

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

SPECIAL MAGAZINE SUPPLEMENT THE DAILY WORKER

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

MAY 23, 1925.

English Pacifism and English Aversion to Theory

By VLADIMIR ILVITCH LENIN.

Note.—The following article by Comrade Lenin was published recently in the Pravda, official organ of the Russian Communist Party, for the first time. The manuscript has not been dated by Comrade Lenin. Hence it is impossible to state exactly when it was written. The Pravda estimates that it was probably written about the beginning of 1915.

IN England there has existed up till now an incomparably larger measure of political freedom than in any other European country. Here the bourgeoisie has been more used to governing than is the case in other countries and understands the art of governing better.

The relations between the classes are more developed and in many respects clearer than in other countries. Freedom from compulsory military service affords the people greater liberty in respect to their attitude to war insofar as everybody is free to refuse to enter the army. The government is therefore compelled (in England the government constitutes in its purest form a committee for conducting the business of the bourgeoisie) to exert all its forces in order to arouse "popular" enthusiasm for the war.

It would be quite impossible to achieve this aim, without committing a fundamental breach of law, were the proletarian mass not completely disorganised and demoralised by the minority of best paid and qualified workers organised in the unions going over to liberal, that is, to bourgeois politics. The English trade unions comprise one-fifth of the wage workers. The leaders of these trade unions are liberals for the greater part, and Marx long ago designated them as agents of the bourgeoisie.

ALL these peculiarities of England enable us on the one hand to understand the nature of present day social chauvinism the more easily, as it is precisely the same in the countries with a despotic form of government, as well as in the democratic countries, in the militarist countries as well in those without compulsory military service. On the other hand they help us, when regard is had to all the facts, to estimate the importance of those reconciliatory tendencies with social chauvinism, which find expression for example in the glorification of the slogan of peace, etc.

The most complete expression of opportunism and of liberal labor politics is undoubtedly to be seen in the Fabian Society. In this connection the reader should carefully peruse the exchange of letters between Marx and Engels and Sorge. He will there find a brilliant characterisation of this society by Engels, who treats Messrs. Sidney Webb & Co. as a gang of bourgeois scoundrels, who wish to poison the workers and to influence them in a counter-revolutionary direction. We can be quite sure that not a single one of the influential and responsible leaders of the Second International has at any time attempted to refute this judgment of Engels and that none of them have attempted to cast any doubt upon the correctness of this judgment.

LET us lay aside theory for a moment and compare the facts. We shall see that the attitude of the Fabians during the war (see for example their weekly paper, The New Statesman) and that of the German social democratic party, including Kautsky, is exactly the same. The same direct as well as indirect de-

ference of social chauvinism, the same uniting of this defense with the inclination to utter all sorts of kind, humane and almost left phrases regarding peace, disarmament, etc., etc.

The fact exists and there follows from it, no matter how disagreeable it may be for various persons, the inevitable and indisputable consequence: that the leaders of the present day German social democratic party, including Kautsky, are in practice just as much agents of the bourgeoisie as the Fabians, whom Engels long ago characterized as such. The repudiation of Marxism by the Fabians and its "recognition" by Kautsky and Co. make not the slightest differ-

ence. The organization is E. D. Morel who is at present a constant contributor to the central organ of the "Independent Labor Party," the Labor Leader. Morel was some years ago the candidate of the liberal party in the constituency of Birkenhead. When Morel, soon after the outbreak of the war, spoke against Russia, he was informed by a letter from the Birkenhead Liberal Association, dated October 2, 1914, that in future his candidature would not be acceptable for the liberal party, that means, he was simply expelled from the party. Morel replied in a letter dated October 14, which has been published in a special pamphlet under the title: "The Outbreak of the War."

many at that time was not yet a dangerous competitor), that the French militarists of the type of Colonel Boucher have before the war, in a number of books, openly announced their intention of conducting an aggressive war on the part of France and Russia against Germany; that the well-known English military authority, Colonel Repington, in the year 1911 characterized in the press the increase of armament in Russia since 1905 as a danger for Germany—when Morel proves all this, we must admit that we are dealing with a courageous bourgeois who is not afraid of breaking with his own party.

Everybody must however, immediately perceive that he is nevertheless a bourgeois whose phrases regarding peace and disarmament remain empty phrases, as without the revolutionary action of the proletariat there can be no talk either of a democratic peace or of disarmament. And Morel, who has now fallen out with the liberals on account of the question of the present war, remains on all economic and political questions a liberal. Why is it regarded, not as a piece of hypocrisy, but as a merit when Kautsky in Germany uses the same bourgeois phrases concerning peace and disarmament, decorated with Marxist terminology? Only the backward development of political conditions and the lack of political freedom in Germany prevents a bourgeois league of peace and disarmament springing up, on the basis of the program of Kautsky, with the same ease and rapidity as in England.

LET us recognize the fact that Kautsky adopts the standpoint of the pacifist bourgeois and not of the revolutionary social democracy. We are living in the midst of sufficiently great events to have the courage to recognize the truth "regardless of persons."

In their aversion to abstract theory, proud of their practicality, the English often approach political questions in a direct manner. They thereby help the socialists of other countries to find the real content within the husk of every kind of terminology—including the "Marxist." In this connection the pamphlet, "Socialism and War," which was published before

"Socialism and War": The Clarion Press, 44 Worship Street, London, E. C.

the war by the chauvinist paper, The Clarion, is instructive. The pamphlet contains a "declaration" by Upton Sinclair the American socialist against war, and the reply of the chauvinistic Robert Blatchford, who has for long occupied the same imperialist position as Hyndman.

SINCLAIR is a sentimental socialist without theoretical training. He puts the question "simply," he is incensed at the approach of war and seeks salvation from war thru socialism.

"We are told," writes Sinclair, "that the socialist movement is still too weak, that we must rely upon evolution. But evolution proceeds in the hearts of men; we are the instruments of evolution. We are told, that our movement against the war will be suppressed. But I declare, and I am profoundly convinced of it, that the suppression of all activity which has as its aim, on the ground of the highest humanity, the prevention of war, would constitute the greatest victory of socialism—the greatest it has ever gained—as this would rouse the conscience of civilization and stir up the workers of the whole world as never before in history. Let us not be too anxious regarding our move-

(Continued on page 3)

MARX AND LENIN



SPOKESMEN OF THE WORLD SOCIAL REVOLUTION.

ence to the matter when it comes to actual policy, but only proves the transformation of Marxism into Struvinism by certain writers, politicians, etc. . . Their hypocrisy is not their personal sin; they can, under certain circumstances, be the best fathers of families. Their hypocrisy is the result of an objective contradiction in their social position. Ostensibly they represent the revolutionary proletariat and in reality, are agents for the promotion of bourgeois chauvinist ideas in the ranks of the proletariat.

The Fabians are more honest and sincere than Kautsky & Co. as they have not promised to go in for the revolution—but politically they are of the same kind.

The "deep-rootedness" of political freedom in England and the high stage of development of English political life in general and of the English bourgeoisie in particular has resulted in the various shades of bourgeois opinions in this country finding quickly, easily and freely a new form of expression in new political organizations. One of those organizations is the "Union of Democratic Control." The secretary and treasurer of this

in this pamphlet, as well as in a number of other articles, Morel exposes his government by proving how incorrect it was to point to the violation of Belgium neutrality as being the cause of the war and to claim that the object of the war was the destruction of Prussian imperialism, etc., etc. . . Morel defends the program of the "Union of Democratic Control": Peace, disarmament, the right of self-determination of all territories on the basis of a plebiscite, and democratic control of foreign policy.

FROM all this it is to be seen that Morel as a person undoubtedly deserves recognition for his sincere sympathy for democracy, for his turning from the chauvinist bourgeoisie to the pacifist bourgeoisie. When Morel proved by facts that his government deceived the people when they denied the existence of secret treaties, although they existed all the time; that the English bourgeoisie, even in the year 1887, was perfectly clear as to the inevitability of the violation of Belgium neutrality in the event of the Franco-German war and emphatically rejected every idea of intervention (Ger-

The Mass Lockout in Denmark

By KARL V. JENSEN
(Copenhagen)

SIX weeks ago 50,000 workers were locked out. On the 22nd of April the struggle was extended by the addition of 100,000 fresh workers. Practically all the factories are at a standstill. This is the greatest struggle in the history of the Danish working class. And this situation has arisen in spite of the fact that the trade union bureaucrats and the social democratic ministers did everything possible in order to avoid the struggle, in spite of the government arbitration commission, which did its utmost to maintain peace, and in spite of the fact that the arbitration proposals on the part of the highest authorities in the Central Trade Union Federation and the Employers' Federation were accepted.

The first negotiations regarding the prolongation of the collective treaty were commenced last autumn. The policy followed by the employers was that of waiting in order to see the effect of the Dawes plan, in order thereby to be able better to judge the competitive capacity of Danish industry, and then to take a definite attitude in the spring on the expiration of the treaty, but at the same time to make use of the preliminary negotiations in order to judge the attitude of the trade union leaders.

FROM the secret minutes of the sitting of the executive committee of the Employers' Federation, which fell into the hands of the Communist Party of Denmark, it was to be seen that the employers were not inclined to enter upon a decisive struggle in order to reduce wages, as they very much feared "meeting with resistance on the part of the workers which they would not be capable of overcoming."

The Communist Party immediately called the attention of the workers to this favorable situation, and called upon the trade unions to put forward their demands accordingly. In spite of the attitude of the president of the Metal Workers' Union, E. A. Hansen, at the first negotiations intimated that he was prepared to accept a prolongation of the old treaty on the basis of a wage regulation according to the index of prices and an increase of the minimum wages which are too low for the metal workers.

The Communist Party put forward the following demands: a considerable increase of wages beyond the price index, factory councils, summer vacation, and securing of the eight hour day by increased rates of pay for overtime.

A number of trade unions adopted these demands. The executive of the

trade union federation, however, did not put forward any joint demands on the part of the workers nor lay down any common fighting tactics, but left this to individual trade unions. This of course, could only lead to shameful compromises.

THIS lack of fighting spirit on the part of the trade union leaders, these strenuous attempts on the part of the social democrats to maintain peace at any price, rendered the employers arrogant, and this arrogance was still further increased by the fact that at the decisive moment the Trade Union Federation put forward as a basis for negotiations the demand that wages be increased according to the price index and, in addition, a further increase of the lowest rates of wages only. In order to compel the workers to drop their wage demands, the employers put forward the demand for a general reduction of wages by 10 per cent, accompanied by the threat of a whole lockout.

After weeks of negotiations, an arbitration proposal was submitted as regards the union of unskilled workers, which numbers about 80,000 members, according to which they would be granted a 30 per cent increase of wages on account of high prices, whilst the workers in the metal industry would not receive a penny increase. When the federation demanded time in order to convene a congress, this was declared to mean non-acceptance of the arbitration proposal, and 50,000 workers were locked out, among them being members of trade unions who had already concluded new treaties. Fresh wholesale lockouts were contemplated, with the result that isolated sympathetic strikes were declared as counter-measures.

In this situation the Communist Party called upon the workers to take up a common struggle and demanded the convocation of the trade union congress in order to organize the struggle by the general strike, and in addition demanded unconditional support on the part of the social democratic government. These demands were immediately and unanimously accepted by the workers in a number of trade unions and met with enthusiastic approval in many workers' meetings in all parts of the country.

INSTEAD of the congress, however, a conference of so-called "representatives" was convened, which rejected the communist proposal regarding the convening of the congress and the calling of a general strike and constituted a tragic-comedy, as the farce was only intended to cover a

new manoeuvre of the trade union leaders. Behind the backs of the workers, the executive of the Trade Union Federation negotiated with the employers and the arbitration committee, with the result that a new arbitration proposal was worked out.

This proposal was at first rejected by the employers, whereupon the Executive of the Trade Union Federation recommended the conference to accept the proposal for tactical reasons in order to demonstrate the will to peace of the workers. This was done. The employers thereupon calmly accepted the proposal, but with the provision that if the proposal should be rejected by even one trade union, the lockout of all the workers would come into force and the 50,000 workers already locked out would continue to starve until everything was settled.

The proposal, however, made no provision for high prices, either for the unskilled or the skilled workers in the metal industry. Whilst the proposal was recommended by the president of the metal workers union, it was very energetically opposed by the president to the Workers' Union (union of unskilled workers) Lyngsle. It is worth remarking that although Lyngsle is an old social democrat and out and out reformist, he still retains some of his proletarian class feeling.

ON a ballot being taken, the metal workers rejected the proposal by a small majority, and this was only due to the very energetic agitation on the part of the Communists. In spite of the fact that Lyngsle was in the minority on the executive of his union, he nevertheless succeeded, supported by a fairly strong communist fraction, in rejecting the proposal with an overwhelming majority at the congress of the trade union. Five smaller trade unions, who had received a 2 per cent increase on account of high prices, accepted the proposal. The 7 trade unions which rejected the proposal represented about 110,000 workers, whilst the 17 trade unions accepting it represented only about 30,000 members. Thus the majority of the workers, refused to accept defeat, and the C. P. has started a renewed campaign for the extension of the demands and for the fight.

The tremendous increase in prices and the growing unemployment forced the Danish workers to put forward their demands for higher wages, and the workers believed—and the majority of them still believe—that "their own government", the Stanning Ministry, would be an important point of support in the struggle. But the workers are being disappointed. The

most important task of the social democratic government up to now has been to stabilize the Danish valuta, that means, to stabilize the capitalist order of society at the expense of the workers. For this purpose a law was passed in January, which imposes fresh burdens of taxation, both direct and indirect, while a pre-requisite for the carrying thru of the stabilization of the valuta was the limitation of the purchasing power of the workers, in other words wage reductions, and that "law and order" be maintained.

IT was for these reasons that the Trade union bureaucrats did not wish to fight and that the social democrats did everything possible in order to preserve "law and order". It was for these reasons that the social democratic ministers everyday urged the workers to have regard for the interests of the whole community. There must be no disturbance of the economic life of the country; there must be no difficulties placed in the way of the government. In order not to disturb the peace of the Stanning Ministry it is the duty of the workers to continue peacefully at work even if they only receive starvation wages. The social democratic ministers who are so much concerned with the interests of the whole of the community, are greatly excited because their party comrade, Lyngsle, threatened a transport strike, which would hit the export of agricultural products and shake the whole economic life of the country.

THE fighting spirit of the workers—however, is increasing every day. At a full meeting of the executive of the Copenhagen trade unions—comprising about 2000 workers—the communist speakers met with applause and a fighting speech by Lyngsle received an ovation. The meeting declared that the demands must be extended and that the workers cannot show regard for the community, but only for their own class interests. The communist demand: Trade union congress and the general strike, extracted the promise from the president of the Trade Union Federation that the trade union congress will be called in the first week in May.

The Communist Party of Denmark is confronted with the enormous task of convincing the Danish workers that the social democratic policy leads to defeat on the trade union front and that the victory of the workers is only possible if they abandon this policy. The Danish workers during the last few weeks have begun to think over this.

Letters From Our Readers

No Miracles in Truth.

To the DAILY WORKER:—Sometimes when I read your paper and see things about lack of prosperity in this country, I wonder where you are getting the news. For I never see it in our daily sheets, tho' I seldom waste my time on them.

However, the editorial in The Nation of May 20, confirms past articles in your paper, and would recommend its quotation in your columns. Its heading is "We Are A Bit Worried." I also spoke to a business man today. He did not see any good times ahead till European debts to us have been wiped off. He cannot quite conceive that such action would shake the foundation of our present system, which is the theory that one has to live up to his contract even tho' it may break his neck to do so.

This manufacturer I spoke to, happened to know that our factory system has been expanded thru the war period to such an extent that we can supply the nation's needs by running our factories four months a year.

Your Alex Reid's article of May 16, about 200 mines out of 274 in Illinois being idle, has been substantiated by the same business man, who quoted the expert testimony of a coal breaker a friend of his, "That running all of our coal mines two months a year will supply all the coal we need."

Now, why are working people so ignorant, even many of Lenin's follow-

ers, and are inappreciative of your efforts to educate them.

Your classes, where you are endeavoring to train workers for militant class conscious agitation, are commendable. Your efforts to give facts in your paper and omitting trash, are laudable. Of course, trade union controversies are at times nauseating, but I presume you are compelled to republish their vicious acts copied from parliamentary filibustering carried on in our legislatures by our paid and honored officials.

Let every worker tell you what he knows, and we will soon know a lot.—A Reader, Detroit, Mich.

Socialist Party Local Dead.

To the DAILY WORKER: I was born in Muscatine, Iowa, in 1881, in a working class family. Always looked up to Debs as a good fighter in the ranks of labor, especially when he went to jail for the railroad men during the 1893 strike. In 1902 I helped organize a local of the socialist party and was financial secretary most of the time and did most of the real work in the local for 16 years, or until the world war started, then I was sent to Leavenworth for two years of rest (which I needed).

From Leavenworth I came to Denver, Colo., where I helped organize Local Denver Workers Party and have been financial secretary of the

English branch for the past three years.

Yesterday I received a letter from a former member of Local Muscatine, Iowa, Socialist Party which tells of the demise of same (which is all O. K. with me), and I hope you will publish the letter as I received it which speaks for itself.

Yours for the DAILY WORKER,

Lee W. Lang.

Muscatine, Iowa, May 11, 1925.

Dear Friend: Will drop you a few lines to let you know I still exist. Am cutting buttons now, but am thinking of fishing and shelling this summer, but don't know just what I

will do. Well, Lee, I guess the local has blown up. The last meeting we had there wasn't enough there to call a meeting, so that is the last I have heard of it. Even the members ain't interested in it enough to attend the meetings. It's enough to disgust the devil if there is such an animal. Did you hear about Joe Miller, the mayor, who is reported to be a K. K. K.? (Miller was a socialist alderman for a number of years). I suppose your folks told you about it. Sunday I drove my Liszy to Wilton carrying six passengers with me and then I drove over to Moeocw (Iowa), and back home again.

As ever your friend,

Charles Haney.

George E. Pashos

COZY LUNCH

2426 Lincoln Avenue
One-half block from Imperial Hall
CHICAGO

GET A SUB AND GIVE ONE!

Madison Pharmacy INC.
BETTER DRUGS

Light Luncheon Served
1154, Madison Street,
Corner Ann
OPEN DAY AND NIGHT
Four Phones Chicago

Mammonart and Communist Art

By Robin E. Dunbar

THE thesis of a late discussion on bourgeois art and artists seems to be that some artists are bigger prostitutes than others, and much glossier line gossip and spicy detail are given to "prove" the theory. There isn't much use in paying serious attention to this attempt at catch-penny sensationalism; were it not for the fact that it fools many of my simple minded comrades.

But just as the bourgeoisie fool many millions of workers into kissing their chains by means of the church, the press, the public school, the platform and even the soap-box, so does it make potent use of the various forms of art expression, such as the novel, the essay, the drama, spoken and silent—and the art critique to ensnare its subjects.

SO the writer who is guilty of the piece of bourgeois collaboration mentioned above has done his masters a good turn by again drawing the red herring of false criticism across the workers trail of the revolution. Let's recall our dogs and start over the path anew.

All art is mammonart save Communist art; so there's that. It is a fact that a bourgeois artist's first works are less obsequious than his later ones, after he has tasted workers blood. But aiming at popularity, which means royalties, even his first works are subtle attempts at class collaboration, whether they are in the forms of novels, poems, paintings, statues, sermons, essays, plays or what-not.

THE difference between those bourgeois artists who start by licking the king's boots, and those who end in doing so is the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedle-dum. Rudyard Kipling likes the dust of his Edward's No. 12's so well that he doesn't stop licking them until he has licked off dust, blacking and all. Bernard Shaw hates the job but he buries his disgust long east to journey to France during the world war and return to make a lick spitting plea for more cannon fodder for king and country (both with capitals you observe). And who forgets that the very man who now draws such fine haired distinctions between god and mammon in bourgeois art prices offered his mighty services to President Wilson to help make this land safe for democracy (this too with capitals) in return for a little recognition and some office of emolument and profit.

I NOTE that this brassy author claims to be the third great artist of the U. S. A., Mark Twain, the humorous cuss, and Jack London, the drunken bum, being No. 1 and 2. He is welcome to such company, so far as we are concerned. Mark spent his last days in financial, political, artistic and philosophical bankruptcy hissing the toe of his god and savior, H. H. Rogers, the Wall St. pirate. Jack didn't sink quite so low, but he bought an estate, stocked it up with horses and booze and a bourgeois wife and renounced socialism, thru which he had acquired all his popularity acquired a fat belly, and died a sot.

THE eminent and profound critic, whom we shall call No. 3, begins to look bloated and puffy, and tho' for the present he keeps fit by daily exercise, he is on his way to a breakdown from over-eating and under-writing. He better turn common laborer, join the union, quit talking about art, and do a little work for Communism, if he wants to be remembered along with the blessed, like John Reed, Joseph Dietzgen and Daniel De Leon, whom I should call the big 3 of American letters.

LET us examine closely into this thing and find out if we can see the difference between bourgeois art and Communist art. The matter is quite important since so many of our shrewdest comrades fail to see it.

In the first place no art is art unless it is first of all wise and truthful. That is, if the artist does not live amongst evolutionists and pro-

letionists, he will get no material worth while. He may like Mark Twain, be an adventurer in his youth, and a loafer in his old age; that won't get him anywhere. Not with adults. I understand his "Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn" circulate widely amongst the children of Russia; for that matter so does "Treasure Island."

NO one claims these books have any value for fighting men and women. There is nothing revolutionary about them. Nothing Marxian or Leninist. In short nothing therein to add that to the wise; or make them more resolute in their struggles to be free. These books are childish; composed by childish minded men, who never grew up, or if they did grow up, became corrupted by sycofancy, parasitism and class collaboration. "Uncle Tom's Cabin" has more guts in one of its historic pages than all of these other works combined, and I don't find it catalogued in the famous Howl by No. 3. (Someone had to take a fall out of that intolerably conceited bourgeois ass; if no one else would do it, I who have no appetite for such nauseous matters must volunteer!)

COMMUNIST art is ripening in Moscow. I can't say much about it as I haven't been there, but Barkis is willing, and I hereby serve notice on my left wing comrades to organize and send me as a delegate there, if they want a better report than I can give now.

However suffice it to say that Pletnev in the Proletcult theaters has kicked out the Nos. 1, 2 and 3's and replaced them with proletarians who give the worker audience the thrill of their lives. He makes them participate in the performances too, as singers, marchers, and collaborators; working class artist collaborators, if you please. He throws out the old Belasco settings with their overstuffed drawing-room furniture; he puts overalls on the John Drew created pants; he sets on the stage platforms, machines, bits of the shop, the circus, the street and the field and centers the action around proletarian revolution. He considers that Communist

art must be all propaganda, just like bourgeois art is now; and he blue pencils love as the prime motive, and makes mass progress the main spring of the new stage.

THE individual is set aside; the great man killed off; the Nos. 1, 2 and 3's with their sloppy and slobbering, heroes and heroines are thrown out of the door by the scruff of their necks, and the clean high spirited men and women actors of the factory are invited in.

The theater itself is torn down and the shows are given in the factory communal halls.

No salaries; no professionals; no charges at the box office. All is for love, instead of all being about love, and sensual love at that.

The dirty, the pornographic, the lewd, the drunken, the low, the bummy, the bourgeois in short is shown the gutter, and the healthy worker running his beloved machine, conqueror of famine, poverty, and want is given the center of the stage.

The trapeze, and the flying rings replace the davenport and the sofa. The setting is for work and for workers, not for lounge lizards, and jazz bounds and sex degenerates, who moan and whine in Oscar Wildean monotonies about not sufficiently satisfying their degenerate appetites, their sadistic cravings, their abnormal thirsts. This stuff is fine business for the artistic brotherhood, who denounce all that part of the brasscock press that doesn't pay them royalties, praise their scribbles, while contributing snide and sly counter-revolutionary article to the so-called radical papers, the other branch. (YES; it is true. No 3 did invite President Wilson to meet him at his local hotel, and take lunch with him. Prexy respectfully declined, showing almost as much contempt for N. 3 as the working class itself does.)

EURIPIDES first put woman-in-love on the stage. According to the other Grecian playwrights, this marked the degeneracy of Athenian art. Euripides had two wives who both betrayed him, like bourgeois wives usually do where it is a question of how much

money they get out of their treachery, they act just like bourgeois artists do. But Greek art was founded on conquest of workers in and out of Greece; it was for the owners of slaves, just as art has been ever since. No wonder that it is rotten; no wonder that the American stage has become Frenchified, where nude women and adulterous wives hold the boards to the exclusion of all other heroines.

Wine, women and song is the bourgeois litaney; all its artists must sing that or pass out. No 3 sings it too, tho' with a wry mouth; but he listens to it with wide open asses ears! That's why he likes his own kind so well; the Shaws, Menckens, Brisbanes and his paymaster, Hearst. No 3 is a sad example of bourgeois perversity. He may be a great humorist like Mark Twain, but he'll never die laughing at his own jokes any more than Mark did.

WHAT killed Mark was he had to keep his mouth shut or lose his job; so he took to his bed and smoked himself to death; just like Jack London took to his front porch and his bottle. Both were good men and true; and both died cursing their paymasters 'an't it too bad, comrades, to be a great author?

The third in America, that means in the world, for America thru Wall Street, leads the world; and of course its artists, being Wall Street artists, are greater than Lombard St. or Wilhelm Strasse, or the Paris Bourse or other literary thorofare artists in foreign countries. And as for Moscow outside the Belasco Art Theater, that town is not in the running at all! Third in the world, and not be recognized by all the bourgeoisie as such and by none of the Third International! Such negation is a great deprivation.

COMMUNISM doesn't pay. I rather like it for that reason. For I am not tempted to follow No. 3's fatal foot steps, and become an unknown number like he is; unknown to the real rebel workers of the world; an X whose value in the equation turns out to be zero.

Jubilee Concert to Honor Proletarian Composer

ON the 24th of this month, Jacob Schaefer, the well-known musician and leader of the Freiheit Singing Organization, will receive an enthusiastic, real proletarian welcome and ovation from the workers of Chicago, as the day will mark the close of his ten years of intensive work and considerable accomplishments in the field of music.

Jacob Schaefer, as a musician identified himself with a proletarian task, namely, to bring the aesthetic and educational influences of music to the workers who labor in factories and in other various places of business and as they endure the harsh conditions prevalent in their personal lives, gradually lose their sensibilities for the finer assets of life among which music probably plays the most predominant part. He had therefore, devoted his talents and time to the work of developing and creating the song of the toiler, clearly indicating thereby, his firm belief in the existence of proletarian music.

HE realizes as well as we do, that the (so-called) class struggle, becoming such distinct an event at the present time, has also reached the sphere of the finer arts. A line of demarcation must be drawn in that great field of art. Our music should incorporate characteristics of proletarian consciousness and reflect the conceptions and tendencies of our revolutionary times. Music of the higher sort is at the disposal of the rich. They are patronizing the artist and the latter, in turn, seeks their favor and tries to satisfy their whims.

IN the future we are bound to see music being responsible to the great events of time. To the facts which will particularly determine the

destinies of humanity as they will be manifested in the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed, downtrodden masses for liberation and freedom. Proletarian music suggests to us the ideas that proletarian emotions are to find incarnation in musical conceptions expressed in musical sounds. Music which has been a source of inspiration to humanity and has been used to elevate the spirit and imbue the soul with longing and desire for justice, spiritual gratification will serve an equal purpose to the workers, yet will strengthen their belief in their ideals and inspire them to do things essential to bring about the realization of their dreams.

TRUE proletarian composers are not to be found in numbers. They are rare; but they will appear in due course of time. One of them is the man mentioned in the previous lines, Jacob Schaefer. His musical compositions present themes, dealing with life of workers. His newly created work which is to be given on the 24th of this month is a musical score composed to the words of a dramatic poem written by a revolutionary Russian playwright. The selection of that dramatic poem for a theme of a musical work and the making of its performance coincident with a time which is regarded by him and his fellow workers as a jubilee, are evidence that he is the new type of a proletarian composer, organically connected with our proletarian aspirations and ideals.

J. Schaefer is a man of whom we can expect very much. His past life had proved that. He came over to America as an immigrant and started to work as a carpenter. Being a child of poor parents he never knew what

meant to live comfortably and enjoy those things which a person in the blooming period of youth is longing for. Here, in America, he faced those hardships and deprivations which meet newcomers. He labored hard, and at the same time spared time and saved some of his meager earnings for the purpose of taking up musical studies. Being a man of energy and determination he overcame the difficulties. He gradually acquired a musical education and thereby afforded his natural talents to come into play and secure for him a prominent place in the profession. It is expected that the workers of Chicago will take notice of this affair and will be present at the Studebaker Theater on the 24th day of May, 2:30 p. m., to hear the work of Jacob Schaefer, performed by the Freiheit Singing Society, members of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and conducted by the composer himself.

Clara Rubenstein.

Dr. A. Moskalik
DENTIST
S. W. Corner 7th and Mifflin Sts.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

GRIGER & NOVAK
GENTS FURNISHING and
MERCHANT TAILORS
Union Merchandise
1934 W. Chicago Avenue
(Cor. Winchester)
Phone Humboldt 2707

Does your friend subscribe to the DAILY WORKER? Ask him!

MASTERS AND SLAVES (A Story of the Working Class)

By John Lassen

Synopsis of Preceding Chapters.

Nickles and Joe Vavas, migratory workers, meet under a freight train while beating their way west. They get off at Colorado Springs. Joe Vavas, Hungarian, is a barber by trade, and Nickles, a Greek, has no fixed trade. In Colorado Springs Vavas buys second-hand clothes for the two and they go to look for work. Vavas gets a job as a barber. Nickles manages to get work at Broadmoor, the mansion of the Broidins. His work is constant drudgery. Vavas is class conscious, but Nickles is not. Now go on with the story.

(Continued from last Saturday)

VI.

JOE and Nickles met often. They did not agree on many things, but liked each other a lot. Joe had more free time than Nickles, and would walk over to Broadmoor in the evening. There is fresh air here and the forest.

Joe felt as if he had been in Colorado Springs from the beginning of time. That is part of a workers' nature. He has no roots. He felt at home wherever there were workers.

"Look here, you ain't got no idea how much the workers are dissatisfied here."

"Ah, that's a lot of talk. I think myself they'd like to tear each other's head off."

"That's something I don't believe. No sir. There ain't no reason why they should. They all work hard, don't they, and the guy that's got a family to support suffers the most, even though he works his head off."

"You can't do a thing to the bosses. They're too strong."

Joe was aware that the power of the bosses depended upon the workers. But Nickles wouldn't hear of it. He clung to the belief that there were always people who had other work for them, and lived from the toil of others, and it would always be so. Anybody who is very industrious and has luck can also come around to the point where he would live from the work of others.

"Why look here, anybody that can talk good American gets along fine."

NICKLES felt great admiration for Joe.

For his enthusiasm. The way he loved his Communist paper for instance. It was always sticking out of his pocket. And he would tell Nickles what was in it. Nickles read the "Denver Post."

It was full of pictures. And yet there was nothing in it that held him really.

The "Denver Post" would always boast about how rich it was.

But Joe reported on every occasion how the Communist paper was in financial difficulties.

And this was certainly a thing to be wondered at.

It was Nickles' idea that a paper that was always in financial difficulties ought to be given up. And yet he saw the very contrary, that the relation between Joe and the paper became the more cordial, the greater the paper's hardships.

And all these collections . . .

Joe never tired of sending in at the end of the week the money which he had saved from his wages. And he didn't earn much!

Nickles was of the opinion—and he told that to Joe—that his actions contradicted his words. Joe always said that all the money, all the property and possessions of the rich must be taken away, and yet he himself gave away everything he had. Nickles thought, why does a man need wealth when he gives away the little that he has?

He thought of how Joe had shared with him his few dollars when they had come here—and that he could have bought a much better suit for himself for all the money.

And another thing. Every time that Joe read in his paper about a misfortune or that in some country the reactionaries were again murdering workers, he would shake his fist, would threaten, say all kinds of things—that the day of judgment would come for those rascals of capitalists. His talk was bloody.

And yet as a matter of fact Joe was extremely gentle. Ridiculously so. He would even get out of the way of a caterpillar.

Nickles often kidded him about it.

And yet. These qualities attracted him to Joe. He had to admit that he liked him so much precisely on account of these qualities. And he even gave his friend something from his low wages for the Russian children or for the revolutionists packed into the prisons of the Hungarian capitalists.

And Nickles didn't realize that through Joe he learned more about what was happening in this big, wide world to the poor, his fellow workers, than he could learn in the thirty-two pages of the "Denver Post" that he read every day.

VII.

"It is a privilege to live in Colorado"—Nickles read at least ten times every day in the "Denver Post."

"But not for everybody"—he thought while polishing the sun alone through the window. There wasn't a bit of breeze.

And the heavy dress-coat in which he had to serve! The heavy, parrot-green dress-coat!

"I don't need no steam bath!" Sweat trickled in big drops down his back, in his armpits, down his neck. With all his might he longed for the evening.

For the forest. For the wind. The soft wind. The forest-wind, of which he got so little.

MARGUERITE accompanied him.

They waited for Joe.

Nickles reached for Marguerite's hand. And Marguerite yielded it. Nickles was a strong, handsome chap. And Marguerite was a lively, affectionate girl. Liking the knives.

It is so natural, after a hot, exhausting day for two bodies to find each other in the cool dimness of the forest.

Did they love each other? Why not? They were lonely. And both of them wanted to love.

Nickles pressed Marguerite tightly. His arms held her in his iron embrace.

Marguerite cried out faintly. Nickles laughed: "Does it hurt?"

Marguerite wanted to free herself from his arms. "You . . . You . . ."

Nickles laughed. He bit the girl on the shoulder.

Marguerite slapped him dutifully on the mouth, although secretly she rather liked his intimacy and didn't really resent it.

They heard steps. Joe came.

His face was unusually cheerful. Nickles asked:

"Did you catch a sparrow?"

"No, but there's big things goin' to happen."

"That so?"

"Yes. Think of it, I brought together all the fellows in my trade, and tomorrow the union organ is coming from Denver."

"Nickles didn't grasp the entire significance of the thing, but anyway he was happy together with his friend.

"Just think, there'll be a fight!"—and Joe stamped from joy.

Nickles had never seen his friend so cheerful before.

Joe reported in detail how he had succeeded in bringing together the dissatisfied, and that there was a splendid chap among them, a certain William who was very helpful to him in the organization.

"He is an American. It's easier for him"—Joe sighed. "Me they call a foreigner plenty of times."

"D'you see?"—Nickles said triumphantly—"that's how your fellow-workers are." And he stressed sarcastically the word "fellow."

"Naturally they are like that. And . . . if they wasn't that way, you wouldn't be Mr. Broidin's servant, you'd be workin' in the public library or the children's sanatorium of Broadmoor. That's what they do with them mansions in Russia, turn them into something useful. And the Mr. and Mrs. would be starin' down at you from the next tree."

This statement gave Marguerite and Nickles a terrible fright.

"Don't spring anything like that! Marguerite might have had dreams."

They laughed.

"I'm tellin' you, something is happening in Colorado Springs."

Marguerite put in a word:

"If it's alright to do such a thing? Will the bosses allow it?"

Joe laughed.

"Is it alright? The constitution allows it. Of course, the bosses don't like to see it happening. The ones that organize are the stronger. When they're stronger they get power. And when they get power, they win the fight. Right?"

That was clear.

Even Marguerite could not find a flaw in the reasoning.

"I see everything so plain and clear, that I can't help believing you"—the girl stammered forth, blushing happily.

The mountains gave forth a deep and heavy fragrance. The three were not conscious that the air was permeated with the fragrance; but in their innermost beings there trembled the wonderful magic of this summer night. After the shop and the kitchen they found salvation far off in the forest which embraced them. The splendor of youth had thrown its spell over them, and Nickles and Marguerite both could not help clinging to each other.

Joe stood there for a moment.

"Some nice couple you make!"

Both laughed.

He took in the situation quickly.

"I'm all the time happy when loving hearts get together."

And he was sincerely happy. He began to whistle the tune of the International.

Nickles and Marguerite did not know the tune. The forest poured forth its fragrance lavishly.

VIII.

IT was a magnificent triumph.

It is true that all weren't present in the hall of the little hotel, but there were twenty-four anyway. Twenty-four barbers from all parts of the city.

He looked with great satisfaction upon those assembled. All were waiting impatiently for the union organizer from Denver.

At last, a fat man.

He came with William, who had fetched him from the railway station.

William was a young chap with quick gestures. His eyes sparkled, they would arouse people to enthusiasm. He greeted the assemblage. He explained the purpose of the meeting; to organize against the insatiable greed of the bosses, to regulate wages and working hours.

Then he gave the floor to the delegate of the union.

The fat man was a disappointment to Joe. He had expected the man to be wise, and to find the right words to say about capitalism which he himself hated so much. He had hoped that the organizer would arouse the people with his speech. That he would fill them all with enthusiasm. Instead he warned them to be cautious. To moderate their demands, to reduce their claims. And about organizing he did not speak with enthusiasm, and love, as Joe had expected.

"I'm not going to interfere"—thought Joe—"the main thing is to get them organized."

A few took the floor.

They had one thing or another to say. They pointed to fruitless attempts in the past. Still, everyone recognized that the situation was unbearable. And that something had to be done.

The decision to form a local of the Barbers' Union in Colorado Springs was made unanimously.

William was chairman of the local, Joe treasurer.

The composition of the executive board did not please Joe. The delegate from Denver had all those elected to the executive committee who had been responsible for the failure in the past.

It was decided, in the interest of the organization to start an energetic campaign for reducing the working time and for a just increase in wages.

THINGS developed faster than Joe had thought. The local union functioned. The ice was broken. The hand-bills were grabbed from all sides. Two weeks later the meeting took place in an over-crowded hall.

And what is more, the workers themselves now demanded quicker action.

"The favorable situation must be utilized"—they said.

It was summer-time. The busy season. The bosses needed workers. The stores were busy from morning to night.

It was decided to draw up the demands in writing and to present them to the bosses' association.

Joe too was on the committee which formulated the demands. He was known to everybody. He did the best work in distributing leaflets. He did

not allow himself to be cowed by the bosses, nor did he become disheartened when he would meet a worker who would say that "he could settle his affairs with the boss himself without meetings and organization."

The formulation of the demands did not go smoothly. In the first place they could not agree on the tone. The old ones spoke of "humble request," the young men of "strong demands."

Finally they agreed and chose a more moderate tone which was in the middle between the two extremes. In the course of the conference there were often violent differences, and at times it seemed as if the two sides would come to a clash and the document would not be drawn up. Still, in spite of all that, they all agreed in the end.

The owners of the small shops attacked the leaders of the association. They charged them with having acted like autocrats.

The union was broken. There was danger that a part of the master barbers would act independently. In order to prevent this it was decided to negotiate with the union.

This was the first victory of the workers.

The "Springs Paper" adopted a new tone. The number of papers sold in the city was constantly dwindling. An open letter addressed to the barbers appeared in the paper—but they no longer read it.

THE old men brought down the fat delegate from Denver, for they saw that the leadership was going over into the hands of the "inexperienced" young men.

It was summer-time. All efforts of the master barbers to recruit strikebreakers were unsuccessful. The pupils of the barber-school of Denver reached only as far as the railroad station of Colorado Springs. As soon as they learned what was the matter they demanded their return fare from the bosses. This caused great confusion. The young fellows raised such a racket at the railroad station and hurled such choice epithets at the heads of the elderly bosses that the latter felt that it was for the best to let those fellows get back the quickest way possible.

This was the second victory of the workers.

The third victory went into the pocket of the fat man from Denver. He sold out.

All the demands were trimmed down, reduced by half. In the end there was hardly anything left of the victory.

The worst of it was that the agreement would terminate at a time when working conditions in Colorado Springs would be at their worst.

The strike was called off.

AND yet—in spite of what happened—victory, betrayal—the strike assumed deep significance. It was a call to battle.

A call to battle for the workers.

A call to battle for the capitalists.

(To be continued)



Organizing Industry For War!

The story of how the bosses are hurriedly organizing the industries of the country for war is told for the first time in

The New Issue of the

YOUNG WORKER

tells how the organization of the big bosses, the Ordnance Advisory Board, headed by E. H. Gary, which is preparing industry on a national scale to make bigger profits than ever before out of the next slaughter of young workers.

How Near Is War?

Dark clouds are gathering over the Pacific and the imperialists are adding more young workers to their armies and navies.

The U. S. navy has been practicing for war in Hawaiian waters and Comrades Crouch and Trumbull are in jail in Honolulu because they opposed the coming war!

All these preparations of the bosses for war have been exposed weakly in the YOUNG WORKER which carries on a continual fight against capitalist militarism and imperialism.

Send for bundle orders of the new issue containing this special story.

5 CENTS A COPY.

Subscription Rates—\$1.50 a year, 85c for 6 months.

THE YOUNG WORKER 1113 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

The Walden Book Shop

307 Plymouth Court

(Between State and Dearborn
Just South of Jackson)

CHICAGO

Second-Hand Books

Used Communist, Labor and Economic books, pamphlets, magazines are made in all languages, bought, sold and exchanged at our prices.

"Daily" Book Exchange
808 James St., Pittsburgh, Pa.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

To those who work hard for their money, I will save 25 per cent on all their dental work.

DR. RASNICK

DENTIST

645 Smithfield Street.

Amalgamated Food Workers

GENERAL HEADQUARTERS

81 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y.

THIS IS OUR



EMBLEM

An Industrial Organization For All Workers in the Food Industry

Bucharin Closes Discussion on Agriculture Question

The DAILY WORKER recently published the opening speech of Nikolai Bucharin, editor of Pravda, official organ of the Russian Communist Party, before the recent meeting of the enlarged executive committee of the Communist International. Following the discussion of his report Bucharin made the following closing address:

By NIKOLAI BUCHARIN.
MOST of the speakers did not oppose the theses, but made various remarks of a supplementary nature. Comrade Varga proposed including a special passage on village poverty, in other words, on small peasants and peasants on small allotments. I formulated the theses in the Russian terminology. We make a distinction between small peasants and peasants on small allotments, and in order to be precise, I believe that we can accept this subdivision.

We can also accept the suggestion of Comrade Varga in connection with the thesis stating that in the present epoch it is impossible for the peasantry to be an independent governing force, to say, instead "a lasting governing force."

On the other hand I do not share the view of Comrade Varga on the formation of peasant parties; nor of the analogous statement of Comrade Dombal.

VARGA'S whole argument consists in his stating that we ourselves claim that the peasantry is becoming political. The political party is the expression of this development, and therefore we must have a political party of the peasants. That may be correct from a vulgar formal standpoint, but viewed dialectically, this is not correct and does not conform with reality. Can one say then that a peasant league is a non-political formation? I believe it is false to say that a class organization can exist without having a political character. The peasant organizations have a political character as the trade union organizations have.

Does, for instance, the A. D. G. B. (General Federation of Trade Unions) in Germany play no political role? Of course it does, and yet it is not a political party. Did the peasant league here in Russia play no political role? Of course it did, but it was not a political party. Here the socialist revolutionaries, menabevists and other parties carried on activity within the framework of the peasant league. This is also the case with the peasant organizations already in existence.

They exist, they grow, new organizations not only one, but sometimes many political parties engage in activity. It may be that these parties differ from one another in very few respects, but that is a fact.

VARGA states that the principal demands of the peasants are counter to the bourgeois state. It is a bit strong to say against the "bourgeois" state. One might get the impression that the peasant organizations are the greatest revolutionary organizations against the state. They are not counter to the state, but they put forward demands to the state which have both an economic and political character, for instance, the question of taxation, for instance, the question of taxes.

Most of the demands of the peasants are of such a nature. The revolutionary elements among the peasants are not so advanced that they set up direct revolutionary demands. It is not right to say either politics and then the political party, or only economic demands and then NO political party. This is how Varga puts the question and Dombal repeats it. Therefore it is no accident that the peasants organize carefully, not in the conventional political form, but in the form of the peasant league. The question which Varga puts and which Dombal repeats can also be raised logically and tactically. They ask whether there is any difference whether some peasant league engages in politics and when it does so as a political party. What is the difference? No difference can be drawn

here because the economic demands are closely bound up with the political demands. And yet a relative difference exists. It consists in the political party being a much firmer organization, which has a definite program, strict discipline, etc. Within one party there cannot be three or four other parties. That is possible in a league. And there are such political parties who to some extent have such a character; for instance, the British labor party; but everyone understands that the labor party is a peculiar structure. It is a cross between a league and a political party in the real sense of the word. What is specific in a peasant league is its mixed character. For us it is better to have such an organization, if only for the possibility of its great extent. In a political party only those may enter who seriously accept the program and do everything the party asks.

THERE is a great deal of liberty of movement in the peasant league. Our people can enter it, and in the amorphous conditions of the peasantry, can create a situation in which we can win more and more new followers. What sort of slogan does Dombal suggest. Not a league, not a party, but a transitional form. In this way we would merely create a different term, nothing else. The specific character of the peasant league is its loose organization form, the possibility of uniting members of various parties and even non-party people into organizations which have not so strict a discipline and which put forward demands of a mixed character. No positive arguments were produced against such a conception. It was merely stated that if the peasantry is developing politically, the parties will grow. I can reply to that that the peasant leagues will also develop politically. That depends on the various circumstances and on whether we work well or badly in these organizations.

Comrade Dombal brought forward two arguments. He says that the theses state that we need a policy which will separate the left organizations from the joint organizations. That is quite clear: we must use them for spreading our influence for the purpose of winning over the majority of the toiling population. By what means? That is the question of our policy, our political and organizational methods, and of the method of drawing the masses into real action. All that is fairly clear.

COMRADE MESHTCHERYAKOV made two observations on the credit system. The theses also speak of this subject but perhaps this sentence can be developed. As far as the second observation of Comrade Meshtcheryakov is concerned, I believe that there is either a misunderstanding or that he represents a false standpoint. The theses state that we need a separate organization of the agricultural workers and it was added that these organizations of agricultural workers cannot and must not enter the organizations of the peasants. I believe that is correct. Comrades Meshtcheryakov says that the Italian experiences have proved the contrary. Comrade Grieco says that the Italian experience shows that in mixed meetings of peasants and agricultural workers, chaos ensued, but he says further that it was evident at the same time that federated alliances of the organizations, joint centers, etc. are possible. This concrete form did not prove feasible in Italy, but generally speaking it was proved that these organizational connections are possible and desirable. If we want to win over the small peasants, and on the other hand, already have won the agricultural proletariat, the latter must somehow or other influence the peasantry.

A FEW more words about Varga. In the preface to his book: "The Status of the Peasant Movement," there are two paragraphs which are absolutely incorrect. He says:

"Social democracy has always prevented the creation of a class alliance between the workers of town and country in two ways, and thus

had a counter-revolutionary effect. Firstly, by issuing the slogan 'Those who possess and those who do not,' in the interpretation of which the toiling and even the poor peasants were placed in the ranks of those who possess. In this manner the social democrats brought about a formal distinction in place of the class distinction between exploiters and exploited, and thus objectively served the interests of the exploiters and enlarged their camp at the expense of the proletariat."

THE fault of the social democrats did not lie in their having spoken of possessing and non-possessing classes. Naturally a distinction must be made between possessing and non-possessing, between class strata which are linked up with private property and those which have no private property whatsoever. But this distinction is not everything. In his polemic against Plekhanov, Lenin, in formulating our first party program, observed that we must first become separate, we must first differentiate ourselves as a revolutionary class, as the proletariat which stands in a peculiar relationship to all other classes. Then, after we have constituted ourselves, the time comes when we must determine our attitude to other classes.

And in this second phase, let us say, lies the fault of the social democrats—I determine myself as a class and am seeking an ally. Here I differentiate between various classes, between earned property and capitalist property, between property which is bound up with exploitation and that which is not. That is a further separation, and here the social democrats began to do serious blunders and political crimes. But to formulate the matter as Varga has done, is theoretically incorrect: Varga says: "Both standpoints were the natural consequence of the general attitude of the social democrats who always considered themselves the party of the industrial working class in the narrow sense and followed the policy of improving the condition of the industrial working class within the framework of capitalism by changing the distribution of income."

THAT is, mildly speaking, a very careless formulation. That means that there is no agricultural proletariat. I believe that Varga wanted to

say something different. Two things must be borne in mind: We are the workers' party, not a workers' and peasants' party. We are first of all the party of the industrial proletariat. When we declare this, it is no betrayal of the cause of the workers. The mistake is not that we are a pure proletarian party. But the mistake of the social democrats, the political crime of the social democrats, consists in the fact that the party placed the working class in an incorrect relationship to the peasantry, that it sees only that which goes on within the proletariat, and does not understand that this class, or this party of the class must have an ally. Why do I say all this? Two dangers menace us: that we maintain a passive attitude in general towards the peasantry, and the other danger, that we dissolve into the peasantry. If we dissolve we are no Marxists and no workers' party and cannot claim the dictatorship of the proletariat. Leninist teaching about the workers' and peasants' bloc does not consist in our being the bloc of the workers and peasants, but in the working class retaining the hegemony within this bloc. That cannot be effluated. The same thing is true after the conquest of political power. The bloc does not consist in our realizing a workers' and peasants' state. Sometimes we call ourselves a workers' and peasants' government. In reality it is the dictatorship of the working class, a class which constitutes itself as state power, which has formed a bloc with the peasantry. We have very good connections with the peasantry, we lean on the peasantry, but from the point of view of class character, we are a proletarian power.

IN Varga's formulation this "nuance" is a very important thing. I believe that these corrections were necessary, for in itself this booklet of Varga's is an excellent piece of work. These introductory remarks might cause a certain degree of confusion, especially in a period when most of our parties have become contaminated by the narrow guild spirit; such a representation might have a repelling effect in the present situation; therefore complete theoretical clarity is necessary. Then we can determine a clear political line, and that is what we need. (Applause).

MAY 1, 1925 IN MOSCOW

By JOHN C. TUCHELSKI.

MOSCOW, (By Mail)—I happened to be one of the lucky ones to witness the May first celebration in Moscow with members of the Kuzbas organization.

We were awakened at seven o'clock by an organization passing our windows on their way to assigned places.

We were given presents, as guests, to the Red Square, in front of the "Brotherly Graves," and we stood in front of John Reed's grave.

The Red Square was lined with Red soldiers and sailors.

On the buildings of Moscow, of the walls of the Kremlin and from wires strung across streets waved red banners, with slogans in white letters, in many languages. A few of the slogans were: "Workers of the World Unite," "Long Live the First of May," "Raise high the banner of Lenin, it brings us victory," "To the prisoners of capitalism, greetings of the First of May!" "To the Workers of England, entering the struggle for the unity of the world labor movement, together with the working class of the U. S. S. R.—Our greetings." "To the marching new elements of the revolution, the brave comrades in the struggle; the toiling women of England, fraternal greetings on the First of May."

A large picture of Lenin measuring 30 square feet, was hung on top of the center entrance to the Kremlin. On each side of it hung the sign, "First of May," in the Russian language.

Promptly at nine o'clock, Commissar of War M. F. Frunze appeared on horseback with his staff from the Kremlin entrance and greeted every regiment. The regiments returned

the greeting and their bands played the international.

At the same time motion pictures were taken, of the crowds lined on both sides of the Red Square, also of the soldiers and sailors.

At nine thirty Commissar Frunze passed us, exchanged greetings and returned to Lenin's mansion where a speakers' stand was set up with a microphone connected with loud speakers set at various places around the Red Square, so that everyone of the large crowd could hear.

Sitting in front of this stand was an English women's trade union delegation, Comrades Zetkin, Rykoff and officials of the U. S. S. R.

At ten o'clock all the bands united in front of the reviewing stand and played military music while the parade passed. The first to pass were the military forces present, and afterwards the workers' organizations, each carrying a red banner with its name and in some instances pictures or models of their trade.

After the workers' organizations, groups of Young Communists, Pioneers, dressed neatly with red handkerchiefs around their necks, sport groups and students passed the stand, also several companies of the Moscow fire department.

It was wonderful to see such a large number of women, girls and children taking part in the demonstration.

No street cars were running, all the stores were closed, only a few nappers were selling cigarettes and fruit on the streets. No, dear comrades, the nappers did not march in the parade. The parade ended after six o'clock.

Our address: Kemerovo, Tomskaya Gub., S. S. S. R., Siberia, Kuzbass.

International Prospects and Bolshevization

By G. ZINOVIEV.

IV.

The Democratic Pacifist Era, Fascism and Social Democracy.

(Continued from last issue.)

The True Character and Significance of the Democratic Pacifist Era.

COMRADES, in recent times, all the important differences that have arisen in the ranks of the Communist International, in the final analysis, have centered round the estimation of the democratic pacifist "era." Persons like Newbold, Phillips, Price, Hoglund, Rosmer, to a certain degree are the casualties of yesterday's democratic "era."

How did these people picture the situation to themselves?

Simply that the revolution has passed and that the world situation had ceased to be revolutionary. They said, since the Soviet Government has not been able to achieve much improvement in the lives of the workers, in the course of five or six years, then MacDonald should be given as much time. This was said by Communists! Hoglund judged events of world historical importance from the fact that Newbold was defeated in the parliamentary elections.

THE question of the proper method of approach to the democratic-pacifist era has been the central point of our tactics during the last nine months. Several comrades were laboring under doubts which, however, they feared to express openly. They stated that, on the whole, they were in agreement with the line of policy of the Fifth Congress, but they continued to regard the democratic pacifist episode as a genuine era, as a prolonged period, as a new epoch in world history. They thought that from this logically follows the necessity to change the whole of our tactics in a more or less social-democratic sense. Newbold and Hoglund fell victims to this illusion. Others were more cautious and more diplomatic. They only caught one of their fingers in the door, but their astonishment was so great that they lost all desire to put any more of their fingers in it. What do the facts teach us?

First of all, with regard to the duration of the notorious "era," the facts show that the democratic-pacifist "era" was nothing more than an episode, as was foretold in the resolution of the Fifth Congress. In a certain sense, it may be said that the "democratic-pacifist" episode was tantamount to the approach to power of the petty bourgeoisie. As a matter of fact, power fell into the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie not entirely, but only within certain limits. In the period of imperialism and proletarian revolution (a period which can least of all be described as democratic-pacifist), the petty-bourgeoisie cannot hold power independently. For that reason, it was compelled to play the part of a puppet in the hands of the big bourgeoisie. England and France serve as a brilliant and historical illustration of this situation, for in those countries it was clearly demonstrated, that in the epoch of imperialism, the petty-bourgeoisie cannot govern a country as an independent force.

WHAT do the facts teach us? They teach us that willy-nilly, MacDonald was working for us. A process of differentiation is taking place within the labor government, and a genuine will to power is growing within it. Presently, the question was put on a "philosophical" plan: what does the MacDonald government really represent? Does it represent the last phase of the post-war crisis, or is it the first phase of a new pacifist era? This method of presenting the question appeared to be highly "dialectical." I think that the MacDonald government was both one and the other. In democratic-pacifism we have merely a single link in the continuous

chain of events which commenced as far back as 1914, i.e., with the outbreak of the war.

The democratic pacifist "era" of 1914 is but an episode in the epoch of imperialist wars and preparations for proletarian revolution. We do not stand in need of "philosophic" definitions. It is sufficient for us to bear in mind: 1, that this period proved to be short-lived; 2, that the petty-bourgeoisie, even as represented by the labor party, cannot play an independent role; 3, that the present time in England, we must count with two decisive factors of social life, viz., the working class and capitalism, and 4, that the MacDonald government with its "constructive socialism" worked for us, Communists, for the Comintern.

The Estimation of Fascism and Social Democracy.

THE question of the character of democratic pacifism is bound up with the estimation of fascism. You remember comrades, the fight that took place in our ranks over this question. Take the elections in Germany, England and in America. In Germany, the masses of the electors voted for the social-democrats; in England, for the labor party and in America for the party of La Follette. The broad masses, petty-bourgeois as well as proletarian, voted for the group which represented the ideas of democratic-pacifism, even when its star was setting. The "era" passed away, but the conservative section of the population still clutching at utopias and all kinds of illusions, continued to vote for democratic-pacifist politics. We do not wish to have democratic illusions reigning in the Communist Party, but the conservative masses still cling to them. We had to combat these illusions in the past, and of course, we must continue to do so in the future.

IN the democratic-pacifist "era," we must distinguish between two groups of countries. One of these were subjects and the other objects of the "era." England and France were subjects. Germany was an object. In passing, I will say that the successes achieved by our party in England and France on the one hand, and the difficult position of our German party on the other hand, arise out of the objective condition of things. Both in Germany and in France, pacifist illusions reign.

But, the soil which fosters these illusions, is not the same in Germany as it is in France. When a man, roused on the ground in the agonies of hunger, is roused with the hope of obtaining a mouthful of bread and water, or a drop of milk, naturally hopes and illusions arise in him. This was the position in which Germany found herself. It was precisely upon this that the social-democrats speculated. It is not surprising therefore, that in the countries which have been the subjects of the "era," where the ruling class were not in a position to propose or promise anything to the masses, could promise no improvement in their conditions, our Communist Parties obtained successes with relative ease.

Social Democracy "Defeats" Fascism by Affirming to it.

IN 1924, Radek formulated a resolution on the victory of fascism over social-democracy. Was that resolution correct? How in the present instance should the term "victory" be understood? You know for example, that the German bourgeoisie was "victorious" over Karl Liebknecht. The bourgeoisie killed him. That is one form of victory. Another form of victory was observed in the Russian revolutionary movement in the '80's of the last century. I have in mind the well-known revolutionary Leo Tikhomirov. He too, was "defeated," but how? He himself went over to the enemy, to the camp of czarism.

Liebknecht was "defeated" by the German bourgeoisie; Tikhomirov was

"defeated" by Russian czarism. These are two forms of "victory." It was precisely in the latter form that social-democracy was "defeated" by the bourgeoisie, and this on a world scale. The leaders of social-democracy simply turned traitors, followed the example of Tikhomirov, and went over to the side of the bourgeoisie. Radek overlooked this detail. He decided that, as the social-democracy had been "defeated" we ought to unite with it politically. This is an example of the theory of the "united front" according to Radek. He lost sight of the fact that the leaders of the social-democracy were "defeated" by the bourgeoisie in the sense that they began to form a wing of the bourgeoisie. It was for that reason, that the theses of the Fifth Congress, which described the social-democracy as the "third" party of the bourgeoisie, were absolutely correct.

IN Italy, fascism was a synthesis of the strivings of the capitalist bourgeoisie and of the social-democracy, and the social-democracy became a wing of fascism. The theses and resolutions of the Fifth Congress on this question were correct in so far as it has turned out that social-democracy is becoming stronger in proportion as the bourgeoisie is becoming stronger. The conservativeness of the broad masses and the retarded rate of development of class conflicts will have the same effect of increasing the strength of social-democracy in the future.

The whole question is, what should be our attitude to this? Some of the right wing comrades are of the opinion that, in view of the increasing strength of the social-democracy, we must revise all our values! We are of a different opinion, and are convinced that to the extent that the bourgeoisie will increase its strength for a time, the social-democrats will take advantage of this; for in our

days the bourgeoisie and the social-democracy are twins. Marx and Engels in their day, quite justly branded vernal leaders of the British labor movement. Today, we must do the same thing on an international scale.

A series of events renders this task easier for us. I will deal only with four of them. 1. The Barmat scandal, the Ebert trial, etc.; 2, the agreement concluded between the Hungarian social democrats and Horty; 3, the last meeting of the Bureau of the Second International and 4, the funerals of Ebert, Branting and Gompers. Recently, I read an obituary notice on Branting written by Heymann. Heymann criticizes Branting with having been, in spite of his republican convictions, an old friend and school chum of the king of Sweden. Well said, was it not? Heymann "buried" Branting a second time.

TO sum up: the social-democracy, Comrade Radek, was indeed "defeated" by the bourgeoisie and by fascism, but unlike Karl Liebknecht and his followers, it did not fall in battle, but was defeated in the sense that it itself, as represented by its leaders, abandoned the labor party and took up a petty-bourgeois position as a wing of bourgeois "democracy." The temporary increase in strength of the bourgeoisie is equal to a certain temporary increase in strength of the social-democracy. The doom of the bourgeoisie will at the same time also be the doom of social-democracy.

Consequently, the tactics of the Communist International were absolutely correct. This is evidenced by the class struggle; this is taught us by the episodes in the civil war, this is testified to by the life and the movement of the masses. The Bolshevik Leninist policy of the Fifth Congress has been completely justified. (Applause.)

(To be continued.)

The Work of the Marx-Engels Institute

Communication of the director of the Marx-Engels Institute, Moscow, D. B. Riazanov to the Enlarged Executive Committee of the Communist International.

The Fifth Congress of the Communist International, upon hearing my report about the activity of the Marx-Engels Institute at Moscow (MEI), acknowledged the necessity of publishing the complete works of Marx and Engels as well as separate editions of some of them. The resolution concerning this point requested moreover all the parties belonging to the III International and the members of those parties to help the Institute in its task of collecting all documents relative to Marx's and Engels' lives and work.

The nine months elapsed since have been employed by the MEI for the multifarious preparatory work necessary to the planned edition. The first thing to do was to secure the possibility of an exhaustive study of the literary heirloom of Marx and Engels preserved at the archives of the German Soc. Dem. Party at Berlin. I have happily succeeded in obtaining this possibility and since December last photos are being systematically taken from all those documents; for the pursuit of scientific research these copies are just as valuable as autograph. Several thousands of them having been taken already in 1923, the moment is not far off when the photos of the whole collection will be concentrated at our Institute. Meantime the MEI has also gathered some precious materials from various other sources, partly in original manuscript and partly in photo copies; it is quite natural however that these documents are not nearly as numerous as those mentioned formerly. Moreover, all kinds of printed materials (books, magazines, papers, etc.) necessary for a critical edition of the works have been collected with the utmost care and good results.

The deciphering of the materials in-

ended for publishing is going on steadily. A whole staff of 12-15 persons—scientific collaborators with their technical helpers—are constantly occupied with it. The work is already advanced considerably enough to allow the first number of the "Marx-Engels Archiv" to appear in May next; it will contain among other valuable contributions part of the "German Ideology".

In autumn two volumes of the Complete Works will follow—Vol. I with the juvenile writings of Marx, of which many have never been published yet, as, for instance, a rather large study upon Hegel's Philosophy of the State and an essay upon the French Revolution; and Vol. XV containing some unknown manuscripts of Engels, among them his "Dialectics in Nature". See for details the prospectus of the Marx-Engels Archiv, of which every delegate received a copy.

The plan for the separate publishing of some of the works has yet to be discussed. Meanwhile, preliminary steps are being taken for elucidating difficulties which might arise in different countries in connection with the printing of these editions.

I should like to end with the repetition of the earnest request addressed to all comrades by the Fifth Congress: lend a hand to the Marx-Engels Institute in securing the necessary materials! This appeal has remained nearly neglected until now. The Central Committees of the Sections should be somewhat more energetic in this respect.

Telephone Moscow 2284

Genoa Restaurant

ITALIAN-AMERICAN

1238 Madison Street

R. E. Cor. Elizabeth St.

Spaghetti and Ravioli Our Specialty

Special Arrangements for Parties on Short Notice

English Pacifism and English Aversion to Theory

(Continued from page 1)

ment, let us not attach too much importance to numbers and the appearance of outward strength. A few thousand with enthusiastic faith and determination are stronger than a million of more cautious and respectable people. And there is no greater danger for the socialist movement than the danger of becoming an accepted institution."

As we see this is a naive, not well thought-out theoretically, but a thoroughly right exhortation against allowing socialism to become rotten and a summons to revolutionary struggle.

WHAT is Blatchford's reply to this? "That war is caused by capitalist and militarist interests, all this is quite true. And I am striving, not less than any other socialist, for peace and the overcoming of capitalism by socialism. But Sinclair will not convince me by means of rhetorical and beautiful phrases, he will not be able to get away from the facts. Facts."

** Re-translated from the Russian.

my dear Sinclair, are obstinate things and the German danger is a fact. Neither we nor the German socialists are in a position to prevent war. Sinclair tremendously over-estimates our forces. "We are not united, we have neither money, nor weapons nor discipline. There only remains one thing for us: to help the English government to increase its fleet, as there is and can be no other guarantee for peace."

On the continent of Europe the chauvinists, neither before nor after the outbreak of the war have ever proclaimed themselves so openly. In Germany there prevails in the place of such sincerity the hypocrisy of Kautsky and the playing with sophism; the same is the case with Plekhanoff. It is especially instructive therefore to observe the conditions in a more developed country. Here it is impossible to mislead anybody by sophistry and by a travesty of Marxism. Here, the questions are stated directly and correctly. Let us learn from the "advanced English."

** Re-translated from the Russian.

Sinclair in his appeal, altho this appeal is at bottom theory correct—in a naive, as he has neglected to observe the 50 years development of the socialist mass movement and the struggle of tendencies within this mass movement; he fails to observe the conditions of growth of revolutionary action along with the existence of an objective revolutionary situation and a revolutionary organization. One cannot make up for this lack by "sentiment." One cannot by means of rhetoric evade the hard and ruthless fight of powerful tendencies in socialism—the opportunist and the revolutionary tendency.

BLATCHFORD badly proclaims the truth, and puts forward the concealed argument of the Kautskyites who fear to speak the truth. We are still weak and that is all—say Blatchford. But thru his sincerity he immediately reveals and lays bare his opportunism, his chauvinism. That he serves the bourgeoisie and the opportunists is to be seen at once. After having admitted the "weakness" of socialism, he weakens it himself by

advocating an anti-socialist bourgeois policy. Like Sinclair, but on the other side, not as a fighter but as a coward not as a hot-head but as a traitor, he also fails to take into account the conditions for the creation of a revolutionary situation.

But in his practical conclusions and in his policy (renunciation of revolutionary action and of the propagation and preparation of this action), Blatchford, the vulgar chauvinist, follows precisely the same path as Plekhanov and Kautsky.

Marxist phrases have nowadays become a cloak for the complete denial of Marxism. In order to be Marxist one must expose the "sham Marxist saintliness" of the leaders of the 2nd International, one must fearlessly keep in view the struggle of two tendencies in socialism and think out the questions of this struggle to their logical conclusion. This is the inference to be drawn from the English conditions which reveal to us the Marxist essence of the matter without Marxist phrases.

REMARKS TO THE MILITANT PARENTS

By NAT KAPLAN.

IN the Communist Children's Movement, the Junior section of the Young Workers' League the basis for the new, more realistic, relationship between adults and children is being laid.

This is demonstrated on the one hand by the methods used by the group leaders (in the main members of the initiative and self activity instincts of the child; the development of its observing instincts thru which it acquires material for its self instruction, etc., and on the other hand, by drawing the parents into the life and struggle of the children, thru the creation of parents' conferences and proletarian parents' school councils.

Why raise this issue of a new relationship between adults and children? Simply because the old relationship—the one in force at the present time is an utterly false one, is based on the bourgeois conception of the "right of the stronger," and as such must be completely discarded. The wielding of an unpremeditated, non-sensical discipline over the child, by virtue of the economic and physical-dominance of the adult over the child, in no wise can be conceived as the guiding of the child along a correct line of procedure. In only one sense can the adult gain superiority over the child for the sake of guiding its actions and that is by acquiring a greater knowledge and a more keenly developed mentality than the child itself. Hence, Herbert Spencer in addressing himself to parents at large has aptly remarked: "In brief, you will have to carry on your higher education as the same time that you are educating your children." One of the first lessons to be learned in this course of "higher education" is that adults and children must meet on an equal plane of comradeship, that only to the extent that the adult is able to win the confidence and friendship of the child, is he able to guide and lead that child in the acquiring of knowledge and in its general activities.

Militant Parents Must Line Up.

For the Communist parents and the militant parents of the labor movement there can be no better start made in this direction than by acquiring a knowledge of the principles at work in the Communist children's movement. Once this is realistically undertaken, we will no longer hear of the many cases of radical parents who have obstructed the class struggle activities of the young rebels by a parental treat, a castigation, or even by depriving the child of a meal.

We will then see the parents taking the initiative in the creation of school councils. We will see them setting up committees to visit the school authorities and presenting the demands of the children. We will see them helping in every manner possible to strengthen the school organization of the children—the school nuclei of the

Junior section and even helping to lead—the concerted actions of the children against the school authorities, against the nationalist and religious dope peddled under the guise of "education" and against the general miserable conditions of the proletarian child in our citadels of learning. The American bourgeoisie has long recognized the necessity of coordinating the home life of the child with its life within the public schools. For this purpose they have set up powerful parent-teacher associations which are decidedly reactionary in character. The answer to the American bourgeoisie on this field must be the united front between the proletarian parents and their offspring in the children's struggle and the class struggle at large.

Wherein the Principles Are Contained

In order to make this start the militant parents will have to acquaint themselves with the literature on the Communist children's movement. The international theoretical and practical publication of the Communist children's movement is known as "The

Bulletin for the Leaders of Communist Children's Groups" and is published by the executive of the Young Communist International. Volume No. 2, Issue 4 of the Bulletin (Ten Cents, Y. W. L., 1113 W. Washington St.) has just arrived from the publishing house. This issue is decidedly up to its standard. Under the title: "The Character of our Work in the Communist Children's Group," Comrade Gertrude Graesser has a very clear article dealing with the systematization of the educational work in the C. C. G. She divides the subject into two main features: (a) The training of the leaders, and (b) The education of the children. The important feature of this article is the plan of educational work that the writer presents us, which is especially adaptable to the 12 to 14-year-old children. (Those who are about to leave public school and are entering the Young Communist Movement).

Comrade Sigl Bammatzer writes in this issue on the necessity of "A closer organizational form for the C. C. G." The American Junior section comes in for special mention as having maintained a compact, centralized organizational form for its children's movement from the very start.

Other important and interesting features of the issue are: A discussion statement on the reorganization

of the Communist children's groups on the basis of school nuclei. An article by Comrade Rosa Moeller on the New Generation in Soviet Russia, a contribution to the question of the "New Humanity," which clearly describes the lot of the child in the U. S. S. R. at the present time; an article dealing with the formation of the Young Spartacist League in Germany to replace the loosely knit Communist children's groups. Two highly instructive articles on the functions of the Young Pioneers in Soviet Russia with its 700,000 young members. Two interesting reports from Great Britain and America and an article portraying the literary achievements of the children in accurately picturing the conditions of the workers' children in the capitalist countries. You should not miss the opportunity of securing your copy at once.

Soviets Open Bank in Turkey
MOSCOW.—(By Mail).—It is reported from Constantinople that the Bank for external commerce of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Constantinople branch office) was officially inaugurated in the presence of the highest Turkish authorities, the prefect of the capital and numerous deputies and representatives of the financial and commercial world and the press.

JOHN REED JUNIORS' AFFAIR COMES OFF TODAY, MAY 23RD

The John Reed Juniors' affair, the surprise party and dance, will be held this Saturday, May 23, at the Workers' House, 1902 W. Division St. They have a splendid program, a surprise and dance, and a speaker direct from Russia, Comrade Max Shechtman, editor of the Young Worker, who will bring greetings from the Russian Pioneers. Admission is the cheapest in town, only 20 cents for adults, and 10 cents for children. Come!

J. KAPLAN
MERCHANT TAILOR
Suits Made to Order at Reasonable Prices
3546 ARMITAGE AVENUE
Phone Albany 9400

Philadelphia, Notice!
Weber Printing Co.
350 N. FIFTH STREET,
Philadelphia, Pa.

TEN YEARS OF LABOR MUSIC!

A Concert in Honor of

JACOB SCHAFER

Director of the Freiheit Singing Society and the Freiheit Mandolin Orchestra

COMPOSER OF WORKING CLASS MUSIC

First Appearance of the Freiheit Children's Chorus

SUNDAY, MAY 24th,

- 2:30 P. M. -

at the

STUDEBAKER THEATER

418 S. Michigan Blvd.

Chicago

Tickets for sale by Freiheit Singing Society, 3337 Roosevelt Road; Daily Worker Office, 1113 W. Washington Blvd.; Local Chicago W. P. Office, 19 S. Lincoln St.