

"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*.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 22, 1923

China's Fight for Freedom

By L. M. KARAKHAN.

NOTE—The following is a translation of the speech delivered by Soviet Ambassador to China, L. M. Karakhan at the entertainment given by Mr. Mochizuki at the Hotel de Peking at Peking, China.

May I be permitted first of all to thank Mr. Mochizuki for the honor of his kind invitation to the banquet, where I see such a brilliant gathering of distinguished representatives of so many various circles of Peking. It was with profound interest that I listened to our host's admirable address, one that is the more valuable and interesting as the speaker is an eminent representative and a most influential member of the leading government party in Japan.

In his speech Mr. Mochizuki touched upon a number of all-important problems connected with China, problems that move us all, and consequently I willingly respond to his invitation to me that I say a few words, and I will try as briefly as possible, without taking advantage of your patience, in the same frank and outspoken way to express my views on the present situation in China, I shall do this in the best hope that, in such a distinguished company, my word will not be taken as evil propaganda.

I think Mr. Mochizuki was quite right when, in his searching analysis of the present events in China, he wished to briefly review facts having occurred during the last decade, and it was quite to the point when our esteemed host recalled the World War, the Versailles conference and the seven demands brot up at that conference by the Chinese delegation, then the fourteen points as proclaimed by Mr. Wilson and, lastly, the policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in China and the treaty concluded between the Union and China in 1924.

Soviets' Policy of Equality.

The facts which he enumerated Mr. Mochizuki looks upon as the cause of the national liberative movement which is growing and spreading before our eyes in China. And I with Mr. Mochizuki believe that the causes of the actual events in China are deeply rooted in those great changes in the conscience and in the relations between peoples which have been brot about by the events of the last decade.

Indeed, what is it that we have witnessed? We had the world war, a war which was trumpeted as aiming at ensuring to the peoples national freedom and self-determination and equality in international relations; then the Versailles conference, where these principles were not taken into consideration, while the proposition of the Chinese delegation which would have placed China on an equal footing with other powers was rejected without so much as having even been given consideration; then again, the Versailles conference, with an interval, followed by the Washington conference, which obviously failed to give satisfaction to China's national aspirations, while even the rather insignificant resolutions of that conference could not be carried out; the fourteen points of Mr. Wilson, which were proclaimed as those over China like a ray of sunshine that vanished all too soon; then at last, the establishment of the Soviet government, which through its prolonged struggle conquered its right to existence worthy of it, the Soviet government with its policy of equality regarding to other countries, and the recognition of unequal treaties by the Soviet republics.

Disillusionment of China.

All those facts, which every Chinese interested in the fate of his own country well knows, could not but make a deep impression on the Chinese people, making it think seriously over its end condition and try to see if it could and must seek ways to establish relations with all the world on a footing of perfect equality.

There may have been some who believed that the silence which immediately followed the close of the war and the non-materialization of Wilson's beautiful principles, meant that the Chinese people were reconciled with its position; this, however, was a mistaken idea; the Chinese people were merely waiting and hoping for the fulfillment of promises it had received. Then, as time went on,

these moves and prompts the Chinese people to wish that China's relations with all be established on the same principles as with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But, then, this influence of the U. S. S. R. on the national liberative struggle of the Chinese people is within the scope of the inevitable historical laws; it is not the result of artificially warmed up feelings. And if our fault is our good policy, I take pride in confessing to our being guilty.

Must Abolish Unequal Treaties.

In his speech today, Mr. Mochizuki has recommended to China to act slowly; first he advises China to set her house in order. I regret to say that I cannot agree with the idea, which nowadays is quite a current one, namely: first, set your house

in order, and then your national aspirations will be satisfied.

To set one's house in order is, of course, a good thing and a necessary thing; but how is one to do it if one is not the master or, rather, not the full and only master of one's own house? If China be left to herself, I am sure the Chinese people will establish the necessary order at home, an order which may eventually not be to the liking of all of us, but it will no doubt be such a kind of order as will be to the liking of the Chinese people themselves.

And this, as I believe everyone will agree with me, is the main point. Therein lies the essential defect of a widespread estimation of the present situation. First, the order, and then the question of unequal treaties. But there cannot be the order such as is equal treaties as long as there exist the serious improvement in the international position until and unless some issue be found from that vicious circle.

China Must Struggle.

Together with Mr. Mochizuki, I am glad to recall the serious and heroic struggle thru which went France, Italy, America. On their victorious banners, with the birth of those nations and states was dawning there

upon the same beautiful words for which China is fighting today: Liberty, fraternity, equality. Take, for instance, the case of Italy or America; there was not as easy struggle, it was one that for years and decades claimed the greatest sacrifices and demanded the straining of all the forces.

Before the Chinese people, too, there lies a difficult path of struggle, unless all its lost rights and privileges be returned to it willingly, on our part. I am far from the slightest intention of instigating anyone; my idea is drawn from the examples history gives us of the formation of the great nations of the world and is based on an analysis of the moving historical forces as they are developing here in China. In no other way can one escape from that vicious circle of which I spoke than either thru a protracted struggle for the rights lost or by their free surrender.

"Don't Throw Cold Water."
Mr. Mochizuki further said today to his Chinese friends: Stop those acts of violence, let there be no violence. Well, of course, there must be no acts of violence, but it seems to me that it is reasonable to make this appeal to both sides which are presently at issue.

To consider my speech, I may venture to draw an example from the medical field. When an alien body, an infection, gets into a live organism, the temperature of that organism rises; this is due only to the reaction of all the sound forces of the organism, its self-defense against infection.

It is not a rise of temperature, being but the result of infection, may in many cases play a useful part. And the physician who would center all his attention on the high temperature, forgetting all about the cause, would be but a poor physician indeed, for missing the effect for the cause he might occasion the patient's death. To fight down the fever alone, while neglecting the infection, is to invite and increase the infection with still higher temperature.

Fever naturally exhausts the organism and is a source of anxiety to those concerned. Nevertheless, it would be irrational to seek to bring down the temperature by covering the patient with ice for, without destroying the infection, we might kill the organism. In other words, one cannot cure a sickness unless one is quite clear as to its cause. The events in China are most complex; this should not make us mix up the causes and effects, or forget that we won't help matters by pouring cold water on an inflamed organism.

Chinese Will Win in Liberation.

I do not know what the issue will be out of the present situation in China and I feel certain that there is no one who does know it at the actual moment. But I do hope and I am convinced that the aspirations of the Chinese people for national liberation and equality in international relations will be realized.

Whatever the way whether it be by following the example of Italy, America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or again, say now the day is not far off when China will establish a really good and friendly relations with all the peoples of the world on a basis of true equality and justice. This is my warmest wish.

Put a copy of the DAILY WORKER in your pocket when you go to your union meeting.

Soviet Trade Union Delegation in China



From left to right, top: Smurgis, Lepes. Bottom: Briskin.

China felt deeply disappointed, seeing the wreck of all her hopes and desire to obtain the right that is hers to take the place of an equal among equals.

It is this disillusionment that plays, in all part in the actual crisis the feelings of the Chinese people are going thru today.

Soviets Influential in China.

There is quite a natural interest attached to the question of influence on the national revolutionary movement in China. There is no denying of the Soviet government is and will continue to be a not unimportant factor in the history of this country. Our influence, however, consists not in propaganda which is so frequently and yet so groundlessly spoken of, but in the simple, the more efficient and strongly pointed out by Mr. Mochizuki. It consists in our policy of equality and justice to China in words and in deeds, a policy which we have realized and have been realizing both thru our treaty and thru our policy in our relations with this country.

Now, since China has thus been able to establish equal relations with a great power, this certainly encour-

age, moves and prompts the Chinese people to wish that China's relations with all be established on the same principles as with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. But, then, this influence of the U. S. S. R. on the national liberative struggle of the Chinese people is within the scope of the inevitable historical laws; it is not the result of artificially warmed up feelings. And if our fault is our good policy, I take pride in confessing to our being guilty.

Must Abolish Unequal Treaties. In his speech today, Mr. Mochizuki has recommended to China to act slowly; first he advises China to set her house in order. I regret to say that I cannot agree with the idea, which nowadays is quite a current one, namely: first, set your house

in order, and then your national aspirations will be satisfied. To set one's house in order is, of course, a good thing and a necessary thing; but how is one to do it if one is not the master or, rather, not the full and only master of one's own house? If China be left to herself, I am sure the Chinese people will establish the necessary order at home, an order which may eventually not be to the liking of all of us, but it will no doubt be such a kind of order as will be to the liking of the Chinese people themselves.

And this, as I believe everyone will agree with me, is the main point. Therein lies the essential defect of a widespread estimation of the present situation. First, the order, and then the question of unequal treaties. But there cannot be the order such as is equal treaties as long as there exist the serious improvement in the international position until and unless some issue be found from that vicious circle.

China Must Struggle. Together with Mr. Mochizuki, I am glad to recall the serious and heroic struggle thru which went France, Italy, America. On their victorious banners, with the birth of those nations and states was dawning there

upon the same beautiful words for which China is fighting today: Liberty, fraternity, equality. Take, for instance, the case of Italy or America; there was not as easy struggle, it was one that for years and decades claimed the greatest sacrifices and demanded the straining of all the forces.

Before the Chinese people, too, there lies a difficult path of struggle, unless all its lost rights and privileges be returned to it willingly, on our part. I am far from the slightest intention of instigating anyone; my idea is drawn from the examples history gives us of the formation of the great nations of the world and is based on an analysis of the moving historical forces as they are developing here in China. In no other way can one escape from that vicious circle of which I spoke than either thru a protracted struggle for the rights lost or by their free surrender.

"Don't Throw Cold Water."
Mr. Mochizuki further said today to his Chinese friends: Stop those acts of violence, let there be no violence. Well, of course, there must be no acts of violence, but it seems to me that it is reasonable to make this appeal to both sides which are presently at issue.

To consider my speech, I may venture to draw an example from the medical field. When an alien body, an infection, gets into a live organism, the temperature of that organism rises; this is due only to the reaction of all the sound forces of the organism, its self-defense against infection.

It is not a rise of temperature, being but the result of infection, may in many cases play a useful part. And the physician who would center all his attention on the high temperature, forgetting all about the cause, would be but a poor physician indeed, for missing the effect for the cause he might occasion the patient's death. To fight down the fever alone, while neglecting the infection, is to invite and increase the infection with still higher temperature.

Fever naturally exhausts the organism and is a source of anxiety to those concerned. Nevertheless, it would be irrational to seek to bring down the temperature by covering the patient with ice for, without destroying the infection, we might kill the organism. In other words, one cannot cure a sickness unless one is quite clear as to its cause. The events in China are most complex; this should not make us mix up the causes and effects, or forget that we won't help matters by pouring cold water on an inflamed organism.

Chinese Will Win in Liberation.

I do not know what the issue will be out of the present situation in China and I feel certain that there is no one who does know it at the actual moment. But I do hope and I am convinced that the aspirations of the Chinese people for national liberation and equality in international relations will be realized.

Whatever the way whether it be by following the example of Italy, America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or again, say now the day is not far off when China will establish a really good and friendly relations with all the peoples of the world on a basis of true equality and justice. This is my warmest wish.

Put a copy of the DAILY WORKER in your pocket when you go to your union meeting.

An Leninist Analysis of Imperialism

By Bertram D. Wolfe

(Critique of Gomers' Article, "Labor and Empire," in the July Workers Monthly.)

THE article "Labor and Empire," written by Max Gomers in the Anti-Imperialist (July, 1932) Number of the WORKING MONTHLY, purports to contain a theoretical analysis of the historic background of imperialism, its economic and social implications for the working class of the imperialist nations, and for the exploited or subject peoples. The article in question is replete with errors of an anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist nature; in fact, all of its basic theoretical propositions are partly or wholly incorrect.

This is all the graver because the magazine in which it appears is a Comunist (and hence Marxist-Leninist) organ; because its editor is the secretary of the American section of the All-America Anti-Imperialist League and, as such, his words carry more weight and responsibility than would those of an individual of lesser official importance or activity; and finally, because it is the only article that seeks to make a theoretical analysis of the theoretical basis of imperialism in the anti-imperialist number of a world-wide Marxist-Leninist organ and therefore its errors cannot be left uncorrected. Nor would a more "correct" analysis in the August issue, without reference to the article of Gomers, be adequate, as it would leave undisturbed the errors already absorbed in the minds of many readers.

Moreover, that is not the way that a Comunist organ should correct errors committed in one of its articles. So much by way of explanation. Now to an analysis of the more important errors, not in the order of their importance, but rather in the order of their statement in the article, "Historic Background of Imperialism." Under this heading the article begins with the remarkable statement: "American workers might have already thrown off the whole system of wage slavery if it was not for the appearance of imperialism." Such speculations are un-Marxist and futile. Marx advised that capitalism leads first to concentration and centralization of capital. This leads inevitably to monopoly capitalism, which is the primary economic basis of imperialism. Thus, in Gomers' "if" partakes of scholastic medieval speculation and not of Marxism. Moreover, there is no justification for the conclusion that imperialism is the premise. Countries that have developed monopolistic finance capitalism are "backward countries." On what ground does Comrade Gomers assume that non-imperialist backward countries imply a victory of the proletariat? Moreover, America, more than any other advanced country, still has, or has had until recently, an expanding home market—but to go further would be to lose one's self in the very maze of scholastic speculation that Comrade Gomers' "if" hypothesis implies.

"The Peaceful Period of Capitalism." This is Leninist phraseology, but Comrade Gomers gets his dates, or rather, his periods, mixed. The "peaceful" period of capitalism in the United States Gomers dates from 1854 to the world war. This, he adds, is an international phenomenon. The "peaceful" period of imperialism (!) The truth of this "historical" matter is that the peaceful period of imperialism ends precisely where imperialism begins. In the "peaceful" period is meant that period roughly included in the second and the first quarter of the nineteenth century when the first wars for capitalist unity were generally at an end (the so-called national wars) and when capitalism in the early production of consumption commodities as its typical industry, and when liberalism, "free trade and Jeremy Bentham" prevailed in economic and political theory in the most advanced countries. The classic land of the peaceful free trade, free competition and non-state-intervention

period was England. The classic imperialist period is roughly from 1840 to 1894.

It was a peaceful period because the "struggle for markets" with textile machinery, the typical export, does not require apocalyptic invasions, colonies, the intervention of states and armies, etc., but merely quantity production, cheapness and good salesmanship. To sell textiles and other goods to equatorial savages, it is not necessary to own the country, to bribe its government, to subvert a revolution or to pry a colony loose from its mother country by war. A German firm can sell red Siamel underwear to naked savages in Madagascar (French colony) if it sends missionaries to convince them of the iniquity of going naked, sends cheaper, brighter-colored underwear and good patient salesmen willing to learn the language and the peculiarities of the natives. As long as free competition continues and "light" or consumption industries such as textile continue to be the basic ones, there is no great need of colonies, spheres of influence, etc. "Colonies," says the imperialist-illuminated "Daily Worker," "are just millstones around our necks." From 1840 to 1890 and even later bourgeois liberalism of the liberal school were in the ascendant. Also monopolistic aggressiveness on the part of England itself, the characteristic color of that country.

But the latter quarter of the nineteenth century is characterized by the change from "light" to "heavy" basic industries—that is to say, from textiles to iron and steel. Also monopoly begins and finally the export of capital itself.

The export of metal products implies the export of capital. It also implies colonies, spheres of influence, control of the governments of backward nations, subsidized revolutions.

A typical form of exported "metal product" is a railway. A railway can not be sold to an equatorial savage by the simple expedient of barter. It can only be "sold" to a backward country through political influence or control of that country's government. A railway, it might be said, is a financial loss on the basis of its net return, above all in a country backward industrial-ly. To make it profitable, the government must subsidize the construction. (1) Grant a concession of the right of way (2) an exclusive monopoly to that right of way, eliminating parallel lines; (3) subsidize the venture with land or money grants or grants of natural resources. Finally, it is superfluous to point out that the exporting of the "metal product" called a railway implies the export (investment) of capital as well.

This begins the scramble for concessions and spheres of influence, for colonies and protectorates, for governments "friendly to foreigners" and governments friendly exclusively to the interests of the home country. French capital, and all the other forms of imperialist wars and onslaughts of imperialist nations on backward ones and on each other. This, the warlike period of capitalism, is the imperialist period, and begins with the beginning of monopoly capitalism, and the export of capital. In other words, the warlike period of capitalism, in the Leninist sense, begins when Gomers says the peaceful period of capitalism begins. Any one who fails to take into account this fundamental difference between the textiles and metallurgy, between the export of underwear and the export of metals and dollars, cannot grasp the first essentials of imperialism and the imperialist epoch.

Moreover, it is a contamination with bourgeois pacifist "Hague conferences" illusions on the one hand, and with the psychology instilled by imperialist propagandists on the other, to believe that the period preceding 1914 (roughly from 1890 to 1914) was a peaceful period. The Hague conferences were only the plaster on the ulcer. The armament race was on, the world-wide war was brooding. It almost broke out in 1905 and again in 1911.

And the so-called "minor" wars, as imperialist apologists would call them, if they count for nothing because they were waged against black and yellow men and not between whites. Naturally, the weak nations were attacked first, but why? Imperialism was easier. Germany, in 1895, attacked German East Africa, in 1897 German Southwest Africa, New Guinea, Kamerun and Samoa. In 1899, Kain-Chan. In France in 1885 occupied Congo. In 1898 appropriated Madagascar, in 1904 Morocco (cause of the crisis of 1905), in 1913 Syria. America in the same period took Hawaii, while Japan seized Formosa.

If that is not enough evidence of a warlike period for Gomers (and it might be multiplied) how about the Spanish War, which was of 1898 for Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines and the control of the Caribbean? How Boer war? The Russo-Japanese war? The Sino-Japanese of influence in Manchuria, Korea and China. The Italian Turkish war for the possession of Tripoli in 1912? The Algerian Crisis, etc.

The period of imperialism is the warlike period of capitalism. A failure to grasp this makes the world war a phenomenon without precedent cause and makes the wars against black and brown and black-skinned wars. In other words, it is an unconscious reflection of pacifist illusion and imperialist apologetics.

Gomers, in his "historical background" takes the strikes of 1870 to 1894 in the United States as an eventful period and after 1894 a peaceful period. This, of course, has nothing to do with Leninist analysis of imperialism although Lenin is dragged in question by the strikes of the latter period. The strike of 1894 is a commercial crisis of the period that followed 1894 (very relative indeed) was caused by the expansion due to monopoly growth and other factors, and was broken by repeated strike crises of great magnitude. But, I repeat, it is of this kind of "peace" to which the Lenin quotation on "peaceful period" refers.

Gomers confusion in the article goes so far as to say that "if (the peaceful period when strikes lessened in scope, number and intensity), was purchased at the expense of the backward and undeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, thru the policy of imperialism." (!) But enough of the "historic background," "super-profits."

The second part of the article deals with the economic basis of capitalism, under the heading of "Super-profits." Here the errors are even graver and in much more elementary things. Marxist economics is turned inside out and upside down.

By super-profits Gomers means profits in excess of the average rate of profit. He points out that imperialism yields such excess profits or "super-profits." This is essentially correct, and very important. The understanding of the economics of this profit is excluded by the kind of "peace" to which imperialism, is the understanding of the economics of the exploitation of the oppressed peoples. This makes it all the more important that Gomers' analysis is incomplete, incorrect and anti-Marxist.

The first source of "super-profit" according to Gomers "results from THE GREATLY INCREASED RATE OF EXPLOITATION AS REFLECTED IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CAPITAL STOCK AND, SECOND, IN BACKWARD COUNTRIES, SHOWS MUCH GREATER PROPORTION OF VARIABLE CAPITAL TO CONSTANT CAPITAL." This is, of course, economic nonsense. The rate of exploitation has nothing to do with the composition of capital. Why? Because at times capitalists who employ more workers to calculate the rate of exploitation on the total capital invested. The

rate of exploitation is the proportion of the unpaid labor to the total labor performed by a worker. The proportion of capital invested as constant or fixed does not enter into its calculation.

The essence of imperialist exploitation is found in the use of a cheap labor force, a low living standard among the workers, inhumanly long hours, inhumanly low wages, dispossession of the backward lands, and forced labor. All of these which form the essence of imperialist exploitation, make it the brutal thing it is and explain the revolt of the colonies, Morocco, etc. mentioned in the four enumerated points. Some of the other points are incorrectly stated, and other important factors are omitted, but this analysis will be prolonged unduly if I analyze the economic section of Gomers' article any further.

"Workers, Subject Peoples and the Revolution." Subject Peoples and the Revolution." The questions here considered are of a tactical, political nature, therefore vital for the action and "practical conclusions" of the Bolshevik party. Again there is lamentable confusion and even a false tactic.

Gomers discusses, citing Bakhrin (in his battle with Boris—the latter is mine) and drawing on Lenin, the corruption that is engendered in the labor movement by imperialism and "practical conclusions" of the Bolshevik party. Again there is lamentable confusion and even a false tactic.

Gomers discusses, citing Bakhrin (in his battle with Boris—the latter is mine) and drawing on Lenin, the corruption that is engendered in the labor movement by imperialism and "practical conclusions" of the Bolshevik party. Again there is lamentable confusion and even a false tactic.

Of course, it is possible that Gomers meant to write "former" in place of "latter," but even if that is so the correction must be made. Moreover, the passage in question sins terribly by omission as well as by inclusion. The masses must be kept in mind, not only not directly from the beginning, but precisely from these corrupted leaders and their error in trade union policy—the omission of the necessity of struggle against the corrupted leadership.

Lenin advocates a more precise and precisely because he comprehended that they were bought by a share of the profits. But Gomers, quoted by Lenin, "labor leaders" of the capitalist class. "If Gomers actually meant that the words appear to say the passage is even further wrong implies that the corrupted leaders of the class can be won to fight against the imperialist class. It is an illusion to expect that fostering an illusion in the masses, that they break with the bosses, it is not with the hope of winning them, but as a means to expand them and annihilating their strategy.

Follows a return to the economic theory in the sentence: "By the export of capital (super-profits) the capitalists have unwittingly helped to build up a private industry in the subject countries by its own . . . bourgeoisie. . . . Of course, incorrect. The export of capital, which is not a part of capital, is not a part of capital." (Continued on page 7)

A Reply to Wolfe's Uncritical "Critique" by Manuel Gomez

ACCORDING to Comrade Wolfe, my article on Labor and Empire in the July number of the Workers Monthly is replete with errors. It is as if there was no polemical discussion under way at the time he might, of course, have written and talked to me about it, and tried to convince me to correct my point of view in detail in the succeeding number of the magazine. In any case he might have had no article to write—and besides, he would perhaps say, "This is not the way that a Communist organ (even a would-be Marxist-Leninist one) corrects the errors committed in one of its articles."

Comrade Wolfe rushes to the attack. To those who have not read my article, he seeks to give the impression that I am not only an ignorant and an eclectic, but also a social-democratic apologist for imperialism, with secret leanings toward Hague conference pacifism. He does not scruple to make use of insinuation, deliberate misquotations and fallacious arguments. For these reckless spiteful acts, for these reckless insinuations, for this article itself is sufficient refutation, representing a full attempt to arouse American workers to the necessity of active alliance with the exploited peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies for the overthrow of American imperialism.

It is with the doctrinal inadequacies of Comrade Wolfe's criticism that I shall deal here.

At the outset I want to say that I should have been more direct and a better if less pompous and pretentious critic of my article. The article was, in a sense, a work in a new field; it was, so far as I know, the first attempt to give the Leninist conception of imperialism a wider practical application to American class struggle by showing the effects of imperialism upon the American working class as well as on the subject peoples. For this reason, a detailed explanation of the mechanics of super-profit in the American empire was essayed, together with the mechanics of the relationship of the super-profit retained by the capitalists and the poisonous "class collaboration" policy in American unions. I also pointed out the connection between super-profit and the role of the American capitalist party. Many of these things had been dealt with before, some of them in much greater detail, but nowhere had they been brot into direct juxtaposition in an article on imperialism. This I conceive to be one of the most important tasks of our party in the struggle against imperialism. We do not direct our articles on imperialism written in English to the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, but to the American working class. And it is essential not only to make the American workers realize that American imperialism exists, by printing long lists of vital statistics (this is also of great importance), but to make them realize how imperialism bears their fight. I do not claim any basic originality for this article. It is simply an adaptation of the these on national and colonial questions adopted at the second congress of the Communist International. I have drawn freely for material upon widely-known writings of Lenin, Bukharin, Zinoviev, Stalin, and Pavlovitch. Practically all of the information on "class collaboration" is taken from the little pamphlet by Comrade Browder, which is undoubtedly the most authoritative work in its specific field. Yet the article was in many respects pioneering. Better articles on the same subject with more tabulated, but somewhat superficial, statistics as all of them are tabulated here:

(1.) That by intense exploitation of subject peoples under the conditions of imperialism, the capitalist

derive a super-profit which becomes the basis of imperialist relations.

(2.) That as a result of this the capitalists are able to continue the system of wage slavery in the home countries of imperialism.

(3.) That imperialism thus becomes a burden not only upon the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, but upon the workers in the developed countries as well, whose conditions moreover become worse and worse as the race for super-profit becomes hotter.

(4.) That the American workers are therefore obliged to struggle energetically to retain even their hard-won gains of the past.

(5.) That a section of the working class, including the trade union bureaucracy and the privileged workers, refuse to take part in the struggle and actually betrays it, having been won over to the bourgeoisie thru a share in the super-profit.

(6.) That sharing directly in the spoils of empire, these corrupted labor elements have a vested interest in the fastest expansion and become conscious, unscrupulous accomplices in the enslavement of subject peoples.

(7.) That super-profits are also the basis for social-democratic pacifism, whose appeal is made to the aristocracy of labor.

(8.) That while the socialists, the Communists do not base their policies on a privileged group but on the needs of the broad masses, which require increasing struggle against capitalist exploitation and imperialism.

(9.) That while the reactionary officials of the trade unions (the bureaucracy) are cynical traitors to the working class and must be gotten rid of, some sections of the labor aristocracy as such (the better-paid, highly skilled workers) can and must be won away from collusion with the bosses and to fight for their own ultimate class interests side by side with the rest of the workers.

(10.) That the theory of super-profit is thus a strong weapon in our hands against the labor bureaucracy and the socialists, and against the imperialist policy of the bourgeoisie, an instrument which enables us to establish a connection between the industrial proletariat in this country and the national liberation movements in the countries under the heel of American imperialism.

(11.) That the American workers must take the lead to establish a fighting alliance with the peoples of America's colonies and semi-colonies.

THESE are the propositions that I Comrade Wolfe says are incorrect. He does not prove they are incorrect. He scarcely deals with them at all. Instead, he restates them to suit himself, and then proceeds to attack the entire premises in the A. B. C. of Imperialism, the development of monopoly, the transition from the era of the hegemony of Great Britain to that of the age of the iron and steel industry, the difference between selling railroads and coal, and so on.

Now as to the "peaceful period of imperialism," about which Comrade Wolfe gets very much excited—so much so that he repeatedly misquotes me. This is the main section of Wolfe's "analysis" and it shows him at his worst. There is in it not a trace of understanding of the development of imperialism in its relation to class war, nor any more than the most superficial conception of Lenin's method of considering it.

DEFORE touching upon my critic's misconceptions, however, I am obliged to clear away some false impressions that he endeavors to create in me. In the first place, it is untrue that I said or intimated that imperialism is not warlike; such an intimation would be ridiculous, and is the exact opposite of the point of view expressed in my article. Wolfe quotes me as having used the term "peaceful period of imperialism" and

THE foregoing paragraphs sum up my article on Labor and Empire and give an idea of the persistent widespread ideas of Wolfe's attitude toward it. They do not touch upon the specific points that he tries to make. I shall now take these up one by one, answering them not only in my own words, but by quotations from official documents and recognized leaders of the Comintern.

The analysis begins by ridiculing my statement that the American workers might have already thrown off the whole system of wage-slavery if it were not for the appearance of imperialism.

"Such speculations," says Wolfe, "are un-Marxist and futile. Marx showed that capitalism leads thru accumulation to concentration and centralization of capital. This leads inevitably to monopoly capitalism which is 'the primary economic basis of imperialism.' Thus Comrade Gomez's 'if' partakes of scholastic medieval speculation and is un-Marxist. Now what ground does Comrade Gomez assume that non-imperialist background countries imply a victory of the proletariat?"

WOLFE ought to know that I do not assume non-imperialist backward countries imply a victory of the proletariat—albeit in the present, imperialist epoch, the overthrow of capitalism in even a "backward" country would be such a victory, and if Wolfe does not understand this his ignorance is worthy of a scolding by Leninist theory. What I was concerned with was to show how capitalism was prolonged thru imperialism. This historical example, serving as an introduction to the proposition that imperialism is the backbone of wage-slavery today. Whether or not my use of broadness was un-Marxist and un-Leninist, I leave for the reader to judge after comparing it with the somewhat contentions of these on the national and colonial questions at the second congress of the Comintern, presented by Comrade Lenin himself.

"But for the extensive colonial possessions acquired for the sale of some raw products and as a source of raw materials for over-greiving industries, the capitalist structure of England would have collapsed under its own weight long ago."

Will Comrade Wolfe have the temerity to say that the "but" in this extract is a part of scholastic medieval speculation and not of Marxism?

My critic will no doubt reply that the conditions in England were quite different from those in the United States, but that does not alter the question of the allowability of hypothesis. Moreover, Comrade Wolfe does not give my original statement intact. In my article I did not speak of the United States alone, but of England, France and the other capitalist countries of Europe (in many the same form as the above quotation from Lenin's theses), at the same part of a "particular country could not be but profoundly influenced by the general development."

Now as to the "peaceful period of imperialism," about which Comrade Wolfe gets very much excited—so much so that he repeatedly misquotes me. This is the main section of Wolfe's "analysis" and it shows him at his worst. There is in it not a trace of understanding of the development of imperialism in its relation to class war, nor any more than the most superficial conception of Lenin's method of considering it.

DEFORE touching upon my critic's misconceptions, however, I am obliged to clear away some false impressions that he endeavors to create in me. In the first place, it is untrue that I said or intimated that imperialism is not warlike; such an intimation would be ridiculous, and is the exact opposite of the point of view expressed in my article. Wolfe quotes me as having used the term "peaceful period of imperialism" and

he places an exclamation point after the misquotation. No such phrase appeared anywhere in my article. What I did say was: "The climax of the war would be reached by the outbreak of a far different from the period of 'peaceful development' which characterizes them not only in the peaceful period but in the struggle to obtain super-profit is something quite different from a 'peaceful period of imperialism.' As the reader will see further on. But where Wolfe has played the most foul is in the important matter of date; by taking two statements of mine out of their context and placing them in unnatural association, he arrives at the following monstrous distortion:

"The 'peaceful period of capitalism' in the United States, Gomez dates from 1894 to the world war. It is not an international phenomenon."

AND this, when I expressly stated that early period of storm and stress of European capitalism culminated in 1871. The period of development in the United States came "later and in a necessarily modified fashion," along in the same paragraph I remain in the same period called "peaceful period of capitalism" (which everywhere followed the period of storm and stress as an international phenomenon.)

To anyone reading the paragraph without deliberate perverseness of intention, the meaning is plain. No one who has seen any of my articles on imperialism—Wolfe least of all—could honestly believe that I date the so-called "peaceful period" of world capitalism from 1894 to the world war.

But I must admit that I cannot agree with Comrade Wolfe's date. "By the 'peaceful period,'" he says, "is meant that period roughly included in the second and third quarters of the 19th century when the first wars for capitalist national unity were generally at an end (the so-called 'peaceful period')." In the second and third quarters of the 19th century occurred the revolutionary springing of 1830-31, 1848-50, 1861 and 1871, and of 1871-72, 1850, 1859, 1864, 1866 and 1870. The period between 1848 and 1871 brot in great wars in Europe, Hungary, Germany. Incidentally, the years 1848-71 marked the peak of the activity of the International Workingmen's Association, the First International, which could hardly be said to reflect a peaceful epoch of capitalism.

THE second and third quarters of the 19th century—the middle years of the century, that is, are revolutionary and not "peaceful." They are so characterized by Comrade Bukharin, who points out that a new period did not set in until later. In his report on the Question for a Program for the Communist International adopted at the fourth congress of the C. I. (November 18, 1922), he says:

"Following the revolutionary period of the middle of the century, an entirely different historic epoch, in the development of the capitalist system set in. It was the epoch of the 'peaceful period' of capitalism. This growth was chiefly based upon the colonial policy of the bourgeoisie, whose stupendous development of continental industry which was chiefly stimulated by the exploitation of the colonial peoples. This created a great consistency of interests between the continental bourgeoisie and the continental proletariat which was the basis for a great period of 'peaceful development' tendency manifesting itself within the working class and, ergo, within the capitalist parties."

Comrade Zinoviev, in his great work on "The War and the Crisis of Socialism," declares that "the year 1871 marks the end of the national war and great revolutionary epoch of the man edition, page 23) and this happens also to be the date I assigned to the end of the First International period of storm and stress."

I had more space at my disposal I could show how Wolfe's con-

What is the Russian Communist Party Among Women

By Comrade Nikoloyeva of the Russian Communist Party.

The active element among the non-party working women were organized in such manner that circles were formed for the working women in the workshops and factories. Working women comrades closely connected with the various shops, departments, etc.

Under the rule of the capitalist order, this form of work was the original form of the delegates' system. But since it was not possible at that time to hold delegates' elections in the factories, these circles were so organized as to permit the party nuclei to exercise influence over the masses of working women.

Nucleus Recruiting Center.

The circle was conducted under the leadership of the nucleus. It served to maintain communication between the nucleus and the masses of women workers. It was the recruiting center for gathering together more and more working women. The nucleus of such circles in the factories naturally led to systematic meetings among their organizers, to consistent and systematically conducted work.

Besides this, common meetings of all circles were held from time to time, in order that reports might be heard, a rapprochement made possible between the working women employed in different undertakings, the feeling of solidarity encouraged, and the members of the circles (and with these the broader masses of working women) revolutionized.

The organization of working women correspondents organized by the periodical Rabotnitsa (The Working Woman), an organ published by the Central Committee of the Russian C. P., attained a position of great importance in our sphere of activity, not only for our agitation and propaganda but also at the same time for the organization of the masses of working women. The working women immediately connected with the factories and with the editorial staff of our newspaper were successful in gathering the masses of non-party working women around our paper; they attained by publishing notices, articles, and poems sent by the working women, and by calling upon the women to support their own press organ.

By means of these measures, aided by the trade unions, the educational organizations and the workers' clubs, we were able to so organize and revolutionize the working women under the leadership of the party that the women have taken part in the struggle and in the revolutionary actions entered into by the working class.

A REPLY TO WOLFE'S UNCRITICAL "CRITIQUE"

(Continued from page 6)

ency to monopolize everything and thus to destroy the native bourgeoisie. The revolt against this, as Wolfe says, a basis for the national liberation movements in the colonial countries. But side by side with this tendency is the conflicting tendency to build up capitalism in the colonial countries, which has the result that the native bourgeoisie grows with extraordinary rapidity instead of being destroyed. Here we have one of the fundamental contradictions of imperialist capitalism. Wolfe's failure to comprehend it leads him into the absurdly extravagant statement of his paragraph on the export of capitalists.

All in all, my critic's article shows the work of self-education attached from my article, without an appreciation of the dialectic movement of things. For him the problem of imperialism is a matter of half a dozen simple formulas. I did not read and ticket my article on Labor and Empire with the exact familiar phrases of these formulas, so Comrade Wolfe was destined to display his knowledge of them. Unfortunately, his knowledge of them is rather uncertain and appears to have been gleaned more from a newspaper's Lord Duffin than from Lenin.

In the time during and after the February revolution, when our party was no longer obliged to work illegally, but was able to go forward to realize mass work, the party activity in the women's circles changed in character and was also enabled to advance more and more to class work.

The small circles in the separate factories were now replaced by large groups of women workers, connecting the different workshops and departments with the masses of proletarian women. The Central Committee of our party received further aid through the affiliation of a special commission for conferring on the work to be done among the women. This commission formed at the same time the editorial staff of the periodical Rabotnitsa. It organized the work among the women, and ensured its being carried on under the leadership of the party. At the same time this commission was complemented by Communist women comrades working in the factories and districts.

Women Workers' Meetings.

Besides the women workers' meetings were systematically organized by the groups of active women workers, under the leadership of the nucleus. At first the general meetings of working women in the undertakings in question did not attend these meetings, but after a while, hand in hand with the development of our agitation, and with the increased activity of the active elements among the non-party women workers around our party, they were more widely participated.

The women workers, becoming accustomed to the women workers' mass meetings, now began to attend other meetings, bearing a politically fighting character. Thus for instance in July, 1917, when the party was again forced into illegal activity, slightly meetings were arranged in the name of the Rabotnitsa, the sole Bolshevik press organ left existing, for the purpose of enlightening the masses on the meaning of the events in July, and on the treacherous role played by the monarchist.

We set special groups of working women to the meetings called the mensheviks, to expose the true nature of the menshevik activity. Here we achieved positive results. We proceeded in the same manner at the meetings convoked by the "League for Women's Rights." At this time there was a mighty increase in the number of letters, posters and other propagandist literature. We devoted special attention to our periodicals, and its circulation increased rapidly.

We may claim that the whole of this work was eminently successful. The working women participated in enormous numbers in the street demonstrations in Leningrad on April 21, 1917, and in the June demonstrations. The preparatory work was carried forward not only by the party members but by a large number of non-party working women. Many of these went to the office of the Rabotnitsa to ask how they could best prepare for the coming demonstrations.

Influence Soldiers.

Residing on active agitation and soldiers sent to Petrograd by the provisional government to suppress the Bolsheviks. The forward march of General Kornilov's Petrograd aroused not only the workers, but the working women as well.

Then came the Red October, and with it fresh work. But fresh forces came as well, fresh energies, fresh strivings in the struggle and for the establishment of our workers' and peasants' state. Every working woman gained a mighty field of activity open to her before her. Now she had become a citizen possessing equal rights and now she could participate in the building up of the first workers' and peasants' state.

The party made this clear to many thousands of women workers and peasants. Day by day, and month by month, the party pursued its work of awakening fresh strata of the back-

ward masses of working women. The party had frequently passed resolutions, at its congresses to the effect that the organization of the broad masses of working women is one of the tasks incumbent on the whole party, and the party committees were thus induced to pay special attention to this sphere of work.

Now that the party had extended its influence over certain strata of the non-party working women, it was necessary to convocate conferences, first among the non-party women workers and later among the non-party women workers and peasants. The first of these conferences of non-party women workers took place in Petrograd before the October revolution. About 800 delegates were present, representing 80,000 working women. The conference declared its completely solidarity with the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) in its struggle for the power of the Soviets.

This conference was followed by a number of similar ones in all the industrial cities and districts of Russia. They proved enormous organizational significance. The October revolution faced us with the necessity of perfecting these forms of activity, in order to reach the greatest number of working women every branch of industry, and to organize at the same time the women peasants and other strata of working women.

Work Expands.

The departments already existing for work among the women were now developed into integral parts of the party apparatus, employing paid comrades. Up to this time, in the first and second periods, none of the comrades carrying on this work were paid, except the comrade responsible for editing the newspaper. The whole of the members of the lower party apparatus performed their duty for nothing, as a part of their duty as members of the party. Now, however, a central apparatus was formed and affiliated to the Central Party Committee, and special organs were provided for the lower party organizations. Every factory nucleus, and every Volost nucleus (rural district cell) appointed a special organizer for work among the women workers and peasants, and among the workers in other strata of the population. In every factory and village delegates' meetings of working and peasant women were organized, the delegates being however so "inner volunteers," but elected.

Systematic conferences were now held among the women organizers, and the question of training suitable comrades for this work arose. Work among the women could now be carried on in complete harmony with the tasks confronting the party and the Soviet power.

Active in Red Army.

Thus for instance the working and peasant women aided the Red Army during the civil war, took part in the sappers' work, took part in the ambulance divisions, participated in the defense of towns, and performed every possible description of work. The actual participation of the working and peasant women in the building up of the state became a reality, 40,000 peasant women became members of the village Soviets, thousands of working women worked in the city Soviets. Many hundreds of working and peasant women distinguished themselves not only in the civil war, but in every kind of civil service. Even the working women, once enslaved and oppressed for centuries, brought forth from their midst a considerable number of energetic women, capable of active participation in the constructive work of the Soviet power.

Millions of working and peasant women are represented by hundreds of thousands of women's delegates. The organized cadres of working and peasant women gathered around the Communist Party grew from year to year. The number of our workers' party members grows in proportion. The development of the institutions

actualizing the emancipation of working women, the abolition of illiteracy and the uplift of the cultural and political level of the broad masses of working and peasant women, are winning millions of these women for the social and political life of our country, and for the constructive work of the Union of Soviet Republics.

In this sphere of work the Party is following faithfully in the footsteps of Lenin.

AN UNLENINIST ANALYSIS OF IMPERIALISM

(Continued from page 2)

unwittingly creates a native bourgeoisie. On the contrary, it tends to destroy it. Again Comrade is confusing the export of commodities with the export of capital. Again the economic error implies a grave political one. The export of capital creates a native bourgeoisie, but such native bourgeoisie would welcome imperialism and its gifts. But the export of capital destroys the native bourgeoisie by competition, by absorption, by monopoly concessions and by use of force—precisely for this reason, the native bourgeoisie fights against imperialism and is a potential ally in the struggle for national liberation which gives the proletariat its allies in the struggle with finance-imperialist capitalism.

Who does not understand the economic fact in question will not understand the political correlation expressed in these on imperialism of the Comrade—and will not be able to utilize, as we would do, the national bourgeois revolutionary movements as potential allies in the struggle against capitalist imperialism, the final stage of capitalism.

John Lassen

By SIMON FELSHIN.

There was none gettin'—
With a pleassantry in the last hour.

He fought to breathe,
But with an slight a frame
He lost to death.

He wished so little for himself,
And yet he was taken,
That is the way of the world.

His pen was a weapon
Against all the oppressors.

Though slight of frame
He shunned to rest.
Even a little rest
From the heaviest tasks.

He was a fighter—
One who does not surrender
Nor even falter.

He fought in two continents,
For which he was thanked
By all the oppressors.

His pen was not for sale,
Self was forgotten
For the holy cause
Of all the oppressed.

Japanese Textile Workers Slow Up As Blacklist Protest

NEW YORK, Aug. 21.—Textile trade reports from Kobe, Japan, state that woolsen textile workers of Nippon Keori Kaisha at Kagawa, Harima province, are slowing up production because of the employers' discrimination against strikers who were active in the April fight.

The strike was over the attempted introduction of a "profit-sharing" scheme by the management. The strike on the job by slowing up work is continuing because the company refused to take back strike leaders prosecuted in the Himeji court after the workers were not convicted and despite previous promises of the employers that all workers would be restored their jobs.

The Crisis in Britain Postponed

When Comrade Foster and Cannon were in England on their way to the enlarged Executive Meeting of the Communist International, they asked the Communist Party of Britain to assign a representative to supply the DAILY WORKER with a weekly review of the situation in Britain.

Thomas Bell, editor of the Communist Review, who is a member of the party, has since written the first article of this weekly series. This feature will insure our readers that the very critical and interesting situation in Britain will be accurately and authoritatively covered.

LONDON.—By Mail—Special—The coal strike which has dominated the political situation here for weeks is postponed. The mine owners have accepted the government proposals for an "exhaustive inquiry" backed up by the substantial inducement of a subsidy. No details are available yet as to the terms of the subsidy, but authorities estimate it at no less than ten million pounds in not less than a period of the truce. There is, of course, the usual howl in certain sections of the press against the "hold-up of the nation" to ransom, and the home secretary has even brot in his King Charles' head, Comrade Zinoviev. The one definite fact, which emerges from the crisis is the united front of the workers' organizations. This display of solidarity upon a new and large scale undoubtedly forced the government and the mine owners to stay their hand.

It is estimated that the loss incurred during the 1931 strike of three months cost £20,000,000. Evidently, a ten million or even twenty million subsidy is considered cheap in the circumstances, for it should be remembered, this crisis would have involved wider section of the workers than at any time in the history of British labor disputes.

What is interesting for readers of the DAILY WORKER is the shifting of labor's center of political direction. From the beginning the trade unions have retained complete control over the situation. Formerly, the parliamentary labor party was successful in hitting the reins out of the trade union leaders' hands. At the time we had the uncorroborated spectacle of Stephen Walsh (the war minister in the labor cabinet) leading a deputation to Russia. MacDonald deftly manning in the event of a strike, the parliamentary labor party would hold up all business in the home of

commons. And Ramsay MacDonald didn't read them any lecture in the beneficence of parliamentary or constitutional action, such as he is forever reading to the Communist, but respectfully promised to put the matter before the party.

It is also interesting to note that J. H. Thomas stated the direction to the transport workers not to move any coal.

While the dispute so far has been distinct though for direct action, and labor leaders in Communist, by taking out membership cards in the Communist Party it would be a mistake to read into events a definite political challenge to the government of capitalism. Neither Herbert Smith or Arthur Cook are prepared to push their victory to its logical conclusion, and call for the abolition of the "Fogers" government. They are not even insistent upon nationalization. They simply stick to the economic demand for a "British" with nationalization as a platitude.

But there is certain to be trouble ahead. When Mr. Baldwin told the miners that he would call the other workers to the aid of the British coal, he meant it. The dilemma before British industrialism before the bourgeoisie is to go in for a cut in wages.

The markets in Italy, Belgium, Germany and France, to mention but a few of the more important ones, are generally closed for British coal. In addition to reparations cost the developments of electricity and oil as fuel in Italy dispenses with the former demand for British coal. Germany is using millions of tons of lignite to meet her own demands, while fulfilling her coal and coke obligations under the Versailles treaty. Belgium and France are also funding reparations dues an offset for British coal.

We can, therefore, only surmise that the retreat of the British mine owners and the government is a method for raising time. Faced with an unexamined unity of the workers and sections like the engineers and railwaymen also negotiating. It is obvious that an attempt will be made to split the ranks and tie up the sections with separate agreements.

One remarkable feature of events is the emergence of the Communist Party into the top. The party has blamed the miners' leaders for not having any positive program to put forward, and allowing the mine owners to choose the ground for the fight. It has demanded the maintenance of the seven hour day, the main-

tenance of the existing agreement and nationalization of the mines. It urged the miners to go to the general council of the T. V. C. and get it to involve the railwaymen, Communist workers in the sympathetic strike. The increased demand for the Workers Weekly in the mining areas is proof of the party's increased prestige and influence.

A big strike has taken place in the West Riding of Yorkshire, with Bradford at its center. In 1930, 1931 and 1932 have struck work against a threatened reduction in wages. It is curious that England should be going through a mining and textile crisis at a time when you in America are on the verge of disputes in similar industries. The woolen manufacturers here complain of the invasion of markets, hitherto monopolized by Yorkshire, by Italian, French and Dutch-made men's wares. These latter now sell freely in the London and provincial markets.

As usual the only way out for the bosses is a cut in wages. However, the textile workers are putting up a stiff fight, and the result is the success of the miners' solidarity.

The party is active in organizing the workers. Many meetings are being called under auspices of the party and the miners' movement. The party has issued a manifesto to the workers to stand firm, and has sent out a delegation into the area of the dispute to assist the strikers.

This week-end concludes the Empire Labor Conference called by the parliamentary labor party. It is the first of its kind having delegates from Australia, Africa, British Guiana, Ireland, Canada, India, etc. What the purpose of the conference was how plain to be seen, since its conclusion no resolutions or amendments were permitted. Interruptions, such as when the Indian Mahan Lal, challenged MacDonald for his conduct during his ministry were impermissibly glossed over and ignored. Some idea of the purpose of the conference may be gleaned from the questionnaire prepared for the delegates on their attitude to the metropolis in the event of war, and on an invasion of colonial territory. It is obvious that Mr. MacDonald is trying to find the weakest link in the chain of empire labor parties in order to formulate his colonial and foreign policy next time in accordance with the wishes of his bourgeois masters. MacDonald has declared for the unity and integrity of the empire (the not on a

basis of equality, for he would still deny India self-government. It still remains the best bulwark against Communism and social revolution.

On Saturday the 24th of July, under direction of the Executive Committee and London district called together a conference of all local labor organizations in London to discuss the situation in the mining and textile areas. Sixteen delegates from 144 delegates turned up representing over 100 trade union branches, trades council, local labor parties, cooperative women's societies, etc. The conference marks a distinct success for our party in London. The conference sent a delegation to the Empire Labor Conference to demand the declaration of the right to Indian independence and separation from the empire. The delegation was refused admittance and when the latter was not up Ramsay MacDonald simply moved back business. It was announced as a shock to the labor bourgeoisie to think that such a large and active conference could be openly called by the Communist Party and attended by twenty to thirty local labor parties.

The Labor Party Conference this year promises to be a bit lively. The question of the exclusion of the Communist Party will be in the front. It will be remembered that last year our comrades declared from the floor of the conference that notwithstanding the vote of the Communist Party, we would still be stronger than ever. This is actually happening. Over 74 branches of trade unions, local labor parties, local and provincial labor parties are sending resolutions in support of the Communist party.

Following upon the conference last year special sub-committees were appointed to inquire into the operation of clause 2, which excluded Communists as delegates. Notwithstanding the vote of the conference, it is impossible to see, the Executive Committee are going to show how they intend to carry out clause 2. It is probable that they will recommend to trade unions and recommend to Communist when selecting delegates to labor conferences.

You should know that there is a standing order which says that no question upon which a decision has been taken may be raised for three years unless with the consent of the Executive Committee. Nevertheless, C. P. affiliation keeps coming up each time in greater and greater volume. This is the case with the Iron and Steel Trade Union, which moves to rescind all previous resolutions against the Communist Party.

Letters from Our Readers

What Ails The American Workers?
To the DAILY WORKER:—In a statement before the institute of politics of Williamstown, W. J. Castle of the state department, pronounced once again the American people who Coolidge objects to the Soviets and is opposed to the territorial rights of Soviet government of Russia. He attacked the Soviet as an "inficer of war." Soviet Russia who has just renounced all the territorial rights and claims of the old czarist government, "an inficer of war."

The revolutionary workers of the world have proclaimed that the exploitation of workers, which represses children by a clique of selfish, greedy, parasitic individuals is an improper, unjust and immoral, which represses only one class, the working class, with no exploiting parasites and to which class all territorial rights are welcome without distinction of race or color.

The Russian workers have accordingly abolished the old antiquated capitalist morality in favor of this high standard of justice, which represses only one class, the working class, with no exploiting parasites and to which class all territorial rights are welcome without distinction of race or color.

The Russian workers have fought valiantly and many paid with their lives.

The Workers' Soviet government is the most stable government in the

world, at present, barring none. The oil army is alert and ready to repel all attacks against the Soviet Union. And the red army has the solid and active backing of the workers and conscientious workers in every country of the globe.

That much is certain, but at any rate, it is in the interests of humanity as a whole, Soviet Russia as well as the rest of the world that normal relations be established and free trade resumed. Our industry is in a state of depression. Many of our factories are shut down, with the warehouses overflowing because of lack of markets. The Russian market could have absorbed a great part of our output of manufactured articles, agricultural implements, locomotives, steel products and machinery, if we had resumed normal intercourse with Soviet Russia. Even as our trade with Russia is restricted because of the abnormal conditions, it is in the interests of the present conditions, it is in the interests of the New York Times that the All-Russian Textile Syndicate has purchased this year about 100,000 worth of cotton alone from the United States. One could imagine then to what enormous extent our exports of all kinds would have grown from free trade and more favorable relations with Soviet Russia.

The official report of the British

Trade Union delegation to Soviet Russia, states: That transportation, industry and agriculture are steadily improving and that the finances of the Soviet Union have been placed on a stable basis.

The Franco-Belgian, German and Swedish labor delegations to Soviet Russia are all united in unanimous praise of the heroic struggle of the workers and their unlimited triumph.

The reports of the workers' delegations to the Soviet Union give the picture graphically to the Green, the Lawless and the other fathers of the A. F. of L. But will the rank and file of American labor allow these fathers to carry on forever? Have they any self-respect? Can they still swallow the craven calumnies about the Soviet Union of nearly all the European workers' delegations' reports?

It is high time that American labor should send its own Delegation to Soviet Russia and learn for themselves the real facts and conditions in the working country.

A country of 100,000,000 is being run by the workers themselves. It is worthwhile studying and may come in handy some day.—Charles Golsman.

Corruption in Michigan.
Detroit, Mich.
Editor the DAILY WORKER:
I wonder we have Ben Cillow cases in

America. A country where such an organization as the Ku Klux Klan can exist is surely in a bad way. Under such conditions we can expect such decisions as those made by the supreme court. This decision is a rank for even Justice Holmes and Chief Justice we find it suits traitors like Berger.

A few days ago I was told of a case which illustrates the rottenness of our capitalist politics. A man named Fitzgerald was appointed about a year ago by Governor Cresswell to a position in the state office building at Lansing. His salary is \$4,000.00 per annum.

His title is Business Manager of the Highway Department to which occupies the fourth floor of the building. He has theoretical duties which he has not the ability or experience to fulfill. But outside of this important duty is to get rid of the Growsack element. If an opposition party could gain power they would cure of course do the same.

Fraternally,
Civil Engineer.

GARY, IND., ATTENTION!
The DAILY WORKER, Workers Monthly, Robotnicka Tribuna and Novy Mir are for sale at the Workers' Co-operative Restaurant, 172 Broadway.