Lessons of October," seven years after these events, that our attitude to the question of the Brest peace was one of capitulation. What did Trotsky himself say on this Seventh Party Congress some weeks after the October differences:

"Before the last journey to Brest-Litovsk we discussed during the whole time the question of our further tactics. And there was only one vote in the central committee in favor of immediately signing the peace: that of Zinoviev. (We assert that there was not only one vote, but also Lenin, Stalin and Sverdlov said the same thing; Comrade Kamenev was arrested in Finland, G. Z.) What he said was, from his standpoint, quite correct: I was fully in agreement with him. He said, that hesitation would only render worse the peace conditions, and that they must be signed at once." (Minutes of the seventh party conference, page 79.)

If the proposal to sign the Brest peace was a "capitulation," then Comrade Lenin was a "capitulator." (As a matter of fact, the tactics of Trotsky at that time would have led to the downfall of the revolution, i. e., to an actual capitulation.) If Comrade Trotsky himself spoke in the above mentioned way as to this affair, who can give credit to his present ultra-polemic remarks? Is it not evident that all this has been discovered afterwards?

At the Seventh Party Congress the debates turned upon quite other questions. It was Comrade Trotsky this time who submitted a declaration regarding his resignation from all responsible posts. (Minutes, pages 147-148.) Against Trotsky and against the "left" Communists, there was directed the resolution of Lenin and Zinoviev (Minutes, page 3), and as regards resignation from the central committee in general, Comrade Lenin said the following words:

"I also found myself in a similar situation in the central committee when the proposal was adopted not to sign the peace, and I kept silent without closing my eyes to the fact that I could not take over responsibility for this. Every member of the central committee is free to repudiate responsibility without resigning from the central committee and without creating a scandal. It is, of course, permissible under certain conditions, and is sometime even unavoidable; but whether that was necessary just now, with this organization of the Soviet power which enables us to control insofar as we do not lose contact with the masses, there can only exist one opinion."

At the Seventh Party Congress Comrade Trotsky, who at that time had only been six months in our party, provoked the first Trotsky crisis. Since that time, unfortunately, these crises occur periodically.

\*It is interesting to mention the result of the election of the new central committee at this party conference. The writer of these lines received only one vote less than Comrade Lenin.

(To be Continued)

Help Insure  
THE  
DAILY WORKER  
for 1925!

"Polikushka" is coming to Gertner's Independent Theater, Jan. 15.

# Sixth All-Russian Trade Union Congress

(Continued from page 2)

ductivity, we as the working class, the Soviet government, the party and the trade unions. We are a unit. We are doing one and the same historic work. We must boldly tell the managers that something depends upon them, and that something is about 50 per cent, the other half depending upon the workers. The trade unions should help the managers raise productivity, not in words, but in deeds. And now, at the sixth congress, we must say this more boldly than at the fifth, even tho because the wages and economic conditions of the workers have begun to improve. True, not yet to the degree that is thought in the village, where it is said that the workers are having a wonderful time.

The question of labor productivity stands point blank, and you cannot back out of it. You must stand above the everyday, sometimes inevitable friction between the managements, trade unions and party members. You must understand and thoroly think out the historical task facing us. I understand that Vladimir Ilich's words on labor productivity have already been read to you. They have now become clothed with flesh and blood.

## Productivity of Labor is of Decisive Importance at Present.

Our international situation depends to a much greater degree upon the productivity of labor than the ability of our red diplomats and even more than upon the Red Army. There was a time when the red army determined our international stability 100 per cent. Of course, it is of great importance even now but at the present moment no one can make open war upon us; their hands are too short. The importance of productivity of labor is of decisive international significance both for the destinies of our country and for the destinies of the international revolution. It should attract, like a magnet, the heart of the workers of all the capitalist countries, for it shows them that socialism is developing here. It alone can strengthen us economically and politically and consolidate our union with the peasantry. Here is the key to the entire situation. Only in raising productivity lies the reply to the question of the relations between labor and the peasantry, to the question of concessions and to our entire international situation.

I heard men speaking along the line of "we are very much to the left, we are not interested in the country boors," we are interested in the workers, we must raise the heavy industries at any price. For this sake we must agree to concessions, and have as many of them as possible, not hesitating to give in to international capital, and agree to a loan even if the conditions may be very bad. Here you have the other side of this leftness which looks very much like menshevism. We think otherwise. We think that there is no special need of being particularly lavish in distributing concessions at the end of 1924. In 1918, when things were pretty bad, this could be done. But now we can ourselves raise the industry and there are no reasons for making special concessions to foreign capital. There is no need of letting the goat into the garden; no need of becoming the slaves of foreign capital. We shall raise much on our own shoulders, but this can be done only if we all of us work unanmously to the end of raising the productivity. Despite all the bad features of this campaign which I have mentioned, all of us clearly see that productivity of labor is only beginning to increase and that some results are already evident.

## The Trade Unions Nearer to Production.

The next question of principle is the question of the trade unions approaching more closely to production. At the Fifth Congress we spoke little about this. At the sixth this must be said loudly and resolutely. Two and a half years were spent to raise the workers' wages. There is no reason for repenting, that was quite as it should have been. But now another

period is coming. The trade unions have made large conquests. This is a fact. During the two and a half years they came nearer to the working masses, and this also cannot be denied. They have catered for their material interests; they have themselves become greater mass bodies, and there lies the achievement of the labor movement. Our trade unions have made great progress also in their educational work. They have set up 2,000 clubs. This is truly proletarian work, instead of prattle about proletarian culture. The trade unions should continue to work in this line. But as regards industry, as regards direct participation of the trade unions in managing industry, we have, in my opinion, lagged behind during these two years. The production circles now being set up are of course, very promising. But this is not enough. The trade unions do not make use of their industrial rights to the extent that Lenin's resolutions have entitled them to, resolutions adopted unanimously. The trade unions were absorbed in other tasks. Of course, it is good that they had fulfilled them, but we are now entering a new phase. The trade unions should engage more closely than before in industry, in the drawing up of the production programs, in forming the administrations in fixing prices, etc. In all this the trade unions should take an active part, and they should raise productivity of labor to the highest possible degree. Only thus can the issue with the peasantry be solved.

## The Problem of the Commanders in the Real Sense of the Word.

It appears to me that in this connection the problem of commanders in the real sense of the word again arises. I am not speaking here of the commanders in the red army. I speak of the teacher who also belongs among the commanders. I am speaking here of the production commanders. The trade unions have begun to promote the production personnel from among their ranks, have begun to remove the sham specialists, in order to replace them by their own people and support the truly honest and real specialists. The question of commanders in the broad sense of the word, never stood as clearly as now. It now stands broadly in relation to the peasantry, in relation to land improvement in the village, in relation to culture, etc., etc., in every sphere in which our life is developing. We cannot pass over this question, which is one of the essential questions of our internal policy. This gave rise to the new attitude to the teachers. This is no mere unprincipled flirtation, but a new historical situation. A similar attitude is necessary all along the line.

The production commanders, both the lower and middle should be sought primarily from amongst your own ranks, and this question should be tackled in all seriousness. Now that the country is warming up, when the alarm over bread and butter has been forgotten, when new political and economic questions are being raised, when new relations between the workers and the peasantry are clearly developing, that represents a possible menace (they are not necessarily a menace if the proper measures are taken), under such a situation the several hundred thousand men throughout the country who make up the commanding personnel in the broad sense of the word, should be ideologically organized by us, should be ideologically with us, so that we could be responsible for them. This should become an object engaging the constant attention of the party and the trade unions. I do not know how this matter will turn out in reality, in practice, but any way, it stands as a political problem intimately affecting also the Sixth Trade Union Congress. I thought it my duty to touch upon it briefly.

## Attention to the Proletarian Students.

One of the sub-groups of this problem is the question of the proletarian students. Let me say a few words on this question. Trade union nuclei are now beginning to be organized among the students. You may discuss how they should be organized; the

question should be considered in the most serious manner. However, we have here also a political problem, for here you have a part of the question about the commanders and our congress should take up in some section or commission the question about the proletarian students and give it due attention. In 192 technical schools we have 20,000 workers, who will make up a large part of the future production commanders. This group of 20,000 workers should hear a word of interest from us, should hear a word of attention and support, should feel definite support and see a true Bolshevik attitude towards them, for I repeat, this is a part of the question about the commanding personnel.

## They Are Basic, Not Temporary Questions.

Comrades, these are the questions standing on the order of the day. Of course, there are many other questions that are, so to speak, eternal, imperishable, fundamental. Among these are primarily the slogan "Nearer to the masses" and the question of the Bolshevization of the labor movement. During the last two years the trade unions have come much more closely to the masses, this is a fact. Still nearer to the masses! No matter how near we come to them, we must not boast of the successes or stop there. We see how the cultural needs of the masses have changed. The worker is different from what he was in 1919. The needs and demands of the peasants have also grown, and our leaders should remember this fact, they should themselves grow and satisfy the growing needs of the masses. The material welfare of the workers and peasants has improved, and with it grow their cultural demands and grow politics. It is wrong to assume that if the peasants will live better he will think less of politics. Just the contrary. With the growth of the material welfare of the peasants and workers will grow their cultural and political demands and interests, that they will put before us, the leaders of the trade unions and the leaders of the party. They must be answered.

## Always Learn From Leninism.

We are now teaching the workers of the world to Bolshevize the labor movement. But we ourselves must also remember this. We are of course, the most Bolshevik party in the world, we are the strongest labor movement in the Comintern. But this does not mean that we have been Bolshevized 100 per cent. Our party still needs more Bolshevization. The trade unions need Bolshevization, and our labor movement as a whole needs it. As long as you live, study Leninism, perfect yourselves and then you will be a real Bolshevik. No self satisfaction. We know our strong sides. But we must also know our weak sides, but we must see both the conscious and unconscious attempts to revise Leninism, that are sometimes made even in Lenin's name.

## Honest and Dishonest Wrongdoers.

You remember how at the beginning of the revolution, when Vladimir Ilich came from abroad, he brought with him a new term "honest defenders." When we lived abroad there was no talk about honest defenders. We only knew the dishonest, dyed in the wool fakers of the Second International who drove the workers to the slaughter. And when Vladimir Ilich came here and saw masses of soldiers and peasants who sincerely and enthusiastically marched off to the defense of the revolutionary "fatherland," he nicknamed them honest defenders and he preached patient, systematic, constant explanation and patience for them.

We now have among us some honest "misunderstandings" of Leninism. Let us see what is taking place. Everybody now calls himself a Leninist. There are men who would like to Leninists, but cannot be, because they have not been boiled in the fire of the organizational discipline of the Bolshevik party, they have learned little, etc. These are men who could be said to be honestly misled. They are honestly wrong; they need explanation; they do not quite understand Lenin's ideas, the vanguard must therefore patiently enlighten them.

But there are men who interpret

Leninism in whatever way suits them best. They cannot be said to be honestly misled. There is very little honesty about them, and we must fight them ideologically in a most determined manner.

The Bolshevization of the labor movement is not only a slogan meant for export. No comrades, this slogan is meant for us as well (laughter).

We live in a country in which there are so many illiterates, in which the legal labor movement is just in its teens. We have a party with a wonderful past. It has gone thru three revolutions, has had an incomparable leader, and teacher, the like of whom cannot be found anywhere in the world. Still we worked in a poor illiterate country, and our organization is weak. And it would have been a miracle were the entire labor movement here Bolshevized 100 per cent. This of course, is not so. We will have to do much hard labor those of us who have learned something from Lenin, that is, the trade unions and the party, will have to work hard many and many a year in order to promote the growth and Bolshevization of the labor movement, to make it keep abreast with the world events, to have it remember that is past services will not bring any more tributes on the world arena, and that it is time to think of the future.

## Conclusions.

I therefore think that we have a number of new problems.

On the question of the international labor movement we are for unity. We shall fight under this slogan resolutely and to the end like Bolsheviks.

On the question of the peasantry we have a new situation. We have various difficulties that are perfectly surmountable, and we shall remove them.

On the question of productivity of labor, down with "we" and "you"! It is clear that this is now the fundamental question of our entire economy, of our world situation. This is of greater importance than diplomacy even than the red army; it is the question of all questions.

The trade unions nearer to industry!

The problem of the commanding personnel is raised for the first time on the proletarian arena.

The problem of the proletarian students is a part of this question.

All these questions are dominated by the economic question. Metal, was the slogan raised by the Thirteenth Congress. We now can say more precisely: metal, textile, coal, oil and railways. This is what decided the fate of our country and in a certain measure, the fate of the international movement.

Well then, the entire determination and passion of the Bolsheviks, which have heretofore been put into the civil war, and in the other businesses that were put forth by the precious situation, the entire determination and passion, the entire "die-hardness," which Vladimir Ilich taught us. The entire energy, the entire power of the masses, all the brains and talents possessed now by the party and the trade union movement, all this must be put into metal, textile, coal, railways, oil, higher productivity of labor (stormy applause), and everything should be solved from the point of view of the problems which Lenin has taught us, in the light of true Leninism, in the light of the modest, quiet, unshowy, but firm work of Bolshevizing our labor movement. If we solve this problem, our congress will be marked as a serious stage in the history of the labor movement of our country, in the history of the struggle of the world working class for the emancipation of labor. (Stormy, lasting applause, deafening the sound of the orchestra).

Watch for the Special  
First Anniversary  
Edition of the  
DAILY WORKER  
January 13,  
1925

# "One Single Cohesive Fear"

By Robert Minor

A TINY corner of the political jungle of the Solid South was illuminated when Senator Pat Harrison, democrat of Mississippi, clashed with Senator Bruce, democrat of Maryland, last Monday afternoon in the senate.

Harrison comes from the depth of the Southern political and economic jungle. Bruce comes from the edge of the feudal jungle. That partly explains the difference. And from their sharp difference we obtain a little picture of the deepening class antagonism in that vast, unhappy, decaying and yet living human mass which we call the Solid South.

Bruce and Harrison are, both equally political vultures. Superficially they are of the same school of vultures—both are members of the "immortal party of Jefferson." But the school of political vultures which is called the democratic party is dividing. The vulture who lives on the edge of the clearing has learned to live on a different kind of meat—the meat which is the political garbage of modern capitalist society while the vulture from the heart of the wilderness still lives on raw jungle meat.

Bruce of Maryland represents the bourgeoisie of that northern fringe of the South which has been reached by the march of modern industry—the big bourgeoisie which has been made big, rich powerful, and has been orientated toward the financial metropolis. Bruce took his stand with the big bourgeoisie of the country as a whole on the Mellon tax plan.

Harrison of Mississippi represents a decaying, backward, ultra-ignorant petty-bourgeoisie, and the decayed remnants of a feudal landlord class. Mississippi has never ceased to be a "slave state"—it is a slave country, not in the sense that all capitalist countries are lands of wage-slavery, but in the sense of still retaining to a large degree the old system of production thru the bodily ownership of chattel-slaves by feudal masters, with an elaborate system of restrictions against "free" competition of workers in the wage-labor market and the "free" production of farm products. Twenty-four years ago there were 137,852 families of agricultural serfs working as "share-farmers" and "tenant-farmers" in Mississippi, with many other scores of thousands of slave laborers without even the claim to hold land as tenants; and since that time the proportion of serfs has increased.

Practically all of the laboring and tenant farming class are completely without political rights, and without redress in courts of law. Less than one-tenth of the adult population of Mississippi exercises the right of the ballot. Thru a system of agricultural "credit" the entire class is practically bound to the land as "debtors" for life, their children inheriting the "debts" and living on in slavery without hope of freedom. It is a notable fact that in Mississippi we have a large agricultural class which has never even known the hope of owning land. The greater portion of these are Negroes—more than half of the population of the state are Negroes—and as such are disfranchised; and those who are not Negroes are mostly disfranchised as "ignorant." Virtually no schools are provided. Lynch law and the stake are the only law for them, and the paranoiac preachers' "God" is the only court of appeal.

There are no cities of consequence in Mississippi, no manufactures, no minerals (and therefore no mines), and until recently there was no seaport. Mississippi is one great cotton plantation, varied here and there with sugar-cane plantation.

The vast field of primitive agriculture is broken only by a few stunted cities and towns, and by lumber camps in which the timber cutting is done largely by labor recruited thru "vagrancy" laws under which slave-hunters are rewarded at two dollars per head for the destitute and homeless laborers that are caught in a moment in illegal idleness and sold "to pay costs" of their conviction for vagrancy, tho they often receive not even a form of trial. For being caught idle, men, women and children are sold by

local officers into forced labor for terms as long as a year, without compensation and under corporal punishment.

This is the social system represented by Senator Pat Harrison. Naturally he does not represent the masses of toilers. He represents their masters. But even the masters are not of the class of the big bourgeoisie—they are a peculiarity primitive and stunted petty-bourgeoisie. The type represented by Harrison is the cross-roads store-keeper, who lends "credit" to the impoverished tenant-farmers and who thus becomes their bodily owner; and the landlord who spends his life haggling with a dozen or a score of "share" farmers, taking customarily one half of their crops as rent and the other half in repayment of "loans."

The Mississippi system of serfdom is a backward form of production and cannot be made to produce large results, nor to produce a really wealthy bourgeoisie. Herein lies the peculiar form of stagnation characteristic to the most backward sections of the Solid South. The master class for the most part remains an impoverished exploiting class, and this gives the class character to Senator Pat Harrison's constituency. It is this which orientates the Mississippi senator on a myriad of questions, including the question of whether the burden of the income tax shall fall directly upon the small parasitic incomes or the large parasitic incomes.

Senator Harrison, representing the snivelling, nickel-nursing parasites, wants the big bourgeoisie of the far-away industrial centers to pay the income tax.

## Senator Bruce

Senator Bruce of Maryland, representing a class of parasites which has been introduced to the more efficient method of exploiting thru wage-slavery in industrialized production (and which nurses dollars instead of nickels), wants the burden of taxation to fall upon the smaller incomes.

So the two "democratic" senators fight. On the face of it, the two should be members of separate parties, each fighting for separate class interests. But it is not so simple as that.

The case was stated sharply by Senator Bruce. He taunted Harrison with the very plain fact that the Mississippi democrat might logically be expected to line up with "Wisconsin, Nebraska and North Dakota"—meaning, of course, that the Southern cockroach bourgeoisie might logically line up with the LaFollette movement which represents the cockroach bourgeoisie of the country generally. But at the same time Senator Bruce taunted Harrison with the reason why he DOES NOT line up with the country's general petty-bourgeoisie movement. Bruce gave the reason as:

"ONE SINGLE, COHESIVE FEAR."  
Fear of the Negro

He meant altho he did not pronounce the words—the "single, cohesive fear" of the NEGRO. He meant that the Southern cockroach bourgeoisie does not dare to face the slightest disturbance of the political surface of its relationships to the Negro. He meant that the backward exploiters of Harrison's constituency do not dare to break the front of the democratic party. The "Party of the Immortal Jefferson" (and of Jefferson Davis, Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson) stood for half a century as the guardian of chattel slavery in the South, and for another half century as the preserver of its remnants. For half a century the democratic party in the South has been the accepted political medium for preserving what is called "White Supremacy."

The master class of the South in general and of Mississippi in particular had never had the slightest aversion to contact with the Negro. To mention the most extreme test, the Southern master class has shown a distinct preference for inter-breeding with the Negro race in numberless instances. At the same time, the ruling class has exercised the most brutal repression and savagery against the Negro. Why?

Why does "the one single cohesive

fear" of the Negro constitute the power that holds the bourgeoisie of the South in a single political line?

Because the fear of the Negro is not the fear of a race, it is the fear of a CLASS. The secret of it is that THE EXPLOITED CLASSES OF MISSISSIPPI CONSIST IN OVERWHELMING PROPORTION OF NEGROES.

The vast majority of the tenant-farmers and laborers on whose backs Senator Pat Harrison's ruling class lives, is composed of Negroes. They are exploited as laborers and peasants. But they can be held in political subjection and directly applied terror more conveniently as Negroes. The coincidence, that the exploited class is mostly black of face, enables the ruling class of the South to obscure its class oppression under the easy cover of race oppression. (In fact the whites of the same economic classes are almost equally terrorized and oppressed).

## Contradictions

The rotting, putrifying, impoverished and discontented petty bourgeoisie of the Solid South has many impulses toward solidarity with the similar class of the North as against the more wealthy bourgeoisie. But it dares not let go or disturb its front for the "One Single Cohesive Fear" that it may lose its hold on its serf class which is mostly black of face.

The big bourgeoisie of the North also at various times during the past thirty years has been inconvenienced by the stagnant cohesiveness of the Solid South. Democratic and republican politicians alike have made repeated gestures toward breaking up the Solid South of the democratic party. As a child in Texas in 1896 the writer was astonished to see a local banker's sons actually flaunting a republican banner, (considered an unspeakable offense) which meant that the danger of the Bryan movement capturing the government thru the capture of the democratic party and hereby using the political strength of the South in a debtor's drive against the big bourgeoisie, was frightening the Southern bourgeoisie. Since that time republican politicians, Roosevelt, Taft, Elihu Root, Harding and Coolidge, have made overtures to the Southern bourgeoisie by offering to commit the republican party to "white supremacy" in the Southern states. Today, subsidized Negro newspapers continue to flaunt the slogan of Frederick Douglass (of the Civil War period) that "the Republican party is the Ship; All else is the Sea," but Mr. C. Bascom Siemp strives to introduce the republican party to the Southern ruling class as the thing it is—another party of "White Supremacy"—which means capitalist class supremacy over the toiling masses whose faces are largely black. And it has already been proven that the democratic and republican parties act on a "gentleman's agreement" by which they co-operate in killing every gesture (however sterile) toward granting political rights to Negroes.

History forces the question of the breaking up of the Solid South upon the order of the day. Yet neither the republican party nor the democratic party (both of the big bourgeoisie), nor any party of the petty bourgeoisie, will do it or can desire to do it at the cost of extending citizenship rights to the most exploited of all classes in America, the Negro toilers. Such citizenship rights would not free the Negro masses from exploitation, terror and suppression. The break-up of semi-feudal restrictions would make the exploitation more efficient and productive, and put the terror and suppression on a more secure basis. But the existing exploiting class has its lines of operation laid in feudal conditions, and dares not face any change which tend to substitute a new and more capable set of exploiters in their place.

This is the impasse.

The big bourgeoisie, generally speaking, has an interest in breaking up the backward system of feudal production. But in concrete cases it becomes the interest of the big bourgeoisie to make a truce with the remnants of feudal conditions. Thus it is, that the republican party in attempting

to introduce itself to the ruling class of the South, offers itself as another party of "White Supremacy." In past history, capitalism, in order to overthrow feudalism as a then ruling system, has been forced to draw the proletariat into political activity. But in the present stage of capitalism it can better afford to ally itself with the beaten remnants of feudalism (as witness Central Europe), than to stir up the exploited masses.

With things as they are in the South, no capitalist party, nor any petty-bourgeois party, will or can dare to stir the exploited masses into even "democratic" political efforts. Under the existing circumstances, none but a revolutionary party—the revolutionary party—will or can do this.

Any effort to break up the Solid South into political divisions of the republican and democratic parties, will be made only with the severest precautions by both parties against political enfranchisement (little as that means) of the black masses.

None but the most exploited masses of the Southern jungle (whose faces are mostly black) can set these masses into motion, and no party whose purpose is not revolution will dare to lead such a movement.

Senator Bruce in a moment of anger can taunt Senator Harrison with indiscrete hints of the fear of the masses whose faces are black. But when his anger cools, the knees of Senator Bruce must also tremble with the "one single cohesive fear."

The Workers (Communist) Party alone can and must become the embodiment of the "one single cohesive fear"—the leader and liberator of the exploited masses of the backward South whose faces are both black and white.

## THREE MOVIES IN ONE EVENING FOR ONE PRICE

The workers of Chicago will have the opportunity to see three live working class pictures in one evening for the price of one. All the pictures were made in Russia during the revolution.

The first is "Polikushka," the famous story of serfdom by L. N. Tolstoy. Made into a movie by the world famous Moscow Art Theatre.

The second, "Soldier Ivan's Miracle," a comedy, tells a serious story about religion, but in a funny, peculiar Russian way.

The third, "In Memoriam—Lenin," is showing Nicolai Lenin in action. The last picture is shown in connection with the first anniversary of Lenin's death.

The pictures will be shown in Chicago only ONE EVENING, THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, from 6:30 to 11 p. m. at Gartner's Independent Theater, 3725 Roosevelt Road, near Independence Blvd.

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

### BOOKS FOR THINKERS

SCIENCE, LITERATURE  
ECONOMICS, HISTORY.

Any Book in Print at Once.

Jimmie Higgins Book Shop

127 University Place  
NEW YORK CITY

A Workers Party Book Shop

Insure The Daily Worker for 1925