

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 3 No. 28

22nd March 1923

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, 111. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, 111 for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Lenin (On the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the C.P.R.). By <i>Karl Radek</i> 215 | Fascism |
| The Frankfort Conference (Special Inprekorr Report) 217 | Fight Fascism! 221 |
| Politics | The Labor Movement |
| The Anglo-American Alliance. By <i>J. T. Newbold</i> 220 | Proletarian Forces in the United States. By <i>I. Amter</i> 221 |

Lenin

(On the occasion of the 25th Anniversary of the C. P. R.)

By *Karl Radek*.

Like everything else in nature, Lenin was born, has developed, has grown. When Vladimir Ilyitch once observed me dancing through a collection of his articles written in the year 1903, which had just been published, a sly smile crossed his face, and he remarked with a laugh: "It is very interesting to read what stupid fellows we were!" But I do not here intend to compare the shape of Lenin's skull at the age of 10, 20, or 30, with the skull of that man who presided over the sessions of the Central Committee of the Party or the Council of Peoples' Commissars. Here it is not a question of Lenin as leader, but as a living human being. P. B. Axelrod, one of the fathers of Menshevism, who hates Lenin from the bottom of his soul—Axelrod's case is an excellent example of how love can change to hate—related, in one of the philippics with which he sought to convince me of the harmfulness of Bolshevism in general and of Lenin in particular, how Lenin went abroad for the first time, and how he went walking and bathing with him. "I felt at that time", said Axelrod, "that here was a man who would become the leader of the Russian Revolution. Not only was he an educated Marxist—there were many of these—but he knew what he wanted to do and how it was to be done. There was something of the smell of Russian earth about him." Pavel Borisovitch Axelrod is a bad politician, he does not smell of the earth. He is one who reasons at home in his own study, and the whole tragedy of his life consists of the fact that at a time when there was no labor movement in Russia, he thought out the lines upon which such a labor movement should develop, and when it developed on different lines, he was frightfully offended, and to-day, he continues to roar with rage, at the disobedient child. But people often observe in others, that which is lacking in themselves, and Axelrod's words with regard to Lenin grasp with unsurpassable acuteness precisely those characteristics which make Lenin a leader.

It is impossible to be a leader of the working class without knowing the whole history of the class. The leaders of the labor movement must know the history of the labor movement; without this knowledge there can be no leader, just as nowadays there can be no great general who could be victorious with the least expenditure of force unless he knew the history of strategy. The history of strategy is not a collection of recipes as to how to win a war, for a situation once described never repeats itself. But the mind of the General becomes practised in strategy by his express study; this study renders him elastic in war, permits

him to observe the dangers and possibilities which the empirically trained general cannot see. The history of the labor movement does not tell us what to do, but it makes it possible to compare our position with situations which have already been experienced by our class, so that in various decisive moments we are enabled to see our path clearly, and to recognize approaching danger.

But we cannot get to know the history of the labor movement properly without being thoroughly acquainted with the history of capitalism, with its mechanism in all its economic and political phenomena. Lenin knows the history of capitalism as do but few of Marx's pupils. It is no mere knowledge of the written word—here comrade Riazanov could give him five points start—but he has thought out Marx's theory as no one else has done. Let us for instance take the small pamphlet which he wrote at the time of our conflict with the trade union movement; in it he calls Bukharin a syndicalist, an eclectic, and a great sinner in numerous other respects. This polemical pamphlet contains a few lines devoted to the differences between dialectics and eclectics, lines which are not cited in any collection of articles on historical materialism, but which say more about it than whole chapters from much longer books. Lenin has independently grasped and thought out the theory of historical materialism as no one else has been able to do, for the reason that he has studied it with the same object in view by which Marx was actuated when creating the theory.

Lenin entered the movement as the embodiment of the *Will to Revolution*, and he studied Marxism, the evolution of capitalism, and the evolution of socialism, from the point of view of their revolutionary significance. *Plekhanov* was a revolutionist too, but he was not possessed by the *Will to Revolution*, and despite his great importance as a teacher of the Russian Revolution, he could only teach its algebra and not its arithmetic. Here in lies the point of transition from Lenin the theorist to Lenin the politician.

Lenin combined Marxism with the general working class strategy, but at the same time he applied it concretely to that strategic task involving the fate of the Russian working class. It may be said that at the Army Staff Academy he studied not only Clausewitz, Moltke, and their like, but he studied at the same time, as no-one else in Russia, the territory of the future Russian proletarian war. Herein lies the whole of Lenin's genius: in his utmost intensity of intimate contact with his field of activity.

I must take some other opportunity of debating why so great a mind as that of Rosa Luxemburg was not capable of understanding the correctness of Lenin's principles on the origin of Bolshevism; I can only outline the fact. Rosa Luxemburg did not grasp concretely the economic and political difference between the fighting conditions of the Russian proletariat and those of the proletariat of Western Europe. Therefore she inclined to Menshevism in the year 1904. Menshevism, regarded historically, was the policy of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, and of those strata of the proletariat most closely related to the petty bourgeoisie. Regarded methodologically, Menshevism was an attempt at transferring the tactics of the West European labor movement to Russia. If we read an article by Axelrod or Martov on the independence of development in the working class, "which has to learn to stand on its own feet," it appears exceedingly plausible and striking to anyone who has grown up in the Western European labor movement. I remember very well that when I became acquainted with Russian social democratic polemics during the first revolution, but was not yet familiar with concrete Russian actuality, I could not comprehend how anybody could deny such elementary truths. This magnificent plan lacked nothing except the pre-requisites for the application of its tactics, and today it is historically proved that all the speeches delivered by the Mensheviks on the "independence of the labor movement" were in reality only speeches on the necessity of the Russian labor movement subordinating itself to the Russian bourgeoisie.

To-day it is most interesting to read the controversy on the famous first paragraph of the Party Statutes, the paragraph which led to the split of the Social Democratic Party into Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. At that time Lenin's demand, that only the members of illegal organizations were to be counted as party members, appeared highly sectarian. But what was the real point in question? Lenin sought to prevent the confused ideas of certain intellectuals from determining the policy of the labor party. Before the first revolution, any malcontent of a physician or lawyer who happened to have read Marx styled himself a social democrat, although at bottom he was only a liberal. Even when they entered an illegal organization, even when they had broken with their petty-bourgeois way of living, history shows many intellectuals to have remained liberals at the bottom of their souls. But the limitation of the Party to such persons as were willing to face the dangers of belonging to an illegal organization, had undoubtedly the advantage of lessening the danger of bourgeois ascendancy in the labor party, and permitted the revolutionary ray emanating from the working class to penetrate the party organizations, however much filled with intellectual elements. But in order to be able to grasp this, in order to be even prepared to split the Party on this account, it was necessary to be as closely bound up with Russian realities as was Lenin, in his capacity of Russian Marxist and Russian revolutionist. And if this was not fully clear to many a good Marxist in the years 1903 and 1904, it became clear enough from the moment when Axelrod began to mix up the class struggle of the proletariat against the Russian bourgeoisie with the famous agrarian campaign, that is, with the appearance of workers at liberal banquets for the double purpose of: getting to know the bourgeoisie, and of becoming filled with hate against the capitalist class which, as is well known, had never seen the working class except at the banquet; moreover, the capitalists were to be thus educated into a comprehension of the necessity of furthering general national interests.

Lenin's way of knowing Russian actuality is another point in which he differs from all others who have stretched out their hands towards the sceptre of leadership over the Russian proletariat. Not only does he know Russian actuality, he sees and feels it as well. At every turning point in the history of the Party, and especially at the moment when we seized power, and the fate of 150 million people hung on the decisions of the Party, I have always been amazed at Lenin's store of what the English call "common sense". It may be remarked that when we are speaking of a human being of whom we are convinced that his like will not recur for a century, it is but a poor compliment to praise his common sense. But it is just in this that his greatness as a politician lies. When Lenin has to decide on an important question, he does not think of abstract historical categories, he does not think of ground rents, of surplus values, of absolutism or liberalism. He thinks of Sobakevitch, of Gessen, of Sydor from the Tver Province, of the Putilov worker, of the policeman on the street, and he thinks of the effect of the measure on the Mujik Sydor and on the workman Onufria, as bearers of the revolution.

And I shall never forget my talk with Ilyitch before the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk peace. Every argument which we brought up against the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk rebounded from him like peas from a wall. He employed the

simplest argument: A war cannot be conducted by a party of good revolutionists who, having seized their own bourgeoisie by the throat, is not capable of closing a bargain with the German bourgeoisie. The mujik must carry on the war. "But don't you see that the Mujik voted against the war?" Lenin asked me. "Excuse me, when and how did he vote against it?" "He voted with his feet, he is running away from the front." And for him that settled the matter. That we would not be able to agree with German imperialism, this Lenin knew as well as everybody else, but when he spoke in favor of the Brest pause for breath, he did not conceal from the masses for a single moment the sufferings which were bound to follow. But it was no worse than the immediate breakdown of the Russian Revolution; it gave us a shadow of hope, a pause for breath, if only for a few months, and this was the decisive moment. It was necessary that the Mujik should touch with his hands the earth which the revolution had given him; it was necessary that he be confronted with the danger of losing this earth, for then he would defend it.

Let us take another example. It was at the time of our defeat in the Polish war, when negotiations were taken up at Riga. At that time I went abroad, and before leaving I paid Ilyitch a visit, in order to speak with him on the differences of opinion which had arisen between us on the relations to the trade unions. Just as Lenin held the Mujik from the Riazan Province before his mental vision when deciding on the Brest peace, knowing that this Mujik was the decisive personality in the drama of war, in the same manner he placed himself in the position of the plain workman as soon as it was a question of transition from civil war to economic reconstruction, for without this plain workman no economic reconstruction is possible. How did he put the question to himself? The Party meetings discussed the role played by the trade unions in political economy; there were controversies on syndicalism and eclecticism. But what Lenin saw was the victimized workman, enduring unheard of and indescribable sufferings, and now called upon to reconstitute political economy. That the economic reconstruction was an imperative necessity, that we had to assemble all our forces, and that we had the right to call upon the working class to take part in the work, all this appeared incontestable to him, but it was a question whether we should begin with this at once, whether we should withdraw thousands of our best comrades from the army, where they had accustomed themselves to commanding, and send them back into the factories at once. Nothing would be produced by pursuing such tactics. "They must have a rest, they are very tired." Such was Lenin's decisive argument. He saw before him the real Russian worker, as he was in the winter of 1921, and he felt what was possible and what impossible.

Marx, in the introduction to his *Critique of Political Economy*, states that history only sets itself such tasks as it can fulfill. This means, in other words, that only he who grasps what tasks are historically capable of fulfillment at a given moment, and who does not fight for the desired, but for the possible can become the instrument of history. Lenin's greatness lies in the fact that he never permits himself to be blinded to a reality when it is in process of transformation, by any preconceived formula, and that he has the courage to throw yesterday's formula overboard as soon as it disturbs his grasp of this reality. Before our seizure of power, we issued, as revolutionary internationalists, the slogan of the peoples' peace against the governments' peace. And suddenly we found ourselves in the position of a Workers' Government, surrounded by peoples that had not yet succeeded in overthrowing their capitalist governments. "How can we conclude a peace with the Hohenzollern government?" was a question put by many comrades. Lenin answered mischievously: "You are worse than hens. A hen cannot make up its mind to step over a circle drawn around it with chalk. But it can at least justify itself by the assertion that this circle was drawn by a strange hand. But we have drawn up our formula with our own hands, and now you see the formula only, and not the reality. Our formula of peace to be concluded by the peoples, had for its object the awakening of the masses against the military and capitalist government. Now you want us to go to ruin, and to let the capitalist governments carry off the victory in the name of our revolutionary formula."

Lenin's greatness lies in his aiming at goals arising out of realities. In this reality he sees a powerful steed which will carry him to his goal, and he trusts himself to it. But he never abandons himself to his dreams. This is not all. His genius contains another trait: After he has set himself a certain goal; he seeks for the means leading to this goal through reality; he is not content with having fixed his aim, he thinks out concretely and completely everything necessary for the attainment of that aim. He does not merely work out a plan of campaign, but the whole organization of the campaign at the

same time. Our organizers, who are organizers only, have often laughed at Lenin as an organizer. Anyone seeing how Ilyitch works at home, in his room, or at the Council of Peoples, Commissars, might think it impossible to find a worse organizer. Not only has he no staff of secretaries to prepare his material, but up to now he has never even learnt to dictate to a stenographer, and gazes at the pen he is writing with, something like a Mujek from the Don district gazes at the first motor-car he sees. But show us in the whole Party one single individual capable of realizing within decades this central idea on the reform of our bureaucratic apparatus, although this reform is inevitable if we do not wait the Mujik, indignant against officialdom, to begin to howl. We all know our bureaucratic apparatus, we all cry out against the scandalous state of affairs named by comrade Steklov (chief editor of the *Izvestia*), with all the delicacy of a semi-official organ: "slight defects of Soviet mechanism". But which one of the party leaders puts himself the question: The new economic policy has created a fresh basis for an alliance between proletariat and peasantry; how are we to prevent bureaucracy from destroying this alliance? But the great politician of the Russian proletariat, prevented by his illness from going through his daily routine, thought of the central question of state organization, and worked out the plan of the struggle for decades in advance. But this is only the preliminary draft, details are dependent on the confirmation of experience. But the more attention we devote to this superficial draft, the more plainly we see that in Lenin's personality the great politician and the great political organizer are combined.

How all this happened to be combined in him, God only knows. (Comrade Stefanov and the Commission for combatting religion will kindly excuse). History has her own apparatus for distilling brandy, and no Tcheka can detect her. The German bourgeoisie could not manage to unite Germany, and somewhere, on a small landed estate grange, history set one of her machines in action, and with the aid of God or the devil, that is, by molecular work, she created Bismarck, who then fulfilled the task. If we read his first reports, if we follow his policy step for step, we are obliged to ask ourselves how it was possible for a landowner to possess such an understanding for the whole of European actuality.

The same thought arises every time we think over the history of our Party, the history of the revolution, and Ilyitch. For 15 years we looked on while this man was fighting over every comma in the resolutions, against every . . . ism invented during the last 25 years, from *Khvostism* to *Empiriocriticism*. For Lenin every such ism has always been the embodiment of some real enemy, existing either in outside classes or in the working class, but in any case in reality. These isms were the feelers of reality, and he absorbed the whole of this reality into himself, studied it, thought it out, until the finished miracle appeared, and the under-ground man proved himself the most earthly man of Russian reality. History offers no second example of such a transition from subterranean revolutionist to Statesman. This combination of the characteristics of a leading theorist, politician, and organizer, has made Lenin the leader of the Russian Revolution. And that this leader should be the only one universally recognized as leader, the human touch was required, the quality which has made Lenin the beloved hero of the Russian Revolution.

He himself tries to convince us that man requires absolute

truth, with is an untruth in Ibsen's individualistic formulation. For many people the truth is deadly; it is deadly even for many classes. If the bourgeoisie were to grasp the truth about itself, and were permeated with this truth, it would be defeated already, for who can go on fighting when the truth of history tells him that he is not only condemned to death, but that his corpse will be thrown into the sewer? The bourgeoisie is blind and dumb to its fate. But a revolutionary class needs the truth, for truth is the knowledge of reality. And it is not possible to dominate this reality without knowing it. We form one part of this reality: the working class, the Communist Party. And it is only if we are able to judge of our power and our weakness that we can judge of the measures to be taken to ensure final victory. Lenin tells the proletariat the truth, and the truth only, however depressing it may be. When workers hear him speaking, they know that there is not a single phrase in all his speech. He helps us to inform ourselves on reality. At one time I was living at Davos with a Bolshevik workman dying of consumption. At that time the right of self-determination of nationalities was being debated, and we Polish communists were opposed to Lenin's views. The comrade of whom I speak, after having read my theses against Lenin, said: "What you have written is perfectly convincing to me, but whenever I have been opposed to Ilyitch, it has always turned out afterwards that I was wrong." This is how the leading party functionaries think, and this is the reason of Lenin's authority in the Party; but the workers do not think so. They do not feel bound to Lenin because he has been in the right a thousand times, but because, if he has once been in the wrong, if a mistake has been committed under his leadership, he admitted openly: "We have made a mistake, and therefore we have been defeated here; this mistake must be made good in such and such manner". Many have asked him why he speaks so openly of mistakes made. I do not know why Lenin does it, but the results of this course of action may be plainly seen. The workman is much too enlightened to believe in redeeming saviours any longer. When Lenin speaks of his mistakes, he hides nothing, he leads the worker into his own laboratory of thought, he makes it possible for the worker to take part in forming the final decision, and the workers see in him the leader who represents their laboratory, the embodiment of their class struggle. A great class, itself needing absolute truth, loves with its whole heart a leader who is himself a truth-loving human being, one who tells the truth about himself. From such a leader the worker can bear any truth, even the hardest. Human beings have faith in themselves only when they conceal nothing, when they know everything about themselves, even the most unfavorable possibilities, and yet feel that they can say: In spite of everything . . . Lenin helps the working class to a full knowledge of every decaying and decomposing element of its own existence, and yet enables it to say in the end: I am His Majesty the Proletariat, the future ruler and creator of life. This is another factor in Lenin's greatness.

On this day of the 25th anniversary of the Party which not only bears the responsibility for the destiny of the sixth part of the globe, but which is at the same time the main lever of proletarian victory, the Russian Communists, and every revolutionist among the proletariats of every country, are filled with the thought and the wish that this Moses, who has led the slaves from the land of bondage, may pass with us into the promised land.

The Frankfort Conference

(Special In-press Report)

By Peter Steiger.

Preliminary notes.

Today, on the eve of the 75th anniversary of the German revolution of 1848, the International Conference convened by the Committee of 23 of the Rhenish-Westphalian Shop Stewards was opened in Citizens' Hall in Frankfort.

A great red flag waves before the house in the proletarian Berger street. Proletarians from all countries gather together in a hall of proletarian bareness and simplicity. German railwaymen and miners sit side by side with representatives of the French, English, Italian, Polish, Czech, Belgian, and Dutch proletariats. Communists sit in friendly conference with members of the German Socialist and Independent Socialist parties, and with syndicalists. The conference is opened—and we may take this as a characteristic symptom, despite the sabotage of the German Socialist Party—by a member of the United Social Democratic Party of Germany, the chairman of the National Committee of the Rhenish-Westphalian Shop Stewards—Fritze.

He speaks to the following effect: The war which has been taken up afresh by the imperialists, their invasion of the Ruhr territory, demand imperatively that the international working class take up its self-defense. We have been silent too long. The workers must put an end to their enslavement by international capital. They must pass from passivity to activity!

After this inauguration, the conference resolves to send a telegram expressing the heartiest revolutionary sympathy to the communist leaders imprisoned by Poincaré: comrades Cachin, Monmousseau, and Jacquemotte.

The Conference elects to the presidium, among others, the representative of the III. International, comrade Kolarov, the delegate sent by the Red International of Labor Unions, comrade Lozovsky, and the representative of the German C.P., comrade Clara Zetkin.

When Clara Zetkin, who has served the revolution for so many years, moves through the ranks of the delegates, the audience of workers greets her with enthusiasm and esteem.

With these harmonious preliminary chords the international Conference begins its work. It is faced with gigantic difficulties.

The task which the Frankfort world conference has set itself is to organize the inevitable struggle on national and international lines. It defies all attempts at sabotage on the part of the reformists, and works in the full consciousness of fulfilling its revolutionary mission at a time when new wars are threatened.

Opening day.

Frankfort, 17. March 1923.

The congress was opened by the chairman of the National Committee of the Rhenish-Westphalian Shop Stewards, *Friege* (United Social Democratic Party of Germany).

On the suggestion of the *Committee of Action of the Communist Parties of France and Germany*, it was decided to elect a presidium of 11 members, comprising representatives of: The National Committee of the Rhenish-Westphalian Shop Stewards, the Communist International, the Red International of Labor Unions, the Communist Youth International, the Communist Party of France, the C.G.T.U. of France, the Communist Party of Germany, the C.P. of England, the C.P. of Italy, and the Social Democratic fractions.

On the suggestion of the representative of the All-Russian Trade Union Alliance, *Ivanov*, the following letter of greeting was sent to comrades *Monmousseau*, *Cachin*, *Jacquemotte*, and others imprisoned by the French and Belgian bourgeoisie:

"The International Conference considers it its class duty to send fraternal greetings, on its opening day, to all of you who are incarcerated in French and Belgian prisons. You have protested courageously against the predatory raid made by a savage imperialism on the peaceful inhabitants of the Ruhr area. You have not permitted yourselves to be fooled by the insolently lying phrases of the bourgeoisie, as if France and Belgium had the right to tread underfoot the disarmed German people. You have defied the howling of the whole bourgeois nationalist pack, and have proudly carried forward the flag of the Communist and Red Labor Union Internationals. You have fulfilled your class duty towards the revolutionary proletariat. You have saved the honor of the French and Belgian working class. It is not by such adventures, not by bloody conflicts, that the workers of the world will be saved, but solely by the comradely overthrow of that system which permits the administrators of the money-bags to stake the lives of millions. We proletarians of all countries, gathered at this International Conference, feel the closeness of the tie that binds us to you of the French and Belgian working class, despite the frontiers and the prison walls lying between us. The war intoxication is vanishing, the working class of France and Belgium is beginning to awaken, to take up action. Your bourgeoisie already sees itself confronted by the spectre of social revolution, and throws itself upon those who are merely expressing in a conscious form that which is fermenting in the whole mass. It hopes to exterminate the germ of revolution by imposing silence on its spokesmen and standard bearers. The bourgeoisie will soon see that it is impossible to annihilate the working class, or to imprison it wholesale — even with the aid of the reformists.

The prisons will never be able to suppress the struggle of the working class for its emancipation.

We greet you, revolutionary trade unionists, communists, and youthful champions of the proletarian revolution in France and Belgium!"

The following agenda was decided upon:

1. The situation in France.
2. The situation in Germany.
3. The predatory raid of the French in the Ruhr, and the impending danger of war.
4. The struggle against the international Fascist reaction.

March 18.

Comrade Kolarov, Bulgaria (Comintern):

"Comrades, I am commissioned to remit to you the revolutionary greetings of the E.C. of the C.I. The E.C. of the C.I. has responded to the appeal made by the *Committee of 23*, and has not contented itself with approaching the London and Amsterdam Internationals with an appeal; it has also called upon all organizations affiliated to the III. International to send delegates to this conference. This conference meets at a moment when the danger of fresh war is hanging over Europe. It is true that the capitalist governments have a presentiment of the consequences of a new war: *The Social Revolution!* But they are no longer capable of controlling the forces they have unchained. We may even say that war has already begun in the Ruhr district.

The proletariat of the Rhine country and Westphalia is aroused, and with it the proletariats of all European states. The working class does not want a capitalist war. But it does not suffice for it merely not to want it. In 1914 the peoples of Europe did not want a world war either, and were none the less driven into the bloody massacre.

We must renounce a fresh war impossible,

we must overthrow the powers which are preparing this war.

In February of this year a conference met at the Hague, convened by the Amsterdam and London Internationals, and having for its object the adoption of measures against war. A resolution was there passed for preventing a new war by an international general strike. But now that the armies of French imperialism have marched into the Ruhr, now that French and Belgian workers are again forced into uniform for the purpose of taking up arms against their class comrades,

now these "Internationals" jail us as miserably as they did in 1914.

Now as then they have shown themselves incompetent of leading the struggle against the danger of war, and now as then the reason is that they will not lead the masses into a conflict against their own and the international bourgeoisie. The reformists in Germany are standing side by side with the German bourgeoisie, as in 1914, for the "defence of the Fatherland", which is still the Fatherland of the bourgeoisie.

After the Ruhr occupation the Comintern and Profintern appealed to the reformist Internationals to join them in common defensive action. The London and Amsterdam leaders did not even deem it necessary to reply. But the masses are beginning to understand the slogans of the Comintern.

Just before the Ruhr occupation we had the first example of the solidarity existing between the German and French proletarian vanguards. The French bourgeoisie grasped the Essen danger at once. The champions of the French proletariat, the leaders of the French C.P. and the C.G.T.U., were thrown into prison. The work begun in Essen was carried on by the German Shop Stewards.

This conference is a landmark in the development of the international proletarian United Front.

We are proud to see in this hall representatives of Social Democratic groups from different countries. This signifies the beginning of clarification with the Social Democratic strata. And this is the beginning of the victory of the idea of revolutionary class struggle. This conference must forge the weapons which will place the proletariats of all countries in a position to break down capitalist class rule, and thus to put an end to all imperialist conflicts once and for all. Long live international proletarian solidarity! Long live ruthless international class war! Long live the Revolutionary International!"

The next speaker was

Comrade Lozovsky:

The Red International of Labor Unions sends fraternal greetings and good wishes to this congress, and hopes that this meeting will not alone demonstrate against the danger of war, but will also find means of fighting its causes. When the Se. 1, 2½, and Amsterdam Internationals convened a so-called peace conference at the Hague three months ago, we of the small Russian delegation said that it was futile to convene a peace conference; what we want is a *class struggle conference*, we do not want pacifism. It is not by pacifism that we defeat the bourgeoisie; of this, experience has given us ample proof. Scarcely three weeks after the Hague conference Poincaré invaded the Ruhr. He showed that he was not in the least alarmed at all the threats of the international reformists.

The proletariat must form a revolutionary bloc if it wants to fight effectually and successfully against imperialism.

The Russian comrades, who carried on the conflict against their bourgeoisie under the most difficult circumstances, are aware that at the present time there are broad strata of the international working class still in a state of indifference. We must find ways and means for rousing these great masses of working people in all countries.

The bloc of exploiters must be opposed by a determined bloc of all exploited and proletarian masses. This is the aim we have set ourselves at this conference.

What do we understand under *United Front*, and on what basis do we want to form the united front of the workers of all countries? Today we do not demand that the broad masses of social democratic workers, and those workers who are not yet our followers, should unite on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat. All we ask is that a united front be formed on the basis of the demands formulated by the Social Democratic organizations themselves. We ask that they convert into reality,

together with us, that which they are always pretending to the masses. Thus the Frankfort conference must appeal to the workers of all countries to form the

United Front on the basis of the class struggle.

We know very well that the reformist leaders will oppose this, but we know equally well that the class consciousness of the workers is awakening, and that they are beginning to realize the necessity of united action against capitalism.

When Fimmen proposed, at the Hague, that the *general strike* be proclaimed if war should threaten, we said: "Do not promise what you cannot fulfil. In the first place you are not agreed among yourselves, and in the second place you are so bound up with your bourgeoisie that you will not be able to keep your promise when the time comes." Unfortunately for the proletariat, our prediction has proved true. What has the exploited working class of the world to hope from such an International? Such an International cannot fight, and never will be able to fight. Despite the sufferings involved for the working class, particularly in Germany, by the Ruhr occupation, it has had at least one good effect: *The international proletariat realizes that reformist methods cannot help the working class.*

Our conference must and will do good work if we confine ourselves to the practical, and do not only pass good resolutions, but at the same time prepare for real and systematic action rendering it possible for us to unite the international working class in one fighting front against the international bourgeoisie."

Comrade Schatzkin, representative of the Communist Youth International.

The Communist Youth International, and the Communist Youth of Russia do not bring you mere resolutions, do not come empty handed. We are already able to report on practical and successful work against war and against Fascism. We fulfil by our deeds that which was bequeathed to us by our murdered leaders Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, for whose death no vengeance has as yet been taken. . . In the occupied territory our youthful comrades distribute leaflets in the French and German languages. They are carrying on successful propaganda amongst the French and Belgian soldiery! We are now distributing a

leaflet in the Moorish language,

as a means of finding a way to our black brothers in uniform. Many of our comrades in the occupied territory have been arrested and sentenced for their activity. Between the 11. and 18. of March we carried on an international fighting week against war and Fascism, the effectiveness of which is proved by the reports of arrests of Communist Youth comrades in all countries.

Our leading comrades have been thrown into prison in Spain, in France, and in Belgium. In the Ruhr area two comrades were yesterday sentenced to 6 months imprisonment by the French court martial.

The dead bodies of our Italian comrades, and the numerous conflicts between German Youth comrades and the National Socialist bands, bear witness to our fight against Fascism.

Soviet Russia has been, remains, and will continue to remain, the firmest proletarian pillar of revolution. Our workers, peasants, Red Army, and fleet, all want peace. But the bourgeoisie must not forget that the Red Army and Fleet are completely at the disposal of the international proletariat.

Comrade Newbold (C.P. of Great Britain).

"I had hoped to come over here with a larger delegation, but for a revolutionist it is not easy to get from England to the continent. The gentlemen of the Labor Party and of the 2½ International say that they could not come. But they could not because they did not want to. For the reformists shrink from coming in contact with the communists in any way. They prefer a united front with the capitalists. This week the Labor Party voted in Parliament for the convention of an inter-parliamentary conference on the Ruhr question, at which the Parliaments of Great Britain, France, and Belgium should meet. That is, representatives of the capitalists and labor representatives of the victorious countries only.

It would be useless for me to give you any hope of help from the Labor Party, or from the mighty British trade unions, of which the great mass of English workers are still members.

The Labor Party is already anticipating the day when it will be in the government, and thus it prefers the sympathy of the bourgeoisie to the sympathy of the working masses of Europe.

If England does not venture to take action at the moment against France's advance, it is because she fears the great army and numerous air fleet of France. But ere long, we shall be confronted by the task of defending ourselves from a war between the imperialisms of France and England. We must

therefore be prepared for a danger which is much more serious than the occupation of the Ruhr and Rhine areas, for the danger that Europe, that the whole world, will be plunged into an imperialist carnage compared with which that of 1914 was nothing. It is our task to prepare the workers of Germany to overthrow their bourgeoisie, and to place the great industrial powers of the Rhine and Ruhr areas in the hands of the German revolution. We must arm ourselves for resistance against the International of Capital, which may very easily arise as soon as the Ruhr adventure is over. This temporary conflict will be followed by the next great war, unless capitalist rule in Germany, in France, in Italy, and even in England, where the revolutionary movement is still weak, is first overthrown.

A representative from India

brought the greetings of the working millions of India: The might of imperialism which oppresses the European states is supported by the exploitation of the working masses in the colonial countries, and for this reason the exploited colonial peoples must join the workers of Europe in the common work of overthrowing their common enemy. The colonies are not only the economic reserves of imperialism, but military ones as well. Just as France is now sending black soldiers into the Ruhr area, in the same manner millions of Indian peasants will be forced to fight against French imperialism. Imperialism must be shattered all over the world by the united action of the European working masses and of the colonial peoples.

Max Thiele (Social Democrat)

remitted a resolution which had been passed unanimously at a meeting held by the workshops of the Frankfort Eastern Railway.

Comrade Marius, representative of the French C.P.

We bring you not only the fraternal greetings of the C.P. of France and of the C.G.T.U.; the French proletariat has proved that it has more than mere greetings and words, that it can fulfil in actual deeds the promises made in Essen. Our comrades have been imprisoned because the bourgeoisie comprehends that the Communist Party and the Unitarian Trade Union Federation are powers whose destiny it is to overthrow the rule of French imperialism.

The workers of Germany and France will not march against one another again. The workers of France and Germany will rise in unity against the bourgeois front.

In this conflict French capitalism is not concerned with saving its native country, the question in hand is the fact that Loucheur wants 60%. As soon as an understanding has been reached between the groups of capitalists,

the Ruhr area will be reduced to a colony, the Ruhr workers to colonial slaves.

The French reformists have not even replied to our appeal for a joint struggle; and in the same manner we see the German Trade Union Alliance, which with its 8 millions of organized workers could easily overthrow Cuno's government, placing itself on the side of the German capitalist government. The workers must follow the red flag of communism only, and then they will shatter the power of the capitalists in France and Germany.

Comrade Lansing (Holland):

brought greetings from the revolutionary trade unions of Holland. Holland, a country of 6½ million inhabitants, holds 35 millions in subjection in its colonies. When the great world war comes, the Dutch colonies will be one of the bones of contention, and then the Dutch workers will be utilized to defend the colonial interests of the Dutch bourgeoisie. Arming has been going on for this purpose since the "peace" of 1918. The Dutch workers must also take up the struggle against the new world war. It was a Dutch revolutionist who proposed the general strike against war as early as the Brussels congress in 1888. But the Social Democrats called him a mad fool. We have nothing to expect from these people.

The longer their resolutions are, the shorter their deeds. It is of no use to us to pass magnificent resolutions in the evening and then to continue to manufacture the arms for capitalist war the next day. We must refuse to work in the barracks and workshops, and work in the interests of the proletarian world community only.

Grothe

spoke on behalf of the National Committee of the German Shop Stewards:

We are glad to be able to ascertain that a great section of the social democratic workers, and the workers in the trade unions, are on our side, even though they have not had the power to induce their leaders to appear here. In face of the sabotage with which the reformist leaders neutralize the struggles

of the workers, the masses of workers are taking to self-aid, and lend their support to the shop steward movement. Comrade Grothe read extracts from the *Vorwärts*, in which it is stated that in view of the present situation the United German Socialist Party sees itself more than ever induced to refuse any co-operation with the communists.

Comrade Grothe expressed in warm terms the gratitude of the German working class for the active aid sent by the Russian proletariat to the Ruhr workers. He closed with an appeal for determined combat against German and international capital.

Comrade Marianski (Poland)

greeted the congress on behalf of the Red Trade Unions and the Communist Party of Poland.

A Franco-German war would signify a war of Poland against Germany, and further a war of Poland against Soviet Russia. Poland is a vassal of France. Its policy is dictated by the French capitalists. After the occupation of the Ruhr, we took up the struggle against the war danger with increased energy. The reformists of Poland opposed us bitterly. We shall continue the struggle, and shrink from no sacrifice in carrying out the resolutions of this congress.

A representative of the striking miners in the Saar area reported that all attempts made by French mining capital to strangle the strike, which has now lasted 7 weeks, are in vain. This struggle is being carried on in an exemplary manner, and will not end until wages and conditions of living have been attained which are worthy of human beings. The Saar workers look to the congress to lay down lines for their activity.

(to be continued)

POLITICS

The Anglo-American Alliance

By J. T. Walton Newbold.

The Ruhr, and to a lesser degree, the Near East have for some months been absorbing practically the entire attention of all those interested in world politics. Yet, at this very time, there has been taking place an enormously important orientation of forces in an entirely different quarter.

When the government of Lloyd George went out of office, it appeared as if the relations of Britain and the United States promised little peace for the near future. Lloyd George may be said to have been the spokesman and agent of the nationalist tendencies in British politics. He was the agent of the industrialists, and as such, he stood for a militant British assertiveness in the councils of the world. The policy for which he and his colleagues spoke was for a survival of the economic phase which had passed some time, prior to his resignation. The new forces, or rather the old forces which had regained economic power as a result of the long continued trade crisis, were those of the bankers and financiers. They had, gradually succeeded in undermining the economic power and political influence of the industrialists who had raised Lloyd George to the head of the coalition. Lloyd George, had he remained at the head of the government would probably have led Britain into a war with France, either indirectly in the East or directly in the West. He would not have been prepared to make the apparent submission to the United States with the same good grace as the government of Bonar Law and Stanley Baldwin, has done. He was associated in the mind of America with hostile oil interests in Mexico, the West Indies and Mosul. He was similarly committed to interests in the financial world hostile to the domination of Chicago and New-York.

The government of Bonar Law, while not by any means likely to yield at all points to the United States conservatives, has already taken a line which is calculated to bring the United States and Britain into alliance, though it would be difficult to say whether this policy only commenced with the entry of Bonar Law into the office. It would seem that for some time previously there had been unofficial approaches to America, made through banking and commercial magnates, and which may have had the tacit approval of the more conservative element in the Lloyd George government. During the year 1922, and especially during the latter half of it, the question which assumed the greatest importance for the government was not the Near East, but the question of arriving at a settlement with the United States Government on the matter of the debt owed to it. Coming events cast their shadows before and we can take it that the Geddes Committee on economy in public services, was appointed with a view to arriving at such a reduction of government expenditures as would make possible the payment of interest and sinking fund on the American debt. The recom-

mendations of this committee have by no means been entirely followed out, but the money saved is certainly about equal to that required for the immediate charges on the debt to America. It is not always the more spectacular aspects of state policy which are worthy of our notice. The adventures of Great Britain in the East were nothing like so vital an interest to our governing class as some people imagine. They were in fact rather a last effort of an obsolete phase of imperialism.

All important as the question of oil is for the British Admiralty the question of finances appears even more important in the minds of the government as a whole. While the war had greatly enriched the manufactures, ship-owners and certain other profiteering interests, their position had been undermined during the two years of depreciation by those other and older economic interests whose capital values, relatively depreciated during the war, had rapidly appreciated during the last two years. In this country, at any rate, the whole banking fraternity and the mercantile houses in the City of London have recovered the position they occupied in the national economy prior to 1914, but which they lost for a while during the war. They have, a natural predilection for friendly relations with the United States. British investments in South America are somewhere in the neighbourhood of 1,000,000,000 pounds and that these, like holdings in Canada, Mexico and the West Indies would be endangered by any complications with America. We can understand how strongly their influence works for the achievement of an entente between the two English-speaking peoples. Sentiment may appear to be a link which binds these peoples together, but in reality it is a class bias an economic community of interest.

Turning now to America, we find that there also, as a result of the terrible industrial depression, the big industrialists have come once more under the domination of those financiers of Wall Street, from whose control they had managed to slip during the war period.

The Wilson Administrations from 1913 to 1921 were a visible political expression of an effort at emancipation from Wall Street, vigorously attempted, and for a time successfully carried out by American industrialists. That is to say, with the building up of huge fortunes as a result of the expansion of American industry, to meet the demands of the war-years, American big business became more self-reliant, more self-assertive and more nationalist in character, and for a time revolted successfully against the big houses of Wall Street, whose power in American finance was built not so much upon American production as upon the service which they rendered to European capital, seeking to exploit the expanding agriculture, industry and trade of the United States. The greatest achievement of the Wilson Administration was undoubtedly the setting up of the Federal Reserve Bank which sought to give American business men a financial service at home, guaranteed and controlled by the American Government. Just before America's entry into the war, the big corporation of business men and financiers connected with Rockefeller and the Chicago Produce Trade, thought to cultivate an American export and carrying trade and an American economic expansion which expressed itself sometimes in terms of decided imperialism. With the entry of America into the war, these interests sought to build up a great mercantile marine, built at the expense of, and constructed by the State and intended to provide American exporters and importers with transport under the American rather than a foreign flag. From 1917 to 1921, numerous corporations were founded and efforts made to foster American trade and influence throughout the American Continent and the Far East. Not only that, but efforts were also made to gain a financial footing within the British Empire primarily in Canada, but also in South Africa and India.

This was the inevitable corollary of the acquisition by the American capitalists of British holdings in American securities, followed as it was by extensive loans, to the British Government and the Allies. It seemed, until last year, that America intended to assert herself as a great world power in active opposition, not only in finance, but in trade and politics, to Great Britain. The same phenomenon of militant industrialism which expressed itself through Lloyd George and the coalition Government, appeared also in America. The failure, however, of the gigantic promotions of the industrialists and the Trust Companies, for the purpose of developing export trade, and the calamitous failure of the American Mercantile Marine, built and promoted by the United States Shipping Board, together with the added inability of Europe to do business with America, have, in America, brought in the same liquidation of bloated industrialism which we have witnessed in this country. The great financial houses of Wall Street, have once more come into their own and resumed their sway in the world of economics. Not only that, but the farmers of the Middle West, unable to sell their produce in any of

American or European markets, have also fallen back into the clutches of these same bankers.

Thus, while the Republican Party came into power in 1921 with a tremendous majority, to carry into practice this policy of splendid isolation and strident Americanism, the logic of events has compelled President Harding to bring his party into the service of its traditional task-masters and paymasters, the bankers of Wall Street in general and J. P. Morgan in particular.

The house of Morgan has been a concern for the active promotion of Anglo-American friendship and co-operation. During the War it was a buying agent for the British Government; it sold immense quantities of securities for the British Government which that government had taken over from its subjects; it acted as a loan agent for all transactions, the cumulative result of which is now seen in the stupendous debt of the British Government to America. In every scene and on every occasion, J. P. Morgan and Company have been the faithful friends and close collaborators of the British governing class.

While Americans have a very considerable influence in Paris and have certainly been behind the electrical industry and behind Loucheur, they are not likely for a single moment to be in sympathy with the policy of the French militarists and petty bourgeoisie which is responsible for the occupation of the Ruhr. They have no more use for French national assertiveness than for the national assertiveness of any other foreign imperialism. In fact, it is doubtful whether Morgan and Company favour imperialism at all. They are essentially the agents of the international bond-holding interests that are a force likely to favour the regime of the League of Nations which, there is reason to believe, has its active though secret aid at every turn. They also, like Bonar Law, desire tranquility. Tranquility, is, of course, just what merchant bankers and bond holders want.

While it would seem at first sight that the Americans have driven a hard bargain with the British Government in the matter of the funding of the debt, it is now evident that the British have not done so badly. The Americans have quietly dropped the Shipping Subsidy Bill, which was causing intense anxiety to British shipowners and which, had it been proceeded with, would without question have resulted in the bankruptcy of British shipping or, at an early date, war between this country and America.

This abandonment of State guarantee for the American shipping industry means, in effect, the actual abandonment of the attempt to build up a great American mercantile marine, for it is quite realized that without such governmental assistance it is impossible for the United States ship-owners to hold their own against the more firmly established and infinitely more experienced British ship-owners. Here again we see the influence of this great house which, while controlling the International Mercantile Company and its great subsidiary lines, the White Star, the Red Star and others, sails them under the Union Jack as British ships.

On top of all this, we have the proposal on the part of the American President, that America, while not entering the League of Nations, shall appoint its judges upon the International Court established in the League.

This coming together of the American and the British financial oligarchy and the harmonious relations being established between the respective executive committees, are phenomena which deserve our most earnest attention. What is coming into existence is an alliance of bondholders, and alliance of creditors and an alliance of international owners of abstract property. The American Government and the British government will come together as agents of the mortgage-holders of the Continent. They both desire and will see that they get, tranquility, however drastic the measures of repression which may be necessary. Together, they will guarantee the supremacy of the League of Nations, together they will formulate a code of laws to govern the hopeless millions who, for the next eighty to a hundred years, shall have one duty, and one duty only—to toil ceaselessly to pay off a debt incurred in order to make the world "safe for democracy".

FASCISM

Fight Fascism!

To the workers of all countries!

A new Horthy Hungary has arisen in Italy. From day to day and from week to week the murderous terrorism of Mussolini's government continues to increase, to follow its aim of completely enslaving the proletariat. The most unheard of deeds of horror are committed daily at the behest of the Italian government.

In its own interests, the international proletariat cannot look quietly on while the Italian labor movement is being annihilated. A suggestion made by the IV. Congress of the Communist International has therefore led to the formation of a Provisional Committee, under the chairmanship of comrade Clara Zetkin, for the purpose of carrying on the fight against Fascism on an international basis, and aiding the victims of Fascism.

The committee appeals to the international proletariat to organize defensive action against the Fascist regime of murder, and relief action for the victims among the brave Italian working class. It will be the task of all proletarian organizations, regardless of political tendency, to fulfil this international duty as a point of honor.

The provisional committee, at the same time, appeals to the executives of the London and Vienna Internationals, as well as to the executive of the Amsterdam trade union international and the international organization of syndicalists, to join the Communist International, the Red International of Labor Unions, and the Communist Youth International, in forming the final committee for combatting Fascism. Workers of all countries, demand of your organizations that they take part in the proceedings of the undersigned provisional committee.

Special national committees will conduct the work, in every country, of collecting in aid of the Italian labor organizations. Working men and women, show your international solidarity! Think of Horthy Hungary! Here the most bestial Terror raged, and the international proletariat failed to step in and prevent it. You must make sure that the Italian proletariat does not share the fate of the Hungarian. The brutal subjugation of the Italian proletariat would be inevitably followed by an enormous increase of Fascist reaction in every country. You are threatened, one and all, by the Fascist outlook of your bourgeoisie. Therefore up and fight against Fascism, by propaganda, by international collections, and by political defensive action.

The Provisional International Committee for Combatting Fascism.

Clara Zetkin, (Chairman).

THE LABOR MOVEMENT

Proletarian Forces in the United States

By Israel Amler.

In our analysis of the political forces in the United States, we did not lay any stress on the political power of the working class. This is due to the fact that the working-class of America is not an organized power, either economically or politically. This does not mean that the workers do not exert any influence what ever. On the contrary, in many sections they are a factor to be reckoned with. But the American worker is possessed of little class consciousness, and is swayed by emotion of a light nature. The *Labor Movement*, both politically and economically, in America is still in the making.

The backwardness of the American working-class is most evident in the frivolity with which an American worker casts his vote on election day, looks at the paper the next day for the results, rejoices if "his" party has won and swears if it has lost. And whether it has won or lost, he forgets the whole procedure till a new election day comes round and warns him that he must vote again.

In 1916, the American workers voted overwhelmingly for Wilson, being assured that the good man would "keep us out of war". He spoke so sincerely and so frankly, man to man, that the American worker believed him. And within two or three months, the same president was talking of war. A revolutionist understands what caused the change. He understands that capital could best use an "anti-imperialist" to lead the way into the imperialist crusade! But the workers did not see—and easily succumbed to the subtle propaganda that filled the press at the expense of the Allies and of the pro-Ally confederates in the United States.

So after voting against war, the American worker went into war. He was ready to make the "most supreme" sacrifice. He was ready to shoot down any one who still retained a spark of reason. When the war was over, he was ready to work harder than ever to aid in the reconstruction of the world. When in 1919, the steel workers went on strike against the inhuman

conditions that they had to work under and when the railroad workers threatened strike, President Wilson, whom the American workers had voted for, did not hesitate to send his favorite General Leonhard Wood with United States troops to shoot respect for capitalism into their bodies.

And when the workers, for this reason, but more particularly because after getting us into war,—about which we were wildly enthusiastic, once we were in—Wilson insisted upon keeping us in Europe, in the League of Nations—when for these various reasons, the workers turned out Wilson and put in Harding, they were confronted with the same problem. Harding, who promised to keep us out of Europe, allowed more than 8,000,000 jobless men and women to take care of themselves, declaring that he would not “look with pleasure upon any unemployment scheme that would touch the public treasury”—at a time when he was recommending a subsidy of \$500,000,000 for the railroad magnates. He sent his troops against the miners in Mingo County, West Virginia. In 1922, he sent them against the miners and textile workers and shopmen. But most of all he allowed a prohibition amendment to be ratified—and the American worker rebelled. So in 1922, the American workers aided the American farmer, who had his own reasons in turning down the candidates of the Republican Party, of which Harding is the leader. And the day after election, the American worker went back to his work, convinced that he had performed a public duty, and satisfied that he had helped to “save” the country.

These are but manifestations of the backwardness of the American working-class.

This backwardness is due to the influence of two elements: the reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the yellow leaders of the Socialist Party.

The American Labor movement should be one of the most militant and revolutionary in the world. The objective conditions—the development of capitalism, the concentration of wealth, the terroristic methods applied by the employing classes—all of these factors should have produced a revolutionary working-class standing side by side with European workers in their struggle against capitalism. But on the contrary, the American workers are isolated from the international movement. The political concept of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, is that the American working man and woman is the equal of any other citizen. The American worker must not degrade himself by forming a party of workers. In politics, he is not a worker—he is a citizen, with rights “equal to Rockefeller’s” as it is so aptly expressed. Gompers’ method is to select the party, and the candidate that offers or promises to do most for labor, and to promote his election with the aid of the whole A.F. of L. machinery. In 1906, Gompers succeeded in having the A.F. of L. accept his “Non-partisan policy” as he called the above-mentioned method. This policy has been confirmed from year to year. And yet Gompers has no victories to score. All he can report at sessions of the Executive Council of the A.F. of L., is that *congress is paying little respect to the wishes of the working-class*. 1920, 1921, the same report and the same complaint—and yet in 1922 Gompers advocated the same policy.

In 1922, when the workers were embittered against the administration because it deprived them of their beer, because of no help in unemployment, and particularly by the issuing of the Daugherty injunction—in 1922, Gompers, who is a Democrat, selected *anti-administration* men, whose election was sure because of this very fact. And when election was over, he demonstrated the merit of the A.F. of L. “non-partisan political” policy, by the election of a large number of candidates approved by the A.F. of L. He did not state that the 3,000,000 organized in the A.F. of L. had no influence among the unorganized workers. He did not state that the farmers were indifferent to the attitude of the A.F. of L. He did not state that, as a whole, where the farmers had their own political organization, Gompers refused to cooperate with them.

Nor did he narrate the amusing case of the election of the Senator from Ohio. The A.F. of L. supported Senator Pomerence; the Railroad Brotherhood, which is an independent labor organization, supported Simon Fess. The A.F. of L. praised Pomerence as the friend of labor; the Railroad Brotherhood called on the workers to vote for Fess, assailing Pomerence. Fess was elected—which proved the greater influence and greater eloquence of the Brotherhood speakers and press. But what was the difference? Neither one can represent the workers. Neither one will be responsible to the workers. The workers have elected a capitalist to represent working-class interests. This is the policy of the A.F. of L. and the Railroad Brotherhoods, which are among the aristocrats of American labor and therefore very conservative.

The Socialist Party has pursued an analogous policy for about the same length of time. When the S.P. split away from the Socialist Labor Party on the question of unionism, and when in 1905 the I.W.W. was organized, slowly and surely, the revolutionists of the American movement began to isolate themselves from the masses. The I.W.W. as a politico-industrial movement, at least preserved a proper concept of the revolutionary movement—regarding it not as a matter of securing votes on election day, but as a daily struggle of the masses against exploitation and for the securing of power. (But we will not enter here into a discussion of the incorrectness of their idea of the nature of the State as later developed.) In 1912, the S.P. passed a resolution against sabotage in industry. This was a repudiation of the I.W.W. and a confession of cowardice. The S.P. leadership was greatly in the hands of professionals, journalists, lawyers, dentists etc., who had no understanding of the labor movement, except in theory. This rejection of the I.W.W. meant the loss of a powerful revolutionary body of men and led to the further degeneration and disintegration of the S.P., which more and more lost contact with the labor movement.

In 1919, as a result of the enthusiasm aroused by the Russian Revolution, the time appeared to demand action. The proletarians within the S.P., called for a new orientation. They demanded on the basis of the experiences of the Russian Revolution, that the S.P. conduct its propaganda not merely for securing votes on election day, but for a mass movement that, one day, would have to use other means, in order to free the working-class and place it in power.

In 1919, the steel workers and railroad workers were on strike. The American Government, the most powerful at the time in the world, was fully armed, and showed no mercy in crushing strikes. A struggle against that government did not quite appeal to the leaders of the S.P., Hillquit, Berger, Gerber and their satellites. They expelled the big mass of the trouble-makers, and peace reigned in the S.P.

Thus the S.P., too, is responsible for the fact that the American worker has not been organized as a body to exercise an influence 365 days of the year, to bring pressure to bear by means of his organizations and thus count as a factor in the daily struggles of the working class, from which result the political struggles, which culminate in a final combat for the control of the State.

Since 1919, the S.P. has degenerated still more. It modified its constitution to satisfy the scruples of the capitalist class. It took everything out of its program that smacked of revolution. It became “respectable”. It no longer combatted the A.F. of L. leaders—on the contrary, it has catered to them. Hillquit speaks at the A.F. of L. convention—he has no terrors for conservative workmen. Schlesinger, former president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, who was supposed to be a Socialist, was sent as delegate to the British Labor Congress, as a reward for his malicious, violent attack on Soviet Russia. The brothers are united in an effort to keep the American workers from a clear understanding of the necessity of having a political party of their own, and of making this party a party of every-day action! Just as the capitalists are organized for activity in every phase of economic and political life.

All of the American labor movement does not live under the spell of Gompers, Hillquit and Co. In the A.F. of L. and especially owing to the influence of the Communists, there has developed a strong progressive left wing, and in the independent unions there are radical and progressive forces that recognize the necessity of the workers acting in political life independently. This has led to the idea of an Independent Labor Party, to be composed of the workers and working farmers.

Notice to our Readers:

In subscribing to the “INTERNATIONAL PRESS CORRESPONDANCE”, send your check or money order thru:

U.S.A.: Equitable Trust Company, New York, N. Y.

ENGLAND: Swiss Bank Corporation, London.

INDIA: Cox & Co., Bombay.

EGYPT: Cox & Co., Alexandria.

NORWAY: Centralbanken for Norge, Christiania.

SWEDEN: A. B. Göteborgs Bank, Stockholm.

Making it payable to:

Bett Simon & Co. a/c Inprecorr, Berlin.

Rates: \$ 3.00 for 6 months; \$ 6.00 for one year.
12/- 24/-

Printed by Friedrichstadt-Druckerei G. m. b. H., Berlin SW. 48