

THE TOILER

VOL. IV

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1921

No. 191

The World Congress of the Third International

The recent Congress at Moscow seen by one of the British Delegates

by Ellen C. Wilkinson

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

American Imperialism and the Harding Administration

by Emil Lyons

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Letters from the Mine Workers' Convention

by Earl R. Browder

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦

Books — International Documents

Five Cents a Copy

Two Dollars a Year

Published every Saturday by the Toiler Publishing Association, 208 E. 12th St., N. Y. C.

If some kind soul would write us, saying "Enclosed find Check for \$10.000"

WELL—we would not reject the money, providing it was not "Hoover conditioned"—for we need money worse than Gompers needs sense.

BUT—if 10,000 workers would write us, each saying: "We will give you \$1.00"—total \$10,000—that would really be an example in solidarity and class understanding.

Your business is our business. We say this to all workers who read these lines. We have no interests apart from yours. You have no interests apart from ours.

THE TOILER IS YOURS. THE TOILER is impossible without you. You have the deciding vote.

One of the coal kings of West Virginia complained to another of his kind the other day, saying that the mine slaves had no respect for laws, or the governor, or mine property, and that his two million dollar investment was not safe "with these unionized red necks around."

No, the mine slaves are not devoid of respect. THEY HAVE RESPECT FOR EACH OTHER. They had enough respect for each other to enjoy a walk in each others' company toward Logan County.

That little walk the mine slaves took TOGETHER brought the United States Government to its feet!

IT COMPELLED HARDING to forget golf for a few minutes and think coal! The coal kings' voice is a loud voice. Harding heard. Soldiers went.

All of which increased the miners' respect for each other and constituted a chapter in the history of the progress of the workers toward FREEDOM.

Let's transfer this lesson to the field of our immediate activities.

If 6,000 West Virginia miners can make Wall Street squirm what potential power do 15,000 readers of THE TOILER possess, once they act TOGETHER?

THIS IS A CALL TO ALL READERS OF THE TOILER FOR UNITED ACTION.

ATTENTION THEN!

1. Two hundred will please step forward with the promise of \$1.00 each week for twelve weeks.
 2. Six hundred will please answer with a promise of \$1.00 a month for six months.
 3. All the rest will please answer to-day with every cent that can be spared.
- TOTAL \$10,000!

IT'S A CHALLENGE! ARE WE UNITED? Are we for workers' control with every ounce of energy and every resource? A letter from you will tell.

A. B. MARTIN, Manager.

THE TOILER

208 East 12th Street, New York City.

CONCERT AND BALL

Given by

THE WORKERS LEAGUE OF NEW YORK

(The Bronx Section)

At London Casino, 3785 3rd Ave., The Bronx,

On Oct 15th, 1921—Admission 25c., Including Wardrobe.
Proceeds for Relief of Soviet Russia and Workers League Campaign Fund.

A Group of Russian Workers of Harlem is arranging a

BALL

At Educational Center, 62 East 106th St.

Saturday, October 22nd, at 8 P. M.

For the benefit of the only Worker's Russian

Daily Paper, "Iskra"

The Entertainment Committee.

ILLUSTRATED LECTURE ON SOVIET RUSSIA

By Allan Strong Broms

Noted Western Lecturer

Hundreds of rare and interesting pictures of life within the WORKER'S REPUBLIC, displayed for the first time in New York City. Just what you have been looking for! Don't miss this opportunity to see SOVIET RUSSIA as she is today.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON, October 9, at 2 P. M.

At the Parkview Palace, 110th St.,
Near Fifth Avenue

Under the auspices of

THE FRIENDS OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Admission 50 Cents

No Collection

The Toiler

Vol. IV.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1921

No. 191

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS.

EDITORIALS

THE NEW WAR ON RUSSIA.

THE AMERICAN FAMINE.

THE WORLD CONGRESS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL.

By Ellen C. Wilkinson

AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND THE HARDING ADMINISTRATION.

By Emil Lyons

LETTERS FROM THE MINE-WORKERS' CONVENTION.

By Earl R. Browder

BOOK REVIEW

INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS.

THE TOILER, published weekly by The Toiler Publishing Association, 208 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. B. Martin, Manager.

Application for admission to the Second Class of Mail Matter at New York, N. Y., pending.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: One year, \$2.00; six months, \$1.00 foreign, one year \$2.50. Bundle rates, any quantity, \$3.50 per hundred copies. Single copies, 5 cents.

VOL. IV.

Saturday, October 8, 1921.

No. 191

Advertising Rates Upon Application

—S—S—S—

LEADERS AND MISLEADERS

THE national convention of the United Mine Workers, in session for the last two weeks at Indianapolis, is one of deep significance for the whole labor movement of the United States. The struggle between John L. Lewis and Alexander Howat is the outward sign of a deeper conflict which is stirring the ranks of labor to their core. Present conditions are forcing the remolding of trade unions from bargaining groups into fighting organizations. Collective bargaining itself cannot be maintained in the face of the open shop drive. American trade unionism is fighting with its back to the wall for existence against injunctions, lockouts, wage reductions, constabulary and administrative orders. It is a question of going on or going under. John L. Lewis and others of his kind are ready for a consideration to lead the unions down the "easy descent to Avernus." Alexander Howat and his kind can lead them forward through battles and bludgeonings to final victory. It is not now a question whether great leaders can be found to lead forth the American unions from the land of Gompers, but whether the labor movement has advanced to the point where it is determined, courageous and unified enough to follow the new leaders. Are the miners ready for Alexander Howat? Are the steel workers ready for William Z. Foster? If not, they soon must be. For the issue is now victory—or death.

THE STILL-BORN UNEMPLOYMENT CONFERENCE

THE National Unemployment Conference opened at Washington on September 26th, called together presumably for the purpose of recommending to the administration methods of meeting the unemployment situation. The opening address of President Harding and Secretary Hoover made it very clear, however, just what they (Harding and Hoover) "proposed to accomplish and just what they did not propose to accomplish." They proposed to "mitigate the evils of unemployment and shorten its duration," to solve the problem by the mobilization of the intelligence and public spirit of the country." Poor food for a hungry man! They proposed to ascertain the facts of the situation and asked the conference to consider "emergency measures and then those calculated to restore commerce and industry" to normalcy. What all this means we do not know. We are told definitely what it does not mean. There is to be no "tonic" in the shape of paternalistic legislation, no calls upon the United States Treasury, no "doles." Secretary Hoover was very emphatic upon this point, declaring that other countries had met the situation by "direct doles from their treasuries," a system which he characterized as "most vicious." There we have it in plain terms, the mid-Victorian policy of Let-It-Alone. Why not then let it entirely alone? Why assemble conferences and waste breath? We are inclined for once to agree with Daniel Tobin, who resigned from the A. F. of L. Executive Committee when they elected Samuel Gompers to the Unemployment Conference. "Words! Words! Words!" moaned Tobin.

QUACK SCIENCE AND EUGENICS

THE Eugenists have assembled in New York from all quarters of America and Western Europe to tell the world how men may be bred as successfully as Holstein cattle or Kentucky horses. That is a proper and useful though a difficult task. Insanity, feeble-mindedness and disease should be weeded out of our inheritance, and the human stock should be improved physically by educating the race to the responsibilities of parenthood. So far we are with the Eugenists. But how are these improvements to be brought about in our present social system with its vicious and unnatural marriage institutions, its patronage of prostitution and venereal disease, its encouragement of slums, of crime and war, and its discouragement of every attempt to improve the mental and physical environment of the people? These questions the Eugenists ignore, and prove thereby that they are ignorant of sociology and narrowly informed in biology. But the worst is yet to appear. No less illustrious a personage than Dr. G. V. de Lapouge, Director General of Statistics of France, expressed in his speech before the congress a point of view that was general among the learned Eugenists: "A great movement has begun among the inferior

racess and classes; and this movement which has the air of being turned against the whites, the rich, is turned against the superior intellectual elements and against civilization herself. The war of the classes is indeed a war of the races. America, it depends upon you, I solemnly declare, "to save civilization and produce a race of demigods!" Here are the worst fallacies of race biology, the most vulgar corruptions of the science of Darwin and the philosophy of Nietzsche! The hollowness of the attempt to prop up capitalistic exploitation and European imperialism by academic *abracadabra* about the superman and the survival of the fittest was exposed years ago, and no respectable intellect of the twentieth century even gives it serious consideration. But then the doctors and professors of to-day are not respectable intellectuals.

TRADE WITH RUSSIA

READERS of the metropolitan press have been startled by a large advertisement of a fur sale of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic at the Leipzig fair. That accused name, anathema on the front page, blazed forth among the commercial notices. It radiated sanity. So it looks apparently to the people of Central Europe. Official relations between Germany and Russia have been reopened by the arrival of Professor Wiedenfeld in Moscow. He presented his credentials to M. Kalinin of the Soviet Central Committee and Nikolai Lenin, President of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, and expressed Germany's satisfaction that "relations between Russia and Germany have again assumed official character in the full sense." Germany, perhaps, and not England, will soon be playing the leading role in Russian trade. Italy, too, wishes to resume trade relations with Russia and has sent a representative to Moscow authorized to conclude a Russian-Italian trade agreement, the main outlines of which have already been approved by the Russian representative in Rome. The agreement provides for regular shipping lines between the Adriatic and the Black Sea and for the dispatch of Italian-American trade experts to Russia. Russia was represented very conspicuously at the Riga fair. And quite recently even France admitted the hated Soviet gold.

CLEVER STUPIDITY

THE decision of Mr. Justice Strong of Brooklyn in the case against the Fancy Leather Goods Workers frankly annihilates the right of picketing. His written opinion declares that "Pickets are unnecessary appendages to any law-abiding association. It is not the labor organization in the shop which is objected to, but the paid agent, the walking delegate and the picket of labor, who so often becomes a menace to society and a danger to liberty. It is because that great American principle of 'the greatest good of the greatest number' is violated by the labor delegates and agents that the acts of these men and women must be so often restrained." This is a fair sample of the outworn liberal phrases and political cliché that make up this document. The great American principle referred to went to the intellectual scrap-heap half a century ago, but it is still high sounding enough to fill up space in an American judge's decision.

Any political ideology, no matter how outworn, any moral

phraseology, no matter how banal, will serve the central purpose of the American courts, the protection of the privileges of the employing class and the legal subjugation of the working class.

JUDICIAL TYRANNY

THE courts are rallying with energy to the support of the open shop campaign. The perpetual injunction granted by the federal courts of Indiana against the United Mine Workers as a criminal conspiracy marks the beginning of a new era in the handling of the labor movement by American capitalism. It jeopardizes the very existence of all labor organizations and places them completely under the tolerance of the employing class. Tame unions with amenable leaders will be allowed to live in spectral and attenuated form. Militant organizations will be made illegal. The Taff Vale decision which gave birth to the British Labor Party twenty years ago was mild in comparison to this injunction. The Danbury Hatters' decision was far less dangerous. The only court decision that compares with this is the declaration of the French courts last year outlawing the C. G. T., the General Federation of Labor, the appeal on which is still pending. The industrial labor movement is meeting here the treatment which was applied so efficaciously during the war to political offenders, the conscientious objectors, the I. W. W. and the communists. But the unions are in still worse case, for the injunction is a judicial instrument and cannot be attacked by political means, whereas the Espionage Act or the English D. O. R. A., oppressive as they are, can be resisted through legislative channels. Administrative tyranny is worse than legislative tyranny, but judicial tyranny surpasses both.

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

Of The Toiler, published weekly at New York, N. Y., for Oct. 1, 1921.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.
Before me, a notary public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared A. B. Martin, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Business Manager of The Toiler, and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are:

Publisher, The Toiler Publishing Association, 208 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

Editor, R. A. Richards, 18 Jefferson Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Managing Editor, Caroline B. Fanning, 208 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

Business Manager, A. B. Martin, 208 East 12th Street, New York, N. Y.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of stock).

The Toiler Publishing Association:

President, Elmer T. Allison, 3207 Clark Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Secretary, Walter Bronstrup, 1244 Walnut Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

Treasurer, Elizabeth Bertram, 2602 Kingston Road, Cleveland, Ohio.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgages, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.)

None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving he names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiants full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

A. B. MARTIN, Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 28th day of September, 1921.

(Seal) Notary Public, N. Y. County, N. Y.
ARON RAUCH,
(My commission expires March 30, 1922.) County Clerk's No. 32, Register's No. 2012.

The New War on Russia

There are unmistakable indications that the imperialist powers are considering the possibility of using the Russian famine as an opportunity for a new combined attack on Soviet Russia. The hungry wolves of capitalism have only been kept at bay since the collapse of their Wrangel adventure by fear of Russia's military power. Soviet Russia showed herself unconquerable materially and morally, and western capitalism even faced the necessity of entering into trade relations with her and possibly of full recognition. Those overtures of peace very thinly concealed active intrigues for another counter-revolutionary offensive when a gambling chance for success might arise.

The Russian famine appears to the imperialists as offering the gambling chance. Bankrupt politically and financially, the capitalist nations of Europe with the connivance of the United States are ready to stake their last strength in a spring upon famine-stricken Russia. They cannot revive capitalism but they may kill communism, this is their desperate reckoning.

France is as usual the arch-conspirator. Her influence on the Supreme Council secured the appointment of the Allied Committee for Russian Relief with the French Kolchakist Noulens at its head. The immediate task of the committee was to be "investigation" of the famine by a horde of counter-revolutionaries. The Soviet government naturally declined such "relief." And imperialist France now emerges in her true colors with a frank question as to whether it is wise to aid the Russian famine sufferers at all. Such influential organs of the bourgeoisie as the *Temps* and the *Journal des Debats* now openly attack all idea of relief and point out the usefulness of the famine as a weapon against Soviet Russia.

Poland, the eastern vassal and creature of France, though herself in a state of complete economic collapse and chaos, has been goaded into a preliminary skirmish against Russia, and has presumed to send the Soviet government a "sharp ultimatum," which expires on October 5th. Poland, even after the peace of Riga, has continued to harbor a nest of Russian counter-revolutionaries and French militarists who are ready to lead that distracted country in the offensive ordered from headquarters at Paris. The peasant government under Witos has fallen, an indication of a return to power of Pilsudski as military dictator for the Allies.

Finland, now the stronghold of a blood-stained reaction, is ready, together with the smaller Baltic states, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, to line up for the counter-revolutionary attack. The bombardment of propaganda has already begun. A dispatch to the New York Times from Washington announces that "charges are made in a statement obtained here today from responsible quarters—not however from the United States government—that the Soviet government is violating its peace treaties with the so-called border states, . . . that is, the new nations set up

out of territory formerly under the authority of the Czar." On behalf of these states "notes have been left with the Cabinet at Moscow in which are enumerated instances wherein the Bolsheviks have violated their peace treaty."

It is not without meaning that this dispatch also includes an issue apparently far removed. "These accusations," it states, "have a particular importance at this time in view of the charges of the British government that the Soviet government has violated its agreement with Great Britain, especially in fomenting trouble in territory adjacent to India." What then are the mysterious "responsible quarters" in Washington from which this statement emanates? The British Propaganda Service for the United States?

The British position in the present issue is interesting. The press was startled last week by the hysterical complaints of Lord Curzon from the British Foreign Office that Soviet Russia had had a hand in the Indian uprisings. The British ruling classes are never hysterical when hard-pressed. What then was Lord Curzon's motive in this affectation of emotion? Was it to serve as a pretext for breaking the trade agreement with Russia, for refusal to aid the Russian famine-sufferers, and finally for participation in a military attack upon the Soviet government? The New York Times correspondent learns, "the British note to the Soviet authorities complaining of their machinations in the East should be taken more seriously in that it did not emanate from the Foreign Office alone. It had the approval of the Cabinet and must therefore be read as the considered judgment of the British government."

The military cordon to the west of Russia is being rapidly completed. Rumania's military incursions in Bessarabia are calculated to lead to a state of war with Russia, in which, remarks Lloyd George's organ, the Daily Chronicle, "it would scarcely be possible that Rumania's co-members of the League of Nations who guarantee her integrity and independence would be rendering aid and comfort to her aggressor." In other words the economic blockade must be re-established in famine conditions.

Jugo-Slavia and Czecho-Slovakia must be connected in order to complete the corridor. Hence the bitter opposition of the League of Nations to the seizure of Burgenland by Hungary. It is their own devious diplomacy and not pity for prostrate Austria that leads them to threaten intervention for the restoration of West Hungary to Austria.

The "corridor" must also be cleansed. The communist movement which has made remarkable headway in a short time in Poland and Rumania, the Baltic States, Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia and Bulgaria is therefore meeting fierce repression from the bourgeois governments of these states, nourished here by the League of Nations.

The United States is not behind her allies in the anti-Soviet manoeuvres. Secretary Hughes in a statement

issued last week by the State department confirms the principle that until "a single recognized Russian government" is in existence, the vast territory that formerly constituted the Russian Empire, with the exception, of course, of that portion ceded to the new Polish nation, must remain under a moral trusteeship of the powers which are to take part in the international conference in November." And the representatives of Russia before the moral trustees are to be Nikolai Avskentieff and Paul Milukoff appointed by the so-called Russian Constituent Assembly in Paris!

So the iron ring is being forged about Russia! But Russia has bitten through an iron ring before. The Red Army is ready for immediate action. While it has been demobilized, the skeleton organization and command has been kept intact and greatly improved by thorough training, and millions are ready to join the ranks. Leon Trotzky, Soviet War Minister, addressing ten thousand soldiers of the Red Army this week in Moscow said: "There are two fronts now, but it is too early to change our weapons for peace implements. The famine has given our enemies encouragement. . . . On behalf of the Moscow garrison we tell the Foreign Offices and their diplomats that everything should be done to avoid war, but if Poland and Rumania attack, we are prepared to meet them. Let us think of peace, but keep rifles and sabres in our hands." The Russian workers are prepared again to lay down their lives for the preservation of the only human state in the world.

What are the workers of other countries prepared to do?

THE AMERICAN FAMINE

If a famine is, as the dictionary tells us, a "general scarcity of food; dearth; destitution," then we are face to face with a famine in America which approaches the Russian famine itself in its extent and in the suffering it entails. It is a famine of workers rather than peasants, a famine distributed over a vast territory rather than concentrated in one region, a famine of one class camouflaged by the luxury and extravagance of another, a famine caused by an evil economic system rather than by nature—but a famine, none the less.

The American famine is, in fact, the most bitter and cruel kind of famine. It is starvation in the midst of plenty, hunger with the savoury odor of food assailing the nostrils at every turn, nakedness when stores are filled with clothing and streets with well-clothed people, exposure and homelessness at the very doors of unoccupied mansions. To the sufferings of privation itself is added the contrast with the comfort of others, the painful awareness that these sufferings are inflicted not by the blind force of nature, but by the brutal callousness and indifference of fellow-men.

Then there is the terrible loneliness of misery in the individualist world of capitalism. The starving peasants in the famine-stricken villages of Russia face death together with stoicism, all stricken by the same fate—a

fate cruel but impartial. They are conscious that their government, that their fellow Russians, are bending every energy and making every sacrifice for their succor. The unemployed American worker suffers amid the cruel indifference and selfishness of bourgeois society, shut off even from a real sense of comradeship with his fellows in misery, with whom he has not yet developed a true solidarity, whom he even regards as his competitors in the "labor market." Bitterness rather than resignation fills his cup.

The American famine, dispersed and covered though it is, shows the same picture of misery and despair when dragged to the light. There are the pale and hungry children crying for a crust of bread, the mother weeping in despair, the father stunned by misfortune, sometimes actually killing his offspring because he cannot feed them. There are the hundreds of suicides seeking refuge in death from a hopeless economic struggle, the women driven to market their last commodity. There are the great bands of hungry workers trekking to the south before the menace of winter, the parks full of hungry men, unfed, unwashed, unclothed, without shelter and without sleep.

The American famine extends to all parts of the country. It includes men, women and children. All ages and occupations, both sexes fall within its grasp. It affects equally the steel-workers of the industrial north and the cotton-workers of the agricultural south; the highly skilled machinists as well as the longshoremen and the unskilled laborers of all industries who live by selling their muscles. The organized as well as the unorganized feel the force of the crisis, though the unorganized suffer most because most easily replaced and least able to protect themselves. The American famine affects the women workers not less but more seriously than the men. For the working women are the most helpless, the worst exploited, the most underpaid section of the working class. They hardly earn a living minimum when at work and have no reserve either of strength or of savings for a period of unemployment. They often support families of children on their miserable pittance, or combine it with their husbands' low and irregular wages to make what the employers optimistically call a "family wage." Now women's wages and family wages have both disappeared in the deluge of unemployment. What has happened to the women and the families?

The American famine now affects millions. The 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 unemployed wage-earners and their dependents, perhaps twice that number, are probably not all entirely destitute as yet. Some of them have savings. Others have relatives and friends on whom they can depend for a time. A small number receive some charitable relief. But millions have exhausted their savings, their borrowing power. Millions are in a state of complete destitution, of actual famine, and millions more will reach that state within the coming winter.

What will the United States government do for the American famine-sufferers?

The World Congress of the Third International

The Recent Congress at Moscow as seen by one of the British delegates

By ELLEN C. WILKINSON

IT is difficult to get back to the old atmosphere after a visit to Russia, so many of one's views and opinions have been changed. The questions with which one is bombarded, "Is communism a success in Russia? Will the Bolsheviks succeed? Did you get enough to eat?" seem as irrelevant as the assumption that communists go to Russia as to a state where Socialism has been established in order to learn how to do it. Russians are rather weary of explaining to naive newcomers that communism in Russia has only begun as yet, and it cannot succeed until the communists in other countries have done their part.

An impertinent young university lecturer once remarked that Lenin should travel. These Russian leaders are the real Internationalists, for they have travelled, and have lived most of their lives outside the country they now rule. The Russian Revolution is to them an engagement on the world front of the class struggle—a fact more generally understood on the continent of Europe than in England and America, owing to the instability of the political and economic situation left by the war.

The Congress of 1921, therefore, was not a gathering of representatives to learn how things are done under communism, but a council of war, a congress of deputies from the various fronts to consider the world revolutionary conflict, to take stock of gains and losses since the last Congress, and make plans for the struggle in the immediate future.

Thus the report of the Executive Committee was followed by a discussion of the situation in the different countries, especially Germany and Italy, where the March action in the one and the seizure of factories in the other had brought victory for the proletariat very near. As the tactics of the parties in these countries were examined, criticised, and appraised, we witnessed not dictation of Moscow, not the forcing of Russian ideas on to alien soil, but the moulding of an effective force in the class struggle. The sole concern of these experienced generals, not by any means all Russian, was the efficiency of the communist party as an instrument of struggle. Infinite patience was shown to the K. A. P. D. (Communist Labor Party of Germany), but there was a firm refusal to tolerate little groups, however fine fighters might compose them, and an insistence on the necessity for an all-embracing army, the one communist party in each country.

* * *

The central feature of the Congress was Trotzky's great speech on the world situation, a brilliant analysis of the economic position of to-day. It is impossible to summarize the close argument and wealth of fact, but its main theme was that which dominated the whole conference—the immediate future of the world struggle.

At the close of the war the bourgeoisie were disunited and the machinery of capital broken. The Russians said

then, and still maintain, that the world revolution could have been accomplished in 1919. But the proletariat was even more disunited. It was betrayed by its leaders. The bourgeoisie had been given time to reorganize, and were frantically trying to restore economic stability and capitalist prosperity. Would that make the task of revolution harder? Immediately—yes, but communists were only concerned with whether these fluctuations were on the up or the down grade. Economic stability could not be restored by capital. England and America were rushing into war. He dared to give the date as 1923-4. The uneasy equilibrium of 1921 could not be maintained, but the bourgeoisie were offering desperate resistance to the workers who were retreating everywhere before them. This created the new situation. The communists must weld together on this basis all sections of the working class.

In conclusion, Trotzky declared that "our successes as well as our defeats have proved that the difference between ourselves and the Social Democrats and Independents does not lie in the fact that we said that the revolution would come in 1919, and they had replied that it would come later. That is not the difference. It consists in the fact that they are supporting the bourgeoisie against the revolution in all situations, whereas we are ready to use every situation, however it may work out, for the revolutionary offensive and the seizure of power."

* * *

After these discussions came Radek's speech on tactics. Radek does not carry the heavy guns of Trotzky. In some ways he is the Puck of the International, delighting in telling cutting home-truths and pricking the swelling balloons of the pompous. His *bon mots* were the joy of the Congress, barbed as they were with sufficient malice to make them stick.

He remarked that the left communists, in criticising the rest for being opportunist, seemed to pride themselves on being men who wouldn't use their opportunities. Some parties had carefully adopted the most correct communist position, and had learned to say all the creeds quite nicely without being aware that it was necessary to get their machinery ready for action. The proletariat was so disorganized compared to the bourgeoisie that it must be welded together on the basis of the defensive. The old leaders said that the aims of the communists were too remote, but we must show that the old leaders would not lead the workers even for immediate aims. The Communist Party must be ready to work even in the most every-day struggles of the workers, relating them to the class war. "Back to the masses, in amongst the workers, you can't lead from a distance," was the recurring burden of a remarkable speech.

We could not discuss tactics for long without coming to

the policy of the Russian Communist Party and its concessions to capital. Lenin said that Russia, ruined by foreign and civil wars, had not and could not set up Communism by herself. After the world revolution she would probably be the most conservative state in the new order, because predominantly peasant. To-day she was the vanguard in the class war, standing "bloody but unbowed" against the smashing blows of the world bourgeoisie until the workers of other countries should be able to make their revolutions. Till then the most important thing for the International was for the Bolsheviks to retain power. Anything must be sacrificed to that. The Russian workers must be fed, and the peasants supplied with machinery.

* * *

Most foreign delegates had the good taste to leave this debate to the Russians themselves, but, watching Lenin closely during this discussion, I thought his humorous smile grew somewhat bitter as certain delegates from countries that had thrown away priceless opportunities for revolution, complained that Russia's attempt to save her people from starvation might make their struggle a little harder.

The best speech in the debate was Kollantai's magnificent reply to Lenin, a re-statement of first principles. "Are you not putting too much faith in locomotives and machinery," she asked, "and too little in the creative impulses of the people that made the revolution possible? By three years of Soviet rule the minds of the people were being moulded into communist ways of thinking. Though they might indulge in private trading, they knew they were doing wrong. Now that free trade was legalized all the old profiteering instincts were reviving, and the work of three years would be destroyed."

Trotsky evaded the main challenge of her speech by ironically inquiring whether she proposed to produce locomotives by creative impulse instead of by machinery. But then Trotsky is a trying person with a nasty habit of being practical at all the wrong moments.

These discussions on the different phases of the world situation brought us to the consideration of the organization of communist parties in the non-revolutionary countries. The communists were faced with a new situation. The bourgeoisie were showing complete contempt for their own laws by the unconstitutional use of armed forces directly organized against the proletariat of their respective countries—the Orgesch in Germany, the Fascisti in Italy, the Volunteer Defense Corps in England, etc. How was this situation to be met?

There were those who, like the K. A. P. D., wanted the communist party to be a body of picked fighters, carefully trained Samurai. They argued that the Bolsheviks before the Revolution were a small party, even now their numbers were insignificant compared to the Russian population, yet they led the people by their power of acting together in a crisis. Lenin's reply to this showed him firmly on the side of those who desired the communist party to be a mass party. At the critical moments of July, 1917, he said, the Bolsheviks made their final victory certain by their slogan of "Back to the Masses." They left the intrigues of the coalition lobbies to go back to the factories and the mines, so that in Novem-

ber they were swept to power by the great surge of the masses they had organized.

The thesis on the "Organization of Communist Parties" went back to the committee for the incorporation of certain amendments in detail, and the revised text must be received before comment is possible, but the dominant note of the thesis was the demands to be made on each individual member of the Party. No one must be a rank and file member in the sense of paying a subscription, reading the party paper, and leaving it at that. Every member must be attached to some committee, some definite work-group, the whole machinery being organized to make the party, not a political party among other parties, but a definite organ of struggle, an instrument of Revolution.

* * *

These are the salient features of a great conference that would need a book, not an article, to describe. We met under the shadow of famine and of cholera, but we know that these men and women comrades in Russia would win through. They had got down to rock bottom, and reconstruction had begun, however slowly. But we were ashamed to think of the price they had paid because of their betrayal by the leaders of the workers in other countries.

The Congress ended with a speech by Zinoviev, who reviewed the work of the International since its inauguration, and then with a magnificent gesture sent forth the delegates to the great work to which they were all dedicated. The Red Army band started the International, and through the great Palace of the Kremlin, monument of the luxury and tyranny of a thousand years, rang the revolutionary anthem. We could not part. Many of those present would never meet again. To all lands they were returning, some to long years in prison, some to the gallows, some to the bullet of the assassin.

The Russians shouted, "Let us all sing our war songs," and they sang their great Hymn to Freedom. The French followed with the Carmagnole, the Spaniards and the German, and the Yugoslavs sang theirs. Then Artem Sergeiev, the beloved leader of the Don Miners, who within so short a time was to meet a tragic death, led out the Russians with their Marching Song, and we all followed down the great marble staircase which had been so often thronged with diplomats and great ladies in the past. But it was not of their ghosts that we thought, but of the shades of those, who, quiet in their graves under the Kremlin wall, had fought for the freedom they were never to know.

In the vestibule we clustered with the Red Army band, and groups of young officers, eager to seize our hands and wish us *bon voyage*. One of them, such a boy, was lifted shoulder high; and again the International pealed forth over Moscow, silent under the stars. And as the groups of comrades, who, in spite of the barriers of custom and language, had got to know each other so well in these fateful days, broke from the crowd to say good-bye, we knew that divided by hostile governments, with little news of what each other was doing, we were not going back to work in separate parties, but in one all-embracing International, to which we were personally dedicated, for the World Revolution.

American Imperialism and the Harding Administration

By EMIL LYONS

THE presidential election of the last year was fought by the two major parties over the question whether the United States should enter the League of Nations as written into the Treaty of Versailles. Governor Cox, the Democratic candidate, was committed to the League of Nations as presented to the Senate by President Wilson. He was nominated on a platform written by those who supported the policies of President Wilson and he consistently defended those policies throughout the campaign. Senator Harding, on the other hand, was the nominee of the Senate "Irreconcilables," those who opposed joining the League of Nations under any conditions.

Outwardly the issue in the campaign was a political question. The arguments for and against joining the League of Nations were made on idealistic grounds. The Democratic supporters of the League said that it would prevent future wars and appealed for votes to safeguard the lives of the youth of the nation. Their Republican opponents were against subordinating the government of the United States to a super-state, which might call for the sacrifice of the sons of American mothers in wars over European entanglements, and demanded that this country remain free from any such entanglements. While it was thus the political and idealistic aspects of the question that were argued before the voters by the opposing presidential candidates and their supporters, these were merely the cover beneath which a conflict of economic interests was being fought out.

The League of Nations is essentially an organization established in the interests of finance capital, of the international banking houses. It is these interests which are heavily involved in government loans and most affected by the status of international credit and the exchange rate. By guaranteeing the integrity of the nations which became members of it, the League of Nations stabilized their bonds and their credit. The League would be an effective instrument for use by the international banking houses as a debt collecting agency against those nations which might default in their obligations. It was significant that among the advisers of President Wilson at the Paris Conference was Thomas Lamont, a partner in the house of J. Pierpont Morgan & Co., which acted as the fiscal agent in this country for a number of foreign governments and is the leading American international banking concern. The League of Nations represented an effort on the part of those capitalists whose interests were primarily international to stabilize the international financial situation and to come to an understanding on the question of the exploitation of backward countries.

The opposition to the League of Nations came from that section of the capitalist class whose interests were primarily industrial. The American industrial capitalists had prospered mightily during the war. Profits had reached heights greater than they had ever dreamed of. Their productive power had not been impaired in any way as the result of the war, but had been greatly increased. These industrial capitalists had no direct interest in the financial position of other countries. In relation to the same group in other countries they were in a position of great advantage. Their financial position had been greatly strengthened through the enormous war profits. The labor situation was not threatening. This country had suffered less during the war and there was no revolutionary movement such as menaced even the victorious European nations. Under these circumstances, why should these industrial capitalists assume any obligation toward the rest of the world through the League of Nations? Why should they concern themselves with supporting this or that mushroom European government?

This estimate of the situation is borne out by the change in the foreign policy of this country which took place with the advent of the Harding Administration. In place of the glib notes, reeking with assertions of international common interests and solidarity, in the penning of which Woodrow Wilson was past master, the international correspondence of Secretary of State Hughes is carried on with an aggressive assertion of national interests. The note in regard to the Yap cable station bristles with new declarations of our "rights." England is warned against trying to establish a closed door policy in the Mesopotamian oil fields. The Dutch government is sharply called to account because a competitor of the Standard Oil Co. has been given an advantage in the exploitation of the Djambi field in the Dutch East Indies. Mexico is brutally told what it must do to guarantee the rights of the American industrial capitalists who are operating in that country, primarily the Standard Oil Co. subsidiaries. Colombia is given \$25,000,000 as a bribe, ostensibly as compensation for the theft of Panama and the Canal Zone, but actually to make secure oil concessions held by certain American capitalists in that country. President Harding speaks in bellicose tone of our willingness to fight to protect our rights, as in the speech to the assembled officers of the Atlantic fleet.

Although the Harding administration has been in power only five months, enough has transpired to show that its international policy will take the form of an aggressive assertion of those rights of American capital-

ists which do not involve the assumption of any responsibility for upholding the broken-down European capitalist structure. It will back to the limit the American companies operating oil and other industries in Mexico in their struggle to escape taxation and the limitation of their rights to exploit that country. It will force an open door for American capital seeking new resources to exploit, as in the pressure upon England with regard to Mesopotamia and upon Holland over Djambi oil. It will fight Japan, if need be, over Yap, in order not to lose an advantage in the struggle for markets, or for the rights of American capitalists in China. It will continue to extend its imperialist control over the countries of Central America and of the West Indies—Panama, Nicaragua, Cuba, Haiti and Santo Domingo are already in the position of dependencies of the United States.

Some of these policies, it is true, were initiated during the Wilson administration, or even before, and do not indicate any change in the general national policy. It is true that the furthering of the adventures of American imperialism in the Caribbean and Central America is a long established national policy, undertaken to a large extent in support of certain great New York banking houses. The part played by the government in assisting the American bankers in the negotiations with regard to ventures do not involve the government of the United States in any agreement which would compel it to go to the assistance of European governments, they do not involve relinquishing the policy of economic nationalism in any way nor the giving up of any part of the great advantage which American capitalism gained during the war. The Harding Administration will protect and fight for the interests of American banking capital when they are presented as purely American in scope and do not involve assuming any responsibility for upholding the broken-down capitalist system of Europe.

Whither the policy of economic nationalism leads is already apparent in the diplomatic struggle with England over the control of oil lands, typified by the sharp notes exchanged over the right of American interests to enter the Mesopotamian fields, and in the growing bitterness in the relations of this country with Japan.

The differences with Japan over Yap and over the steady advance of the Japanese in China is, no doubt, the most immediate menace growing out of this policy. American diplomacy won a diplomatic victory in the decision of the British government not to renew the treaty with Japan at once. The calling of the Disarmament Conference and the coupling with it of a conference on the Pacific question, is another move in the diplomatic game being played against Japan. The Japanese scent the danger which threatens them from the Harding Conference, and their press and their spokesmen are already growling about the Anglo-Saxon attempt to isolate them. They see in the coming conference the attempt of two competing imperialist powers to force from their teeth part of the booty they seized in Asia while the European powers and the United States were too busily engaged

elsewhere to make an effective protest. So far as Japan is concerned the Harding Conference has aroused bitter feeling over threatened economic interests and has paved the way for greater preparation for armed conflict rather than for disarmament.

While the Harding Administration talks disarmament, it authorizes naval expenditures on a scale, which, if extended over a period of years, mean a greater burden to the United States than the cost of reparation to Germany! The Disarmament Conference has been called as a sop to those interests which are loudly demanding the reduction of the national expenditures. It is a gesture which will be as productive of results as the fine phrases of President Wilson about the "war to end war." The attitude manifested by Japan, and the speech of the Australian premier, serving notice that Australia has certain interests in the Pacific which she would not surrender even at the cost of war, shows that there is as little likelihood of the success of the Harding Conference in bringing about disarmament and the end of war as there was of Mr. Wilson's "war to end war."

While the Harding Administration indulges in the pose of calling upon the nations to confer on the question of disarming, it is pursuing policies which lead in exactly the opposite direction; policies which, although not so openly stated, are parallel with the German policies for several decades before the war, or for that matter, with those of any of the great powers.

English imperialism, as well as the lesser imperialism of France and Italy, has been somewhat shaken and weakened as the result of the war. These countries are not so sure of the ground under their feet. They have been weakened economically and financially by the war. There are militant working class movements which threaten them. Because of the effects of the war they are inclined to some international agreement between the remaining great powers under which the rest of the world will be divided for exploitation. They cling to the League of Nations as the instrument through which common security and the division of the spoils can be affected.

In contrast, American imperialism, immensely strengthened by the war, both economically and financially, not threatened by any militant labor movement, stands forth under the Harding Administration arrogant and self-sufficient, bent upon using its strength to the fullest extent in advancing the interests of American capitalists. The position of Japanese imperialism is comparable to that of the United States. It too has been strengthened rather than weakened by the war.

The policies which the Harding Administration is now pursuing can have only one result. The period of diplomatic jockeying, which has already begun, will continue until another deadlock arises such as existed in Europe in 1914. It may be a matter of months or a term of years before the *impasse* is reached. The stage is being set, however, and the clash of rival imperialisms can bring no other result than another great imperialist war such as that which devastated half a continent and slaughtered

millions of human beings. Europe is still in the midst of the struggle against hunger and disease which capitalist imperialism brought upon it, but the forces are already at work to create another such cataclysm.

In his recent book on the Russian Revolution, Henry Noel Brailsford summarizes what happened in Russia as follows:

The Communist Revolution in Russia was, to my thinking, the desperate effort of a society in the last stage of dissolution and despair to reconstruct itself upon a new foundation. Its motive force was the social force of self-preservation which asserted itself with growing strength as the early phase of wreckage and struggle was outlived.

It was the suffering which the imperialist war brought upon the Russian workers which compelled them to act for their own self-preservation. In a great part of the remainder of Europe the question whether capitalism can temporarily reconstruct itself or whether the workers will be compelled to adopt the same mode of self-preservation is still a doubtful one. Another imperialist war will bring the workers of the United States face to face with that same problem. The present policies of the Harding Administration lead directly to that situation.

Letters from the Mine Workers' Convention

By EARL R. BROWDER

Indianapolis, Ind., Sept. 20, 1921.

The convention of the greatest labor union of America has just been called to order. Over 500,000 men, who operate one of the basic industries of America, are members of this union. The convention is the leading organ of these men. The potential power existing in the gathering of delegates in Tomlinson Hall this morning is immense, beyond calculation. More than 500,000 members, united in over two thousand local unions, are represented by something more than 1,500 delegates. These delegates are supposed to be elected from the local unions, to be regularly attending members of these locals, and to be actual working miners. And most of them are.

To one acquainted with the actual membership of the United Mine Workers, however, it is plain that there has been some selective principle at work other than the selection by the men of their natural leaders. What makes this body of delegates so different from a local union? A little examination makes it clear. The delegates here look uniformly "American." The great mass of foreign-born miners are not represented here according to their numbers in the local unions. I asked one foreign-born delegate, a Pole, to explain this to me. He said, "The Americans will not listen to a foreign worker. It makes no difference if we put up the good ideas. If one speaks with an accent, then one is not heard. So the

foreign-born delegates are only from those locals where one race is in a great majority, and they will not try to talk in the Convention. They know from experience that they would not be heard."

It is plain that the administration of the United Mine Workers, including this great national Convention, is thoroughly "American"; and in order to emphasize this point, the hall is draped with a mass of national flags. The "red, white and blue" is flung from every side. And the proceedings are also "American." It is impossible to imagine a labor congress in Europe starting out in the smooth, placid, Sunday-school atmosphere that prevails. Everything seems far removed from the class-struggle. Even the rank-and-file delegates (and the vast majority really are such) are in their "Sunday best," and on their good behavior. The presiding officers are splendid examples of sleek, well-fed respectability. A super-annuated clergyman makes a formal request to the Deity to bestow his blessings upon the gathering.

But we soon get an intimation that all will not be so placid. Through all the speeches of welcome, opening addresses and formal felicitations, through all the inevitable fol-de-rol of an American labor Convention just beginning its session, runs a thread of cautious reference to unmentionable things. Gradually it comes more and more to the foreground. The honorable mayor of the city makes a star-spangled appeal to the patriotism of the convention in his speech of welcome. He mentions incidentally that while there may be a few little things wrong in this glorious country—he is not prepared to deny that a few irregularities have occurred in West Virginia—yet under the great and glorious constitution, etc., etc.

Finally the great and mighty ones of the State and Church are gone. Reports are the order of the day, a report on "Rules and Order of Business." Suddenly the suave, soft-voiced, well-groomed, smooth-running progress of events is interrupted. A high, strained voice calls out "Mr. Chairman!" It is a voice from the mines. In the order of business is "Report of Scale Committee." The voice from the floor demands that the Scale Committee shall be instructed to present its report by the tenth day of the convention. The motion is seconded. The convention is immediately alive. The first clash has come. One of the floor leaders of the administration attempts to have the motion tabled. He is voted down in a great roar. He then talks against the motion. Three delegates from the floor speak briefly for the motion. They had experience at the last convention with the Scale Committee. This time they are determined to know what they are doing before any of them have to go home. They want to know where they stand. They, the delegates, have nothing to conceal. They hope that the Scale Committee has not.

The motion is carried by an immense majority.

So there is some dynamic force beneath the exterior of this smoothly running machine. It growls again, and peeps forth once or twice during President Lewis's report. Anything that smacks in the least of defiance to the

dark forces against which the miners are struggling gets an immediate response. But as a whole the report stirs them little. It is not militant; it is so damned polite and utterly bourgeois. But through it all runs the same story: here, there, everywhere, the miners are in conflict with the machinery of the *State*. In West Virginia and in Alabama they are being murdered, in Kansas they are being jailed, in Washington they are being betrayed and "injunctioned." The "great and glorious" constitution, they are told by Lewis, makes their dream of nationalization of the mines an impracticable Utopia. The immense sums of money raised since the last Convention, more than \$7,000,000, have all gone for lawyers' fees, court costs, strike relief, etc., etc. Judgments for tremendous amounts in damages have been assessed against them by the courts. Unemployment has hit the mines very heavily. Hundreds of miners are in jail under indictments for murder. Through it all, and behind all, looms ominously—the capitalist Government!

There are forces here in Indianapolis! Blindly stirring! One feels them vaguely. Officials speak cautiously, so as not to disturb the beast. A splendidly equipped organization machine is running here to keep it within bounds. Plans are gradually being disclosed to prevent its energies from being unleashed, but every official seems to know that it must not be crossed. This Convention must be cajoled, coaxed, pleaded with, but not defied, nor bullied. The only coercion will be the threat of the power of the Government. The power of the Government, there it is, threateningly in the background of every act of the Convention! Whether anything will develop—well, that is another question. Perhaps, but we will not prophesy. It is enough to observe.

PLANTING THE GUNS

Indianapolis, Ind., Sept. 21, 1921.

Some things emerge from the routine of reports. Lewis and his Administration expect to keep this convention from doing anything about the contract that expires next March. They expect to refer everything pertaining to the coming great struggle to a "reconvened" convention to be called next February. The smooth-spoken president of the Miners' Union has denounced Alexander Howat and Robert Harlin and opened his fight upon them. Green has put forth the policy of the officialdom—complete submission to any orders from the Government, negotiation as the basis for all national policies on wages and conditions. Very, very carefully the ground is being prepared for the official acceptance of the wage-cuts that will be demanded by the mine operators next spring.

Some interesting figures were given out to-day regarding the strength of the Miners' Union. The membership is the highest in history, being actually about 550,000, with an average number paying dues for the year of 442,057. Over \$3,000,000 was expended in strike aid. The Alabama strike cost over \$1,770,000 for relief, attorneys, publicity, etc., and the general financial condition of the International is at a low state. Membership is, however,

at its highest, new locals are being organized, and the miners seem to be unusually militant.

The big events of this Convention are yet in the dim unknown. What will this great mass of unorganized, undirected delegates do? No one knows, least of all the eminent gentlemen who now direct the course of events. Yesterday Lewis told the delegates that nationalization of the mines is "practically an impossibility under our present constitution." Today the delegation from district No. 2, under the leadership of John Brophy, distributed pamphlets containing an impassioned demand for "nationalization." But it will be hard to get up a big fight on this. Howat has not arrived at the convention. One hears his name often. The delegates are patiently listening to reports. They are waiting.

LEWIS AND HOWAT—AND THE GOVERNMENT

Indianapolis, Ind., Sept. 23, 1921.

"For God's sake, have some respect for your President!" pleaded the chairman, Vice-President Murray, when three-fourths of the assembled delegates seemed determined to hear no more from Lewis. Lewis was attacking Alexander Howat, and expounding his own views of what a union should be. Howat had just left the stand twenty minutes before, receiving the first genuine ovation given any speaker in the convention.

It is significant that Murray did not have to plead for the convention to have respect for Howat. From the time Howat stepped upon the platform until he left it, the great hall was alive, responding to every word, but giving the closest attention. There was no disorder. Howat spoke simply, in the miners' language. He told about the disputes with the operators which had originated this case, how the operators had refused to treat with the union, how Lewis had heard the pleas of the operators, and had sent two of Howat's personal enemies as a committee to investigate, how this committee had ordered Howat to order the men back to work, how Lewis now brought it to the convention to obtain the endorsement of the delegates from all over the country to his order.

"Lewis says, 'You miners are wrong; go back to work,'" said Howat. "That sounds very familiar. We have heard that song for years. The operators say it, Governor Allen says it. The Industrial Court says it. And now comes President Lewis and says it. And he wants you delegates to say it too. Maybe you will——"

"No! No!" roared back the convention.

Howat talked the miners' own tongue. He spoke in terms of struggle. Everybody understood him, and most of them loved him for what he said and the way he said it. Howat has one message: if the workers want anything, they must fight for it. After they get it, they must fight to keep it. And they must keep on fighting, so long as there is anything which should be theirs that is withheld from them. It was the first honest-to-God talk that had been heard in this convention, and the delegates flowered out like rose-buds in a warm rain. No, that figure is too peaceful. "They rose like lions after

slumber"—that is better, and is just as literary. Anyway, they roared, literally roared their appreciation of this touch of reality in an unreal convention.

"The United Mine Workers is a business concern," these words of President Lewis sounded the keynote of his speech. The United Mine Workers is a business concern, and if it would place profitable contracts it must not injure the feelings of the good capitalists. Howat injures their feelings. Therefore Howat is bad business.

"The coal operators of West Virginia base their opposition to us on the ground that we do not enforce our contracts. They cite Howat as an example. And if this convention does not rebuke Howat, and re-establish the sanctity of the contracts, and put us back upon a solid basis of business, then the West Virginia operators are right." I will not guarantee the exactness of these words, but I will swear that such was the plain and clear idea that Lewis conveyed and intended to convey to the convention.

No wonder Murray had to plead, "For God's sake, have some respect for your President!" There were few there who had after that. But Lewis and his kind have other ammunition.

The vague menace that has been hanging around the convention for three days, suddenly became sharp and definite today. Lewis was fighting with his back to the wall. The crowd of delegates, over 1,500 of them, was hostile, there were questions, boos, whistles, hisses. So he had to pull out his real guns. They were Government guns. The Government has been hanging around in the atmosphere here all the time. Lewis dissipated the vagueness. He made it clear and distinct.

"If you do not accept the policy which I have laid down for you, then will the United Mine Workers surely be destroyed."

Then, just as the convention was about to adjourn until tomorrow morning, the Great Trump Card was played. United States Marshals from the Federal Court of Indiana, appeared upon the stage and served the papers in a suit for a "perpetual injunction" against the United Mine Workers, charging it with being a criminal conspiracy.

"There, what did I tell you!" said Lewis.

About an hour before, Mr. Lewis had said, "Howat charges me with being a friend and henchman of the coal operators. Is it true?"

The great crowd of delegates were silent.

It looks that way, Mr. Lewis, it looks that way.

SAMUEL WILL PRAY FOR US

Indianapolis, Ind., Sept. 24, 1921.

"I will pray for the United Mine Workers," said Samuel Gompers to-day, addressing the Convention. He had come to the point where it seemed that he should propose something in the way of action. This was his offering.

Most of his time was taken up by sentences which began "I remember"—not one of them began "I propose." A rather absent-minded old gentleman, musing over dusty records of past trivialities! With European labor discussing

one main question, how to destroy Capitalism, with the United States facing the most serious crisis in history, a general assault on labor organization by all the forces of government, press, pulpit and employers, with unemployment bringing starvation to millions, still the keynote of his speech was "I remember." Along toward the last was incidental advice not to accept wage reductions, but this was quickly followed by the advice, "Do not over-run," "Get our goal by evolution and not by revolution!" and the last pronouncement was against the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The miners are a brave lot, and hardy. They take punishment well. The majority are still in the hall at 11.30 after more than a half hour of this. Of those that are left, a few are asleep, some read their papers, a few more stroll out every few minutes. All is peaceful. An occasional murmur, presumably applause, will undoubtedly be noted by the sharp-eared stenographers.

"Labor leaders should not leave their jobs for posts in government or business," said Mr. Gompers. "Those whom I whom I recognize are married to their jobs and cannot be divorced." Then he turned to Lewis and said, "My race has not been run yet." They both "are married to their jobs," and will only be divorced by some great spiritual revival in the labor movement.

Another forty minutes of harmless chatter, some leaky economics, reminiscences, "the great John Mitchell, now in Heaven", "give the miners an opportunity to (11:57 A. M., Will the end come soon?), "that democracy might be safe", "profiteers" (applause), "spirit of freedom", "we should voice our protests in a minor key", etc., etc. Silence! The great man is gone.

Wm. Green, the Secretary of the Miners Union, had read to the delegates the application for injunction, filed yesterday by the coal operators, which is directed at the very life of the Union. He told the convention that it contained the testimony before the Senate Committee of a former President of the United Mine Workers, now a hired agent of the mine-owners, which was made part of the evidence against the Union. This former President had stated that he knew and admitted that the U. M. W. was a conspiracy. Upon demand from the floor he named the former official who had openly turned traitor as T. L. Lewis. No, this is not the Lewis now in office, who is for the present ostensibly working in favor of the miners.

Yesterday was taken up with a discussion of Lewis's charges against Howat, and his demands that the convention instruct Howat to order certain miners back to work. This question was interrupted by the entrance of the Great Man who had made the morning session today so tranquil.

If this convention votes the way it cheers, there is only one decision possible. Howat is the big man in the convention. He stands for the whole militant spirit of the miners, which is balked at every turn by the "business man" administration. He is the incarnation of that defiance and hate of the oppressive hand of the Government, which hovers over this convention, and becomes

Books

ROBERT WILLIAMS—The New Labor Outlook.
Leonard Parsons—London, 1921.

One of the more progressive of British labor leaders throws light on the new "psychology of labor." A docker and the son of a docker, Bob Williams expresses the spirit of the unskilled workers of England which the New Unionism of the period after 1890 organized and made vocal.

He gives us in this small book a clear and lively account of the progressive disillusionment of the workers during the war and the betrayals of their leaders. We see the Rt. Hon. Arthur J. Henderson, prophet of Labor and the New Social Order, who was more energetic than the premier himself in securing maximum production of munitions, supporting the government against the labor organizations in its proposal to import 100,000 indentured colored laborers into the British labor market. There was the secretary of a national workers' federation who would have Mr. Williams handed over to the D. O. R. A. (Defense of the Realm Act) for his persistent support of the workers against the government, but there, too, is Robert Smillie refusing one cabinet post after another, Minister of Pensions, Food Controller, or Controller of Mines, with £5,000 a year and headquarters in Grosvenor House or any other ducal mansion.

The story of English labor during and after the war throws light on the lying deceit and chicanery of which they were the victims and on their own courageous reaction to these tactics.

"While their leaders had either sold themselves or handed themselves over gratuitously to the militarist rulers, the militant members of the rank and file continued to show an aptitude for taking advantage of every revolutionary contingency, and in July, 1917 an attempt was made . . . to form a British Workers, Soldiers and Sailors Council."

The temper of the militant section of the proletariat became enormously more revolutionary during the war. The chief factor in this newer outlook of labor was undoubtedly the Russian Revolution, which "with all it implied and involved, was the turning-point in the attitude of the international proletariat towards the war-mongering of the proprietary class. So even the leaders, who were, maybe, themselves misled, and who in turn certainly misled the workers, were beginning to realize the imminence of a change in the mentality of the people and a growing revolutionary outlook."

The British workers began to ask themselves "If in Russia, why not in England?" The tactic of direct action for the first time gained a foothold in the classic land of parliamentarism, and made such rapid headway that by 1919 it was controlling the resolutions of the National Trades Union Congress and setting that industrial organization at odds with the British Labor Party. This growing spirit of defiance within the labor movement received a tremendous impetus from the intrigues of the government against Soviet Russia. Mr. Williams testifies that "The movement in favor of direct action for definitely and avowedly political purposes has sprung chiefly from an implacable hatred of British interference in the affairs of Socialist Russia, and I have no hesitation in declaring that every attempt to destroy the Soviet power in Russia has contributed in an immeasurable degree to the destruction of bourgeois institutions, not only in Britain, but throughout western Europe."

Those, too, were the great days of the Triple Alliance before the Rt. Hon. J. H. Thomas succeeded in making it a laughing stock. It withdraws from the government's National Industrial Conference with its program of social pacifism in February, 1919 and declares that the only limit to be placed upon our collective capacity to produce and equitably share abounding wealth is the limit of our collective labor power. . . . The organized workpeople want redress for their manifold grievances, and moreover they want something like immediate redress."

This accumulation of experiences is leading British labor directly into the arms of the Third International, according to Mr. Williams. The Communist Party formed recently by a combination of the British Socialist Party and the left wing of the Independent Labor Party with the Communist Labor Party, though numerically weak, exercises a great moral influence among the workers, and every day receives accessions to its ranks. The parliamentary socialism of the Labor Party is losing its hold upon the British workers. The corpse of the Second International has been brought to London, but the guile and subterfuge of its champions and the patronage of the bourgeois press and politicians cannot save it from decay. "Bourgeois social democracy is as dead as Manchester Liberalism; and the now energetic and pulsating Third International is destined to grow as unemployment and destitution make themselves increasingly manifest in western Europe. Capitalism cannot restabilize itself, and despite the frantic efforts of its avowed supporters, as well as of those of others who attempt to curry favor by allying themselves therewith, a new order, based upon proletarian brotherhood, must supersede capitalism. The Second International is dead; long live the Third International!"

International Documents

The Red Trade Union International

By G. ZINOVIEV

(Continued)

III.

Industrial and Political Action

The Communist Party is the vanguard of the proletariat, that clearly recognizes the ways and means to be used for the liberation of the proletariat from the capitalist yoke and consciously accepts the communist program.

The Trade Unions represent mass organization of the proletariat which develops into organizations uniting all the workers of a given branch of industry; they include not only the conscious communists but also the medium and backward ranks of the proletariat, who through the lessons taught by their life experience are gradually educated to understand communism. The part played by the trade associations before the power is secured by the proletariat is different in many respects from the part it plays while this power is being secured and after this has been done. But throughout the different periods the trade unions represent a wider organization than the party, uniting a greater mass of people and the relations between the party and the unions must be the same as between the centre and the periphery. Prior to the securing of power the truly proletarian trade unions have to organize the workers principally on an economic basis to fight for the improvements that can be obtained before capitalism is completely defeated. Their principal object, however, must be the organization of the proletarian mass fight against capitalism and for the proletarian revolution.

During this revolution the truly revolutionary trade unions conjointly with the party organize the masses for the immediate attack on the strongholds of capitalism.

After the power has been secured by the proletariat the trade-unions concentrate the greatest part of their activity on the organization of economic conditions on a socialist basis.

During all these three phases of the campaign, the trade unions must support the proletarian vanguard, the communist party, which takes the lead throughout the proletarian fight.

In order to achieve this end the communists together with sympathizing elements must organize communist fractions within the trade unions, which must be completely under the control of the Communist party.

The tactics adopted by the II Congress of the Communist International in regard to the formation of communist fractions in every trade union proved fully effective during the course of last year and have given good results in Germany, England, France, Italy and a number of other countries. The principles of the Communist International respecting the participation of communists in the trade union movement must not be influenced by the circumstance that considerable numbers of politically inexperienced workers, have lately left the free social-democratic trade-unions not expecting to have any direct advantage from membership in the same (as has lately been the case in Germany). It is the task of the communists to explain to the proletarians, that they will not find

salvation in leaving the old trade-unions before creating new ones, as this will only turn the proletariat into a disorganized mob. They must be told that it is necessary to revolutionize the trade unions, to expel the spirit of reformism together with the treacherous reformist leaders and thus convert the trade unions into a real support of the revolutionary proletariat.

IV.

Communism in the Unions

During the next epoch the principal task of all communists will be to concentrate their energy and perseverance on winning over to their side the majority of workers in all labor unions. They must not be discouraged by the present reactionary tendency of the labor unions, but take part actively in the daily struggles of the unions and win them over to the cause of communism in spite of all resistance.

The real test of the strength of every communist party is the actual influence it has on the workers in the labor unions. The party must learn how to influence the unions without attempting to keep them in leading strings. Only the communist fraction of the union is subject to the control of the party, not of the labor union as a whole. If the communist fractions persevere, if their activity is devoted and intelligent, the party will reach a position where its advice will be accepted gladly and readily by the unions.

In France the labor unions are now passing through a wholesome period of fermentation. The working class is regaining strength after the crisis in the workers' movement and is learning to recognize and punish the past treachery of the reformist socialists and trade-unions. Many of the revolutionary trade-unionists of France are still unwilling to take part in political fight and are prejudiced against the idea of a political proletarian party. They still revere the idea of neutrality as expressed in the well-known *Charte d'Amiens* of 1906. The point of view of this fraction of the revolutionary trade-unionists may be regarded as a source of great danger for the movement. If this fraction should gain control of the majority in the unions, it would not know what to do with this majority. It would be helpless against the agents of capitalism, the Jouhaux and the Dumoulins.

The revolutionary trade-unionists of France will remain without definite lines of demarcation as long as the communist party itself lacks such lines. The Communist Party of France must strive to work in friendly co-operation with the best elements of revolutionary trade-unionism. It is, however, essential that the party should rely solely upon its own elements. Sections should be formed wherever three communists are to be found. The party must at once undertake a campaign against neutrality. It must point out in a friendly but decided manner the defects in the position of revolutionary trade-unionism. This is the only possible way to revolutionize the trade union movement in France and to establish close co-operation between the party and the trade union movement.

In Italy the situation is very peculiar. The majority of the trade-union members are revolutionary, but the leadership of the Federation of Labor is in the hands of centrists whose sympathies are with Amsterdam. The first task of the Italian

Communists will be to organize an intensive daily struggle in every section in the trade unions; to endeavor systematically and patiently to expose the treachery and indecision of the leaders, and to wrest the trade-unions from their control. In regard to the revolutionary trade-union elements of Italy, the Italian communists will have to adopt the same measures as the communists in France.

In Spain we have a strong revolutionary trade-union movement, which still lacks a clearly defined final purpose, and a young and relatively weak Communist Party. In view of the existing conditions, the party must do everything possible to secure a firm foothold in the trade unions. It must support the unions in word and deed and exercise a clarifying influence on the whole trade-union movement. It must likewise establish friendly relations with the unions and make every effort to organize the whole struggle in unison.

Important developments are taking place in the British trade-union movement which is rapidly becoming more and more revolutionary. The mass movement is growing, and the influence of the old trade-union leaders is on the wane. The party must do its utmost to establish itself firmly in the great trade unions, miners, etc. Every member of the party must work actively in some trade-union, and must endeavor to make communism popular through active and persevering work. Every effort must be made to get into closer contact with the masses.

The same process is taking place in America, although at a slower rate. Communists must on no account leave the ranks of the reactionary Federation of Labor. On the contrary, they should get into the old trade unions in order to revolutionize them. Co-operation with the best sections of the I. W. W. is imperative; this does not, however, preclude an educational campaign against the prejudices of the I. W. W.

In Japan a great trade-union movement has rapidly come into being, but it lacks an enlightened leadership. The communistic elements of Japan must support this movement and use every effort to direct it in Marxian channels.

In Czecho-Slovakia, our party is backed by the majority of the working class, but the trade-union movement is, to a great extent, still in the hands of the social patriots. This is because the party itself has lacked organization and clearly defined principles. The party must make a great effort to put an end to these conditions, and to get control of the leaders of the trade-unions.

In Austria and Belgium the social patriots have with great cleverness succeeded in getting control of the trade-union movement. The trade-union movement is the chief field for revolutionary action in these countries. That is why it should have received more attention from the Communist Parties.

In Norway the party which has the majority of the workers behind it, must become more influential in the trade-union movement.

In Sweden the Party has not only to contend with reformism, but also with petty bourgeois tendencies in the socialist movement.

In Germany the party is gradually getting control of the trade-union movement. On no account should concessions be made to the partisans of the movement "Leave the Trade-Unions."

This would play into the hands of the social-patriots. All attempts to expel communists from the unions must be met by constant and energetic resistance if we are to win over to Communism the majority of the organized workers.

V.

Communism and Trade Unionism: The Two Internationals

These considerations will define the mutual relations to be established between the Communist International on the one hand and the International Council of Trade Unions on the other.

The task of the Communist International is not only to direct the political struggle of the proletariat in the narrow sense of the word, but to guide its entire struggle for liberation, whatever form it may acquire. The Communist International must be not only the arithmetical total of the central organizations of the Communist Parties of different countries. The Communist International must stimulate and co-ordinate the work of the class struggle of all proletarian organizations, purely political organizations, trade unions, the Soviets and cultural organizations.

Quite unlike the Yellow International, the International Council of Trade Unions will in no wise adopt the point of view of non-partyism or neutrality. Any organization which would wish to remain neutral with regard to the Second, the "two and a half," and the Third International, would unavoidably become a pawn in the hands of the bourgeoisie. The program of action of the International Council of the Red Trade Unions which the Communist International will lay before the First Congress of Red Trade Unions, will be defended in reality by the communist parties alone and by the Communist International. On these grounds alone, if we are to succeed in carrying out the new revolutionary tasks of the trade unions, the red trade unions will have to work hand in hand and in close contact with the Communist Party, and the International Council of Trade unions will have to bring each step of its work in agreement with the work of the Communist International.

The prejudices of neutrality, of "independence," of non-party and non-political tactics, with which certain revolutionary syndicalists of France, Spain, Italy, and other countries are infected, are objectively nothing more than a tribute paid to bourgeois ideas. The red trade unions cannot conquer the Yellow Amsterdam International and consequently capitalism without repudiating the bourgeois ideas of independence and neutrality once for all. From the point of view of economizing forces and concentrating blows, the formation of a single, united proletarian International would unite in its ranks political parties and all other forms of labor organizations. The future will undoubtedly belong to this type of organization. However, in the present transitional period, given the actual variety of trade unions in the different countries, it is unavoidably necessary to create an International Association of Red Trade Unions, which will on the whole stand for the platform of the Communist International, but which will admit members much more freely than is done by the Communist International.

The Third Congress of the Communist International promises its support to the International Council of Trade Unions which is to be organized on these lines. To bring about a closer union between the Communist International and the International Council of Trade Unions, the Third Congress of the Communist International proposes that it should be represented by three members on the Executive of the International Council of Trade Unions and vice versa.

The program of action which in the opinion of the Communist International should be accepted by the Constituent World Congress of Red Trade Unions runs approximately as follows.

(Continued)