

THE COMMUNIST



Vol. VII

No. 1

JANUARY, 1928



PRICE

25 cents

THE COMMUNIST



Vol. VII

No. 1

JANUARY, 1928



PRICE

25 cents

AFTER TEN YEARS—*Report of the First American Trade Union Delegation.*

PAPER 50c—CLOTH \$1.00

REPORT OF THE FIRST AMERICAN RANK AND FILE LABOR DELEGATION TO SOVIET RUSSIA

25 CENTS

MISLEADERS OF LABOR

By WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

Outlining a program for freeing labor from its false leaders and welding the trade unions into powerful fighting organizations.

CLOTH \$1.75



WRECKING THE LABOR BANKS—*By* WM. Z. FOSTER
The collapse of the Labor Banks and Investment Companies of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.

25 CENTS

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
39 East 125th Street New York, N. Y.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A LETTER TO THE WORKERS. By Lenin	1
THE CRISIS IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT. By Wm. Z. Foster	10
THE LESSONS OF THE CANTON UPRISING. By Harry Joven	21
PREPARING FOR THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE.	25
By Ella G. Wolfe	
NATIONAL AND COLONIAL REVOLUTION. By V. I. Lenin	38
AMERICA DISCUSSES THE OPPOSITION. By Bertram D. Wolfe	44
CHEMICAL WARFARE. By Robert Macdonald	58

our aid. I added that the workers will have to break with Gompers and Renner. Slowly but surely the workers are approaching Communist or Bolshevistic tactics.

Less than five months have passed since I wrote these words. It can be said that during this time the world revolution of the proletariat has matured with tremendous rapidity, and the workers in various countries have gone over to Communism and Bolshevism.

At the time of my writing the above-mentioned letter, on the 20th of August, 1918, our Bolshevik Party was the only one which determinedly fought the old Second International, which lasted from 1889 to 1914, and which was shamefully bankrupted during the imperialistic war of 1914-18. Our party was the only one which unqualifiedly took the new road, which leads away from Socialism and Social Democracy, contaminated by an alliance with the brigand bourgeoisie, and toward Communism—the road which leads away from petty-bourgeois reformism and opportunism, which had completely permeated and still permeates the official Social Democracy and Socialist parties, and toward real proletarian and revolutionary tactics.

FORMATION OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Now, on the 12th of January, 1919, we find a great number of Communist proletarian parties, not only within the confines of the former Empire of the Czar, as in Lettonia, Finland, Poland, but also in Western Europe—in Austria, Hungary, Holland, and finally in Germany. When the German Spartacus League—led by its world-renowned and celebrated leaders, by such real supporters of the cause of the laboring class as Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin, and Franz Mehring—finally broke off its co-operation with the Socialist traitors of the Scheidemann and Suedekum stamp, these social chauvinists (Socialists in words, but chauvinists in action), who forever contaminated themselves by their alliance with the imperialistic brigand bourgeoisie of Germany and with Wilhelm II; when the Spartacus League took the name of the Communist Party of Germany, then the foundation was laid for the real proletarian, the real international, the real revolutionary Third International. The Communist International became a reality. Its formation has not yet been formally established, yet, in fact, the Third International is already acting.

Now, no conscious workingman, and no sincere Socialist, can

fail to see what shameful treason against Socialism was perpetrated by those who, in line with the Mensheviks and "social revolutionists" of Russia, with the Scheidemanns and Suedekums of Germany, with the Renaudels of France, and the Vanderveldes in Belgium, with the Hendersons and Webbs in England and with Gompers and Co. in America, supported "their" bourgeoisie in the war of 1914-18.

This war has completely revealed itself as an imperialistic and reactionary war of brigandage on the part of Germany, as well as on the part of the English, French, Italian and American capitalists. They now begin to quarrel between themselves about the division of the captured spoils, about the division of Turkey, Russia, of the African and Polynesian colonies, of the Balkans, etc. The hypocrisy of phrases about democracy and the "League of Nations" is being rapidly exposed when we see that the left bank of the Rhine is being taken by the French bourgeoisie, when we see that Turkey and parts of Russia (Siberia, Archangel, Baku, Krasnovodsk, Aschabad, etc.) are being captured by French, British and American capitalists, when we see that the division of the spoils of brigandage makes for increased hostility between Italy and France, between France and England, between England and America, between America and Japan.

Side by side with these cowardly penny-wise mongers who are stuffed with the prejudices of bourgeois democracy, side by side with these "Socialists" who yesterday defended "their" imperialistic governments, and who today confine themselves to platonic "protests" against "military" intervention in Russia—side by side with them we see in the Allied countries an increase in the number of those who have chosen the Communist road, or the road of Mac-Lean, Debs,² Loriot, Lazzari, Serrati—the number of those who understand that only the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the annihilation of the bourgeois parliament, only Soviet rule and proletarian dictatorship, can put an end to imperialism and safeguard the victory of Socialism, safeguard a permanent peace.

Then, on the 20th of August, 1918, the social revolution was still confined within the borders of Russia, and the power of the Soviets, i. e., the whole state power, in the hands of the council of the representatives of the workers, soldiers and peasants, seemed to be (and in fact was), a purely Russian institution. Now, on

²Debs was at that time in the Left Wing of the Socialist Party.

the 12th of January, 1919, we may notice the powerful Soviet movement, not only in parts of the former Czar's Empire, as Lettonia, Poland, and Ukraine, but also in Western European countries; in neutrals: Switzerland, Holland, Norway; (of those that have suffered from war), Austria, Germany. The German revolution,³ which is particularly important and characteristic, as it takes place in one of the most developed capitalistic countries, at once took the Soviet form. The whole trend of the evolution of the German revolution, and, especially, the struggle of the Sparticides, the sincere and only representatives of the proletariat against the alliance of the Scheidemannist and Suedekumist elements, with the bourgeoisie; all this clearly shows the historic aspect of the conditions in Germany.

It is a question of either Soviet power or bourgeois parliament, under whatever name (as a national or constitutional convention) it may appear.

This is the world-historic formulation of the question. Now it can be said, and it must be said, without any exaggeration: The "Soviet power" is the second world-historic step, or stage, in the development of proletarian dictatorship. The first step was the Paris Commune. Marx's genial analysis of the meaning and importance of this Commune in his book entitled "The Civil War in France" shows that the Commune gave birth to a new type of state, the proletarian state. Every existing state, even the most democratic republic, is nothing but an apparatus of one class for the purpose of suppressing the other classes. The proletarian state is the apparatus whereby the proletariat suppresses the bourgeoisie. Such suppression is unavoidable because of the savage, desperate and unscrupulous opposition which is evidenced by the landowners and capitalists, the whole bourgeoisie and all its supporters, all exploiters, when their downfall begins, when the exploiting of the exploiters begins.

THE QUESTION OF PARLIAMENT

As long as the property of the capitalists and their power is being protected, the bourgeois parliament, even the most democratic parliament in the most democratic republic, is an apparatus for the

³This was before the Socialist agents of German capitalism had succeeded in destroying the Soviets and crushing the uprisings of the workers under Communist leadership. Thousands of workers including Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were murdered by the Socialist Defense Minister Noske and his cohorts.

suppression of millions of toilers through small groups of exploiters. Socialists who are fighting for the deliverance of the toilers from exploitation must use the bourgeois parliaments as a tribunal, as one of their bases of propaganda, agitation and organization, as long as our struggle confines itself within the boundaries of the bourgeois social order. Now, when world history has placed on the order of the day the question of the destruction of this whole system, the question of the crushing and suppression of the exploiters and the transition from Capitalism to Socialism—to confine ourselves now to bourgeois parliamentarism, to bourgeois democracy, to picture it as “democracy” in general, to cloak its bourgeois character, to forget that universal suffrage, as long as capitalist property is being protected, is merely acting for the bourgeois state—means shamefully to betray the proletariat, to go over to its class enemies, the bourgeoisie, to become a traitor and a renegade.

These two currents within world Socialism, of which the Bolshevik press was already tirelessly speaking as early as 1915, appear before us with particular clarity when illustrated by the bloody struggle and civil war in Germany.

Karl Liebknecht—his name is known by workers in all countries, everywhere, but especially in the Allied countries, for it stands as a symbol for the fidelity of a leader to the interest of the proletariat, and for fidelity of the Socialistic revolution; this name is a symbol for the real convinced, devoted, self-sacrificing, pitiless struggle against capitalism; this name is a symbol for the ruthless war against imperialism—not in words, but in action, a struggle ready for sacrifice, even when one’s own country is in the grip of the hysteria of imperialistic victories. Together with Liebknecht and the Sparticides stand everything that has remained pure and really revolutionary among the German Socialists, all that is the most conscious within the proletariat, the exploited, in whose heart the spirit of rebellion is rising and giving birth to revolution.

Against Liebknecht stand the satellites of Scheidemann and Suedekum and the whole gang of despicable servants of the Kaiser and bourgeoisie. They are traitors to Socialism, as are Samuel Gompers, Webb, Renaudel and Vandervelde.

CORRUPTING THE ARISTOCRACY OF LABOR

Here we have that upper stratum of the working-class which has been bought by the bourgeoisie, and which we, the Bolsheviks, addressing ourselves to the Russian Suedekums, the Mensheviks, used

to call "the agents of the bourgeoisie within the labor movement," and which in America is now more appropriately designated by an expression that is magnificent in its expressiveness and striking truthfulness, "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class."

The newest and most modern form of Socialist treason has found expression in this feature: In all the civilized countries the bourgeoisie, either by colonial exploitation, or by pressing financial profits from formally independent weaker nations, is plundering a population many times as numerous as the population in their own country. Here we have the economic possibility of "super-profit" for the imperialistic bourgeoisie. And the fact that this bourgeoisie, to some extent, can use this "super-profit" in order to bribe that well-known upper stratum of the proletariat and change it into a reformistic, opportunistic, revolution-scared petty bourgeoisie. Between the Sparticides and the Scheidemanns are fluctuating the Kautskians, the soul-mates of Kautsky⁴—in name independent, in action the most dependent in everything and in all connections; dependent today upon the bourgeoisie and the Scheidemanns and tomorrow on the Sparticides, sometimes following the first-mentioned, sometimes the other ones. People without ideas, without character, without politics, without honor . . . a living embodiment of Philistine confusion. In words they recognize the social revolution, but in fact they cannot grasp it when it begins, instead of which, in their renegade manner, they advocate "democracy" in general, whereas, as a matter of fact, they are advocates of bourgeois democracy.

In all capitalistic countries, any thinking worker can recognize in this treasonable position, which is analogous to conditions of national and historic nature, just these three fundamental tendencies, both among Socialists and syndicalists; for the imperialistic war and the beginning of the world revolution of the proletariat, has revealed with the utmost clearness these ideological-political tendencies.

THE MURDER OF LIEBKNECHT AND LUXEMBURG

The above lines were written before the base and bestial murder

⁴At that time the "center" was organized into a separate organization from the right-wing Social Democratic Party. The Sparticides (later the Communist Party) formed the left and the Kautskyans or "Independent Social Democratic Party" formed the center. That Lenin's analysis of them was correct was proved by their finally fusing frankly with the right wing and accepting its program.

of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg was accomplished by the Ebert-Scheidemann government. These beadles and lackeys of the bourgeoisie entrusted the German White Guards, who were defending the sacred possessions of capital, with the task of lynching Rosa Luxemburg and shooting Karl Liebknecht in the back, under the manifestly fraudulent pretext that he had sought to "escape." (Russian Czarism, which choked the revolution of 1905 in blood, frequently found it a useful pretext, in shooting down offenders, to accuse them of having attempted to "escape.") Simultaneously, these beadles vested the White Guards with authority as if they had been guilty of nothing, since their government, of course, stood above all parties. One cannot find words to express all the vile, contemptible devices resorted to by these creatures who pretend to be Socialists. Evidently history has chosen a course which is to compel the "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class" to "run the whole gamut" of low-down, bestial, vile actions. The stupid Kautskyians, in their paper, *Die Freiheit*, may talk about a "judgment seat" to consist of representatives of "all the Socialist parties" for they continue to call the Scheidemanns, those beadles, and serf-like lackeys, "Socialists."

These heroes of Philistine obtuseness and petty bourgeois timidity do not even understand that "a court" is an organ of state power; but the struggle and the civil war in Germany are precisely concerned with the question of who is to hold this power, either the bourgeoisie whom the Scheidemanns will "serve" as beadles and instigators of pogroms, or the Kautskyans, the jurists of "pure democracy," or the proletariat, which will overthrow the exploiting capitalists and break down their opposition.

The best men of the proletarian world international, the unforgettable leaders of the proletarian Socialistic revolution, have fallen, but their blood admonishes new and ever new masses of workers to desperate struggle, if not for life then for death. This struggle will lead to victory. In the summer of 1917, we in Russia passed through the "July days," in which the Russian Scheidemanns, Mensheviks, and Social-Revolutionists also were cloaking the victories of the White Guards over the Bolsheviks, by calling them victories of the "state power," when the Cossacks in the city of Petrograd lynched the worker Veinoff for circulating Bolshevik proclamations. We know from experience how quickly such "victories" of the bourgeoisie and their slaves cured the masses of their

illusions as to bourgeois democracy, as to "universal suffrage," and other such things.

MILITARY INTERVENTION

Within the bourgeois governing classes of the Entente we can now observe a certain hesitation. One section of these circles recognizes that the process of dissolution of the Entente troops in Russia, where they are aiding the White Guards by advancing the blackest monarchism and feudal landlordism, has already begun, that a continued military intervention and an attempt to influence Russia by force would require an army of occupation of a million strong for a long period, the surest way of swiftly transplanting the proletarian revolution to the Entente countries. The example of the German army of occupation in the Ukraine is sufficiently convincing.

Another section of the bourgeoisie in the Entente countries clings as firmly as ever to the idea of military intervention in Russia, together with an "economic siege" (Clemenceau) and of crushing the Soviet Republic. The entire press that serves the bourgeoisie, that is, the greater part of the daily papers in England and France which have been purchased by the capitalists, predicts an immediately impending collapse of the Soviet power, depicts the horror of hunger in Russia, and spreads lies about "disorders" and the instability of the Soviet government. The White Guards, the troops of the capitalists, aided by the Entente with officers and war supplies, with money and auxiliary troops, these officers cut off Russia's hungry center and north from the grain districts of Siberia and the Don region. Famine among the workers in Petrograd and Moscow, in Ivanoff-Voznessensk, and other labor centers, is, as a matter of fact, great. Never have the masses of the workers suffered such depths of misery, such pangs of hunger, as those which they are now condemned to by the military intervention of the Entente, an intervention which is partly masked behind a hypocritical assurance that they will not send "their own" troops, while they are continuing to send mercenaries as well as war materials, money, and officers. The masses could not bear such misery if they did not understand that they are defending the work of Socialism both in Russia and the rest of the world.

The Entente and White Guard forces are holding Archangel,⁵

⁵American troops were among those stationed at Archangel until they mutinied and had to be withdrawn.

Perm, Rostov-on-the-Don, Baku, Ashabad, but the "Soviet movement" has taken control of Riga and Kharkov. Lettonia and Ukraine are becoming Soviet Republics. The workers see that these tremendous sacrifices are not being made in vain, that the Soviet power is great and spreading, growing and establishing itself all over the world. Each month of severe struggle and tremendous sacrifice strengthens the cause of the Soviet power all over the world and weakens its enemies, the exploiters.

THE REVOLUTION WILL CONQUER

Undeniably, the exploiters still have forces at their disposal with which to murder and lynch the finest leaders of the world revolution of the proletariat, to multiply the sufferings and tribulations of the workers in the occupied or conquered countries and districts. Yet all the exploiters in the world have not enough power to conquer the world revolution of the proletariat which will bring to the human race a liberation from the yoke of capital, from the constant threat of new and unavoidable imperialistic wars in the interest of capitalism.

The Crisis in the Labor Movement

By WM. Z. FOSTER

THE trade union movement now finds itself in a dangerous crisis, precipitated by the breaking down of the Miners' Union and coming as a climax of long years of wrong policies and crassest misleadership by the controlling union bureaucracy. The Miners' Union is in grave danger of being shattered by the employers' offensive. This would enormously stimulate the open shop movement in every industry. It would encourage the employers to attack the labor movement generally with redoubled vigor; an attack which the unions, with their antiquated structure, confused ideology, weak numbers, and criminal misleadership are in no position to withstand. The situation is so critical that the unions are actually in danger of being wiped out or so reduced in strength and control as to be of little or no value to the workers. Even the right wing union leaders admit the danger. In many recent statements, Green speaks of the threatening attempt of the employers to destroy the unions. The trade union movement now faces the deepest crisis in its history. It is the task of our Party to warn the workers of this crisis and to make the most energetic efforts to liquidate it by rallying the masses of workers to stop the capitalist offensive and develop a counter-offensive to save and rebuild the unions.

THE BANKRUPTCY OF THE "HIGHER STRATEGY OF LABOR"

During and after the 1922 railroad shopmen's strike, which was the disastrous climax to a long series of struggles unfavorable to the workers in nearly all the industries, the left wing proposed the reconsolidation of the workers and the development of a militant policy by the unions. But the trade union bureaucrats rejected this completely. Practically abandoning all idea of struggle against the employers, they came forward with a whole program of intensified class collaboration. One phase of this, eventually dubbed "the new wage policy," called for co-operation in production with the employers, an agreement to speed up the workers, in return for which the employers should pay the workers added compensation and allow

them to maintain company unionized trade unions. Another phase, trade union capitalism, proposed co-operation with the employers in the realms of finance and business. This whole system of no struggle was finally named "the higher strategy of labor."

This intensified class collaboration movement was greeted with enthusiasm not only by the right wing leadership but also by the progressives, as the solution to the difficult situation in which the unions found themselves. Some left elements were also deceived by it. Illusions were widespread that the new wage policy would give the workers higher wages, and, with permission of the employers, would extend the trade unions far and wide, at least among skilled workers. Trade union capitalism, it was hoped confidently, realizing the Carveristic illusions of labor becoming capital, would raise the trade unions to the power of big capitalist combinations and enormously strengthen the labor movement in every direction.

FAILURE OF "NEW WAGE POLICY"

But the practice of the past five years has demonstrated the utter failure of the whole "higher strategy of labor." Trade union capitalism has received a deadly blow in the B. of L. E. financial debacle. It is a punctured balloon, so flat that even the wildest enthusiasts of a few years ago, those who expected to see the organized workers buy out the industries shortly, have largely lost faith in it. Likewise, the new wage policy has demonstrated its bankruptcy. It has not raised wages, shortened hours, improved conditions, or increased employment, as its champions hoped.

As we shall see, it has not even served to maintain the existing organizations, much less provided a basis for extending the trade union movement.

The employers, especially in the big trustified industries, have met coldly the proposals of the trade union leaders, which are in substance, "Allow us to organize our degenerated trade unions in your plants and we will give you greater and cheaper production than you can secure through your company unions or by keeping your workers completely unorganized." The bosses do not fall in line with this proposition. This is partly because they are not prepared to accept trade unions as vital factors in production. Even their company unions, despite the elaborate argumentation of efficiency experts, developed principally as bars against trade unions. Their widest expansion took place during the war years, under

mass pressure from the expanding trade union movement. Now that that pressure is greatly reduced the company union movement has come to a standstill, if it is not actually receding. Those that were organized after 1918, especially in the packing and railroad industries, were formed directly to defeat the trade unions. The employers are more inclined to rely upon welfare systems, group insurance, etc., rather than company unions, to demoralize their workers. Hence when the trade union leaders come with their "union-management co-operation" schemes the big employers, suspicious of all forms of trade unionism, skeptical of the positive role of labor organization in production, and confronting no great mass upheavals of the workers which can be conveniently sloughed off through such means, commonly reject their propositions.

For example, the American Federation of Labor, as the basis of its campaign to organize the automobile workers, approached the employers with offers of "union management co-operation." The employers rejected these flatly and the organization campaign blew up completely. This is the typical attitude of great unorganized industries in the present absence of strong mass pressure from the workers. The new wage policy has organized no new industries for the unions. It has only been adopted by employers where the unions are strong or potentially strong, and then in order to weaken these unions. Thus on the railroads some companies accepted the B. & O. plan (new wage policy) and most of them joined with the union leaders in formulating the Watson-Parker law. But these measures they accepted not to extend the unions, even in view of the many no-strike and co-operative features the latter offered, but to hamstring the existing organizations and to place barriers in the way of trade unionism generally.

Despite all the offers of co-operation by the trade union officials, the general policy of the powerful employers, rich with the spoils of their imperialist policy, and seeking cheaper mass production and a free hand in their industries, is to smash the most proletarian and ideologically the most advanced sections of the trade unions, to prevent the organization of the great masses of the semi-skilled and unskilled and to undermine the skilled workers' unions in various ways. The breaking up of the miners' and clothing workers' organizations, coming in the wake of so many other shattered unions, and the vicious resistance to the Passaic and Colorado strikes, indicate the determination of the employers to exterminate all effective

mass organization among the workers. Through Watson-Parker Laws, "union-management co-operation" schemes, injunctions, etc., they systematically weaken the skilled workers' unions, pending the time when the employers deem the situation auspicious to deliver them still heavier blows.

HOW FAR WILL EMPLOYERS' OFFENSIVE GO?

This raises the question of how far will the employers push their offensive against the existing unions? Will they try to break them up altogether? Or will they aim to preserve them as a bar against revolutionary unionism and action of the masses? Are the unions really in danger, or not?

The employers, especially in the more trustified sections of industry, while looking on the conservative trade unions in a general way as barriers to radicalism among the workers, do not generally tend to preserve and extend them. They feel capable of handling the situation without the help of the union leaders and an organized trade union movement. They have confidence that the workers, at least decisive upper layers of them, are not at such low wage levels as to give them revolutionary moods. They feel also that, with their vast power, they can take care of such upheavals as may occur from time to time. Undoubtedly they consider that their anti-union policy in the steel, packing, automobile, rubber, and many other industries, is highly successful. For the most part, they look upon the unions as a hindrance, not a help, in facilitating the exploitation of the workers. Were the capitalists confronted with broad, surging upheavals among their workers, they would change their minds and listen more sympathetically to the trade union leaders. But this is not so at present. How far they are willing to go against the unions was evidenced by the great drive of 1919-22, when even such unions of skilled workers as the printing and building trades were confronted with life and death struggles in spite of militant mass resistance by the workers. It is certain that, should strong left movements among the masses not develop in the meantime to check them, the employers would gladly shatter many existing unions and undermine the whole structure of trade unionism if they could see immediate advantages to be gained thereby. The unions *are* in danger.

The upper union leaders are doing nothing to meet the employers' offensive except to vainly hawk their "union-management co-

operation" offers to the unresponsive capitalists. Instead of organizing the unorganized, they allow the A. F. of L. base to be narrowed more and more to skilled workers. They do not amalgamate the unions although the employers are constantly consolidating their forces. They are now more opposed to the labor party than ever, having completely surrendered to the old parties. They have become abject tools of American imperialism at home and abroad. Never were they so cynical and corrupt, never were they so vicious in their attacks against everyone and everything progressive and revolutionary in the unions. The sum of their policies is a complete lay-down before the employers.

For several years past the employers' offensive has continued with varying degrees of intensity. The unions, undermined by speed-up systems, specialization, and confronted by an ever more consolidated and powerful enemy, have been in almost constant retreat, losing post after post, section after section, and with a steadily lowered morale and weakening organization. Even in the years of prosperity they did not regain their shattered forces by increasing their numerical strength. This course now culminates in a real crisis with the breaking of the Miners' Union. The coal operators, representing the most powerful financial interests in America, are tearing the union to pieces in this strike in the key Pennsylvania and Ohio bituminous districts. Should they break the union in these districts, and the danger is exceedingly great, it will undermine the organization nationally. So badly has the union been injured already in the struggle because of the criminal misleadership of Lewis that even in the unlikely event that it secures a general settlement in the three strike-bound districts the whole union will be in a very serious crisis. The failure of Secretary Davis' coal conference indicates the intention of big capital to smash the Miners' Union.

LABOR MOVEMENT FACES CRISIS

The serious weakening of the U. M. W. A. throws the whole labor movement into a deep crisis. The open shop employers, encouraged by such a major victory and the growing unemployment, will redouble their attacks on all fronts against the retreating trade union movement. The approaching industrial depression is not likely to produce in the near future such a mass movement as to so terrorize the employers that they will consciously seek to preserve the conservative unions as bars to more revolutionary unions. They

will seek to wipe out the trade unions, or to disastrously weaken them by legislative action (Coolidge's proposed mining law); by multiplication of injunctions (I. R. T., Penna., Stone-Cutters, etc.); open terrorism (Pennsylvania and Colorado) and by sharpened anti-union policies in the shops.

Against this employers' offensive the controlling trade union leaders will organize no real resistance. On the contrary, they will surrender all the more abjectly and seek to force the unions to surrender also, thus aiding the employers' union-smashing campaign. The reactionary policy of the miners' officials in the present strike illustrates this general tendency. They cannot maintain the existing organizations, not to speak of building a powerful movement. Their class collaboration policies are leading straight to the liquidation or complete degeneration of the trade unions. So real is the crisis that surely unless ways and means can be found by the left wing to mobilize the masses for real struggle, in spite of the surrender policies of the union leaders, to halt the employers' offensive, the labor movement is in for a major defeat.

DISCONTENTED MASSES, DISILLUSIONED PROGRESSIVES

Vitally important for our Party to understand and to take advantage of is the spreading discontent in the trade unions and among unorganized workers, bred of the sharpening offensive of the employers against the workers' standards and organizations and of the failure of the trade union leadership to develop policies to stop that offensive.

In the Miners, Needle workers, Chicago Traction workers, Machinists, Locomotive Engineers, and many other unions, there is a widespread and growing opposition to the corruption and no-struggle policies of the bureaucracy. These organizations and groups of workers offer fertile fields for our Party. Likewise, our experience in the unorganized industries, rubber, automobile, textiles, etc., indicate a widely growing spirit of discontent at the ever sharpening speed-up, constant wage cuts, and steadily worsening conditions. These tendencies towards mass discontent and mass movement are bound to increase with the development of the industrial depression. There are many potential Passaics and Colorados now in the industries.

Highly important in the present situation is the growing disillusionment of the "progressive" wing of the trade unions, espe-

cially in the lower ranks, with the new wage policy, trade union capitalism, and other features of the intensified class collaboration program of the right wing. When in the deep crisis following the Shopmen's strike of 1922, the right wing came forward with this class collaboration it was eagerly accepted by progressives everywhere. This was one vital reason, together with the lessening of the industrial crisis and slackening temporarily of the employers' offensive, why they dropped the Trade Union Educational League's amalgamation fighting program. They were the biggest boosters for labor banks and the B. & O. plan. In fact, the reactionaries took much of this program from that of the progressives. That was one of the paradoxes of the situation; when the right wing took its sharp turn still further to the right it was along the line of some of the "progressive" policies. Thus the right wing and the progressives formed a united front; in fact, the progressives were pretty much swallowed up by the right wing. The alliance, based largely upon labor banking and the B. & O. plan (new wage policy) was further cemented by the concentration of the trade union forces generally around the candidacy of LaFollette. This was the period of the Party's and the T. U. E. L.'s greatest isolation.

But now the united front between the right wing and the progressives tends to dissolve. Labor banking has been deeply discredited by the B. of L. E. grafters and has lost much of its attractive power for progressives. The new wage policy has failed completely and many progressives sense this, though they may not have analyzed it. They no longer look upon it as a panacea. The Watson-Parker Law, embodiment of the worst features of class collaboration and the masterpiece of the right wing, has a growing host of enemies among progressives. More and more the best elements among the progressives reject the right wing position regarding the Soviet Union and adopt an open attitude of friendliness as evidenced by the trade union delegations. The coming national election will hasten the disintegration of the right wing progressive united front which has been so disastrous to the trade union movement. The reactionaries will ask the workers to support the candidates of the old parties. Large numbers of sincere progressives, especially rank and filers and the minor officialdom, will rebel at this. They will cast about for some form of opposition policy on the political field. They will be ripe for labor party movements.

The characteristic of the present situation is that the right wing and the degenerated progressives (Hillman, Fitzpatrick, etc.) flounder further to the right, bankrupt in the face of the offensive of the employers, while growing numbers of confused but sincere progressives tend to break with them and to develop a program of resistance. This tendency is exemplified typically by the growing opposition to Fitzpatrick in the Chicago Federation of Labor. The general tendency will increase as the crisis, intensified by the growing industrial depression, sharpens in the trade unions and among the unorganized workers. In the deep crisis following the shopmen's defeat the right wing was able to demoralize and capture the progressives with its glittering "higher strategy of labor" which it put forth with blowing trumpets as a saving panacea. But in the present still greater crisis, they have nothing substantial to offer. Mere whipping up of their discredited intensified class collaboration program and clinging terroristically to union control will not prevent the breaking away of the more sincere and militant progressives. The trend of these is towards the left. To give them a program and to draw them and their extensive following under the general leadership of our Party and its auxiliaries is a basic task in the present situation, a major consideration for halting the capitalist offensive, for preventing the disintegration and devitalization of the trade unions, for organizing the unorganized, and for giving our Party a real mass following.

WHAT MUST BE DONE—(a) SLOGANS ON THE CRISIS

In order to most effectively mobilize the progressives and their following, as well as the more conscious left elements, it is necessary that the Party and the left group in the unions approach these masses with slogans indicating that the trade unions are actually in danger. They must be told frankly that the policies of the right wing leadership are leading the unions and with them the workers' wage and working standards straight to drastic defeat. The left wing policies must be put forth to them not only in the sense of ultimately building a powerful labor movement, but primarily as immediately necessary for the saving of such organizations as now exist. The crisis in the trade unions must be the keynote of all our work among the organized masses.

Crisis slogans must not be put forth in any panicky sense. If

so, they will lose their effectiveness. But our work must be shot through with the propaganda that the unions are actually in danger and that only by an aggressive mobilization of the best elements for struggle against the bureaucrats and employers, only by the application of the left wing action program, can the unions be saved and rebuilt. In 1922, the railroad shopmen, sensing their danger, rallied to the correct T. U. E. L. crisis slogan, "Amalgamation or Annihilation," although their reactionary leaders prevented their taking definite action. In 1926, the crisis slogan, "Save the Miners' Union," which was also basically correct, served as a means for a broad united front in the Miners' Union. And the crisis slogans, "The trade unions are in danger," "Save the trade unions," etc., will serve to unite masses with the left wing in the coming months. Many disillusioned progressives and backward rank and file masses can be made to see the correctness of such slogans and the necessity of taking definite action on left wing lines. These can be utilized for revolutionizing the unions, for organizing the unorganized. It would be a mistake, however, to attempt to call conferences of left wingers and progressives simply around the slogans that the unions are in danger. Opposition organization must be built around more concrete programs, labor party, organizing of the unorganized, resistance to wage cuts, recognition of Soviet Russia, amalgamation, etc., etc., and then the movement infused with the realization that the very life of the unions is menaced.

The Party must support aggressively the formation of T. U. E. L. groups in the various localities and industries upon the basis of the T. U. E. L. program, taking advantage of the impetus given by the T. U. E. L. National Conference. Systematic efforts shall be made to draw progressives into these groups, stress being laid upon the deep-going crisis in the labor movement. Progressives are awakening to the seriousness of the situation and this can be used to draw them into the organized opposition in the trade unions.

Every effort shall also be put forth to get up special committees and left movements around specific questions. Unemployment becomes an increasing menace and offers growing opportunities for left wing agitation and organization in the unions and among the unemployed. Resistance to wage cuts offer another effective lead for left wing work. The growing friendliness for the Soviet Union presents increasing opportunities for organization of trade

union delegations, committees for the recognition of the Soviet Union, opportunities which must be systematically exploited by the Party. If the sentiment for recognition now existing in the trade unions were solidly organized it would constitute a powerful weapon against the right wing bureaucracy and would split its ranks.

The best specific issue for organizing a united front between the left wing and the progressives against the right wing at the present time is that of a labor party. Compared with 1922-24, the sentiment among the workers for a party of their own is relatively small this year. But it is being rapidly fed from two quarters. First, the growing industrial crisis is compelling larger and larger masses to look for a means to express their grievances and discontent, which means a growing labor party sentiment; and second, the fact that the A. F. of L. Convention has decided that old party candidates shall be supported in the coming elections alienates large numbers of progressive unionists who believe in a labor party and who went hand in hand with the union bureaucracy in 1924 in supporting LaFollette. The development of labor party sentiment and organization in this period is not only the mobilization of masses of workers against the bureaucracy, but also the furthering of a split in the bureaucracy itself.

Our Party must redouble its activity in the matter of the labor party. It must support and initiate the formation of national and local trade union committees to work for a labor party and look forward to the establishment of local, state, and national labor tickets and labor parties wherever the amount of mass support justifies such organizational steps. All the labor party work in the industrial centers must be linked up and co-ordinated with the farmer-labor party developments in the agricultural states. The Socialist Party, confronted with the necessity of at least partially splitting with the trade union bureaucracy or of supporting old party candidates, is attempting to set itself up as a labor party or a substitute for it. This we must counter by supporting energetically bona fide labor party developments, especially the formation, at this time, of trade union committees for the labor party. Our labor party work should be permeated with systematic, but not overemphasized or panicky propaganda, that the trade unions are endangered and that the building of the labor party, as well as the application of the left wing program generally, are immediately necessary for liquidating the crisis, and for extending the unions among the unorganized.

The organization of the unorganized remains the central task of the left wing in the trade union work. Every force must be expended and every situation utilized to this end. Building a strong left wing progressive opposition in the trade unions is basically important—the left wing will never surrender the 3,000,000 trade unionists to their reactionary leaders. Carrying through this task must facilitate, not hinder, the organization of the unorganized masses. The question of organizing the unorganized, especially in the basic industries, must be put in the sense that it is indispensable for liquidating the present crisis as well as for the eventual building of powerful labor organizations.

Definite contacts can and must be made with the progressive elements on the basis of organizing the unorganized. The unions must be saturated with movements to draw in the unorganized. Meanwhile the movements for independent organization must be intensified in those industries where the existing unions are too weak or reactionary to serve as the basis for unionizing the workers. Developing wage cuts in various industries will render greater masses ready for organization and struggle. Our aim must be to bring into the main stream of the labor movement such unions as are organized on an independent basis. The question of organizing the unorganized must be raised to a major issue throughout the labor movement. In connection with it must be emphasized as vitally important the amalgamation and democratization of the unions.

William Z. Foster will write on "The Crisis in the Miners' Union," in the next issue.

The Lessons of the Canton Uprising

By HARRY JOVEN

THERE are many today who, after the Canton uprising, with the streets cluttered with the mangled bodies of butchered revolutionaries, will say in the words of Plekhanoff: "They should not have taken up arms. . . ." Such opportunistic tears are not needed by the heroic dead in Canton. In the words of Lenin they too can answer: "The working class, through revolutionary action no matter how full of mistakes, will win freedom and power."

The revolutionary proletariat must draw the lessons from the Canton uprising.

It is difficult now to tell exactly how and under what conditions the uprising began. But we can say this: that it is evident that the uprising was not the result of a long preparation. It seems to have come as the result of compelling circumstances. It came as the result of the attempts of Chang Fak Wei to disarm some of his "untrustworthy" troops, which, as events proved, were connected with the revolutionary movement. These troops were faced with the alternative: either to surrender their arms or to take up arms.

At that time in Canton there were very few troops who could be considered trustworthy by Chang Fak Wei. Moreover, the general situation in Canton was very tense because of the great unemployment and the soaring prices. But above all there was the effect exercised by the outburst of uprisings in the surrounding countryside.

On the basis of this general dissatisfaction there began to be formed detachments of armed peasants and of workers guards, afterwards branded as bandits by the bourgeois press but which were well organized and animated by the idea of revolutionary struggle.

In such a situation, every defensive struggle can easily be converted into an offensive, can become the signal for a general offensive against the South China military-bourgeois-landlord machine.

It is possible that the South China Communists were mistaken in their estimation of their own and the enemy's forces—yet this can be finally decided only through struggle. Generally the situation was favorable for a struggle against the militarists; therefore the revolutionary troops decided to take up arms.

The result of a three-days' struggle was the defeat of the insurrectionary masses. *There was indeed a time when it seemed as if victory was on the side of the insurgents.* They controlled the whole city except the part situated on the island of Honan, which served as the basis for the concentration of the reactionary forces.

It is evident now that the decisive factor was the Chinese navy and the support of the imperialists. The role that the navy can play in Canton is very great. The whole geographical situation is like that of New York which also is situated upon and surrounded by water. In the first day of the uprising the Chinese navy wavered, but in the end it decided to support the White forces (as they are called in the Hong-kong dispatches) and this determined the issue of the uprising. This action of the Chinese navy and the whole feeling of the reactionaries was strengthened by the presence of the imperialist forces which actively supported them. The headlines in the New York papers proclaimed: "U. S. Gun Boats Aid Nationalists." Armored sloops of Socony (Standard Oil) were not only engaged in rescue work but unquestionably gave material support to the reactionaries. It is self-evident that the presence of such a "third force" in the case of an uprising tells against the insurgents. The extremes of brutality to which the South China reactionaries have gone could only have taken place under the silent protection and inspiration of the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes.

On the basis of this unsuccessful uprising we can draw several lessons which speak for the Chinese revolution, for the maturity of the Chinese working class, and which must be learned by every revolutionary worker.

1.—Under such circumstances a general strike should inevitably be converted into an uprising, a struggle for power—or else should not be called at all. The Chinese Party has already learned this and this the Chinese masses have also learned.

2.—An uprising is a struggle for power. The logical result of an uprising is the organization of a new power corresponding to the class basis of the uprising. Immediately after the uprising the Canton workers and peasants organized such a power in the form of Soviets by the side of the staff that led the uprising.

3.—"The People's Council of Kwantung Province"—as this soviet was called, began to act in the first hour it came to power in order to mobilize the masses. They declared their program of action; they had learned the lesson of Shanghai where, after the

successful uprising, the new government remained inactive for a long time. They did not wait for constitutional endorsement. They threw forth slogans which will never be forgotten by the Chinese masses: "Land for the peasants!" "Rice and meat for the workers!" "Power to the workers and peasants!" From the first hour of the uprising they strove to get contact with the masses.

4—They organized their own army—the Workers' and Peasants' Red Army. We do not know how successful they were in this task, but that the army existed there can be no doubt. The heavy fighting is a sufficient proof. It was one of the first voluntary, unmercenary armies in China and it was an army of peasants and workers.

These are great political results of the Cantonese uprising.

But besides these political lessons we must learn some of the lessons of the technique of the uprising. The plan of the uprising was a good one if we take into consideration the little time they had at their disposal since the uprising was compelled by circumstances. The insurgents acted suddenly and simultaneously. At one and the same time were captured all key positions in Canton and in several small towns surrounding it: railway stations, power stations, telephone and telegraph offices, water communications, and important buildings in the city.

But it seems—as far as we can gather from newspaper accounts—that the significance of the navy in Canton was not fully appreciated. The revolutionists failed to organize their own naval detachments or forces for protection from the action of the fleet. It could have been done because they had at the disposal of the striking Seamen's Union a number of boats, junks, and ordinary sloops. Even such a primitive fleet could have hampered the action of the navy and the conveyance of troops along the rivers and canals of Canton. *As far as we know, the insurgents relied upon land methods of protection.*

We also have no information as to what use was made of the railways and especially of the railway cars which, slightly armored with wood or sacks of flour, etc., can be used effectively for protection in fighting. What happened, moreover, to the railways when the insurgents retreated from Canton—did they remove the railway engines and cars or did they leave them behind?

It seems to us that the insurgents had a good plan for the original uprising but that, owing to the lack of training of the masses and

of the leading groups, their actions afterwards were not on the same level. For instance, it is difficult for us to understand why the persistent struggle should have been only for the Police Headquarters. It seems that the forces of the insurgents were concentrated there and they were trapped. The fact that the struggle lasted so long shows that the forces were big, but in street fighting it is not advisable for the insurgents to concentrate their forces because the insurgents are usually the most active elements and the sources of the energy for the masses. If these active elements are concentrated in one place, they are unable to arouse and activize the masses for support. Concentration is good for the regular troops who have no hope of support from the masses and who must act with intensive force. It is also not clear exactly what steps the insurgents who had captured the whole city except Honan took to advance upon that section as well.

Taking into consideration the high degree of strategical skill shown in the general plan, it would be impossible to say that the revolutionists neglected to see the importance of this advance; it is likely that they were somewhat confused by the wavering of the navy. For the proletariat of every country it is not sufficient to be thoroughly acquainted with the political doctrines of the revolution; it must also have a thorough mastery of the technique of revolt.

On every side we hear the reformists cry: "Armed revolt under modern conditions of warfare is futile; it's no less than suicide!" And to support this opportunistic thesis they point even to Canton. But the lessons of the uprisings in Moscow, in Hamburg, in Shanghai—in Canton itself—belie their very words. In Canton machine guns, cannons and almost all modern methods of warfare were used and notwithstanding this the uprising was almost successful. It was the navy that decided the issue. This points to the absolute necessity for regular work in the navy and armed forces of the enemy a long time prior to an uprising.

Having mastered these lessons learned through bloody experience, the Chinese working masses, under the leadership of the Communist Party, the party of uprising, will march forward to make their own October.

It will not be very long. . . .

Preparing for the Pan-American Conference

By ELLA G. WOLFE

THE presidential elections are approaching and the administration has begun to put its house in order. The most battered section of the house—the section that passed through the most disastrous storms and needs most patching is the one dealing with United States foreign policy, and the administration's "best efforts" are now focused on the restoration of the lost prestige of the State Department.

Throughout the present administration Latin-American resentment towards American imperialism has been growing steadily. The constant bullying of Mexico, the virtual annexation of the Caribbean and more recently the murder of Sacco and Vanzetti and the invasion of Nicaragua have greatly intensified this resentment.

The European market for investment and goods is more precarious than that of Latin America. The signs pointing to an economic depression in the United States, the renewed challenge of European capitalism even in South America itself, make especially imperative the attempt to re-establish American "prestige" and "satisfactory relations" with the republics to the south of us.

On January 16, the Pan-American Union Conference will convene in Havana, the first conference in five years. The United States government is making every effort (short of the "trifling" matter of giving up its imperialist policy) to make that a love-feast and not a scene of protest and recrimination. Protest must be stilled. The "alarming" tendency recently manifested to appeal to the League of Nations must be stopped. The Pan-American Union must be made the American League of Nations, under the hegemony of the United States, in the best Monroe Doctrine tradition. The State Department's policy in Latin America must for the present be one of "conciliation."

IMPORTANCE OF LATIN AMERICA

As a factor in our economic life Latin America has risen rapidly in importance. At the turn of the century American interests had \$290,000,000 invested. By 1925 the U. S. Department of Com-

merce reports \$4,240,000,000. By June, 1927, the figure rises to \$4,800,000. Since then there have been huge loans to Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Columbia and Peru. The new year tops the five billion dollar mark in Latin-American investments—this out of a total of thirteen billions in foreign investments. The old slogan of trade follows the flag has long given way to a newer one—trade follows loans and investments.

R. H. Patchin, vice-president of the Grace National Bank, one of the heaviest investors in Latin-American enterprises, said recently:

“The total quantity of merchandise exported to Latin America as compared with domestic consumption is not large, but it is the final 10 or 15 per cent of production in relation to profitable distribution that makes the difference between prosperity and hard times. This being the case, Latin America is a substantial weight in the economic balance and determines our domestic welfare.”

The untempered greed of American capital as reflected in the bungling policy of the U. S. Department during the past two years came near losing this “substantial” market. America’s intervention in Nicaragua; her bullying threats towards Mexico; her forcing of a treaty on Panama—aroused universal distrust and hostility throughout Latin America. The articulate anti-imperialist leadership was shaken from its lethargy. Manuel Ugarte, for years the outstanding symbol among intellectuals of protest against the encroachments of United States interests, issued a manifesto calling upon all of Latin America to unite in resisting the “utilitarian absorptions” by the “Colossus of the North.” In his impassioned appeal he says:

“Three names have echoed through the heart of Latin America during the last few months—Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama.

“In Mexico imperialism is endeavoring to break the resistance of an indomitable people defending its future.

“In Nicaragua the same imperialism is landing conquering legions.

“In Panama it is imposing a treaty compromising the independence of that little nation.

“And as a logical corollary, a thrill of solidarity is rising among the people from the Rio Grande to the Straits of Magellan, translated into the slogan we launched in 1912—

LATIN AMERICA FOR THE LATIN-AMERICANS. The manifesto continues:

“At the opening of this century, Latin America was able to find support in the powerful bulk of a Europe intact, anxious to win markets and financially omnipotent. The most elemental logic counseled an attitude of partiality toward her. Many of our governing men lacked the moral courage necessary to such a policy. And it cannot be argued that at that time Imperialism had not yet thrown off its mask.”

Ugarte urges as a first step in the direction of Latin-American solidarity an arrangement for the reciprocal granting of the rights and duties of citizenship to the natives of the sister republics. This proposal was eagerly picked up by the Mexican government, a resolution passed in the legislature to that effect and submitted by Mexico to the other Latin-American legislatures. A few days ago the government of Panama, under pressure of the U. S. State Department, replied that such a plan was not feasible at this particular time. Ugarte continues to urge the establishment of a Superior Commission of Latin America charged with formulating a common international course, a homogenous financial policy and a coordinated education system. “Remember,” he says,

“Imperialism is carrying on its hostile work. To protest against the offenses is logical as a means of relieving our feelings—but above all it is necessary to prevent these offenses. We must establish a close coordination of our republics. Our slogan must be RESIST OR GO UNDER.”

This stirring appeal was followed by organizational steps throughout Latin America. The Associated Press reported two weeks later the formation of the CONTINENTAL ALLIANCE by delegates from Honduras, Guatemala, Peru, Uruguay and Argentina. The object of the alliance—to promote the constitution of a Latin-American League of Nations, contrary to both Pan-Americanism and the League of Nations at Geneva; the principal aim of the organization—“to fight for republics now under North American protectorate, to regain their full sovereignty in order that a League may be formed by independent Latin-American nations.”

The Latin-American Union formed in 1924 by students and professional intellectuals reaffirmed their program to struggle for:

1. Political solidarity of all Latin-American peoples and joint action in all questions of mutual interest;
2. Repudiation of official Pan-Americanism;

3. Solution by arbitration of disputes arising among Latin-American countries by exclusively Latin-American jurisdiction;
4. To oppose financial policy compromising national sovereignty or justifying intervention of foreign capitalist states.

ALL-AMERICA ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE

The All-America Anti-Imperialist League, also formed in 1924, has intensified its activity; arranged huge demonstrations of workers and peasants in all the large cities protesting American intervention in Nicaragua and the meddling in the affairs of Mexico. It more than doubled its affiliated member sections. It is the most influential of the various anti-imperialist organizations because it has the greatest mass support and the most conscious and far-reaching program. Its continental center is in Mexico City and it has branches throughout Latin America and in the United States.

"The Union of Central and South America and the Antilles," composed of Latin Americans, other than Mexicans, residing in the City of Mexico, organized large protest demonstrations at one of which Isidro Fabela, noted Mexican writer and speaker on imperialism, urged Latin America and especially Mexico to cultivate British and European investments rather than American, alluding to the first as "an evil somewhat further removed," and urged a united front against "Northern aggression."

THE PROTEST OF THE PRESS

The entire press of Central and South America raged with indignation. Even such well-known conservative newspapers as *El Universal* of Mexico (which usually favors the interests of foreign capital as against the Mexican worker and peasant) declared that "this policy of ruthless imperialism backed by brute strength, befogged by hypocrisy and falsehoods with which the U. S. attempts to conceal its purposes, is destroying one of the illusions that remained to the world after the great war. . . ."

"The landing of armed forces in Nicaragua is causing disquietude and indignation, wounding at the same time the independence of one Latin-American republic and the sensibilities of all Spanish-America."

El Excelsior of Mexico City—a reactionary newspaper expressing the interests of the landowners and the Catholic Church, stated

that "It is again clear that the policy of the U. S. is dictated by American brokers, and that the recognition of the Diaz usurpation is only an insurance policy taken by Washington in favor of American concession hunters."

The conservative *La Nacion* of Buenos Aires describes U. S. intervention in Nicaragua as "an assault upon international law and a hard blow at the Monroe Doctrine which had established the definite right of American nations to liberty against all colonizing encroachments. . . .

"According to the precedent established by the Nicaraguan affair, the sovereignty and rights of American countries are to be subordinated to the number of dollars which the U. S. has invested in their territory."

La Critica, the largest afternoon paper of Buenos Aires, stated that "the Nicaraguan problem in spite of its geographical distance has begun to assume importance because of its moral influence upon American relations."

La Nacion of Santiago, Chile, referring to U. S. imperialist designs, said, "This situation is bound to throw the shadow of disquietude over the horizon of the Americas, and has the effect of recalling precedents in the policy of the U. S. which Latin-American countries wished to forget."

O Jornal of Brazil described U. S. policy in Nicaragua as audacious and imprudent and said that the United States shows a spirit capable of causing consequences certain to disturb continental tranquility.

Nuestro Diario of Guatemala declared: "Years of patient diplomatic labor, thousands of speeches, gatherings, congresses bent on eradicating from the Latin American mind the remembrance of the Big Stick Policy have come to nought at a single stroke. . . . We wish to protest energetically against the pressure being exercised by the U. S. upon other Central American governments to recognize Diaz" of the Conservative clique in Nicaragua. "This is an unwarranted meddling in affairs which do not concern her."

El Diario of Costa Rica not only protested in its columns but organized large protest demonstrations which the government suppressed because it had recently received a loan from American bankers.

The press of Peru, Salvador, Honduras, and every other country

of Central and South America protested and issued warnings against the aggressive policy of the State Department. Protests were voiced in every legislative body of Latin America.

The correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News* reported that the anti-American demonstration in Buenos Aires grew so menacing that they had to be suppressed by the government and that many speakers were arrested.

The Secretary of the Bolivian Legation in Brazil made such a fiery attack upon the United States that he "had to be recalled."

Senator Justo, leader of the Socialist group in the Argentine Legislature, made a motion for the elimination from the national budget of the provision of 20,000 gold pesos voted towards the support of the Pan-American Union in Washington, stating that "by helping to support the Pan-American Union we appear before the world as morally tied to the United States and this tie can, in the eyes of many, be nothing else than a tie of vassalage."

THE BOYCOTT MOVEMENT

Pretty soon all of these speeches and articles and demonstrations began to crystalize into a movement of boycott on American goods. In Argentina the movement was started with the slogan of "Buy from Those Who Buy from Us," which assumed threatening proportions. This move was praised by the Cuban press which has its own particular grudge against the high tariff barriers of the U. S. on Cuba's sugar and tobacco crops. *La Nacion* of Chile urged a similar movement. The Federation of Port Workers in Vera Cruz declared a boycott against purchase of goods manufactured in the United States; and started an organization campaign to get all other port workers' locals to do likewise.

In Mexico City the All-American Anti-Imperialist League in a united front campaign with other groups called for a boycott of American manufactures.

Although the movement of Latin-American protest has not reached any great proportions due to the fact that most of the subservient Latin-American governments were forced to suppress the movement by force, nevertheless the U. S. Department of Commerce reports that exports to Latin America for 1927 were about the same as those for 1926 only because Argentina showed a considerable gain; that exports to Chile, Peru, and other countries actually decreased. This loss in South American markets is

attributed to the energetic competition from England and Germany who have known how to capitalize in their own favor Latin-American resentment against the U. S.

TRYING TO PATCH THINGS UP

With the Pan-American conference so close, and the presidential elections only a little beyond, the administration could not afford to let this situation continue. Neglect here would mean a severe blow to American economic and political relations with her neighbors. Such neglect would result in endless difficulties and embarrassment to the Republican administration. The State Department set about trying to improve the situation by a series of conciliatory gestures without altering in any fundamental way its policy of brutal aggression.

As a first step Dwight W. Morrow, a partner in the house of Morgan, was appointed ambassador to Mexico in place of Sheffield. Though he represented more "direct action," yet his soft smile and silken manners contrasted favorably with the boorishness of Mr. Sheffield and the stupidity of Kellogg. His smooth language and "friendly" trips with the Mexican president "won the confidence of Calles," who was strangely willing to be wooed, as well as of the unprincipled Mexican bourgeois press, and of the leaders of the Mexican Federation of Labor (C. R. O. M.).

To entertain his new friends, Morrow brought down Will Rogers who kept the executive howling over ham and eggs. He brought down Lindbergh and the "whole Mexican nation went mad with excitement and enthusiasm" and the C. R. O. M. forced all of its members (at the threat of a fine of a day's wages if they did not go) to demonstrate in greeting the young American flyer. Only the Communist Party denounced the Lindbergh trip as imperialist propaganda.

In addition to all this Morrow promised the Mexican government a 70 per cent reduction in the payments of the 1928 installment of the foreign debt. Since Mexico can count upon a total income of 290,000,000 pesos for the year, and since the installments on the debt are almost 120,000,000 million pesos, Morrow's "generous concession" was "much appreciated" and yielded more than its weight in gold.

THE OIL DECISION

In was only a short time afterwards that the Mexican Supreme

Court rendered a decision in favor of the Mexican Petroleum Company of California—the Doheny Company which passed into the hands of the Standard Oil of Indiana a few years ago. This is the first decision rendered by the Supreme Court since the oil and land laws went into effect in January, 1926—the law which aroused the protest of the oil companies and an interchange of notes between the U. S. and Mexican governments.

This decision has been followed by an amendment to the oil law, formulated by President Calles and just passed by the legislature. The amendment provides in place of a 50 year concession, a concession to run the same length as the title; that is, if the title is in fee simple then the concession runs without limit of time; if a leasehold, the concession runs the length of the lease.

The Calles government thus makes another step to the right. It is, to be sure, not as far to the right as American capital would like to see it go—but it is as far as they dare to push at the present moment. Morrow “is letting Calles off easy” in return for good behavior at the Pan-American Union Conference. When that is over there will be two years until the new amendment goes into force, plenty of time for bickering and trading, and Morrow will know how to continue his good efforts on behalf of the class he so ably represents.

Under the slogan of “friendship at any price” with Latin America before the Pan-American Union Conference, the flights of Lindbergh were organized. They have produced a most startling effect in Mexico and countries of Central America. With Morrow’s “extreme tact,” Will Rogers’ comic wit and Lindy’s hops the air seems properly charged for a “peaceful” session at Havana.

A DELEGATION OF NOTABLES

The sixth conference of the Pan-American Union will open its sessions in Havana on the 16th of January. The congress will be greeted by Lindbergh in the air. The United States is sending its “leading political figures.” No less a personage than President Coolidge himself will make the opening address. Never in the history of the United States has any president gone as a delegate to an international conference except for the trip of President Wilson to Versailles. This shows how much importance American finance capital is attaching to the forthcoming Pan-American Union conference.

Kellogg will be there. Charles Evans Hughes, who spurned a representation to Geneva, is going as the chairman of the American delegation. Morrow will be there—a silent, shining testimony of what polish and finance can accomplish in an economically backward country. Henry P. Fletcher, an expert on Latin-American affairs and at present ambassador to Italy; Oscar Underwood, former Democratic Senator; Ray Lyman Wilbur, President of Leland Stanford University and brother of the Secretary of War; Morgan J. O'Brien, James Brown Scott and Dr. Leo S. Rowe, director of the Pan-American Union, make up the rest of the delegation to this most spectacular conference in the history of Pan-Americanism. The United States government is obviously mobilizing for something it considers important.

EFFECT OF SANDINO'S HEROISM .

Yet all the effect of Lindy's flights and Will Rogers' wise cracks, of Morrow's soft soap and Coolidge's sweet physiognomy are destroyed in a moment on the eve of the conference by the heroic challenge of Sandino and the decision to send more marines to Nicaragua. Diplomatic gestures are meaningless for in imperialist aggression as in other matters "actions speak louder than words."

In order to prevent the discussion of matters vital to the interests of Latin America the agenda of each conference is fixed at the one before: There the only potentially important point which will be discussed at Havana is the first point on the agenda which deals with:

"Organization of the Pan-American Union on the basis of agreement which would make the Union a kind of an American League of Nations under the hegemony of the United States."

It should be stated here that at the present time the Board of the Pan-American Union is made up of the diplomatic representatives to the United States from the different Latin-American countries. As diplomats they haven't very much freedom of criticism. If their criticism becomes too sharp the United States can request their recall. Several attempts have been made to change this form of representation but each time it was blocked by the U. S. delegation. Some of the Central American republics will attempt to effect a change in the method of representation under point number one of this agenda. The other matters on the agenda are of

relative unimportance as compared to this important first point. They deal with such unimportant matters as postal regulations, "intellectual co-operation," consular fees, etc.

The Latin-American countries, if they dare to make a serious affair of the Pan-American conference, will try to make it turn about the only question that really matters, the question of U. S. intervention.

It is reported that HAITI wants to present a resolution at this conference stating "That any action carried out by a state, whether by means of diplomatic pressure or armed force, in order to force its will upon another state, constitutes intervention."

ARGENTINA has prepared a resolution to the effect that "A state may not intervene in the internal affairs nor in the external affairs of another state."

MEXICO and the DOMINICAN REPUBLIC have agreed to present the following: "No state may, in the future, directly or indirectly, nor by reason of any motive, occupy even temporarily any portion of the territory of another state. The consent given to the occupying state by the state occupied will not legitimize the occupation, and the occupant will be responsible for all occurrences resulting from the occupation not only with respect to the state occupied but to third parties as well."

PARAGUAY: "Intervention or any act of a state within the territory of another state without previous declaration of war, with the intent to decide by force, material pressure or moral coercion, internal or external questions of the other state, will be considered as violation of international law.

It is of course a foregone conclusion that none of the above resolutions will be permitted to pass should they ever reach the discussion stage. Lindy, Coolidge and the other notables are being sent to prevent this ever reaching even that stage.

PROBABLE GROUPINGS AT THE CONFERENCE

The conference will probably divide itself into the following three groups:

1. The United States with its satellites—the governments she has set up in Nicaragua, Cuba, Panama, Chile and Peru. These will try to suppress all attempts at discussion of U. S. policy in the Carribean during the past two years.

2. Mexico and those countries which hope to start political discussion. It is likely, however, that the diplomacy of Morrow and Lindbergh will have been sufficiently successful to move Mexico into the first, subservient group.)

3. The third group, under the leadership of Argentina, will try to play the League of Nations and British imperialism against America.

Before venturing to forecast the results of the sixth conference it would be well to run over the events of the fifth conference of the Pan-American Union. It was called to meet at Santiago, Chile, in 1914, but the war intervened and the conference was postponed until 1923.

PROTEST AT LAST CONFERENCE

When the conference finally took place in 1923—eleven countries formed an opposition bloc to the United States and attacked its activity in the Caribbean and Central America. An unofficial delegate from Santo Domingo accused the army of the United States of murder, arson, pillage and many other brutal crimes which it had committed during its invasion of his country. A proposal for the limitation of armaments led to a most bitter discussion. Nothing, however, except discussions, were permitted, and the conference ended, as other conferences in the past, without definite action.

La Prensa of Buenos Aires, commenting on the results of the congress, said: "The absence of Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, protests from Haiti, Santo Domingo, the discontent of the delegates from Cuba, Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela, and the reforms supported by the 6 Central-American republics and Panama, disclose a spirit of discontent more than latent on the part of those republics over which the United States exercises constant influence, political, military and commercial, sometimes quite disturbing."

"El Mundo" of Havana, said that the conference "was entirely under the control of the United States; the same old patents, trade marks and sanitation."

Numerous editorials in the press at that time pointed out that the hope for Latin America lay in Latin-American conferences from which the United States should be excluded.

THE SIXTH CONFERENCE OF THE PAN-AMERICAN UNION

The sixth conference of the Pan American Union will open in

an even more hostile atmosphere than the fifth. But the United States delegation will use all known devices—president's arrival, Lindbergh's air tricks, the puppet governments, every parliamentary obstacle and every form of cajolery and coercion, to neutralize and divert this resentment. From present indications in the press of Latin America it is obvious that they expect as little from this conference as they got from the fifth. But if they should succeed in turning it into a protest forum, it will likely have more organizational results than the previous one in the building of an anti-imperialist movement.

In Cuba the problem of hostile press comments was settled simply by an order to the press issued in the name of the Dictator Machado, that no notes, news or information should be printed during the conference which might injure national susceptibilities, expressly pointing out as examples the problems of the United States in Nicaragua and Mexico.

President Coolidge will make his speech along the lines of the agenda above indicated and will pledge undying love and friendship for his neighbors to the south. Kellogg will ape the president.

In the ante-chambers of the conference hall many shady deals will be contracted. The "Liberal" General Moncada of Nicaragua, recently purchased by President Coolidge's personal representative Stimson, if not in person, then through his representative, will join with conservative Diaz of Nicaragua in songs of praise of the U. S. for its "saving" intervention. He will testify that General Sandino, who is carrying on a heroic struggle to free tiny Nicaragua from the mighty colossus of the North is only a common bandit leading other bandits against the "civilizing" marines of the United States. In return for all of which the U. S. State Department will make him the next president of Nicaragua.

Mexico, hailed by the rest of Latin America as the leading liberalizing and militant force against the aggression of American imperialism, will in all likelihood betray its trust, and take a silent and unrebelling seat at the conference or perhaps make a few feeble gestures. If she behaves "well" her debt payments will be lowered for the year, (a postponement, not a reduction in the totals to be paid), and the arms embargo will be lifted to permit her to purchase airplanes and other military accessories at an enormous profit to the American manufacturers.

Little protest will be permitted at this congress. The present

diplomatic representation on the directing board makes it difficult. The United States and its puppets will fight any attempt at radical change in the system of representation. Changes there will be, but only in matters of international money orders and trade marks and patents. Nothing vital will be accomplished. The Republican administration hopes to be able to flaunt a diplomatic victory in its foreign policy. Latin America must be made to realize that the Pan-American Union, as it is now constituted, is an unconquerable obstacle to their national development and growth; and an effective instrument of United States imperialism for the absorption of Latin America. We must utilize the conference to that end.

National & Colonial Revolution

By V. I. LENIN

The material printed below is a collection of excerpts from the writings and speeches of Lenin dealing with the question of colonial and national revolutionary movements. They give the key to the Leninist approach to the problems of the Chinese revolution and are particularly timely in view of the abandonment by the Opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in the International of the Leninist method of analyzing the Chinese question. They show how far the opposition has moved away from Leninism.—B. D. W.

THE characteristic feature of imperialism is that the whole world, as we see, is divided at the present time into a large number of oppressed nations on the one hand, and an insignificant number of oppressing nations, which possess colossal wealth and powerful military forces, on the other. The overwhelming majority of the people, numbering more than a billion, probably a billion and a quarter,—and if we take the population of the whole world at one and three quarter billions, then 70% of the population of the world—belong to the oppressed nations. These nations are either in a state of colonial dependence, or belong to the outlying colonial states like Persia, Turkey and China, or have been conquered by the armies of the great imperialist powers and forced into a state of dependence upon the latter by treaties.

*Report on the National and Colonial Question
at the II Congress of the Comintern (1920).*

THE AWAKENING OF ASIA

ONLY a little while ago China served as an example of age-long and complete stagnation and now China is seething with political life. The social and democratic movements are pouring forth like a torrent. Ferment is growing in British India. The revolutionary democratic movement has now spread to the Dutch Indies—to Java and other Dutch colonies.

Hundreds of millions of oppressed peoples, who for ages have slumbered in medieval stagnation, are awakening to a new life, to the struggle for the elementary rights of men and for democracy.

The workers in the progressive countries of the world are watch-

ing with keen interest and enthusiasm this mighty growth of the world liberation movement that is going on in all parts of the world and in all forms. Bourgeois Europe, scared by the power of the labor movement, has rushed into the arms of reaction—of the militarists, of the priests and the obscurantists. The proletariat of the European countries and the young democracy of the Asiatic countries sure of its strength and confident in the masses, is marching to take the place of the bourgeoisie, which is rotting alive.

The awakening of Asia and the struggle for power commenced by the progressive proletariat of Europe marks a new stage of world history in the beginning of the 20th century.

—*The Awakening of Asia* (1913).

IN CIVILIZED and progressive Europe, with its brilliantly developed technique, its rich and diversified culture and constitutions, a historical moment has arrived when the commanding bourgeoisie, in its fear of the growing power of the proletariat, is supporting all that is conservative, moribund and medieval. Dying out itself, the bourgeoisie is combining with all that is obsolete and moribund in order to prop up the swaying system of wage slavery.

Progressive Europe is being commanded by a bourgeoisie which is supporting all that is conservative. Europe is progressive in our days, not because of the bourgeoisie, but in spite of it, for the proletariat alone fills the ranks of the millions of fighters for a better future. The proletariat alone preserves and spreads ruthless hostility to that which is conservative and barbaric, hostility to privilege, slavery, and the degradation of man by man.

The *only progressive* class in “progressive” Europe is the proletariat. The bourgeoisie is prepared to commit every act of barbarity, brutality and crime in order to save doomed capitalist slavery.

A better symptom of the decaying state of the whole of the European bourgeoisie could not be found than that it supports reaction in Asia for the sake of the selfish aims of financiers and swindling capitalists.

In Asia a mighty democratic movement is growing, expanding and becoming stronger. The bourgeoisie in Asia is still siding with the people against the reaction. Hundreds of millions of

men and women are awakening to life, to the light and to liberty. What enthusiasm does this world movement arouse in the breasts of all class-conscious workers who know that the path to collectivism lies through democracy! What enthusiasm is roused among honest democrats for young Asia!

But what about "progressive" Europe? It is plundering China and aiding the enemies of democracy and of liberty in China.

The whole of commanding Europe, the whole of the European bourgeoisie is in alliance with all the forces of reaction and medievalism in China.

On the other hand, young Asia, i. e., the hundreds of millions of the toilers of Asia, have a reliable ally in the proletariat of all civilized countries. No power on earth can prevent its victory which will liberate both the nations of Europe and of Asia.

—*Conservative Europe and Progressive Asia* (1913).

TO THINK that the social revolution is possible unless the small nations in the colonies and in Europe revolt, unless a revolutionary outbreak occurs among certain sections of the petty bourgeoisie in spite of all its prejudices, unless a movement breaks out among the non-class conscious proletarians and semi-proletarians against landlordism, clericalism, monarchy, and national and other tyranny—to think that means to *renounce the social revolution*.

We would be very bad revolutionaries if in the great proletarian war for liberation and Socialism we failed to utilize *every* national movement against the various misfortunes caused by imperialism, for the purpose of intensifying and expanding the crisis. If we shouted at all the cross-roads that we were "opposed" to all kinds of national oppression and on the other hand described the heroic rebellion of the most active and intelligent sections of certain classes of the oppressed nations against their oppressors as a "putsch," we would sink to the level of the stupid Kautskyans.

—*Summary of the Discussion on Self-Determination* (1916).

THE ROLE OF THE ORIENT

THE social revolution will not be exclusively, or even principally, a struggle of the revolutionary proletariat in each separate country against its own bourgeoisie. No; it will be a fight of all colonies and countries oppressed by imperialism and of all dependent countries against international imperialism. Our Party

program, which was adopted in March last year, describing the approach of the world social revolution says that the civil war of the toilers against the imperialists and the exploiters in all progressive countries will combine with national wars against international imperialism. This is confirmed by the progress of the revolution. This will be the destiny of the Orient. We know that the majority of the population of the Orient will rise as independent participants, as creators of a new life, because hundreds and millions of these people belong to the dependent, disfranchised nations who up till now have been the objects of the international policy of imperialism, and who existed for capitalist culture and civilization only as fertilizer.

The imperialist war has roused the Orient also, and has swept its peoples into the arena of international politics. Britain and France have armed the colonial peoples, have taught them to utilize military technique and modern machinery; but these colonial peoples will employ this science against the capitalist rulers. Following the awakening of the Orient a period will commence in contemporary revolutions of a direct participation of the oriental peoples in deciding the fate of the world in such a way that they will not serve merely as a means for the enrichment of others. The peoples of the East are awakening in order that each nation may take a practical part in determining the destiny of the whole of mankind.

—*Speech at the Second All-Russian Congress of Oriental Peoples (1919).*

IN RELATION to the more backward states and nations, those in which feudal or patriarchal and patriarchal-peasant relations prevail, we must particularly bear in mind the following points:

(a) All Communist Parties must render active aid to the revolutionary liberation movements in those countries. The form in which this assistance should be rendered should be discussed jointly with the Communist Party in the particular country concerned if such Party exists there. The duty to render the most active aid rests first of all upon the workers of those countries upon which the backward nation is dependent, either as a colony or financially.

(b) It is necessary to combat the reactionary and medieval influences of the church missionaries and similar elements.

(c) It is necessary to combat the Pan-Islam and Pan-Asiatic

and similar tendencies which strive to combine the struggle against European and American imperialism with the growing power of Turkish and Japanese imperialism, of the nobility, large landlords, the priesthood, etc.

(d) Particularly necessary is it to give special support to the peasant movements in backward countries against all manifestations or survivals of feudalism. Efforts must be made to make the peasant movement assume a more revolutionary character and wherever possible to combine the peasants and all the exploited in Soviets and in this way to bring about the closest possible alliance between the West European Communist proletariat and the revolutionary peasant movement in the East, in the colonies and backward countries generally.

(e) It is necessary resolutely to combat the attempts made to paint non-Communist revolutionary liberation tendencies in backward countries in Communist colors. It is the duty of the Communist International to support the revolutionary movements in colonies and backward countries only for the purpose of enabling the elements of future proletarian parties, Communistic not only in name, in all backward countries, to be grouped and trained to recognize their special tasks of fighting the bourgeois democratic movement in each country. The Communist International must enter into temporary agreements and even alliances with the bourgeois democracy in colonies and backward countries, but must not merge with it, but preserve the absolute independence of the proletarian movement, even in its most rudimentary form.

(f) It is necessary persistently to explain to and expose before the masses of the toilers, particularly of the backward countries and nations, the systematic deceit which the imperialist powers, aided by the privileged classes of the oppressed countries, perpetuate by setting up allegedly political independent states which in fact are completely dependent upon them economically, financially and in a military sense. In contemporary international conditions, there is no salvation for the dependent and weak nations except in an alliance of Soviet Republics.

—*Thesis on the National and Colonial Question* (1920).

CAN we accept the assertion that the capitalist stage of development of national economy is inevitable for those weak nations which are now liberating themselves and in which symptoms of

progress are observed, now, following on the war? To this question we reply in the negative. If the revolutionary victorious proletariat will conduct systematic propaganda among these nations, and if the Soviet Government will render them all the aid it is capable of, then it will be incorrect to assume that the capitalist stage of development is inevitable for backward nations. We must not only form independent cadres of fighters and Party organizations in all colonies and backward countries, we must not only carry on propaganda in favor of setting up peasant soviets and strive to adapt them to capitalist conditions, but the Communist International must accept and give a theoretical foundation to the postulate that with the aid of a proletariat of the more progressive countries the backward countries may pass over into a Soviet system and through definite stages of development to Communism, avoiding the capitalist stage of development.

It is impossible to say beforehand what is required to bring this about. Practical experience will show this. But it has been definitely established that the Soviet idea is understood by the toiling masses of the backward nations. These Soviets must be adapted to the conditions of a pre-capitalist social system and the work of the Communist Parties in this connection must be started immediately in all countries.

America Discusses the Opposition

By BERTRAM D. WOLFE

THE controversy in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has caused widespread discussion in the United States. The discussion has extended far beyond the circles of the Communist movement, and its closest sympathizers. Renegades from Communism and consistent opponents of the Communist movement have picked it up and sought to settle old grudges or find new "justifications" for old positions of antagonism to the Soviet Union and the Communist Party. The capitalist press has filled columns with information and misinformation, both editorially and in the form of news. The Jewish Daily *Forward* and other conscious enemies of the Communist movement have tried to "fish in troubled waters." Jewish nationalists have made of the question a "Jewish issue." Old Mensheviks like Abramovitch have become sudden defenders of "true Communism" in the person of Trotsky, against those who are abandoning Communist doctrine. "Trotsky is a visionary" say these new-found friends of world uprising, "but he stands for the world revolution. Stalin is realistic, but he succeeds by abandoning the world revolution—by unfaithfulness to Bolshevik principles."

It is interesting to examine these discussions by non-Communists, ex-Communists, anti-Communists. They throw additional light on the nature of the controversy. They show where the hopes of our enemies are grounded. And they throw far more light on the "American scene" itself, on the nature of the various currents within and without the labor movement, on the real attitude of various groups and periodicals toward the Soviet Union, its Communist Party and the Communist International.

Unfortunately, limitations of space and of time to make the analysis prevent me from taking up more than a few typical reactions to the controversy and from analyzing any of them very exhaustively. I have therefore had to limit myself to a casual examination of articles in the following papers and periodicals: *Modern Quarterly*, *Volkszeitung*, *Advance*, *Nation*, *New Republic*, *World Tomorrow*, *Jewish Daily Forward*, *Reflex*, and *New York Times*. Special attention has been paid to Eastman and Lore and their respective satellites. All matters treated here are necessarily fragmentary.

In most of these comments on the controversy in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, certain type arguments and viewpoints recur again and again.

TYPICAL VIEWPOINTS

Chief of these are:

1. An attack on Communist discipline, a denial of the necessity of discipline in a Communist Party, a denial of the right of a Communist Party to limit general discussion to a discussion period before a convention and a demand that it turn itself from a party of action into a permanent debating society, a denial of the authority of conventions and their right to settle anything, a denial of the right of a party to expel those who fundamentally disagree with its program and who refuse to accept and abide by its decisions.

These attacks come principally from the Mensheviks and Socialists, who have always denied the Leninist concept of the Party as a fighting organization built on the principles of democratic centralism, and from renegades and ex-Communists expelled for refusing to carry out the party program, for violations of discipline and for un-Communist and anti-Communist activities.

Such arguments are found in the Socialist *Forward*, in the writings of the Mensheviks like Abramovich, and in the writings of the expelled Communists Lore, Salutsky and Eastman, where these arguments form the chief matter to the exclusion of any serious discussion on the fundamental political differences.

FREE LANCE INTELLECTUALS

The same arguments are made by intellectuals on the fringe of the revolutionary movement who have never been willing to subordinate their "well-developed" egos to the collective judgment and discipline of the Party, and to do the difficult work and stand the consequences of being a Communist in America, where it is far from an easy task, and where those who worship only the God of success cannot see flashing successes from day to day.

Such elements come nearer to our movement when the revolution flames up abroad or when the Party is scoring some notable success as in Passaic, but move away again when the labor movement suffers defeat, when the Party has to retreat, when it goes through a painful period of controversy, when it is under sharp attack—in short, when it is seen that a revolutionary movement is not built overnight and

that much patience, determination, devotion and unpicturesque and undramatic hard work (often "backstage" rather than "in the lime-light") is required to build our movement and prepare it for leading a still politically backward and divided and disorganized working class to victory over the most powerful capitalist class in the world.

Such elements have always sought for "reasons" and arguments to justify their not being Communists. They have found justification in being sniffingly superior persons, far, far above the battle and able to sit in judgment, to jest and sneer about, to knock and criticize and to feel dreadfully superior to a movement which they would earn the right and the ability to criticize only by being active in it and helping to strengthen it.

They see in the arguments of Trotsky and Zinoviev, in the attacks of the Opposition upon the party, "Communist arguments" to justify their old position, "Communist reasons" for not being members of the Communist Party!

ATTACK ON THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

2. The second type of viewpoint advanced is an attack upon the dictatorship of the proletariat, a denial of the necessity on the part of the Soviet Union surrounded by hostile capitalist countries to continue its restrictions on freedom of speech and press.

The *New York Times* puts the question very clearly in an editorial comment on the defeat of the Opposition. It declares that one of the results of the defeat will be "the extinction of the feeble spark of democracy discernible in Trotsky's demand for free discussion. . . Had that been granted it is not inconceivable that the despised bourgeois freedom of speech might have been extended with time beyond the confines of the Communist Party."

THE BUILDING OF SOCIALISM

3. The third type of viewpoint deals with the question of the correctness of Communist theory—with the possibility of constructing socialism in the Soviet Union.

Out of the mouths of Communists, the enemies of Communism try to find new arguments to substantiate their old theory that the Bolsheviks were wrong, that they should not have seized power in November, 1917, that Russia is economically unripe for the build-

ing of socialism, that the peasants are incurably anti-socialist, that the Russian revolution is doomed to failure and a return to capitalism. These opponents of Communist theory range from the Mensheviks and *Forward Socialists* to the *New York Times*.

A CLEVER MANEUVER

At every turning point of the revolution, the more enlightened of them has used the subtle trick of hastening to approve the measures taken by the Communist party and the Soviet government but has interpreted them as "realistic steps away from Communism." Thus they interpreted the NEP, the grain tax, the concessions policy, the effort to secure recognition by various governments, etc.

While Lenin was alive, he was treated by them as a crafty realist determined to hold on to power by sacrificing his principles, and the Workers Opposition and other opposition movements were the unpractical dreamers and visionaries faithful to those ideals which could never work in the real world where human nature is unchanging and hostile to Communism. Now this argument is applied by Abramovitch, by the *New York Times*, etc., to the latest controversy.

The subtlety of their method will be apparent when you realize that they really agree, as they have always agreed, with Trotsky's wrong estimate of the peasantry as the enemy of the working class and with the Trotskyite viewpoint of the impossibility of the construction of socialism in the Soviet Union, but they declare that Trotsky does not recognize these things, while Stalin does and is realistically but secretly making the Soviet Union a peasant and a capitalist government.

4. As an offshoot of the theory that the peasant is essentially hostile to the working class, that the alliance between them is against the nature of the peasant, that the peasant will become articulate and lead Russia back to capitalism—come grave explanations to the effect that Stalin is an Asiatic and a peasant, that the Soviet Union is now a peasant government, that "Stalin's victory means the peasants are the ruling class."

Closely related to the above are the theory of the degeneration of a ruling group, the theory of bonapartism, the theory of Thermidor, all of which the opposition has unconsciously absorbed from Menshevik and other bourgeois sources, and now the Mensheviks and other defenders of capitalism hasten to quote these viewpoints

not as their own, but as the viewpoints of the "true Bolsheviks" themselves.

THE THEORY OF DEGENERATION

5. The opposition has also provided the enemies of the Soviet Union with new ammunition in their efforts to prove that capitalism is eternal because it is in harmony with "eternal human nature." If you make the rich poor and abolish the ruling class, a new rich and a new ruling clique will spring up. It happened in the French revolution with Thermidor and Bonaparte and the victory of the speculators and new rich of France. It is happening in Russia with the Kulak, Nepman and Bureaucracy with Stalin as the Bonaparte and the fall of Trotsky (Danton) and Zinoviev (Robespierre) as the Thermidor. So runs this argument.

THE QUESTION OF DEFENSE

6. Most dangerous, although least clearly expressed because the capitalist press does not dare talk frankly about it, is the comfort being derived from the slanders of the opposition against the Soviet Union in connection with the approaching imperialist attack upon the Soviet Union.

It is becoming every day more apparent that the great imperialist powers are laying plans for a new attack upon the Soviet Union. In such a war there is no doubt that the Soviet Union cannot compete in technique, in armaments, in poison gas, in airplanes, in wealth, in war industries, in battleships, with the attackers. The first workers' republic would be doomed to destruction were it not that the armies sent against it must be made up of workers who will refuse to attack and will even actively defend the Soviet Union.

But the opposition insinuates that the Soviet Union is no longer a workers' government, and is not building socialism, but going back to capitalism. Then what have we to defend? What worker will risk his life in the defense of a government of Kulaks, Nepmen and Bureaucrats? This the enemies of the Soviet Union perceive, and without daring to draw the lessons (for they dare not talk openly of war on the Soviet Union) they spread this poison far and wide.

In the material examined below, the reader will find one or more of the above matters appearing with all sorts of variations and in all sorts of combinations, also with varying subjective intentions and motives. I begin first with Max Eastman and his admirers

because of the active role that he has played in disseminating misinformation concerning the subject in the United States, England and France. Then Lore and those connected with him, such as Salutsky. Then the Liberal press. And finally the viewpoint of the *New York Times*, organ of finance capital.

THE GOSSIP OF MAX EASTMAN

The opposition has rallied choice elements to its cause in the various countries of the world. In Germany it is the expelled and renegade Communists Maslow, Fisher, Korsch and Katz, whose activities today consist not in fighting capitalism or the government of Germany, but in fighting the Communist International and the government of the Soviet Union. In France it is Souvarine, another expelled Communist, who publishes a paper whose whole fire is directed against the Communist International and the Soviet Union. And so one may go from country to country and in each it is the renegade, the ex-Communist, who becomes the outstanding apostle of the views of the opposition. In the United States, this noble role is played by Max Eastman.

Eastman illustrates admirably the kind of elements that are attracted to support of the Opposition and the international connections between them.

In 1925, Eastman published a scurrilous book of old-maidish catty gossip on the controversy in the C. P. S. U. under the title "Since Lenin Died." The attacks upon the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its leadership were of so vicious a character, so full of falsifications and scandal based even in many cases on White Guard rumor-factory products* that Trotsky felt called upon to repudiate it.

Eastman, whose *aplomb* and self-assurance are boundless, no doubt explains away Trotsky's attack upon his book as "forced upon

*Eastman even publishes an engagingly frank footnote to one of the choice tidbits of gossip which reads: "There is no mystery about my possession of this and the foregoing information; it is all contained in official documents stolen by counter-revolutionists and published in Russian, at Berlin, in the *Sozialistichesky Viestnik*. (Like the Macdonald forgeries and the Hearst Mexican documents."—B. D. W.) This paper, which is a remnant of Menshevism, publishes a great deal of nonsense and irresponsible rumor about Russia, but the authenticity of these documents is recognized by the Bolsheviks (!). I took pains of assuring myself of it absolutely before leaving Russia . . ." (Mr. Eastman could teach Mr. Hearst a thing or two about how to testify before Senate committees on "stolen documents"!)

him by the bureaucracy." The only trouble with this explanation is that it does not jibe with Eastman's description of Trotsky as "a proud man," "selfless and fearless," etc. Nor does it harmonize with the character of Trotsky's denunciation of the book.

Thus Trotsky declares:

TROTSKY'S REPUDIATION OF EASTMAN

"Eastman's book is bare of any political value . . . approaches the events of the inner life of our Party without a serious political criterion, in a purely psychological manner . . . he is nourishing the Menshevist legend on the Bonapartist character, the pretorian guard character of our army. . . .

"Eastman's assertions that the Central Committee confiscated pamphlets or articles of mine in 1923 or 1924 or at any time, are untrue. . . . Another false assertion is that Lenin offered me the post of chairman of the Council of People's Commissars."

". . . conclusions placing our Party and its leaders in such a light that the same attentive and thoughtful reader is inevitably forced to the question: *What bonds can unite Eastman and this party, or Eastman and the revolution led by this Party?*" (Emphasis mine.—B. D. W.)

Eastman's book was published in Great Britain and the United States and translated in whole or in part into other languages. Opponents of Communism and lovers of scandal and gossip made good customers for a book which attacked the leadership of the Communist Party and the Communist International as: "the machine" (p. 33), "the heads of the bureaucracy" (p. 35); which describes the conventions of the Party that leads the working class in the Soviet Union in this wise: "The performance at this convention (the XIIIth) was a continuance of the deliberately unscrupulous campaign carried on during the winter (p. 98) "Nobody can tell how much Trotsky's sickness played into the hands of his enemies. It is certain that they consciously reckoned with it in starting this unscrupulous campaign." (p. 96). "It was undoubtedly one of the most perfectly packed conventions ever held in the history of the world." (The whole world, no less—and in all history!) "Their (the delegates'—B. D. W.) performance reminded me of nothing so much as the Armistice Day exercises in a patriotic American private school." (p. 90). "Their speeches (those

of the leaders—B. D. W.) and articles . . . would be thrown out of a prize essay contest for defective children.” (p. 51).

AN “ORPHAN” PARTY

The party that made the revolution and is building socialism in the face of incredible obstacles, Eastman describes in such language as is employed in a description of how a single speech of Zinoviev “stampeded the whole Russian Communist Party, and produced a condition of intellectual mob-hysteria that lasted all winter.” (p. 60). Or again: “When Lenin was gone, the party was left, not only with the wisdom he had taught them, but also with the irresponsibility, the childlike dependence upon his will and judgment. A large family of orphans suddenly found the sixth part of the terrestrial globe in their hands . . . and no practice in the art of tackling big problems independently.” (p. 100-101). And so on to the point of nausea. . . .

But even at the risk of nauseating the working-class reader, I must make one more quotation from Eastman’s “analysis.” It is of interest as an evidence of the profound intellectual snobbery of Eastman’s attitude towards the working class and its party.

Eastman feels called upon to explain how it is that the Communist Party so overwhelmingly repudiated Trotsky, how it is that the workers have again and again rejected his viewpoints, and why it is that such little support as he had and retains is predominantly among intellectuals of petty-bourgeois origin. His answer is that it is “not only because the workers are inherently more subject to organizational management (he means manipulation—B. D. W.) than the intellectual” but also because of the “intellectual complexity of the trick which had been played upon them.”

EASTMAN USES THE *Times*

A renegade radical who writes such stuff as that naturally discovers (as so many of our tired radicals have discovered) that he has the columns of the *New York Times* open to him for further performances. In October of 1926, Eastman availed himself of the privilege to publish in the capitalist journal a new slanderous attack upon the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This new attack repeated some of the old gossip and some new. It ended with a declaration that the victory of the present leadership means the rule of the landowners and the bourgeoisie, “and once more

the workers will have been betrayed, and after all, the famous Russian revolution will not be more than a bourgeois revolution."

HIS INTERNATIONAL CONNECTIONS

The *New York Times* paid Eastman a substantial sum of money for this latest attack upon the Soviet Union and when he was reproached for receiving money for attacks on the Soviet Union in a capitalist paper, he sent a letter to the *Nation* in which he declared that he had not kept the money but had turned it over to French Communists for use in the service of the Communist movement. Some time later, the renegade ex-Communist Souvarine, who publishes a paper which dedicates itself to the task of attacking the Communist International, the French and Russian Communist Parties, and the Soviet Government, published an acknowledgment of having received money from Eastman, thus showing the international connections between all these renegades who, in the guise of supporting the opposition attack the Communist Party and the Soviet Union.

EASTMAN REVISES MARX

Eastman's activities have not stopped there. He has proceeded from an attack on the Russian Party and the Communist International and their leadership to an attack upon Communism in general, of course in the guise of "improving" Communism, of making it "more scientific"; of saving Communist theory and practice from its own baser nature—from its "metaphysical character."

This "theoretical" contribution to "the science of revolution" was in part printed piecemeal in the columns of the *Modern Quarterly* (January-April, 1917) and the *New Masses* (September, October, November, 1927).

The entire attack on the Communist revolutionary viewpoint, theory and practice has finally appeared in book form in the United States after previous publication in France and England. It is entitled "Marx and Lenin" with the sub-title "The Science of Revolution."

Written in the name of saving Leninism from its own theory and purifying Marxism from its "non-scientific and metaphysical" character, it is a general attack upon the whole of revolutionary science. Its method is to set up a grotesque caricature of Marxism, a Marxism that would make its founders turn in their graves.

Having set up this straw man, Eastman proceeds bravely to knock him down and tear him to pieces.

In its viewpoint, it returns to utopianism, mixed not as Eastman believes with the psychology of Freud but with the antiquated psychology of Jeremy Bentham, a metaphysical psychology of "the real nature of man" (p. 191) which, of course, is timeless and unchanged by the changing material conditions in which man lives and works and learns and thinks and feels.

WHAT'S "WRONG" WITH MARXISM

Eastman "refutes" Marxian economics, the dialectic method, the materialist interpretation of history, the "wrong" Marxian attitude towards Darwin, the "wrong" Marxian way of meeting revisionism (of which "ism" Eastman's work is one of the worst specimens), the "wrong" answer of Lenin to the anarchists, the "wrong" answer of Marx to the Utopians, the "wrong" answer of the Bolsheviks to the Mensheviks, etc., etc., etc.

He clamorously puts metaphysics and mysticism out of the front door on every page, or at least declares he is doing it, but energetically hauls them in again by the back door.

It is not my purpose to review the book here. There is, however, one element in the book which concerns us for the purpose of this article, and that is the question of its relation to the Opposition discussion.

The jacket of the American edition contains an interesting line in italics which reads: "This book has nothing to do with the so-called Trotsky controversy." Nevertheless, we cannot take Eastman's (or the jacket's) word for it. The book has much to do with the "Trotsky controversy."

A THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THERMIDOR

I do not, of course, mean to imply for an instant that Zinoviev or Trotsky share any of the stupid "theories" advanced in this book. But there are certain chapters in the book which state in a generalized and heavy abstract theoretical form Eastman's views on some of the issues involved in the controversy in the Russian Party. This is especially true of such chapters as "Bureaucratism and Revolutionary Education."

A quotation or two will suffice to illustrate his method.

"A pious repetition of these ideological phrases [of Marxism]

will tend to replace the active science of revolution, and *provide a cover for the rebirth of the old system.*" pp. 201, 202. (This is the "Thermidor" theory restated in the jargon of Eastmanian "revolutionary science."—B. D. W.)

"That the Hegelian-Marxian metaphysics plays straight into the hands of this enemy, needs no demonstration. . . . For animistic mysteries have always been employed by an aristocracy to befuddle the masses, and the moment the danger arises of a 'revolutionary' aristocracy—a danger which only fools will deny—this materialistic animism stands ready to do its work. . . . Being a religion, it is the natural property of a priestly class. . . ." (pp. 202, 203.) (This is Eastman's way of expressing the theory of the degeneration of the leadership of the Communist Party.)

"Moreover, if Lenin had understood his own thinking, he could have left in his place a body of men better trained to carry it forward than those he has left. . . ." (p. 205.)

"They have established in the place of it [of "a great system of education"] this great solemn fetich of dialectic materialism, which is nothing but the old shoes of the Almighty God." (p. 206.)

At the same time, it is interesting to note that in his earlier book, "Since Lenin Died," Eastman already incubated the germ of the present work. Thus we find on pages 112 and 113 of "Since Lenin Died" such passages as: "It is not difficult to see the connection between these three points of disagreement between Trotsky and the triumvirate. Underlying them all is that one conflict . . . between the 'abstract agitatorial' attitude and the attitude of a Marxian engineer engaged with the 'concrete life problems' of the revolution. . . ."

"... a lapse into the old vague talk, the emotional self-deception, the separation of theory from practice, the *practical Utopianism* [emphasis Eastman's] of the pre-Lenin days [all this is Eastman's affectionate way of referring to Marxism]—that is what the triumvirate represents in these real disputes with Trotsky." Similar passages may be found in other parts of the book.

THE UNION OF THE EXPELLED

Finally, it is interesting to note that such opponents of Marxism-Leninism are the kind of support that the opposition has found in America. That in every country, it is the ex-Communist, the expelled Communist, the anti-Communist, who is attacking Com-

munism *in its own name*, that takes up the banner of the opposition in its struggles against the Communist International and Leninism. It is true that Eastman was repudiated by Trotsky (although all too gently), but Eastman proves to be tied up with Souvarine whom Trotsky never repudiated. Add to these Maslow and Fisher, Roland Holst the "God-seeker," the Italian renegades weary of the struggle against Fascism, Pollipopoulos, the opponent of Macedonian self-determination and proponent of the liquidation of the Communist Party of Greece, and all the other petty-bourgeois revolutionists gone mad and tired radicals looking for a "Communist" reason for not participating in the Communist struggle and a chance to justify their absence from the ranks of the Communist Party or treachery to the cause of Communism in the name of Communism itself.

SAMUEL SCHMALHAUSEN AND THE FREE SPIRIT

Among those "near-Communist," "also-Communist" and revolutionary radical free-lancers "above Communist dogma" and Communist discipline, who group themselves around the *Modern Quarterly*, is a marked trend towards support of the Opposition in the C. P. S. U. and the seeking of "revolutionary" justification for having remained outside of and "superior" to Communist discipline. What was before shame-faced evasion now becomes heroic defiance. One can line up with Trotsky and "defy the apparatus." There is "revolutionary" warrant for rejecting discipline. It can now be done in the name of Communism itself, in the name of saving Communism from the petty dictatorship of the bureaucracy. In fact, several of the little band of "free spirits" that rally around this free "Magazine of the Newer Spirit" timidly flirt with the idea of turning it into an organ of the Opposition in this country and more openly flirt with Max Eastman to become the leader of such a movement.

Samuel Schmalhausen writes a smart-alecky article in the November *Modern Quarterly*, in sophomoric style, bristling with puns, alliteration and wise-cracks, which makes up in quantity for what it lacks in quality. It takes up 35 pages of the *Quarterly*. It consists of "criticizing" in turn liberals, socialists, ex-Communists and Communists, and must, no doubt, have given much self-satisfaction to the writer in enabling him to square a lot of old grudges and to feel superior to so many of his contemporaries, quite a few of whom he has scarcely earned the right to criticize.

The article would be of no concern here were it not for the fact that the few whom Schmalhausen singles out to praise in the course of his thirty-five pages of knocks show a definite tendency on the part of the author to urge the formation of a new party of an "also-Communist" character with Eastman as its leader. This is the more interesting because Schmalhausen is no accidental contributor but has been helping to shape the editorial policies of the *Modern Quarterly*. Were it not for this fact it would be unexplainable how the *Modern Quarterly* or any other periodical with similar pretensions could give thirty-five pages or thirty-five lines to such puerile stuff.

For Lore he has only one reproach—that he is wasting his "splendid socialist . . . abilities" on German-speaking Americans. He pleads with Lore to "devote his abilities to the American situation among working-class Americans."

A MOSES FOR TIRED RADICALS

Of Max Eastman he demands active leadership of the American revolutionary movement. Eastman is a "Bolshevik with a mind of his own." (Most Bolsheviks in America, according to Schmalhausen, "never know what to think until they have received orders and specifications as to how to proceed with their matutinal cerebation.")

"Eastman's socialism has the high merit of being based not only on the logic of revolution, but as emphatically upon the psychology of human behavior. It is high time that Eastman faced the duty of becoming the leader of the younger generation of revolutionary radicals whose one deep need is a leadership like his, at once courageous and far-seeing."

Come thou and lead us out of the wilderness of tired radicalism and supersophisticated cynicism! is the prayer of Samuel Schmalhausen. "There is a lot of splendid courage among our Communist comrades: what they lack is insight. . . . More will and less reverie, great comrade!"

So Eastman has gotten unto himself a disciple. . . . Like master, like man! The kind of disciple can be judged by the "activities" of Mr. Schmalhausen in recent years. Or by smart alliterations about Communist discipline—"the rigid ritual of American Communism oftentimes in practice a left-wing fascism. . . ." (!)

It is interesting to contrast the gentle treatment given Lore and

the hero-worship given Eastman with the venomous scurrility with which Schmalhausen approaches the best type of Communist leadership developed in America as symbolized in the person of C. E. Ruthenberg. "The ruthless Ruthenbergs [Schmalhausen would sacrifice anything for the sake of an alliteration] love hate too wholeheartedly to be trusted with the sane and scientific task of recreating civilization."

(To be concluded in the next issue.)

Chemical Warfare

By ROBERT MACDONALD

1. DEFENSE AGAINST GAS

THE first part of this article in *THE COMMUNIST* for November described the various kinds of gas, what they are made of and what they do to unprotected human beings. In this article, questions of defense and of strategy will be considered.

Side by side with the development of new types of gas, there was steady progress in protecting troops. In matters of chemical warfare, the Germans were always one or two jumps ahead of the Allies, so the Germans did most of the attacking, and the Allies most of the defending.¹

Chlorine called forth the first and simplest gas masks. They were just pads of cotton, or cotton waste wrapped in muslin, and soaked in a mixture of hypo and washing soda. The pad was tied over the mouth and nose. It served fairly well against the low concentrations of chlorine then used.

Later, when the much more poisonous phosgene began to be used too, the pad was changed into a flannel bag or helmet, with mica or glass eye-pieces, and other chemicals had to be added.

These helmets also soon became inadequate, and by 1916 work had begun on the "Box Respirator," which is the same *type* as that used today. These masks removed all poisonous vapors very satisfactorily, and were later developed to remove smokes too. They consisted of a rubberized fabric face-piece with an inflated rubber edge like the inner tube of an auto tire. This fitted very tightly against the skin, and was held on by head straps. The entire face was covered—from the forehead to below the chin, and on the cheeks almost as far back as the ears. Eye-pieces are very impor-

¹The fact that the Germans held the chemical initiative during the war does not mean that they were more "fiendishly wicked" than the Allies, but merely that they possessed a much more highly developed chemical industry. This explains the tender care that the capitalists of all nations have lavished ever since upon their respective chemical industries. Indeed, all of them have tried so hard to be independent—whether England or Italy, Poland or the United States, France or Japan—that the world's equipment for chemical manufacture is about 50% over-expanded. In consequence the scramble for markets has become so keen that a great Chemical Trust, embracing France, England and Germany has recently been formed.

tant, because bad ones not only expose the soldier to danger, but greatly reduce his efficiency. Triplex glass—a glass sandwich with a very thin layer of celluloid in the middle—was found to be most satisfactory. The mask contained a rubber one-way valve that permitted air to be breathed out, but none to come in except through a large, flexible, corrugated rubber hose which connected the mask with the cannister, the heart of the outfit. The cannister was attached to the chest with straps. It was just a small box in which is filled with the chemicals necessary to destroy or absorb the various poison gases. These chemicals were chiefly soda-lime, and alkaline permanganate which decompose most war gases, and specially prepared activated charcoal which absorbs them. Special provision was made later for filtering out smokes.

Such masks when properly adjusted were thorough protection for the eyes, nose and throat, and lungs, and so were satisfactory against all types of gas except the vesicants—the skin-burners.

HOW IT FEELS TO WEAR A GAS MASK

But even the best gas mask is uncomfortable. It is all very well to wear one for a couple of hours while sitting quietly in a laboratory, but it is quite another matter when carrying out the necessary duties of a soldier at the front, such as digging trenches, moving sand-bags or shell, or digging artillery out of the mud. There is some resistance to breathing—as though someone were holding a handkerchief over your nose and mouth—and the air is so thoroughly dried by the chemicals that the nose and throat get sore after a while. When the soldier does hard work the mask gets very hot and stuffy. After being exposed to gas for long periods at a stretch, soldiers occasionally tore off their masks and said they would rather face the gas than the endless discomfort of the mask! In fact it is now a part of regular tactics to send over a smoke cloud with just enough tear gas in it to force the wearing of the mask, and thus harass the enemy and wear down his resistance.

In regard to the protection of the civilian population, a recent dispatch to the *New York Times* states that the house committees in Leningrad have been ordered to see that everyone is provided with a gas mask, and that special gas-proof cellars be constructed large enough to accommodate all the people living in the house. This is a good example of the foresight of the first Workers' and Farmers' Government. They know that Imperial Britain is trying

to line up a capitalist united front against the U. S. S. R., and that the attack may come at any time now. Consequently every effort is made to train and protect not only the soldiers of the Red Army, *but also the industrial workers in the great cities*. For the Russian workers' leaders know that the next war will be a war of chemicals, airplanes and tanks.

We saw above that good gas masks protect against gases that attack the lungs, against tear gases, and against those that cause violent sneezing and vomiting. But they do not protect one's skin against the vesicants, like mustard gas. Mustard gas in the vapor form is practically odorless and invisible. *It penetrates all ordinary clothing*. Even in the liquid form it acts so slowly that the writer knows of an ambulance driver who drove several kilometers while sitting in a puddle of it, thinking that it was merely rain that had got in while he was collecting the wounded! Despite its *delay action*, its after-effects are sure and terrible. Indeed it is so effective in producing casualties that the gas research laboratories of all countries worked steadily during the war, and have been working ever since, trying to develop adequate defense against it. There have been salves to smear on the skin, there have been gas-proof suits of all types and kinds—some made of oil-cloth, some impregnated with boiled linseed oil, etc. But the body must breathe, and what is more, soldiers cannot wear stiff, heavy suits and still be efficient. So even today there is no satisfactory defense against mustard—it remains the King of Gases.

2. STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Before it is possible to consider this phase of the problem of chemical warfare, we must get a general idea of the nature of war. War is basically the imposing of your will on the enemy by force. To do this an old rule of the militarists says that it is necessary "to have at the decisive point at the decisive moment a more effective force than that of the enemy." Another one insists that if you want to win, you must seize the initiative, and thus by depriving the enemy of his free choice of time and place, make his fight on your terms. Passive resistance gets nowhere. Marx understood these principles very well when he said that in a strike, or in an uprising, it is necessary to win a first success, and then day by day, sometimes even from hour to hour in critical times, it is necessary to win some victory, however small.

What are the "decisive points" in modern mechanized warfare? When several million men are uprooted from their daily life, and flung on the battlefield, the burden of feeding, clothing and sheltering them, to say nothing of supplying them with weapons and ammunition, is enormous. Thus the enemy's jugular vein is the railroad and motor roads, or the railroad and ships that lead back to his base of supplies. For instance during the last war, England's line of communications consisted of the Southern Railway, the ships across the Channel, and the Northern Railway of France (Chemin de Fer du Nord). The Germans after the first gas attack almost succeeded in taking the Channel ports and cutting the British lines. In trench fighting the immediate objective may be a hill, a village at a cross-roads, a bridge, etc., but the chief decisive points are railroads, important cross-roads, ports; and behind the lines, railroad centers (Paris, Cologne, Moscow, New York, Chicago), ammunition dumps, and all large industrial towns where basic industry is carried on and munitions are made.

Thus we see that the object of war is not just to go on killing until one side gets tired of it, but rather to seek out these "nerve centers" of the enemy, and by attacking them to paralyze him. The killing is incidental.

HOW IMPORTANT IS GAS?

In the last war gas proved itself particularly effective in trench warfare. How many people know, for instance, that the Germans relied mainly on gas for the great March assault in 1918 that might have changed the course of "civilization"? A definite idea of how important the Germans considered gas may be gained from two examples. First—when the Allied inspectors crossed the lines after the armistice, they found that approximately 50% of the shells in the German ammunition dumps were gas shells! Second—a captured order of the 7th German Army dated May 8, 1918, giving instructions for an attack on the Aisne on May 27. It ran thus: for counter-battery and long range bombardments, use the following shell:

¹Blue Cross 70%. ²Green Cross 10%. High Explosive 20%.

For a creeping barrage for the bombardment of infantry positions:

Blue Cross 30%. Green Cross 10%. High Explosive 60%.

¹Arsenicals (sneezing and vomiting gas).

²Lethal gases (Kill by damaging the lungs).

The high percentage of chemical shells is immediately obvious. When one stops to consider some of the tactical advantages of gas, it is easy to see that its importance cannot be exaggerated.

1. It goes around all obstacles and sneaks through tiny cracks. (Sandbags or trenches will protect against rifle bullets, but not against gas!)

2. It is effective in very small quantities.

3. Due to the *delay action* of certain types of gas, (e. g. phosgene, mustard gas), troops occasionally fight unawares in low concentrations, and become casualties later.

4. It is *persistent*. (High explosive shell burst and disappear.) The fact that some gases are much more persistent than others makes them strategically important.

5. Exposure to unseen death at all times of day or night wears down the morale of troops. All drinking water and food near the lines is in danger of contamination.

As a result of these various properties, gas has developed certain special uses. Non-persistent lethal gases, like phosgene, are sent over just before an attack is made. The gas harms the enemy, but evaporates before the attacking troops get there.

Gases are mixed in a variety of ways. Sneezing gas is sent over together with a lethal gas: the former may catch the soldier before he can get his mask on and make him sneeze and vomit—meanwhile the lethal gas kills him. Tear gases are used in all sorts of combinations to force wearing of the mask, and break down efficiency and morale.

But it is mustard gas that makes possible the new strategy. The flanks of an army can be protected by spraying the territory with mustard. A retreating army can make the surrendered region untenable by its use. Strong points that could only be stormed with tremendous loss of life can be taken with mustard, even if they cannot be occupied immediately.

A NEW TYPE OF OBSTACLE

Obstacles have always been important in war, whether barricades, forts, rivers or other natural or man-made barriers. The Hindenburg Line and the Canal du Nord were tremendous obstacles when backed by German artillery, rifles and machine guns, but without the latter, they would have been mere inconveniences for the pas-

sage of any army. Chemical warfare, and mustard gas in particular, offers a new method of blocking out an area so as to prevent its use for military defense or for communications. Thus a normal flat piece of country-side can be made as impassable without serious casualties, as a natural obstacle well manned by rifles and machine guns. It only needs to be drenched with mustard gas.

AIRPLANES AND GAS

An English expert writes, "The war gave us no direct evidence of the successful use of gas and war chemicals from aircraft. This, however, is no criterion as to its eventual importance. . . . The main reason for the lack of development on these lines was probably the fact that the most suitable type of gas (mustard) only developed during the later stages of the war, when it was required exceedingly urgently at the front." The enormous development of airplanes since the war, and the tremendous growth of the chemical industries of all the powers, means that there will be airplanes and mustard aplenty when the next war comes. Airplanes and gas-proof tanks will be the most important mechanical devices, and will greatly extend the use of gas. No civilian workers will be safe, because the enemy airplanes will fly over the railroad centers and great cities and paralyze them with mustard.

SMOKE

One other important development of chemical warfare, which may be briefly mentioned, is the use of smoke. Dense white smoke is easily produced by various methods. It may be used to mask known enemy observation posts or machine gun nests. It serves to hide the concentration of guns and tanks, and conceals the front and flanks of advancing troops. It may be used as a feint to draw the enemy's attention to a false front, or to cover the construction of bridges or trenches in the face of the enemy. Smoke would play a very important part in a civil war. One of the best smoke producers is phosphorous, which also causes severe burns. It takes fire spontaneously and burns either wet or dry. There is no better weapon against a machine gun nest than phosphorous shell.

The above article, and the one in the November COMMUNIST have skimmed the surface of the very important subject of Chemical Warfare. Let no one get the idea that the subject is one that concerns only the militarists. A new war is coming, and as revolu-

tionary workers—the most bitter and resolute enemies of the capitalists and imperialists—we need to have a thorough knowledge of what they consider to be their most powerful weapon.

References:—

Chemical Warfare	Fries and West	(1921)
The "Riddle of the Rhine"	V. Lefebure	(1923)
Medical Aspects of Chemical Warfare	E. B. Vedder	(1926)
Medical Aspects of Chemical Warfare	U. S. Army	(1926)
Der chemische Krieg	R. Hanslian	(1925)
Der Gaskampf und die chemischen Kampfstoffe ..	J. Meyer	(1925)

LIBERALS

Liberals sit apart in the manner of a setting hen on her eggs. When something happens that threatens to disturb their routine they peck out anxiously and little gurgles of distress come from their throats. . . . In a moment they have settled back comfortably to brood.

John Dos Passos in the "New Masses."

Marxian Classics

MATERIALISM AND EMPIRIO-CRITICISM.

In this book Lenin reveals himself a militant dialectical materialist, fighting against all attempts at philosophic revisions of Marxism. \$4.00

MARXIAN ECONOMIC HANDBOOK AND GLOSSARY *by W. H. Emmett.*

A complete elementary primer containing all the essentials for understanding Marx's Capital, with a glossary of 700 economic and other terms. \$3.25

SELECTED ESSAYS *by Karl Marx.*

A collection of the early, and for the most part unknown, essays of Karl Marx. \$1.75

THE PEASANT WAR IN GERMANY *by Friedrich Engels.*

An analysis of the social and economic forces which brought about the peasant uprisings, and their relation to the Reformation. First time in English. \$1.50

THE 18th BRUMAIRE OF LOUIS BONAPARTE *by Karl Marx*

A new and striking translation of Marx's literary classic, with a glossary of terms, names and dates. \$1.50

THE ECONOMIC THEORY OF THE LEISURE CLASS *by Nikolai Bukharin*

A criticism of the value and profit theory of the Austrian School of Economics. \$2.50

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM — A SYSTEM OF SOCIOLOGY *by Nikolai Bukharin*

All the social phenomena closely scrutinized and interpreted from the materialist viewpoint. \$3.25

KARL MARX AND FRIEDRICH ENGELS *by D. Riazanov*

A striking account of the lives, theories and practical achievements of the founders of scientific socialism, by the director of the Marx-Engels Institute \$2.50

KARL MARX: MAN, THINKER AND REVOLUTIONIST.

A collection of essays on Karl Marx, by Engels, Plekhanov, Mehring, Luxemburg, Lenin, Lafargue, W. Liebknecht, Riazanov, and others. \$1.75

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
39 East 125th Street New York, N. Y.

NEW NUMBERS IN THE WORKERS LIBRARY

Number 2

THE COOLIDGE PROGRAM

By JAY LOVESTONE

A ruthless exposure of the bunk of democracy, prosperity and Justice, and the misery and poverty under which the bulk of the American workers live.

5 CENTS

4 Cents in Lots of 10 or More

3 Cents in Lots of 100 or more

Number 3

STALIN'S INTERVIEW *With the First American Trade Union Delegation*

A vivid picture of life under the Soviet system and the building of Socialism. Stalin answers the questions of the American trade unionists and poses a few of his own.

25 CENTS

5 for One Dollar

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
39 East 125th Street New York, N. Y.

IF

You want to know what the coal miners are doing in their struggle in the coalfields of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Colorado

and

The struggle of the
Nicaraguan patriots

Then Read

THE DAILY WORKER

"The National Labor Daily"

33 First Street, New York, N. Y.



On sale at all New York newsstands

SUBSCRIBE!

RATES:

Outside New York

Per year\$6.00

Six mos. 3.00

Three mos... 2.00

In New York

Per year\$8.00