

"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, 1925 290

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 a 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 their national freedom and self-determination and equality in international relationship; 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 Paris conference was, 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 for a moment shone over China like a ray of hope that vanished all too soon; then at last, the establishment of the Soviet government, which thru a prolonged struggle conquered its right to an existence worthy of it, the Soviet government with its policy of equality with regard to China just as in regard to other countries, and the renunciation of unequal treaties by the Soviet republics.

Disillusionment of Chinese.

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 sad 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,

ages, 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

shone the same beautiful words for which China is fighting today: Liberty, fraternity, equality! Take, for instance, the case of Italy or America; theirs was not an 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 model. 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 conclude my speech, I may venture to draw an example from the medical life. 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.

In itself, 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 causes, would be but a poor physician indeed. By mistaking 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 a new paroxysm of 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 causes. The events in China are most complex; still, 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 relationship with all the world are on their way to infallible realization.

Whatever the way, whether it be by following the example of Italy, America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, or again, any new ways to be found by the Chinese people themselves—I am confident that the day is not far off when China will establish really good and friendly relations with all the countries 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, Lepse. 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, no small part in the acute 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 our influence on the national revolutionary movement in China. There is no denying it, and I do believe that the policy 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 that propaganda which is so frequently and yet so groundlessly spoken of, but in the simple, the more efficient and stronger fact, which was so ably and correctly pointed out to 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 every step in our relations with this country.

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

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 desired as long as there exist the unequal treaties. Nor is any lasting and serious improvement in the situation possible until and unless some issue be found from that vicious circle.

China Must Struggle.

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

An Un-Leninist Analysis of Imperialism By Bertram D. Wolfe

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

THE article, "Labor and Empire," written by Manuel Gomez in the Anti-Imperialist (July, 1925) Number of the WORKERS MONTHLY, purports to contain a theoretical analysis of the historic background of imperialism, its economics and its political 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 un-Marxian and un-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 Communist (and hence Marxist-Leninist) organ; because its author 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 general analysis of the theoretical basis of imperialism in the anti-imperialist number of a would-be Marxist-Leninist organ and therefore its errors cannot be left uncorrected. Nor would a mere "correct" analysis in the August issue, without reference to the article of Gomez, be adequate, as that would leave undisturbed the errors already absorbed in the minds of many readers. Moreover, that is not the way that a Communist organ corrects the 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 were not for the appearance of imperialism." Such speculations 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 not of Marxism. Moreover, there is no justification for the conclusion, even allowing the premises. Countries that have not developed monopolistic finance capitalism are "backward countries." On what ground does Comrade Gomez 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 Gomez's "if" hypothesis implies.

"The Peaceful Period of Capitalism."

This is Leninist phraseology, but Comrade Gomez gets his dates, or rather, his periods, mixed. The "peaceful period of capitalism" in the United States Gomez dates from 1894 to the world war. This, he adds, is an international phenomenon. In another part of the article he even speaks of the "peaceful period of imperialism (!)"

The truth of this "historical" matter is that the peaceful period of capitalism ends precisely where imperialism begins. By the "peaceful" period is meant that period roughly included in the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century when the first wars for capitalist unity were generally at an end (the so-called national wars) and when capitalism was based on the production of consumption commodities as its typical industry, and when liberalism, "free trade and Jeremy Bentham" prevailed in economic practice 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 industry textiles. The climax of this period is roughly from 1840 to 1880.

It was a peaceful period because the "struggle for markets" with textile products as the typical export, does not require spheres of influence, colonies, the intervention of states and armies, etc., but merely quantity production, cheapness and good salesmanship. To sell red flannel underwear to equatorial savages, it is not necessary to own the country, to bribe its government, to subsidize a revolution or to pry a colony loose from its mother country by war. A German firm can sell red flannel 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 textiles continue to be the basic ones, there is no great need of colonies, spheres of influence, etc.

"Colonies," says the imperialist-minded Disraeli in 1852, "are just millstones around our necks." From 1840 to 1860 and even later bourgeois politicians of the liberal school were in the saddle and opposed any colonial aggressiveness on the part of England itself, the characteristic colonizing country.

But the last quarter of the nineteenth century is characterized by the change from "light" to "heavy" basic industries—that is to say, from textiles to metallurgy. 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 and colonial wars.

A typical form of exported "metal product" is a railway. A railway cannot be sold to an equatorial savage by a salesman and a missionary. It can only be "sold" to a backward country thru political influence or control of that country's government. A railroad, to begin with, runs at a financial loss on the basis of its net returns, above all in a country backward industrially. To make it profitable, the government of the backward country must (1) grant a concession of the right of way (2) an exclusive monopoly to that right of way, eliminating parallel lines as a possibility; and (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.

Thus begins the scramble for concessions and spheres of influence, for colonies and protectorates, for governments "friendly to foreigners" and governments friendly exclusively to American or British or German or French capital, and all the other sources of imperialist wars and slaughters 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 export of capital. In other words, the warlike period of capitalism, in the Leninist sense, begins when Gomez 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 conference" illusions on the one hand, and with the psychology instilled by imperialist apologists 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 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, do 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 robber imperialism is no less warlike because its victories were easier. Germany, in 1885, seized German East Africa, in 1897 German Southwest Africa, New Guinea, Kamerun and Samoa. In 1899, Kuiu-Chau.

France in 1885 occupied the Congo, in 1895 appropriated Madagascar, in 1904 Morocco (cause of the crisis of 1905 which was of world-war magnitude), 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 Gomez (and it might be multiplied) how about the Spanish-American war of 1898 for Cuba, Porto Rico, the Philippines and the control of the Caribbean? How about the English-Boer war? The Boxer war of the combined powers against China? The Russo-Japanese war for spheres of influence in Manchuria, Korea and China? The Italo-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 causes, and makes the wars against yellow and brown and black-skinned races no wars at all (or "peaceful" wars). In other words, it is an unconscious reflection of pacifist illusion and imperialist apologetics.

Gomez, in his "historical background" takes the strikes of 1870 to 1894 in the United States as an evidence that up till 1894 there was a warlike period and after 1894 a peaceful period. This, of course, has nothing to do with Leninist analysis of imperialism although Lenin is dragged in and quoted. The strike epidemic in question was due to the world commercial crisis of the period. The relative "class peace" 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 not this kind of "peace" to which the Lenin quotation on "peaceful period" refers.

The Gomez confusion in the article goes so far as to say that "It (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." "Superprofits."

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

By "superprofits" Gomez means profits in excess of the average rate of profit. He points out that imperialism yields such excess profits or "superprofits."

This is essentially correct, and very important. The understanding of the economics of this profit in excess of the average rate, that is yielded by imperialism, is the understanding of the economics of the exploitation of the oppressed peoples. This makes it all the more unfortunate that Gomez's analysis is incomplete, incorrect and anti-Marxian.

The first source of "super-profit" according to Gomez "results from THE GREATLY INCREASED RATE OF EXPLOITATION AS REFLECTED IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE CAPITAL EMPLOYED, WHICH, IN BACKWARD COUNTRIES, SHOWS A MUCH GREATER PROPORTION OF VARIABLE CAPITAL TO CONSTANT." (Emphasis mine.)

This is, of course, economic nonsense. The rate of exploitation has nothing to do with the composition of capital, altho vulgar economy at times tries to calculate the rate of exploitation on the total capital invested. The

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

The essence of imperialist exploitation is found in the use of a cheap and docile labor supply, a low living standard among the backward people, inhumanly long hours, inhumanly low wages, dispossessing of the backward peoples from the land, 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 China, Morocco, etc., from the imperialist yoke, are not mentioned in the four enumerated points. Some of the other points are incorrectly stated, and other important factors are omitted, but this article will be prolonged unduly if I analyze the economic section of Gomez's article any further.

"Workers, Subject Peoples and the Revolution."

Passing over other errors of a minor nature, I jump to the end of the article. The last section is called "Workers, Subject Peoples, and the Revolution." The questions here considered are of a tactical, political nature and therefore vital for the action and "practical conclusions" for a Bolshevik party. Again there is lamentable confusion and even a false tactical position.

Gomez discusses, citing Bukharin (in his battle with Boris—the alteration is mine) and drawing on Lenin, the corruption that is engendered in the labor movement by imperialism which is able to bribe leaders and even whole sections of the "aristocracy of labor" with some part of the enormous profits, and thus win them to class collaboration and support of imperialism. This is correct, as is the position of Gomez that this corruption must be fought and an effort must be made to win away the "aristocracy" of labor from class collaboration. But the vagueness of the passage and the failure to draw a distinction between corrupted leaders and labor aristocracy leads to this lamentable sentence in which the two are unconsciously merged and illusions fostered on the possibility of winning the corrupted leadership. Here is the sentence:

"While we fight to win the masses away from the leadership of these corrupted elements, we must endeavor to break the LATTER away from the bosses and draw them more and more into the struggle. It is in unceasing struggle that the hope of the working class lies."

Of course, it is possible that Gomez 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 what is stated. The masses must be broken away, not only nor directly from the bosses, but precisely from these corrupted leaders. This is a fundamental error in trade union policy—the omission of the necessity of struggle against this corrupted leadership. Lenin advocated it all his life, and precisely because he comprehended that they were bought by a share of imperialist profits and were objectively, to use a DeLeonite phrase, quoted by Lenin, "labor lieutenants of the capitalist class." If Gomez actually meant what the words appear to say, the passage is even worse for it implies that the corrupted leaders as a class can be won to fight against the bosses, thus fostering an illusion in them. If we demand that they break with the bosses, it is not with the hope of winning them, but as a means of exposing them and annihilating them utterly.

Follows a return to the economic theory in the sentence: "By the export of capital, the capitalists have unwittingly helped to build up a native industry in the subject countries with its own. . . bourgeoisie. . ." This is of course, incorrect. The export of capital, neither wittingly nor

(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. Inasmuch as there was no polemical discussion under way at the time he might, of course, have come upstairs 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; but in that 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 vague conference pacifism. He does not scruple to make use of insinuation, deliberate misquotation, and falsification of facts. For these reckless epithets, my article itself is sufficient refutation, representing as it does an 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 sincerely glad of a better if less pompous and pretentious criticism of my article. The article was, in a sense, pioneer 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 in the American class struggle by showing the effects of imperialism upon the American working class as well as on the subject peoples. For the first time a detailed explanation of the mechanics of super-profit in the American empire was essayed, together with the mechanics of the relationship between the super-profit reaped by the capitalists and the poisonous "class collaboration" policy in American trade unions. I also pointed out the sinister connection between super-profit and the role of the American socialist 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 statistics (altho this also is of vital importance), but to make them realize how imperialism bears they must fight it. I do not claim any basic originality for my article. It is simply an adaption of the theses 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 special field. Yet the article was in many respects pioneering. Better articles on the same subject will certainly be written, but in its fundamental propositions the article is correct as it stands.

AND here I encounter Comrade Wolfe, who declares that all of my basic propositions are incorrect.

What are these propositions? I have set them down plainly in my article, the first six of them tabulated, with numerals precisely 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 mainspring of imperialist relationships.

(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 becomes 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, refuses to take part in the struggle and actually betrays it, having been won over to the bourgeoisie thru a share in the super-profits.

(6.) That, sharing directly in the spoils of empire, these corrupted labor elements have a vested interest in imperialist expansion and become conscious or unconscious 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, unlike the socialists, the Communists do not base their policies on a privileged group but on the needs of the broad masses, which require unceasing struggle against capitalist exploitation and imperialism.

(9.) That, while the reactionary officialdom 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 collaboration with the bosses to fight for their own ultimate class interests side by side with the rest of the workers.

(10.) That the theory of super-profits 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 in establishing a fighting alliance with the peoples of America's colonies and semi-colonies.

THESE are the propositions that 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 give me an elementary school lecture on the A. B. C. of imperialism, the development of monopoly, the transition from the era of the hegemony of the textile industry to the era of the iron and steel industry, the difference between selling railroads and flannel underwear, etc. If my critic did any research work to get this material he might have saved himself the trouble by consulting one of my own articles, entitled, "Lenin and the New Wave of Marxism," which appeared in the March number of the Workers' Monthly, this year. Comrade Wolfe's criticism shows that he does not even perceive what the basic propositions of my article on Labor and Empire are, notwithstanding the fact that they are clearly stated and enumerated. One might read his article thru without having the slightest conception of what I had been writing about. The truth is that he, and the group in our party which he represents, are not deeply interested in the problem of getting the American masses into motion against imperialism but rather in academic generalizations separating theory from action.

THE foregoing paragraphs sum up my article on Labor and Empire and give an idea of the persistent wrong-headedness 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 not of Marxism. On 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—altho 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 conception has nothing in common with Leninist theory. What I was concerned with was to show how capitalist rule 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 hypothesis was un-Marxian and un-Leninist, I leave for the reader to judge after comparing it with the following sentence from the theses 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 her surplus products and as a source of raw materials for her ever-growing industries, the capitalistic structure of England would have been crushed under its own weight long ago."

Will Comrade Wolfe have the temerity to say that the "but" in this sentence "partakes 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 capitalistic countries of Europe (in much the same form as the above quotation from Lenin's theses), at the same time drawing in America which as part of a world system could not help but be profoundly influenced by the general development.

Now as to the "peaceful period of capitalism," 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.

BEFORE touching upon my critic's misconceptions, however, I am obliged to clear away some false impressions that he endeavors to create about my article. In the first place, it is untrue that I said or intimated that imperialism is not war-like; 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 appears anywhere in my article. What I did say was: "The climax of the struggle to obtain super-profits is thus far different from the period of 'peaceful development' which characterized its earlier stages." A peaceful period in the struggle to obtain super-profits is something quite different from a "peaceful period of imperialism," as the reader will see further on. But where Wolfe has played me most foul is in the important matter of dates; 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. This, he adds, is an international phenomenon."

AND this, when I expressly stated that early period of storm and stress of European capitalism culminated around 1871, adding that this development in the United States came "later and in a necessarily modified form." Farther along in the same paragraph I remarked that "the so-called peaceful period of capitalism" (which everywhere followed the period of storm and stress) "was an international phenomenon."

To anyone reading the paragraph without deliberate perverseness of intent, the meaning is quite clear. 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 dates. "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 national wars) . . ."

In the second and third quarters of the 19th century occurred the revolutionary uprisings of 1830-31, 1848-50, 1863 and 1871, and that wars of 1854-55, 1859, 1864, 1866 and 1870. The period between 1848 and 1871 brot into being modern Italy, Hungary, and Germany. Incidentally, the years 1868-71 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, delivered at the fourth congress of the C. I. (November 18, 1922), he says:

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

Comrade Zinoviev, in his great work on "The War and the Crisis of Socialism," declares that "the year 1871 marks the close of the national wars for western and central Europe" (German edition, page 33) and this happens also to be the date I assigned in my article to the end of the first period of storm and stress.

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

(Continued on page 6)

RUSSIA TODAY: Official Report of British Trade

(Continued from Yesterday's Daily Worker)

SYNOPSIS.—The official report of the British trade union delegation to Soviet Russia described the workings of foreign trade, transportation, industry, finance and agriculture in the Soviet Union. The trade union leaders concluded that foreign trade is increasing, and that in agriculture and industry the level of production is being raised. The finances have been placed on a sound basis, the report showed. Harm is being done to England by the absence of full diplomatic relations, the union leaders stated. Schools and universities, and literature, music and opera and the theatre were then discussed. Art collections, censorship, newspapers, wall newspapers, and freedom of the press were explained, with the conclusion that "the results of education are astounding." The report then took up hospitals, welfare work, sanitation, birth control, abortion, cleanliness and housing, rent regulations, family life, and prisons. "The Soviet government is achieving most remarkable results in respect to public health, housing, and the prison system," says the report. Regarding the trade unions and labor conditions, the report states, "The Delegation were much impressed by the position and activities of Trade Unions under the Soviet system."

As to the Government's attitude towards the problem, an interesting light is thrown by the last report to the Congress of Trade Unions (page 255): "In the conditions of economic organization established here and in view of the concentration of the fundamental industries in the hands of the Government, public works are not a sound system for dealing with unemployment. Efforts should rather be directed to the extension of industry."

Unemployment caused an outcrop of small informal Co-operative Craft Societies (artel). Many of these enterprises, such as the very common one of a bakers' artel, were broken up by the Trade Unions. Others again, such as those of tailors and tanners, made good. Of the 73 tailor artels started, most were successful, and some have been taken in to the national industrial organizations. On the whole, however, such artels, when managed solely by the unemployed, failed; and only succeeded when advised and assisted by the Labor Exchanges and the unions. About 5 per cent of the unemployed have found relief in this manner.

Owing to the financial failure of the contributory system of social insurance, it has been very difficult to keep the unemployed in benefit, and only 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. are in regular receipt of this relief.

Unemployment has caused some official inclination towards restricting overtime, but this has found no encouragement from the unions, and overtime is anyhow on the decrease. The average day worked in factories divides out at seven to nine hours, but this does not take into account the six to seven hours to which dangerous trades are restricted, the five hours of those receiving special education, the time off allowed for public duties, the four to six hours of young persons, and the seven hours night shift. The average overtime per month of a worker (other than transport and Don coal) fell from 29.6 hours in 1922 to 25.1 in 1923, and for railway workers from 52 to 22.

That the causes of unemployment in Russia are of a different character from those creating it elsewhere is evident from that fact that the increase of unemployment has been accompanied by an increase of employment. If the total of unemployment is equivalent to a fifth of the industrial population, the total of employed workers is increased by a fifth between August 1st, 1923, and August 1st, 1924. That is to say, the development of industry would have provided employment already for all were it not that a large proportion of the unemployed are unemployable under present conditions and that the improvement in wages and welfare of the town workers has drawn labor from the countryside.

Insurance

One of the first acts of the Revolution was an act for industrial insurance at the cost of the employers, but this was, of course, put an end to by War Communism; for under War Communism workers drew full wages whether the factory worked or not. The whole system was, indeed, based on the State supporting the population, and getting such service as it could in return. Expenditure in public relief and social insurance on a scale such as this soon reached an extravagance that was ruining the State, while the individual was not receiving as much as under the old system. "A noble inspiration, but quite hopeless," is the epitaph pronounced on this policy by a publication of the Commissariat of Social Welfare (Miliutine, 1921).

The New Economic Policy restored social insurance on the usual lines arranged to suit the new needs of time and place. The system at present is:—

- Voluntary rural relief committees, with power to raise a rate. (The State does not contribute, though to some extent controls.)
- Compulsory contributory insurance for all wage-earners.
- State relief for the remainder, together with pensions.

Social Insurance

The system of social insurance will be found in the Labor Code. It covers the usual benefits, including grants, on birth and death, and for "notable service in the Revolution." (For details see Visit to Moscow Insurance Department, page 203.)

The minimum unemployment benefit is one-sixth of the average wage, the normal being one-third, and its maximum period must not be less than six months. Unemployment relief in-

cludes the free use of public services, lighting, heating, water, meals at half cost, one month's rent, and no taxes.

It was intended that the scheme should be financed by contributions from enterprises and employers on scales officially assessed, but these contributions were soon, and still are, hopelessly in arrears. In 1922 only about one-third was paid, and this involved a corresponding reduction of benefits. In 1922 the rate of contributions was reduced from 16 per cent. to 14 per cent. of the sum total of wages, and in 1924 80 per cent. of the contributions on this reduced scale were coming in. The benefits were then improved, in some cases up to par. But even now insurance contributions are still on the whole heavily in arrears, the private enterprises paying best, the Co-operative and leased business next, and the State undertakings least; the latter owing in December, 1924, as much as over two millions. So this sick benefit fund and the medical benefit fund have been in difficulties and borrowing from the other funds, and on an average unemployment benefit is still only 60 per cent of the minimum budget, which is itself 50 per cent. below average real wages. Sick benefit has lately been raised to 100 per cent. of wages, but chronic invalids only get half-benefits. Malingering is much complained of. The total number of insured workers was in 1923 5,250,000, and in 1924 over 5,500,000, organized under 870 funds. Fund Committees are elected by conferences of factory delegates.

The Central Insurance Department controls 6,200 beds and numerous sanatoria, which in 1923 took in 30,000 cases. One of the best features of social welfare in Russia is that of the rest houses, or hotels for workers' holidays. Over 85,000 were so accommodated by the Central Committee in 1923, and the provincial committees have their own as well. Collective agreements now in many cases require the employer, as in Germany, to provide such holiday homes. The Trade Unions have their own unemployment insurance, with very varying rates and regulations.

Labor Inspection

The most unusual feature in Russian labor inspection is the staff of inspectors appointed by the Inter-Trade Union Councils, who work in connection with the Communist "nuclei" for the education of the worker. Besides these elected inspectors, there are technical inspectors and sanitary inspectors, appointed as elsewhere, by the Administration. It seems likely that the "elected" inspectors will in time be replaced by officials, as has already been the case with the inspectors for the protection of children at first organized by the Young Communists. But as yet the more important work is done by the Trade Union inspectors.

The number of elected inspectors was so high at one time as to suggest that their functions were political as well as industrial. This impression is strengthened by the large proportion of Communists and of workers, the former as high as 77.8 per cent. in 1919, and the latter 75 per cent. But during 1922 the number has been reduced from 1,150 to 808, and higher qualifications required; while the proportion of Communists fell to 63.3 per cent. and non-partisans rose from 11 per cent. to 34.8 per cent. Of the technical inspectors 70 per cent. have a higher technical education and considerable experience.

The results of this inspection were 6.3 prosecutions per 100 inspections in the last quarter of 1923 in Government factories, 6.5 in Co-operatives, and 42.3 in private. These figures suggest that inspection has concerned itself so far more particularly with private enterprises. During the same period they investigated 171,095 offenses as to overtime and 3,018 as to under age. The demands of the technical inspector as to improvements and so forth were carried out in proportion of 67 per cent. But their reports show that on the technical side the equipment for safeguarding machinery leaves much to be desired. From a sanitary point of view, energetic education of the workers has produced a remarkable improvement.

General Conclusion

The Delegation find that labor regulation in the U. S. S. R. is a practical compromise presenting features that are interesting and instructive. Evils, such as unemployment, strikes, etc., though they exist in Russia, are not there, as elsewhere, essential to the system of employment.

CHAPTER III

Wages

Wages Under Communism

As the nationalization of industry developed, wages came to be regulated by decree at first through the Commissariat of Labor, then under decree of June 8th, 1920, through the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions. At this period, the height of Communism, the Trade Union organization was an Executive Department of the Government. The wage scales were fixed without regard to the value of the labor, and were paid up to 80 per cent. in kind. The money was paid by the industry; food, clothing, and so forth by the government department; housing, fuel, and so forth by the municipal department; and as these could only pay when they had supplies the real rate of wages was never realized. The food ration was regulated for heavy workers, light workers, and non-workers in the proportion of 4 : 3 : 2, though the latter for the most part got nothing. There were also attempts to reward extra exertion with extra rations; but these were discouraged. And supplies being deficient, these wages, or rather rations, were always irregular and

"Who Is Who British Del

HERBERT SMITH, 30 years president Yorks. Federation. President, 1911, of Great Britain's president, 1907. Serv. royal commissions. F. national Miners' Com. of school board, West. county council and oth. for many years. Mem. ary committee, trades 1913-16, and general. Appointed J. P. in 1911. tra) committee, mine: central committee, ml board.

BEN TILLET, ge of trade unions since of Dockers' Union, w from the Tea Coope Laborers' Union esta. A pioneer of trade u nationally. Contested mentary elections. El. Remained dockers' ge until amalgamation to General Workers' Uni ary of Political and I partment of Amalg Member of trades uni eral council since 19 parliamentary com: union congress, 1892-0.

JOHN TURNER, socialist organizations timate with founders socialist thought, su Morris, Belfort Bax, neers. Closely associ: Kropotkin from 1886 to Russia in 1917. A hours legislation and Assistants' Union. union from 1898 unt general secretary aft in this position until general council, trades 1921; re-elected by co to 1924 for period to.

JOHN BROMLEY, of railway trade uni many positions of tr pointment as branch sociated Society of L eers and Fireman, 1 ganizing secretary of Secretary also of cor Elected general secre 1914. Elected membe executive, 1920 and member of trades uni eral council, 1922-24. bor party delegati t times candidate for 1924. Prominently as bor and socialist prop years.

ALAN A. H. FIND United Pattermake since 1893. Branch other offices. Electe eral secretary, execu 1913. Elected genera. Formerly treasurer, Shipbuilding Trades three years, subsequ president, at presen position. Elected to gress general council each year until 1924, September, 1925.

A. A. PURCELL (e gation). Member of Union since 1891. M mocratic federation n ber, Salford Borough years. Sectional s quently organizer, fi Parliamentary candi ford, 1910. Contested 24. Elected 1923. Si tor in co-operative ar Elected to general union congress, 1919 year. Elected by tra tional conference, V president. President union congress. Vic eral council. Appoi American labor conv companied the delegs 1920.

Union Delegation

Thru Courtesy of the International Publishers Co.

Copyright in the United States by the International Publishers Co. All Rights Reserved. Copyright by the Trades Union Congress General Council in Great Britain.

in the ation

P. Nineteen Miners' Federa- s 1921. Vice- on several ident, Inter- ee. Member- ing (Yorks). public bodies , parliament- on congress, uclil, 1923-24. Member, cen- welfare and g examining

al secretary 89. Founder n originated and General hed in 1887. n movement veral parliad- ed for North al secretary ransport and Now secret- national De- ated Union. congress gen- Member of ee, trades

ociated with ce 1884. In- d leaders of as William d other pio- with prince il his return neer of shop nder of Shop ial of this etirement as twelve years t. Elected to ion congress, ss each year tember, 1925.

P. A pioneer sm and held prior to ap- etary of As- oative Engin- Elected or- union, 1910. ation boards. of the union, labor party 21. Elected congress gen- er of la- eland. Three row, elected ated with la- ada for many

, member of Association cretary and ssistant gen- department, retary, 1917. ineering and deration for ly appointed cupping this es union con- 21, re-elected term ending

m n of dele- shing Trades er, social-de- years. Mem- uncil for six tary, subse- shing trades. , West Sal- ventry, 1923- ssful arbitra- her disputes. uncil, trades- elected each ion interna- na, 1924, as 1924 trades airman, gen- delegate to on, 1925. Ac- to Russia in

generally inadequate. Therefore, like soldiers whose rations are insufficient, the Russian industrial workers deserted and fled from the towns to the villages where food could be got. This again led to conscription of labor in 1920 under rigorous conditions. Its results were entirely unsatisfactory, and it was finally repealed by decree of the Central Executive Committee, of March 3rd, 1922.

The Fifth Congress of Trade Unions in September, 1922, recommended that wages be paid in money. This change was forced not only by material but by moral conditions. The Communists could enforce a very high level of discipline and devotion in their own ranks, but they could not bring conscripted labor into line as a body. They could not even stop the non-party and un-political workers from putting money in their pockets by filching immense quantities of goods and by falsifying their ration cards. For example, by 1921, though the urban population amounted only to 12,000,000, 22,000,000 were drawing rations.

But with the New Economic Policy wages, which had become little more than the pay of a rationed labor army, became again the subject of free contract, of Trade Union negotiation, and of Governmental regulation. And with currency stabilization, wages in kind, already steadily in decline, began definitely to disappear. In so far as they still exist, their value is deducted from the money rate at current open-market prices.

The optimistic theory of War Communism that a worker would for an equal living wage give his full energy, experience and efficiency to the public good, was not justified by the experience of the years, 1918-1921. It has now given place to the plan of paying a living wage and getting the best possible production by further awards, such as piecework payment, special rates for specialists and prospects of promotion. This plan is applied even by the Communist International to those employees who, not being members of the Party, cannot be relied on to do their best without pecuniary recognition. It is now proposed to extend the system to employes in State trading and Co-operative concerns so that by paying them a percentage on their sales, their efficiency may be raised to that of the salesmen in private trade. At present in retail trade, the private tradesman, the State and the Co-operative salesman are estimated to compare in efficiency as 118:92:89.

Wages During the Change to Money Payments.—During the time when the currency was daily falling in value, food rations held a large place in wages and money wages were reckoned in "goods" roubles on a system much like that which developed under similar conditions in Germany. At first certain industries calculated wages in terms of the rising cost of their own product; for example, in terms of a "flour rouble," a "leather rouble," etc. But this caused almost as great inequalities and inequities as the previous War Communist practice of allowing payments to workers in the goods they produced. These methods of payment were accordingly converted into general payment in "goods roubles." A minimum budget, representing the daily needs of an average worker was drawn up; the cost of this budget was determined, eventually, as often as four times a month; and the value of the "real" or "goods" rouble was calculated accordingly. The result was a living wage, though a very low one. For the cost was often, as in the Don Basin, fixed much lower than it really was so as to help industry back towards a paying basis.

Money Payments.—In May, 1923, wage rates began to be fixed as a percentage of the total minimum budget. But as soon as there was a stable gold currency (Tchervonetz) this system too began to go; and an order of the Supreme Economic Council, September 13th, 1923, brought in payment of government salaries in gold roubles. It was, however, thought that to pay all workers wages at once in gold roubles would unduly burden industry and unbalance the gold rouble. Such gold payment was, therefore, brought in gradually and first made applicable to transport workers, metal workers, chemical workers, the Don Basin and the Urals. With the exception of the Urals, there was, however, in the winter of 1923-24, a fall of the real value of the gold rouble to 80 per cent. on an average, explained elsewhere (See Currency) which called for additional bonuses. But with the spring, this last crisis, caused by the collapse of the old paper rouble, was over, and it was decided to give up the complicated calculation in goods roubles and get on as quickly as possible with payments in gold roubles, which had by then gained general confidence. There were, however, great difficulties of detail in carrying this out. One was the want for a time of new currency of small denominations; which caused losses to the workers. This was first dealt with by temporary paper issues and then by the new metal silver and copper currency.

The want of working capital in industry still causes delays in payment, but these matter much less now that the currency is stabilized and arrears do not lose their value. They are, however, the main cause of discontent at present. Last autumn arrears were about 10 million g. r., but last winter they were reduced to about 3 million. The delays seem generally to be only a week or so, though there were cases in the Don Basin of September wages not paid until November. Complaints were also made to the last Congress that too large a proportion of the wages was paid in credits for goods in the Co-operatives.

Present and Pre-War Wages Compared.—It is almost impossible to compare wages under War Communism with pre-war wages or with wages at the present time. But since the

return to money wages under free contract there has been a steady rise amounting from 150 per cent. to 200 per cent., and a steep rise between October, 1922, and September, 1923, amounting to as much as 70 per cent. The average wage in 1922 in the heavy industries was still in money little more than half the pre-war wage, though this was exceeded in some cases.

The general average of wages seems now to be approaching three-quarters of pre-war rates, being over half pre-war in the heavy and nearly full pre-war in the light industries. In May, 1924, the percentages were: all industries, 68.3 per cent.; food, 116.9 per cent.; paper, 103.5 per cent.; printing, 98 per cent.; leather, 96 per cent.; textile, 85 per cent.; chemical, 82 per cent.; mining, 52.1 per cent.; railways, 41 per cent.; metal workers, 31.9 per cent. In October, 1924, metal workers had been raised to 56 per cent., railway workers to 50 per cent., and textile, to 91 per cent. Wages in Moscow generally are 93 per cent pre-war and in Leningrad 81.6 per cent. But figures can only be depended on in so far as they show a general movement. The A. R. C. T. U. now intends to raise wages in heavy industry and transport so as to reduce inequalities.

Inequalities of Wages.—This difference in the rate of wages between heavy and light industry is due to the much greater difficulty in restoring heavy industry to a business basis. It works exclusively to State order and was therefore more affected by the stress of the change to a business basis. On the other hand, the light industry producing largely goods of prime necessity could at once find its home market. While private business, picking out the most profitable enterprises without regard for the general public interest and with reduced overhead charges for national purposes, could pay the best wages of all. Thus during the early period of the New Economic Policy, wages in private industry were 25 per cent. higher than in nationalized industry.

There are also still considerable differences in wages between localities and between industries. These differences have caused great dissatisfaction and cases arose, as in Yaroslavl, where the Provincial Trade Union Council illegally suspended a collective agreement on that account. This difficulty was dealt with by the State giving more orders to heavy industry and more working capital, so enabling it to raise the lowest rates. The total of this assistance given in 1923, reached 700,000,000 gold roubles.

Wage Scales and Categories.—The next difficulty which became serious in the latter part of 1923, was the "Scissors" crisis (See Agriculture). In order to close the "Scissors," wages had to be kept as they were or even be lowered. For these and other reasons a regulation of wages was undertaken by the Government. The wage scales as fixed by the Trade Unions were revised so as to reduce them generally and raise the lowest rates. The new official scale is as follows:—

Categories	Unskilled labor.				Skilled labor.				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Co-efficients	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.8	2.2	2.5	2.8	3.1	3.5
Experts—	Inferior.				Superior.				
Categories	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	
Co-efficients	4.2	4.6	5.0	5.5	6.2	6.7	7.2	8.0	

The general application of this uniform scale is proceeding rapidly. In January, 1924, it was already applicable to 44 per cent. of the industrial workers, and 90 per cent. of the transport workers, or 75 per cent. of the whole.

Since the closing of the "Scissors," there has been a rise of wages as above described.

Wages and Benefits.—When to the rates of money wages are added the advantages represented by contribution from the industry for social insurance, worth from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. of the wage; for educational institutions, worth 5 per cent.; for Factory Committees, worth 2 per cent.; and for welfare work required by the Labor Code (holidays, working clothes, grants for technical classes, etc.), worth any money up to 25 per cent.; and when to these are again added the advantages in respect of State and Municipal services, in the shape of relief from, or reduction of, rent and rates, and in the form of free tickets, etc., for excursions and entertainments—it seems safe to say that the present pay of the Russian worker is very much better than pre-war.

Productivity of Labor.—The productivity of Russian industry compares not unfavorably with that of Europe generally, where there has been a marked falling off in consequence of the war. Thus as the daily output of a coal miner in England was as low as 55 per cent. in 1921, and only 82 per cent. in 1922, in Russia the figure for a Don Basin coal miner was 77 per cent.

Wages have increased more rapidly than individual output. Between 1920 and 1924, wages increased five times but individual output only doubled. Between October, 1923, and March, 1924, wages increased 15 per cent., but the output only 8 per cent. Wages being now about 68 per cent. pre-war general productivity seems to be not more than about 60 per cent.

The improvement is due to a more intensive activity. In pre-war times the productivity of a British worker as compared with a Russian worker was as 1.55:1.16. The average working day was ten hours, but working days in the year were no more than 252. In 1921, with an eight-hour day, they were 214; in 1922, 254; in 1923, 263, or 88 per cent. of the calendar working days. Allowing for the liberal leave now given by law, and the usual average for sickness, this is fairly satisfactory.

(To be continued in next issue.)

A REPLY TO WOLFE'S UNCRITICAL "CRITIQUE"

(Continued from page 3)

sion as to dates is due to his pedantry in simply affirming to himself that any peaceful period of capitalism would have to fit neatly within the confines of the period of the hegemony of the textile industry. It is true that the rapid growth and dominant position of the textile industry furnished the basis for what Lenin has termed the "so-called 'peaceful development' of capitalism." But how? Not simply, as Wolfe tells us, "because the 'struggle for markets' with textile products as the typical export does not require spheres of influence, colonies, the intervention of states and armies, etc.," but also by the very fact of the expansion of the market itself. Capitalism was "boiling over" within its narrow state confines and the expansion of the market provided an escape valve. It was this that made possible comparative "class peace" in the home countries of capitalism. To conceive of the "peaceful" phase of capitalist history apart from the development of the class struggle, as Wolfe apparently does, is undialectical and un-Leninist. That the leaders of the Communist International do not have any such conception, is shown by the quotation from Bukharin's speech at the fourth congress, given above.

"How are we to combat socialist-jingoism?" asks Lenin in his pamphlet on "The Collapse of the Second International." "The latter is opportunism which has become ripe, strong, and impudent, during the long, comparatively 'peaceful' era of capitalism." (page 53.)

Was this the second and third quarters of the 19th century? Was it in the revolutionary upheavals of 1830, 1848 and 1871 that opportunism became ripe, strong and impudent? Or was it in the parliamentary epoch which followed?

SUPER-PROFITS played their role in the development of the so-called "peaceful period." It is very important to bring this out here, because Comrade Wolfe's main trouble comes from the fact that he cannot think of super-profits except as an attribute of the later period of world imperialism. To him they belong only to the warlike era of capitalism whereas actually they were one of the bases for the establishment of the "peaceful period."

Bukharin, in his answer to Boris at the fifth congress of the Comintern, quotes Marx as follows:

"J. B. Say, in his comments on Constanze's translation of Ricardo, made just one correct observation on foreign trade. Profits can also be made by cheating. One wins what the other loses. Gains and losses within a country cancel each other. But this is not the case between various countries. And even according to Ricardo's own theory—which Say does not notice—three working days of one country can be exchanged for one working day of another. Here the law of values must be essentially modified. Or, as highly skilled, complex labor within a country contains a certain proportion of unskilled simple labor, so the working days of one country can bear a certain proportion to the working days of another country. In such a case the richer country exploits the poorer. . . ."

And Bukharin adds: "The decisive factor is that we clearly see that this doctrine of super-profits of richer countries is an entirely Marxian doctrine."

In the paragraph quoted Marx is dealing with super-profits realized in trade, quite before the epoch of world imperialism—super-profits which can be realized from the sale of flannel underwear as well as from the sale of iron and steel.

IN my article on Labor and Empire I referred to the so-called "peaceful period of capitalism" to show not only that it rested on the extension of markets (in primitive countries, etc.) but also to explain how it damped down the class struggle at home—not just automatically, thru "capitalist stabilization," but thru the purchase of class peace. The possibility of working within the law bred reform-

ism. But how was capitalism able to grant reforms and amelioration of the conditions of the workers? Thru the super-profits, which were partly shared with the upper strata of labor.

I was also interested to show that this did not put an end to the class struggle, but that it merely offered the chance to the opportunists to betray the class struggle and sell out to the capitalists. No article such as mine on Labor and Empire would be complete without a suggestion of how the opportunists and reformists betrayed the working class during the period of the so-called "peaceful" development of capitalism.

When textiles gave way to iron and steel as the dominant industry the problem of capitalism had become not simply one of extension of the market but also of export of capital, acquisition of raw materials, etc. Moreover, monopoly was displacing "free competition" in the home countries of capitalism. The race for colonial possessions was on, full blast. For these reasons, and because of the special attributes of the iron and steel industry which differentiate it from the peacefully expanding textile industry, this later period is characterized by increasingly war-like developments between nations and an intensification of the class struggle at home.

BUT it must not be supposed that this change came about all at once, or that it can be explained by the mere fact of export of iron and steel products instead of textiles. It is true that Wolfe mentions also the other factors (such as export of capital, colonies, spheres of influence, etc.—in short, imperialism) which must be considered in connection with the iron and steel industry. But can he maintain that imperialism was full-blown in 1871? Or that, as he says in his criticism, "the war-like period of capitalism in the Leninist sense, begins when Gomez says the peaceful period of capitalism begins?" (Emphasis his.) As a matter of fact, the so-called "peaceful" or "stabilization" period of capitalism continued and was actually further developed by some of the very factors which later became integrated into the system of imperialism (i. e. super-profits from the colonies.) The period lasted practically until the last decade of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.

"Let us recall what induced a substitution of the present-day imperialist era for the former 'peaceful' era of capitalism," says Lenin in his "Collapse of the Second International." "The facts are that free competition has given way to capitalist monopolies, and that the whole globe has been divided up. It is clear that both these facts and factors have a real world significance. Free trade and peaceful competition were possible and necessary as long as there was nothing to hinder capital from increasing the number of its colonies and from seizing unoccupied lands in Africa and elsewhere. . . . The division of the globe compels the rivals to pass from peaceful expansion to an armed struggle for a re-division of colonies and of spheres of influence." (page 29.)

And in his book on "Imperialism, the Final Stage of Capitalism," he says:

"When the colonies of the European powers comprised one-tenth of the territory of Africa, as was still the case in 1876, then the colonial policy could yet develop non-monopolistically, that is, the development of the colonial policy could, so to speak, proceed along the lines of 'free seizure' of territory. But when nine-tenths of Africa was found to have been already occupied (about 1900), when the world was found to be divided, then inevitably ensued the era of monopolistic possession of colonies, and, what follows therefrom, of a particularly sharpened struggle for the division and re-division of the earth." (pages 126-7; Marxian Educational Society edition.)

REFERRING specifically to the United States, Wolfe objects to my having taken the strikes of 1870 to 1894 "as evidence that up till 1894 there was a war-like period (in the class struggle of this country) and after 1894 a peaceful period." Where-

upon he declares innocently that "the strike epidemic in question was due to the world commercial crisis of the period." What is there in this to contradict my statement? Nothing. On the contrary, it merely serves to bear out my contention that the same general factors which had caused European capitalism to "boil over" took effect in the United States, "later and in a necessarily modified form."

My critic goes on to say that the "class peace" that followed 1894 was only relative, which of course, it was—albeit it was marked enough for every outstanding writer on American labor history to take note of it. His comment on this is that the relative "class peace" "was caused by the expansion due to monopoly growth and other factors. . . ." My only answer is that this is exactly what I have been maintaining.

But, says Wolfe, this "class peace" "is not the kind of 'peace' to which Lenin's quotation on 'peaceful period' refers." Here I must begin to differ with my critic again. Relative "class peace" within a country is naturally not all that is meant by the term, "so-called 'peaceful period' of capitalism"—indeed it may continue to prevail long after the nation in question is embarked on imperialist wars, as I think I have already shown. Nevertheless, the relationship between "class peace" and the so-called "peaceful period" as a whole is of fundamental importance. I refer my critic to the various quotations from Lenin which I have given above.

WOLFE blithely misrepresents me as having said in my article that the "peaceful" period in the United States, 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."

What I did say was:

"In Europe, the social-democratic parties built themselves into mass organizations. The 'peaceful period of capitalism' was an international phenomenon, as Lenin has shown us. It was purchased at the expense of the backward and undeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, thru the policy of imperialism."

It might be reasonably objected that the word "imperialism" is used somewhat loosely here, but the import of the above sentences is clearly quite different from what Wolfe's misquotation implies. If my critic questions that the so-called "peaceful period" was purchased at the expense of the backward countries, it would be well for him to re-read the following already quoted passage from Bukharin:

"Following the revolutionary epoch of the middle of last century, an entirely different historic epoch in the development of the capitalist system set in. It was the epoch of the gigantic growth of capitalism. This growth was chiefly based upon the colonial policy of the bourgeoisie, and the stupendous development of continental industry which was chiefly stimulated by the exploitation of the colonial peoples."

TO Comrade Wolfe's superfluous information that the world did not enjoy peace in the years "preceeding 1914" and his insulting assurance that "the Hague conferences were only the plaster on the ulcer," I find it unnecessary to reply except to say that they are in the same class with his nasty insinuation to the effect that I believe the so-called "miner" wars count for nothing because they were waged against black and yellow men and not between whites.

Comrade Wolfe finds fault with my explanation of how super-profits are wrung from the colonies and semi-colonies. I maintained in my article that in the last analysis super-profit may be said to result from: (1) the greatly increased rate of exploitation, (2) the exaggerated extension of monopoly characteristics in dependent countries, (3) the pressure of the imperialist state, (4) robbery of virgin resources. These four points include all the items cited by Wolfe—the low living standard, the inhumanly long hours, inhumanly low wages, dispossessing backward peoples from the land, and forced labor. Moreover, I went into most of these factors in detail.

I admit that I ought not to have said the rate of exploitation is reflect-

ed in the composition of capital employed. This is incorrect. The confusion is due to the fact that in one paragraph I speak of the rate of exploitation and in the following paragraph of the rate of profit.

NOW as to the section of my article dealing with the corruption of the bureaucratic trade union officialdom as well as a whole section of the upper strata of skilled workers (the labor aristocracy), thru their share in the super-profits, Wolfe speaks of many "mistakes" in this connection but he does not show a single one. It is untrue that the passage is vague or that I fail to draw a distinction between the union officialdom and the privileged workers making up the labor aristocracy.

I say in my article (page 422 of the Workers' Monthly):

"It is not only fakers that are corrupted in this way (thru a share in the super-profits), but the entire crust of the trade union movement, the so-called 'labor aristocracy' consisting principally of the most highly skilled workers and workers engaged in privileged trades."

On page 423 I go on to say: "The whole matter is not as simple as the payment of a bribe—albeit in the case of reactionary trade union officials, bribery, 'rake-offs' and the awarding of all sorts of contracts are no inconsiderable item. . . ."

"As for the labor aristocracy," I continue, "its share of the super-profits comes primarily in the form of increased wages—and indeed all other sources of its income (insurance schemes, etc.) really constitute an addition to wages."

I explain that "the selling out of the reactionary officials is in this sense a special problem which the workers will one day deal with as it deserves."

IN the passage quoted by Wolfe—quite out of its context—I am referring to the labor aristocracy and not to the bureaucrats. Anyone who takes the trouble to read the entire paragraph from which this quotation is abstracted will convince himself of this at once.

I stand by the paragraph exactly as it is, and Wolfe's suggestion that I might have meant to say "former" where I said "latter" is sheer nonsense.

Comrade Wolfe's "critique" closes with a final misconception. He sets forth the novel idea that the export of capital does not help to build up a native capitalist class in the backward countries. According to him, it is not the export of capital that creates the native bourgeoisie, but the simple export of commodities. Does not Comrade Wolfe know that the existence of a powerful bourgeois class in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is comparatively recent? This class sprang into prominence with the general industrial development of the colonies and semi-colonies, a development which had been systematically retarded in the period when export was primarily of commodities, but which became an inevitable concomitant of the export of capital.

THE theses of the second congress of the Comintern declare:

"Owing to the imperialist policy of preventing industrial development in the colonies, a proletarian class, in the strict sense of the word could not come into existence until recently. The ingenious craft industries were destroyed to make room for the products of the centralized industries in the imperialist countries, consequently a majority of the population was driven to the land to produce food, grains, and raw materials for export to foreign lands."

Obviously there could be no bourgeoisie without a proletariat. The entire system of capitalism in the backward countries was advanced by the export of capital from the imperialist nations. The monopolistic holdings of foreign finance capital could not stand alone, without a host of smaller native industrial and commercial enterprises growing up in their very shadow.

"The export of capital," says Lenin in his book on "Imperialism," "tends to hasten greatly the development of capitalism in the country to which it is exported." (page 66.)

IT cannot be denied that export of capital carries with it the tend- (Continued on page 7).

Work of the Russian Communist Party Among Women

By Comrade Nikolayeva of the Russian Communist Party.

The active elements among the non-party working women were organized in such manner that circles were formed for the working women in the workshops and factories, by 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' meeting. 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 existence 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 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; this they attained by publishing notices, articles, and poems sent in 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 strikes, 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 is, 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 exploited 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 statements of his paragraph on the export of capitalism.

All in all, my critic's article shows the work of self-conscious student detached from reality, 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 mark and ticket my article on Labor and Empire with the exact familiar phrases of these formulas, so Comrade Wolfe was inspired to display his knowledge of them. Unfortunately, his knowledge of them is rather uncertain, and appears to have been gleaned by more assiduous reading of Louis Boudin than of 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 real mass work, the party activity in the women's circles changed in character, and was also enabled to advance more and more to mass 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 thru 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 workers working in the factories and districts.

Women Workers' Meetings.

Besides the general factory meetings, special women workers' meetings were systematically organized by the groups of active women workers, under the leadership of the nucleus. At first the general mass 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 organization of the active elements among the non-party women workers around our party, more and more women participated.

The working women, thus 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, nightly 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 mensheviks.

We sent special groups of working women to the meetings called by 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 publication of leaflets, posters and other propagandist literature. We devoted special attention to our periodical, 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 came to the office of the *Rabotnitsa* to ask how they could best prepare for the coming demonstrations.

Influence Soldiers.

Besides this, the working women carried on active agitation among the soldiers sent to Petrograd by the provisional government to suppress the Bolsheviks. The forward march of General Kornilov on Petrograd aroused not only the workmen, 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 saw a mighty field of activity opened out 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 to certain strata of the non-party working women, it became 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 complete solidarity with the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviks) 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 of 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 in 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 working 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 work 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 women of the other strata of the population. In every factory and village delegates' meetings of working and peasant women were organized, the delegates being however no longer 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, organized ambulance divisions, participated in the defense of towns, and performed every possible description of work. The actual participation of 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 of the East, enslaved and suppressed 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 grow from year to year. The number of our women party members grows in proportion. The development of the institutions

actuating the emancipation of working women, the abolition of illiteracy and the uplift of the cultural and political level of the broad masses of the 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 Gomez is confusing the export of commodities with the export of capital. Again the economic error implies a grave political one. If the export of capital creates a native bourgeoisie, then such native bourgeoisie should 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 corollary expressed in the theses on imperialism of the Comintern and will not be able to utilize, as we must and can, the national bourgeois revolutionary movements as partial allies in the struggle against capitalist imperialism, the final stage of capitalism.

John Lassen

By SIMON FELSHIN.

There was none gentler—
With a pleasantry in the last hour.

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

He wished so little for himself,
And yet he was thwarted—
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 tracked
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 woolen textile workers of Nippon Keori Kaisha at Kakogawa, Harima province, are slowing up production because of the employers' discrimination against strike leaders 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 altho the workers were not convicted and despite previous promises of the employers that all workers would be restored their jobs.

The Crisis Britain Postponed

When Comrades 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, the official monthly of the party, has sent us the first article of this weekly service. This feature will insure our readers that the very critical and interesting situation in Britain will be adequately and authoritatively covered.

LONDON, —By Mail—Special—
The coal crisis 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 to cover the period of the truce. There is, of course, the usual howl in certain sections of the press about 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 1921 strike of three months cost £200,000,000. 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 mastery and control over the situation. Formerly, the parliamentary labor party was successful in lifting the reins out of the trade union leaders' hands. This time we had the uncourageous spectacle of Stephen Walsh (the war minister in the labor cabinet) leading a deputation to Ramsay MacDonald demanding in the event of a strike that the parliamentary labor party would hold up all business in the house 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 Communists, but respectfully promised to put the matter before the party.

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

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

But there is certain to be trouble ahead. When Mr. Baldwin told the miners that the wages of all the other workers must come down, it was no slip of the tongue. He means it. The dilemma before British industrialism compels the bourgeoisie 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 practically closed for British coal. In addition to reparation coal 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 reparation dumps 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 gaining time. Faced with an unexampled unity in trade unionism, 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 policy on 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 and transport workers in the sympathetic strike. The increased demand for the Workers Weekly in the mining areas is proof to us of the party's increased prestige and influence.

A big strike has taken place in the West Riding of Yorkshire, with Bradford as its center. 130,000 workers have struck work against a threatened reduction in wages. It is curious that England should be going thru 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 wear. 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 are encouraged by the results of the miners' solidarity.

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

This week-end concludes the Empire Labor Conference called by the parliamentary labor party. This is the first of its kind having delegates from Australia, Africa, British Guiana, Ireland, Canada, India, etc. What the purpose of this conference was is now plain to be seen, since its conclusion. No resolutions or amendments were permitted. Interruptions, such as when the Indian Chaman Lat, challenged MacDonald for his conduct during his ministry were impertinently 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 against England or 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 (tho not on a

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

On Saturday the 24th of July, under direction from colonial committee and London district called together a conference of all local labor organizations in London to discuss the situation in China and Morocco. 164 delegates turned up representing over 100 trade union branches, trades councils, local labor parties, cooperative women's guilds, etc. This 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 of Indian independence and separation from the empire. The delegation was refused admittance and when the letter was brot up Ramsay MacDonald simply moved next business. Still it came as a shock to the labor bureaucrats to think that such a large and representative conference could be openly called by the Communist Party and be 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 Communists is again well to the front. It will be remembered that last year our comrades declared from the floor of the conference that notwithstanding the adverse vote on Communist affiliation we would return next year stronger than ever. This is actually happening. Over 76 branches of trade unions, trades councils, local and divisional labor parties are supporting resolutions in support of the Communist party.

Following upon the conference last year a special sub-committee was appointed to inquire into the operation of clause 3, which excluded Communists as delegates. Notwithstanding the volume of evidence to show how unoperable it was, the Executive Committee are going to propose to the next congress to ratify all three clauses and to go further and recommend to trade unions not to appoint Communists 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 year in greater and greater volume. This year one large trade union, the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, moves to rescind all previous resolutions against the Communist Party.

Letters from Our Readers

What Ails The American Worker?

To the DAILY WORKER:— In a statement before the institute of politics of the state department enlightened once again the American people why Coolidge objects to the Soviets and is opposed to the recognition of the Soviet government of Russia. He attacked the Soviet as an "inciter of war." Soviet Russia who has just renounced all the territorial rights and claims of the old czarist government, "an inciter of war."

The revolutionary workers of the world have proclaimed that the exploitation of working men, women and children by a clique of selfish, greedy, parasitic individuals is as improper, unjust and out of date, as the old-time slavery and serfdom.

The Russian workers have accordingly abolished the old antiquated capitalist morals in favor of this higher standard of justice, which recognizes only one class, the working class, with no exploiting parasites and to which class all workers 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 red army is alert and ready to repel all attacks against the Soviet Union. And the red army has the solid and active backing from all the class-conscious 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 overstocked 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 under the abnormal present conditions, it has been reported in the New York Times that the All-Russian Textile Syndicate has purchased this year \$36,300,000 worth of cotton alone from the United States. One could imagine then to what enormous extent our exports of all kinds would have grown under 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 Russian workers and their unlimited triumph.

The reports of the workers' delegations to the Soviet Union give the lie most emphatically to the Greens, the Lewises and the other fakers of the A. F. of L. But will the rank and file of American labor allow these fakers to fool them forever? Have not the members of the A. F. of L. any self-respect? Can they still swallow the crazy calumnies about the Soviet Union in face 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 workers' country.

A country of 130,000,000 is being run by the workers themselves. It is worthwhile studying and may come in handy some day.—Charles Golosman.

Corruption in Michigan.
Detroit, Mich.

Editor the DAILY WORKER: No wonder we have Ben Gitlow 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 handed down by the supreme court. This decision was too rank for even justices Holmes and Brandeis, yet we find it suits traitors like Berger.

A few days ago I was told of a case which illustrates the rottenness of capitalist politics. A man named Fitzgerald was appointed about a year ago by Governor Groesbeck to a position in the state office building at Lansing. His salary is \$6,000.00 per annum.

His title is Business Manager of the Highway Department 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 his important duty is to get rid of the anti-Groesbeck element. If an opposition party could get into power they would of course do the same.

Faternally,
Civil Engineer.

GARY, IND., ATTENTION!

The DAILY WORKER, Workers Monthly, Rabotnicza Tribuna and Novy Mir are for sale at the Workers' Co-operative Restaurant, 1733 Broadway.