



The COMMUNIST

Official Organ of the Communist Party of America

(Section of the Communist International)

FORMED AT THE JOINT UNITY CONVENTION of the UNITED COMMUNIST PARTY
and the COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA.

VOLUME 1, No. 2

AUGUST, 1921

PRICE 10 CENTS

CONTENTS

	Page		Page
A. F. of L. Convention. <i>By Roger B. Nelson</i>	1	Review of the Month.....	16
Need for Open Work. <i>By David Damon</i>	5	The American Socialist Party. <i>By Th. Rogers</i>	18
America as a World Power. <i>By Louis C. Fraña</i>	6	Hardy's Report to the I. W. W. <i>By Geo. Moore</i>	23
National and Class War in Silesia. <i>By Paul Frölich</i>	11	The Third Congress. <i>By Karl Radek</i>	26
New Economic Policy of Soviet Russia. <i>By N. Bukharin</i>	12	Class Divisions in America. <i>By Roger B. Nelson</i>	27
Fear of the Great Clash. <i>By Karl Radek</i>	15		

The A. F. of L. Convention

By ROGER B. NELSON.

THE entire life of the country is today in a state of ferment. Business is getting duller with an alarming persistency. The tides of unemployment are sweeping on with ever-growing volume. The open-shop campaign is taking an impetuous turn. But everything is in a state of flux. Practically nothing seems to be definite. The Forty-first Convention of the American Federation of Labor reflected this condition very vividly. It brought to open view the vagueness of aim and the overwhelming inertia with which the American labor movement is at present afflicted. Through the limpid disinterestedness of the great majority of the delegates in the problems confronting the working-class, one could clearly see the marked low degree of class-consciousness.

Report of the Executive Council

The American Federation of Labor has to-day 3,906,528 members. In 1920 it had a membership of 4,078,740. Compared with the growth of trade unionism in other large capitalist countries, the American labor organizations are travelling at a very slow pace. As a matter of annual course the report waxes eloquent over "Labor's" glowing "aspirations." The "ethics" of Labor are dramatized. "Democracy"—the real American kind, in industry as well as in politics, is idolized as Labor's goal. Great tribute is paid to

the militant yet "dignified" struggles of the workers. However, very little is said about actually taking steps to promote the interests of the working-class.

The heroic working-class of Russia is most basely maligned in a savage attack by the labor-lieutenants of American imperialism. The bestiality and fury of the anti-Soviet diatribe is a glowing tribute to the terror the proletarian dictatorship has struck in the hearts of the capitalist class and its lackeys the world over. Gompers and Company's record of miserable treachery and outright treason to the working class is most fittingly crowned by this vile vituperation heaped upon our bleeding but unconquerable Russian brothers. Truly "The Gods make mad whom they would destroy!"

Bureaucracy Supreme

It would be fallacious to attribute the bureaucracy's iron grip on the convention solely to the listlessness and disinterestedness of the delegates. The very administrative structure of the American Federation of Labor makes for bureaucratic domination. Gompers practically appointed all the important committees. The committees on Rules, Ways and Means, Resolutions, Organization and International Affiliation made an auspicious monument to the handicraft of the "Grand Old Man."

Besides, one cannot but recognize the great parliamentary skill of the officialdom and its retinue. Most delegates found themselves in a maze of red tape. Our labor-lieutenants of capital showed themselves at this convention to be unbeaten and unbeatable artists at the game of parliamentary shuffling, trickery and deceit. But here and there opposition would threaten to develop in spite of the adamant wall between the mass of delegates and the controlling clique. On such occasions the crafty junta would throw in speakers on syphilis and cancer. What brutal irony for those who are an incurable canker on the body-politic of American labor to favor a trade union convention with first-hand information about cancer! The reactionaries would now and then ride a wave of opposition by referring resolutions to the Executive Council "for study." When necessary Gompers would even participate in grand-stand revolutionary acrobatics. A rather ungraceful attempt at this was his posing as a bloated opponent of the government in the matter of unemployment relief. He vociferously proclaimed that he would rather see Labor fight for its rights than beg for a few "crumbs for the unemployed from the Government." Such is the monumental hypocrisy that carried the day at Denver and swept back into office Gompers and his whole nefarious crew!

Labor as a Convention Commodity

The American labor-czars have spilled oceans of ink and wasted acres of paper in struggling with the truth of labor-power (the proletariat at work for a capitalist) being a commodity under capitalism. But if ever workmen were sold in the market, it was at the American Federation of Labor Convention. Carpenters fought railroad men and railroad men fought carpenters. All was a mad scramble for job-control, dues receipts and the narrowest of craft interests. With the blow of Gompers' gavel on the convention auction block thousands of workers would be turned from one union into another. Some trade-union auctioneers even talked of splitting away from the parent body unless they were awarded more dues-collecting privileges. In short, at the conference in Denver American "labor" was a new sort of commodity—a convention commodity. And at this grand sale Gompers was the chief Master-of-Ceremonies.

Backwardness of American Labor

The Denver convention painfully brings into bold relief the political and industrial impotency of the American working-class. At this convention the American Federation of Labor won the palm for being the embodiment par excellence of business unionism. Its narrowness of vision and aim is incomprehensible. Even the Yellow American Amsterdam Labor International was too red for Gompers and his black henchmen. In spite of the voluminous noise of a group of Irish delegates the convention did not consider effective aid for the workers of Ireland but merely passed a toothless resolution "in behalf of Ireland."

Of course, a labor convention that at this date tolerates an

attack on the Workers' Soviet Republic of Russia would be likely to stand for anything. Small wonder then that the murderous gang of American White Guards—the Ku Klux Klan—escaped attack from the delegates. A resolution proposing to abolish the Ku Klux Klan was refused even consideration. Another feather in Gompers' cap.

The narrow nationalistic view and the craft policy of the organization showed themselves most strikingly in the convention's approval of total and permanent exclusion of Chinese and Japanese workers from America. This is certainly dancing to the tune of the American capitalists and feeding race hatred in order to dupe the workers of these countries into a suicidal war.

Our valiant defenders of "democracy" were given a chance to display their unfathomable solicitude for the safety of capitalist America. There was proposed a resolution to place the power to declare war only in the people of the United States. Even the complete realization of this proposal would afford the workers only a formal, thoroughly restricted and really ineffective means of preventing war. But our Labor-Czars would not brook even the slightest interference with the interests of the bourgeoisie. Therefore this resolution was voted down.

Thwarting the Class Struggle

The convention rejected every step calculated to improve the workers' organizations and help them withstand the onslaught of Capital. Equal rights for women and negroes in the trade unions were turned down on the specious plea that the consideration of this was a problem for the various international unions. Hence, for the convention to devise ways and means of organizing the millions of women and negro workers so direly in need of unionization would be a violation of autonomy.

The proposal for the organization of One Big Union of all workers in America was rejected with practically no dissenting vote. It is characteristic of the reactionary and opportunist labor leaders of every country to strive to keep the broad laboring masses out of the unions through artificial organization lines, prohibitive initiation fees and dues, and countless other restrictions. The bureaucrats do this in order to perpetuate their strangle hold on the labor movement. Should large masses join the unions they would tend to become organs of revolutionary struggle. Were the labor unions to become organs of revolutionary struggle the misleaders would be doomed. Everywhere, then, does the bureaucracy struggle against improving the labor organizations. No steps that will baffle the will and thwart the activity of the masses are omitted by them. Pursuing this path of self-preservation, the delegates defeated the proposal for a chain of ten daily labor newspapers, motion picture theatres for labor and five labor universities.

Approximately five million workers are now unemployed. Many plants are shutting down. The capitalists are making very strong efforts to lengthen the working-day and reduce the wages. The lengthening of the working-day cuts down

the number employed. Thus also is the army of unemployed swelled. But the reactionary labor-leaders refuse to face the crisis. A nation-wide campaign for a six-hour day was, therefore, rejected. The campaign for a shorter day would involve the working-class in a sharp struggle with its exploiters. Besides, it is conceivable that a well organized Federation of Labor might utilize such a campaign for decreasing the number of unemployed. However, policies and tactics of such character are not to be expected from the American Federation of Labor as long as it is infested with and has at its helm servants of the capitalist class.

On Guard

The labor lieutenants are not soldiering on the job. They are not asleep at their posts. They have their ears to the ground. The breakdown of capitalist production and exchange is becoming more and more evident to the working masses of all countries. The workers are beginning to question the need of the capitalist in social production. They are becoming aware of the uselessness of their exploiters.

There is a world-wide tendency among the proletariat to assume an interest in the management and control of production. In Europe this tendency is much more developed and has already taken on definite and concrete forms. In America this tendency has so far manifested itself only vaguely and weakly. But the more enlightened of our trade union bureaucracy is well aware of the fact that the tendency is here and therefore must be controlled, guided and turned into safe channels. There was thus passed a resolution demanding government ownership and democratic operation of mines and railways and "equal rights for Labor and Capital in all organized industrial enterprises."

With the intensification of the class war the capitalist state is more and more openly and frequently crushing the workers. The class struggle is taking on a more political and revolutionary character, and the workers are beginning to pay greater attention to politics. One of the forms in which this tendency has manifested itself in America is the effort to organize a Labor Party. All the moves for the formation of such a party have been sabotaged and stifled by the Gompers machine under the guise of non-partisanship in politics. Actually Gompers and his satellites have been for many years in the service of the Democratic Party. Despite this opposition the tendency toward independent working class political activity has been making headway. The bureaucracy recognized this and passed a resolution proposing the organization of a "non-partisan political bureau to seek Labor's objects in the national political campaigns." Thus do our reactionary trade union leaders plan to keep the American working class safe from all "evil" influences.

The Progressives and Radicals

The radical and progressive forces at the convention were weak and hopelessly divided. They lacked unity of purpose and organization. The "socialist" Mahlon Barnes fought against Gompers, but the "socialist" Schlesinger fought for

Gompers. At no time in the convention did the "left" elements show firmness or threaten to act in a concerted manner. They were not even an apology for an opposition to the Gompers steam-roller.

The progressives' caucus for a resolution on American trade with Soviet Russia was more of a bedlam than a working body. Confusion was the sole fruit of the "socialistic" efforts. The Socialist delegates refused to commit themselves because of the attitude of the Communist International toward their opportunist Party. This is a fine example of the Socialist Party policy of being for the Soviet Government but against the Communist International. Others seized upon the Johnson episode as their last straw. Many refused to join in any move to aid the Russian workers because of communist activity in some of the larger trade unions. Thus did the progressives fail miserably. It was left for a Near-East Relief agent collecting funds for Armenia to utter the only near-favorable words for Soviet Russia.

The Gompers-Lewis Contest

This was the first American Federation of Labor convention in many years at which an opponent polled enough votes to indicate any danger to Gompers. Lewis secured fully one-third of the votes in the first tangible expression of dissatisfaction since 1893. He had about half the votes of the big Central Labor Councils and State Federations. Gompers won because he had a better machine. His clever electioneering devices played no small part in his election. The Hearst issue was also injected with deadly effect. Besides, Lewis's giving in to the most extreme anti-labor injunction in American history served Gompers' cause mighty good stead.

Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers, the largest union in the American Federation of Labor, is a conservative. He is by no means a strong man. His race against Gompers was not a struggle of progressivism against conservatism. This is true in spite of the fact that he ran on the "radical" program of the convention. The division in the presidential election was not along the lines of principles and policies. These were not even considered by most of the unions in the choice of delegates. In the rank of Lewis's supporters there were to be found such reactionary elements as the Brotherhood of Carpenters that heartily joined in the attack on Soviet Russia and the One Big Union, as well as such progressive unions as the Miners' and Machinists. Most of the Socialist delegates supported Gompers because they felt that he was going to win anyhow. This is the acme of opportunism—true "business" socialism.

The "radical" program on which Lewis stood was that of government ownership and democratic operation of railroads, ways and coal mines and government control of natural resources. On these questions there was really no disagreement at the convention. The plea for government control of natural resources won unanimous approval, and the rail-

road and mine clause had the support of the overwhelming majority. Also, **program or no program**, Lewis proclaims himself to be first and foremost an "American." And this Americanism is in the true capitalist sense as shown by his backdown in the last mine strike fiasco.

The election of Lewis would not at all have meant the driving out of the capitalist adjutants from the labor unions. It would not even have meant the substitution of a progressive administration for a conservative one. But a victory for Lewis would have broken the forty-year palling spell of Gompers over the American labor movement. A defeat for Gompers would have caused no convenient derangement in the ranks of the trade union bureaucracy and would have stimulated a discussion of union problems in the American Federation of Labor. Besides, Lewis would be a much easier man to displace at a convention having an organized progressive bloc.

The Present Situation

There is a vast discontented army of wage-earners in America. Yet the political and industrial impotency of the American labor movement is appalling. Many causes have been given for this condition. The large number of foreign-born, the artificial restrictions set up by the unions themselves, the effects of the machine process, the activity and powerful opposition of highly organized employers' associations, and the brutal governmental interference have all played their part. For a time there was some degree of opportunity for economic advancement. The failure of the workers to develop a strong political party and the exodus of the revolutionists from the dominant trade unions have also played havoc with the growth of our labor movement.

Some of the above conditions prevail no longer. The "foreigners" are to-day among the best union men. They are a source of great revolutionary energy. Free land and economic opportunity are things of the past for the broad working masses. A careful analysis of the action of the delegates on the issues before the convention at Denver would lead one to conclude that American labor is on the threshold of a period of transition. Its fear to reject the fundamental views of its bureaucracy is growing smaller, but it is yet too reluctant and not ready to replace these views. In the contest over the issues, few though they were, the Gompers junta did not fare as well as it did in the elections. In fact, none of its victories on this field was clear cut and here and there it met defeat.

Our Immediate Task

The paramount task of the Party at this moment is to take immediate concrete measures for especially enhancing the class-consciousness of the millions of workers in the trade unions. Our members in the trade unions must wage an aggressive fight against race and sex barriers. The red tape and prohibitive financial regulations must be swept away. A more democratic system of labor union administration—the Shop Committee and Shop Delegate system—

is indispensable for the turning of the unions into organs of revolutionary class struggle.

The bureaucracy lives on the masses of union members. It is our task to draw as many workers as possible into the every-day life and struggles of the union. We should, in co-operation with all sympathizers and progressive elements, wage an energetic campaign for the adoption of the English plan of national and local conferences for special problems and emergency situations. Such a system of conventions develops a revolutionary leadership, raises the intellectual level of the mass of workers, and inevitably promotes their class-consciousness. Not only the union membership but also the unorganized workers tend to be drawn into the orbit of independent proletarian activity by such conferences.

Our members in the unions should spare no effort to win their way to the national and State labor conventions. They should therefore see to it that the election of delegates is preceded by an intense discussion of the problems confronting the working-class. Such discussions will aid in bringing to the front the radical and progressive elements. Only then will our labor conventions cease to be a prey for the reactionary leaders. All of these are necessary steps to be taken by our union members. Without diligent activity of this sort the Communist Party will never win a foothold in the American labor movement, let alone win it over to the side of the proletarian revolution. And without the support of the labor movement the revolution, especially in America, cannot succeed. This truth we must never forget. It is the crux of our Party problems. It is the very core of our labor union tactics.

HELP SOVIET RUSSIA!

.. Comrades, to work! Help Soviet Russia. There is no time for delay. Millions of Russian workers and peasants are face to face with famine because of a terrible drought. All Europe is hard pressed. But Soviet Russia, on account of years of war, revolution and blockade is least able to weather the stress and storm. The world imperialists are anxiously awaiting Red Russia's collapse. A scourge is their savior. Pestilence, disease, and death are the allies of capitalism in the struggle against Communist Russia. Comrades, give your all to aid our bleeding Russian brethren. Comrades, give until it hurts the imperialist robbers. Start an agitation at once in your shop, mill, and labor union in behalf of the Soviet Republic—the citadel of the proletarian revolution. Don't permit your exploiters to sail in to victory, at the eleventh hour, on a sea of blood. Proletarian Russia's defeat is the defeat of every worker; her victory is the victory of the world working class. Comrades, workers, to your task! Put your shoulder to the wheel! Help Soviet Russia!

The Need for Open Work

By DAVID DAMON

THE Communist Party is definitely an outlaw organization in the United States. The manifesto adopted by the Left Wing, while still a part of the Socialist Party, and that of the Communist Labor Party, have been declared illegal, although these programs attempted to maintain a semblance of legality by using vague phrases in describing the tactics advocated to overthrow the capitalist state. With the present openly stated purpose of the party, that the use of armed force in the struggle to overthrow the capitalist state is an inevitable phase of the Proletarian Revolution, there is no question that the Communist Party will be able to maintain its existence only as a secret, underground organization, until such time as the imminent victory of the Proletarian Revolution enables it to boldly assume the open leadership of the struggle.

The problem to be considered is: Can the Communist Party as such (a secret, underground organization), fulfill all its functions in preparing the ground and leading the working masses in the revolutionary struggle against the capitalist state? And if not, by what method can it function in the open?

The position of the Communist International on the question of legal and illegal methods is very clear. It urges that both methods must be part of the tactics of the Communist Party. Where bourgeois democracy still permits the party to exist openly, it must develop an underground organization in preparation for the time when it will have to meet the attack of the capitalist state and to do that work which cannot be done openly; and where capitalist terrorism has forced the party underground, it must take advantage of every means to conduct open work. The Communists of the United States have been criticized by the Communist International because of their failure to take advantage of all the available means for carrying on open work.

One need not look far to find the reason for the position of the Communist International, that the party must avail itself of all the possibilities of open work where it can maintain itself only as an illegal, underground organization. If the revolutionary struggle were nearing a crisis, with great masses of the workers already arrayed in a conflict with the capitalist state, the Communist Party would not need to concern itself greatly about the possibilities of open work, but in a country in which the working class masses are still so far from the conscious class struggle as in the United States, where they are still dominated by such an ideology as that of which the American Federation of Labor is the official expression, or in the case of the unorganized, where they still support with practical unanimity political parties so openly arrayed against their class interests as the Republican and Democratic parties, in such a country it is necessary to conduct a widespread agitation to destroy the

illusions which hold the workers loyal to their capitalist exploiters. Anyone who has participated in underground work will admit its difficulties. The need for secrecy, of not exposing the organization, hampers the work at every turn. The cost in labor and money to carry on work secretly is many times greater than in performing the same work openly. It is doubtful, under the conditions of underground work, whether it will ever be possible to carry on an agitational campaign of such an extent as necessary to meet the conditions in the United States today.

This is not all. The Communist Party must gain prestige in the eyes of the masses. It must win the confidence and through it the leadership of the mass of the workers. Can this prestige be established and leadership won, merely through the literature of the party—by an organization whose representatives are unknown to the workers, which they never can see in action? It is very doubtful. Prestige, confidence, leadership can only be established by winning it upon the field of action, in such a way that the workers recognize and see the men and the organization which are seeking to become their leaders in the class struggle. To accomplish this would be indeed a difficult task for a secret, remote, unseen organization such as an underground organization must be of necessity.

Further, the members of the Communist Party themselves need the stimulus and encouragement which will come to them from great mass meetings and demonstrations which they know to be the work of the party, even though they are carried out under the name of another organization. Every movement, even the Communist Party, needs the consciousness that its work is having an impact upon life, to build the morale and stir the fighting spirit which will carry it forward. The greater part of petty, soul-destroying bickering which has helped so much to keep the Communist Movement in this country sterile, has been due to the fact that the conditions of underground work threw the membership inward upon itself, in place of outward in an attack upon the capitalist class.

All of the foregoing forces the conclusion that in order to function effectively in the present situation in this country, the party must find means of carrying on open work. There is no question here of the party, as a party, becoming an open organization. The underground organization has its tasks, tasks which are of first importance, which cannot be carried on openly. It must keep before the workers the goal of overthrowing and destroying the capitalist state; it must develop a membership which understands the full implications of its program and educate this membership to assume the leadership of the masses; it must have its tentacles reaching out into every form of workers' organizations, striving to sway, to control, to develop revolutionary

purpose; it must maintain its illegal press and distribute its illegal literature in which its whole program is fearlessly presented; it must prepare the organization and means of using armed force in anticipation of the revolutionary crisis. These tasks cannot be accomplished by an open organization.

What is argued here is, that to conduct its work most effectively the Communist Party must have two arms, one out in the open, functioning publicly, the other unseen, secret, underground.

Let us see what are the dangers of such an organization, which must be met in deciding upon the organization form. No doubt the greatest danger to be apprehended for the party from an open organization which cannot, and does not advocate the full program of the party, is that it will attract a large number of workers who are not Communists who might, if the organization form did not prevent it, gain control and wrest the open organization from the party. Another danger is that the open work will, because of its comparative safety, attract the party workers and thus endanger the underground work.

The first of these dangers can be met by so organizing the open arm of the party that none but Communist Party members can participate in its control. It cannot be an organization with a dues paying membership which is open for any

worker to join. The second danger cannot assume serious proportions if a party discipline is established under which party members are assigned the work they must perform.

Essentials of the Open Organization

In order to fulfill the requirements set forth above, the open organization must be known to the masses as the legal expression of the Communist Party. There is no valid reason why this should not be so. The U. C. P. during the period of its existence created an open organization which was known as an auxiliary of the party. In some cities the authorities and the White Guard organizations of the capitalist class charged that this organization was but the camouflaged U. C. P., but no attack was made upon it and its work was not interfered with. The fact that such connection is established by general repute cannot serve as the basis for prosecution so long as no provable connection can be established between the open organization and the Communist Party, and its activities are not of an illegal nature, and in the open organization becoming known as the open expression of the Communist Party the party purpose is served in that the prestige of the activities of the open arm redound to the credit of the Communist Party.

America As a World Power

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

THE situation in the United States, at this moment, is complicated in its very simplicity. There is a serious economic crisis and decline in foreign trade, but still American Capitalism is unshaken. There are between four and five million unemployed, but this fact produces no revolutionary energy or action. There is now going on a tremendous struggle between capital and the labor unions, but in this capital is assuming the offensive while the unions have definitely accepted the defensive. There is a very severe national reaction and repression, but the masses don't answer by means of more aggressive action. Monopoly is more dominant and oppressive, but the *petite bourgeoisie* accept this domination (having definitely accepted and merged in Imperialism). In spite (or because) of the industrial crisis, American Capitalism is preparing an economic and financial offensive throughout the world, but the offensive still lingers and does not project itself in action. There are indications of coming collapse, there is a concentration of revolutionary forces—but these are still largely potential factors in the process of proletarian revolution.

What explains the complicated character of this simplicity? It is a fact that the coming-to-a-crisis in the American sit-

uation depends almost completely upon developments in the world situation.

America is in a condition of "watchful waiting." It waits upon the world developments in industry, in trade, in finance, in revolution. American Imperialism has usurped world-power, but this power is necessarily shaken by economic collapse and proletarian revolution. America, accordingly, is developing a two-fold policy: (1) crush the proletarian revolution—hence the severe repression of American Communists and the continued boycott of Soviet Russia; (2) restore the world economically and financially—hence the slow, but sure, preparation to re-enter Europe (in spite of rejection of the League of Nations).

I

AMERICAN ECONOMICS DURING AND AFTER THE WAR

1) The War and Production

American industry before the war was famed for its productive capacity. By extensive use of machinery, by an extensive standardization of output and a sub-division of labor, American industry produced abundantly and cheaply; and in spite of larger costs in wages, was able to compete success-

fully with Britain and Germany. The United States was the largest producer of iron and iron goods in the world, of manufactured articles in general; while it exported enormous masses of agricultural products and raw materials. But the United States by no means had a world hegemony in production and trade.

The War Definitely Established an American Economic Hegemony

During the first two years of the war (before America's entry) enormous demands were made by the Entente upon American industry and agriculture; and the response was a production of goods unparalleled in economic history. The Entente requirements for munitions enormously developed the American iron and steel industry; the requirements for manufactured goods multiplied manufactures, while the requirements for food produced a "golden age" in the history of American agriculture. With the magic touch of Midas America transmuted the agony and death of Europe into fabulous profits.

This enormous development of industry (and consequently of surplus capital for export) actually realized the formerly potential American capacity for world-power. The war being a war for world-power, the United States could not remain neutral; it had to go in.

While organizing an army of four million men, the contribution of the United States to war was still dominantly industrial. Through the government, the whole industry of the country was mobilized for war purposes. But in this process American industry was also mobilized for peace purposes after the war. The industrial mobilization was of such an order, so managed, that every new industry or new addition to industry made necessary for the war could very simply be transformed to a peace basis. For example, the Entente had difficulty with transports; the American Government builds an enormous number of ships; and today the United States has a larger ship-building capacity than Britain, and threatens British mercantile supremacy.

Before the war the United States was not a very large exporter of capital; in fact, it even imported capital—the United States was a debtor nation to the extent of approximately three billion dollars. The first two years of the war was enough to alter this; while today the United States is a creditor nation to the extent of probably twenty billion dollars.

While breaking down the industrial apparatus of Europe (excepting England, where, however, it was weakened) the war revived, developed, integrated the industrial apparatus of the United States. While exhausting the capital reserve of Europe, the war multiplied the American reserves of capital. It was an unprecedented reversal of economic status. The conclusion of the armistice (November, 1918) found America the greatest producer of goods and possessor of capital in the world, with an infinite capacity for development—the dominant financial and industrial power.

The great military duel between Britain and Germany for world domination had been won—by the United States.

2) After the Armistice

America was a world-power, *the* power. President Wilson interpreted this fact in terms of the League of Nations. But the League met the unrelenting opposition of two sections of the American people, which together constituted an overwhelming majority. One section opposed the League of Nations because they conceived it as assuring the supremacy of Great Britain, they felt that America must not relinquish its power, must be independent of any force that might interfere in maintaining and extending American world-power, and particularly independent to struggle against any revival of British supremacy. The other section interpreted American world-power in purely business terms, of production and trade.

While President Wilson was battling for the League of Nations and being chained to the monstrous reaction of France by Clemenceau; while a small group of Republicans were developing a definite imperialistic world-policy—the complacent assumption of the majority of Americans was something of this sort: The war is won, and we have made enormous profits out of it; Europe owes us a lot of money which it must pay, *how* is Europe's affair; we shall continue to manufacture and sell goods, while Europe prepares to pay its debts to us. This attitude developed more and more strength, becoming dominant after the American Senate's rejection of the Wilson League of Nations. America isolated itself in monstrous self-satisfaction, cold to the tragedy of a world in ruins; while, with the generosity of hogs wallowing in their own super-abundance, the Americans threw a few bones of charity to starving Europe (but, with business calculation and malice, excluding Russia).

But the American capitalist had seriously miscalculated prevailing factors in the world situation. They had conceived a quick recovery of Europe, and a tremendous demand for goods which only America could supply. The year 1919 was a prosperous one, American foreign trade showing a favorable balance of about four billions dollars: Europe starving and short of goods, mortgaged its future in order to purchase. In 1920, however, indications appeared of a collapse in trade. The favorable trade balance declined to about three billion dollars (an increase over 1919 of \$300,000,000 in exports and \$1,375,000,000 in imports); but the figures are deceptive, since there was an actual decrease in the movement of *goods*; the increase being due to abnormally high prices; upon the same price basis as 1919, American foreign trade in 1920 would have shown a decline of \$700,000,000. Concerning exports to Europe, the situation was much more serious, exports having actually declined by \$700,000,000 on the basis of 1920 prices, and a much larger decline in goods in terms of 1919 prices.

This trade, moreover, was maintained by the extension of large business credits to Europe, which since the armistice total about \$4,000,000,000.

Already in 1919 there were indications of an economic

crisis; American industry had a capacity for production greater than its foreign trade; and there was much curtailment of production. The tremendous financial expansion and inflation of credits, together with a 25 per cent. decline in wholesale prices produced financial stringency. Liquidation was the order of the day—a financial panic was in the making. But a financial panic was averted by means of the Federal Reserve System, which unites all the banks together (a bank system introduced by the Wilson Administration, which practically realizes the old dream of American monopoly for a "Central Bank"). This was the situation in 1920; an actual decline in foreign trade, panic-conditions in finances, closed mills, decreased railroad earnings (and demoralization), idle ships and unemployment.

In spite of these ominous facts, American business still maintained its insularity; the dominant sentiment still was: "To hell with Europe's problems; let's get down to business."

But they could not "get down to business." American industry had a tremendous capacity for production, but Europe could not buy the goods. American business was now cautious in extending more credits, since Europe could not pay; where Europe did pay, it paid in gold, weakening European credit, and increasing American stocks of gold to such an extent that American business wailed: "What shall we do with our gold?" The situation became almost disastrous. Industrial plants closed down; half the American merchant marine was idle; unemployment increased terrifically. During six months ending in May, 1921, American foreign trade declined 50 per cent, almost exclusively in trade with Europe.

II

THE CHARACTER AND OBJECTIVES OF AMERICAN IMPERIALISM

1) Apparent Variations in Foreign Policy

It was in these conditions that President Harding was elected and assumed office. It was imagined, during the election campaign, that the Republican Party, historically the party of American expansion and Imperialism, might initiate a "liberal" foreign policy. But precisely as the pressure of economic and political facts compelled Wilson to become an imperialist (in deeds, if not in words), so a similar pressure is compelling Harding to develop a world policy in accord with America's world-power. Imperialism and the world-crisis, all the factors involved in the United States being a world-power, are forcing the Harding Administration to actually carry out (in all respects except the League of Nations) the foreign policies of President Wilson. There is only one difference: that while President Wilson employed the lofty language of universal history, President Harding employs the business slang of the American manufacturer. . . .

There were large hopes placed upon Harding by persons who imagine that words and election slogans (of all places in America!) determine the politics of a nation; and the

only results are large disappointments. It was imagined that Harding would pursue a policy of "isolation"; but on May 24th President Harding said to a meeting of manufacturers and bankers: "The United States never were, and never will be, able to maintain isolation. The war made us a great creditor-nation. . . ." It was imagined that Harding would immediately open trade relations with Soviet Russia; but Secretary of State Hughes' note to the Soviets makes it clear that Harding is as opposed to relations with Russia as was Wilson. It was imagined that Harding would do something (it was never clear precisely what) to help Germany; but the opposite developed, since America's loans to the Entente give it a huge stake in German payments. It was imagined that Harding would repudiate the Versailles Treaty; but this treaty is an instrument for capitalist domination in Europe and against proletarian revolution, and it will in one form or another (excluding the League of Nations) be ratified by the Harding Administration with such reservations and modifications only as are in accord with America's own interests. It was imagined that Harding would "boycot" Europe; but steadily the new American Government is intervening in Europe; if Europe cannot or will not go to America, and buy and pay, America must come into Europe, and make it buy and pay—a vulgar case of Mahomet and the mountain.

The indefinite forms and variations in America's foreign policy are due to the fact that the war thrust economic and financial supremacy upon America so quickly that Americans had not the necessary time to develop a definite world policy—they continued to think in purely business terms and insularity.

Up until the war American Imperialism was still largely national in scope; it had not projected itself in world policy beyond the Monroe Doctrine—"America for American capital." American Imperialism developed definitely after the Civil War (1861-1865), with the building of the great transcontinental railways, which opened the west to capitalist exploitation. The west for twenty years played the role in American Imperialism of undeveloped colonial territory, immigrants being equivalent to colonial peoples. All the peculiar national forms of Imperialism prevailed in the United States—monopoly, the domination of finance-capital, State Capitalism, intensive exploitation of labor; but the international forms did not develop so quickly. Even the imperialistic war with Spain (1898), the annexation of the Philippines and the building of the Panama Canal did not develop a definite international policy for American Imperialism. Nor, strangely, did the war develop such a policy, except in a small group.

But political thinking cannot long lag behind economic facts. America has had world-power thrust upon it. Slowly but surely, America is developing a world policy compact of aggression and domination. American Imperialism may be pictured as a colossus with its feet planted firmly in Latin-America, while one hand reaches out to grasp China and Asia, and the other Europe.

2) America and the South

Latin-America (Mexico, Central and South America) may be considered as the colonial basis of American Imperialism. The United States has a political protectorate in Cuba, military protectorates in all the Caribbean Republics, and is preparing to conquer Mexico; while all South America is under the control of American capital.

Before the war, in spite of the Monroe Doctrine, Britain and Germany had larger interests in South America than the United States. But today all is different: Germany has been expropriated, Britain relegated to a minor position, while the United States is supreme. The commercial supremacy of the United States is undisputed. In 1910 the value of United States trade with Latin-America was \$689,000,000; in 1912, \$818,000,000; in 1915, \$1,000,000,000; while in 1920 it was \$3,373,185,567 (a gain over 1919 of \$1,940,144,950). There was a decline during the first five months of 1921, but it is not serious.

It is not simply in terms of trade, as such, however, that we must measure the domination of the United States in Latin-America. More important is the export of capital and machinery for developing the vast undeveloped territories of Latin-America. The United States is a tremendous reservoir of investment capital, it produces vast amounts of machinery, all of which must be exported. Then there is the factor of oil. The United States has a practical monopoly of oil resources, with Mexico next. Supremacy in oil resources is today a vital factor in world supremacy. The United States must possess itself of Mexico's oil resources (as well as of those in other Latin-American lands). Moreover, the United States now imports raw materials, and Latin-America possesses these in abundance.

The process which is now completing itself is to make Latin-America an integral unit of the industry and finance of the United States.

This American "urge to the South" now plays the role that the expansion westward played in American history up until the end of the nineteenth century. The Monroe Doctrine has been transformed into the political expression of this "urge to the South," and it is being used to deny oil and other concessions to foreign nations (other than the United States!) in the Latin-American republics on the ground that such concessions menace the political independence of these republics.

President Harding is pursuing a systematic policy of consolidating and extending the economic domination of the United States in Latin-America. The developing program indicates that the industrial, financial and if necessary military control of Latin America is to become the solid basis of the Imperialism of the United States in its struggle to maintain and extend its world domination—precisely as the control and consolidation of Central Europe up to Turkey was to have been the basis for Germany's domination of the world.

3) America, Japan, China

The traditional American policy in China has been the

"open door"—that is, equality of economic right and opportunity for all nations. This policy was partially abandoned by President Wilson in 1915, when, through the Lansing-Ishii Agreement, he recognized that Japan had "special rights" in China because of "territorial contiguity." This was one of the acts which particularly aroused imperialistic ire against Wilson.

There are, at this moment, no particularly important American interests in China. The prevailing trade and investments are not very large, but rapidly increasing, and the potential importance of China is enormous. The economic awakening of China is imminent; it is a country which must necessarily absorb vast amounts of capital and iron goods. The United States, accordingly, is now developing an acute struggle to prevent Japanese hegemony in China (for this is the American policy, in spite of the Lansing-Ishii Agreement and Wilson's approval of the award of Shantung to Japan). Relations between Japan and America are becoming strained; in both countries there exists a powerful party whose agitation directly makes for war.

The hegemony of China is indispensable to Japanese Imperialism; imperialistic Japan must expand or burst. But in a strictly industrial and financial struggle with America for control in China, Japan is doomed, since America is infinitely superior in industrial and financial resources. The United States is preparing an economic offensive in China; against this Japan is feverishly preparing by means of consolidating its political power in China and increase in armaments.

There is no possibility of a peaceful solution of this struggle for China, since, indispensable now to Japan, China must soon equally become indispensable to America's capital and iron goods when other markets reach the point of saturation.

A struggle for China between America and Japan becomes inevitably a struggle for the domination of the Pacific. But should this struggle become war, it will involve more—a struggle for world-power, into which Britain would be fatally drawn (because of the rivalry between America and Britain considered later on).

An American-Japanese War is not a factor that can affect the *immediate* policy of the Communist International. But should the proletarian revolution not sweep onwards, then this war (drawing in Britain and other nations) becomes inevitable and of supreme importance to the International.

4) America and Europe

America's relations to Europe are determined; in the first place, by its financial stake in Europe. What is this stake? It amounts to, approximately \$18,000,000,000, distributed as follows: loans by the American Government to Great Britain, France, Italy and Belgium (including unpaid interest), \$11,000,000,000; other loans and business credits; \$3,000,000,000; business credits extended since the Armistice, \$4,000,000,000.

Upon receipt of payment for these loans and credits de-

pends America's financial integrity. Payment is possible only by means of trade, goods and investments. Payment with gold is impossible; Europe has not enough; moreover, America has almost half the world's gold reserves, and is being choked by it—"it would be better," said President Harding recently, "and more useful for this gold to remain in vaults abroad, guaranteeing the gold standard and the fair exchanges which are vital to international trade." The problem is the restoration of the industry and trade of Europe, which are almost vanishing. America has a compact, efficient machine to produce goods and the ships to transport them; but both are now largely idle, since customers are unable to purchase; the problem is to finance the customers.

Europe must pay in goods. But American business is still under the influence of the old protectionist ideas of high tariffs, as well as the American Congress. This problem is creating tremendous discussion, and emphasizing the enormous contradictions of Imperialism.

On the other hand, American business is realizing that the restoration of normal trade depends upon America extending still larger credits to Europe. Corporations have been formed for the purpose of financing foreign trade. On May 7th the National Foreign Trade Council of America adopted a resolution, which said:

"A return to normal conditions depends largely upon the development of foreign trade. The United States must continue to increase its imports or exports necessary to stable employment of labor and permit liquidation of the obligations of nations indebted to the United States. The solution of the present situation depends upon our ability to create facilities for long-term credits, which are now so badly needed in Europe. Unless credits are granted their business and ours must remain stagnant."

The Harding Administration has already practically pledged itself to the program of an extensive grant of business credits to Europe. But the plans are being slowly formulated, because it is the intention to use this extension of credits in a calculated policy for establishing American industrial and financial hegemony in Europe.

America's financial control over Europe is already immense; with the extension of more credits this control will assume enormous proportions, accelerated by the fact that large amounts of American capital are being invested in European industry by means of purchase of European business enterprises. Moreover, America's extension of credits must have security, and this will largely take the form of pledging European key industries and natural resources (as is already the case in Austria). And, should Europe recover industrially, and pay America its loans, these will partly represent an accumulation of surplus capital, much of which will be invested in European industry—consolidating American domination. Even before the new Harding policy this development was so important that a writer in "The Fortnightly Review" (London) said: "It is not inconceivable that through the purchase of European under-

takings by Americans Europe may become a dependency, if not a colony, of the United States."

Should this tendency develop to its conclusion (and for the moment we exclude from the problem the factors represented by Great Britain and Soviet Russia) Europe must become a hewer of wood and drawer of water for America, rendering its tribute to American Imperialism, deprived of initiative and independence. In a financial and industrial sense, Europe would be a colony, its manufactures the subject princes of American capital, while the workers would be subject to the double exploitation of European and American Capitalism.

That Europe is doomed in the struggle for world supremacy is clearly recognized by the French scholar, A. Demangeon, who, in his book, "Le Declin de l'Europe," says: "No one can question the fact that Europe, which ruled until the end of the 19th century, has relinquished her supremacy to other lands. We are beholding *the shifting of the world's centre of gravity*. . . . By an astonishing turn of affairs Europe, mother of so many colonies, is becoming a field for American colonization. No European country, from the most backward to the most advanced is escaping this powerful movement."

Two years ago, it appeared as if Europe was doomed to become a colony of Britain. But now, according to the writer in "The Fortnightly Review," Britain is itself in danger of becoming an American protectorate. . . . America is now the world's great provider of capital, New York becoming world-banker in place of London; America is also becoming the world's great provider of goods; more and more American export trade becomes one in manufactured goods, on which British supremacy was based (in 1880-1890, the American export of manufactured goods was 15 per cent; during the years preceding the war it averaged 30 per cent; during the war and after it was 50 per cent); while the great American merchant marine built during the war threatens British maritime supremacy (assisted by the fact that, in trade with the Orient, the Panama Canal is wresting control from the Suez Canal). Most threatening of all to Britain, American capacity to produce steadily increases while British capacity declines (the output of the American worker is three times that of his British comrade). America is aggressively becoming what Great Britain formerly was—the world's manufacturer, merchant, shipper and banker.

The struggle between Britain and America expresses itself in all parts of the world, but it is becoming particularly acute in Europe. Europe is rapidly becoming the arena of a great conflict—shall Europe become a colony of Britain or America? While France imagines that it can secure the hegemony of Europe by means of military and political arrangement with newly-created states (Poland), these states, and France itself, are dependent upon England or America; after the military factor wears itself out and French policy accordingly collapses, France must itself, together with all capitalist Europe, become a colony of—

Britain or America. Lloyd-George instinctively appreciates the situation. His recent actions (as, for example, his speech on the Upper Silesian situation) are determined by his appreciation of Europe's problem as one of finance and economics, while France and Poland see it in terms of politics and military actions. Lloyd-George wants this problem of political and military disturbances settled, so that by means of peace and production Britain may engage in its great struggle for the domination of Europe—and the world.

It is a struggle of destiny for Britain. Defeat means retrogression, and that means collapse. But a powerful nation does not yield imperialistic supremacy without a resort to the arbitrament of the sword. A resort to the sword means another world war, with Britain, America and Japan as the principals.

In this situation Europe plays the role of the victim waiting for the sacrifice. There can be no initiative or independence in a capitalist Europe; it is doomed.

5) The Great Duel

But, in reality, fundamentally and historically, there are two great world powers: America, involving all the multiplying contradictions of Imperialism; and Soviet Russia, implying all the factors making for the proletarian revolution.

America, the imperialistic world power, bonds the world to its domination. It has in seven years increased its national wealth by fifty billion dollars; it controls enormous natural resources and is stretching out to control more; it has immense economic power; it dominates the world economically.

Soviet Russia, the revolutionary world power, strives to liberate the world by means of proletarian revolution. Soviet Russia, bruised, wrecked, starving, attacked by the whole capitalist world, has by means of its revolutionary policy resisted becoming a colony of either Britain or America. Revolutionary Russia may compromise, may make concessions, but through them all it calls the world to proletarian revolution. Soviet Russia *has* resisted colonization, it still maintains its revolutionary offensive—that is a fact of world historical importance.

The world revolution has resolved itself into a great duel between bourgeois America and Soviet Russia. America represents all the forces of Imperialism to "restore" Capitalism; Russia represents all the forces of revolutionary Communism to destroy Capitalism. America disposes of the forces of Capitalism everywhere, and in the process subjects them to its domination; Soviet Russia disposes of the revolutionary forces in all lands (particularly in Europe and Asia) and in the process liberates the world.

NATIONAL WAR AND CLASS WAR IN SILESIA

Paul Frölich

The Upper Silesian question may be considered as solved. Lloyd George has played his trump card against Briand. For the first time, the French Government has conceded to British policy. Korfanty has expressed his readiness to withdraw his insurgent troops. The Polish question will be solved by an agreement among the World Powers.

Owing to the strong nationalist illusions of the Polish workers in Upper Silesia, it was extraordinarily difficult for the Communist Party in Upper Silesia to combat the Polish-Nationalist demagogy. The Communists regarded their most important duty to be to warn the Upper Silesian workers against both the Polish and the German capitalists and nationalists, and to call upon them really to take the mines into their own hands, and to arm in order to defend the position against any form of counter-revolution, and to win new revolutionary positions for themselves.

It was to be expected that the Communists could be successful only when the test of hard facts dispersed the nationalist illusions. Even in Germany very little news was received regarding events in Upper Silesia, but definite facts already prove that the nationalist struggle in Upper Silesia is becoming converted into a class struggle. The economic position in Upper Silesia, which has developed as a consequence of the revolt, will hasten this process. The insurgents supply themselves with the necessaries of life by expropriations, and in this way come into conflict with the small owners. Korfanty attempted to receive food in exchange for coal. He, for example, offered coal to Germany, Austria and Hungary, but he has neither the will nor is he in the position to draw the logical consequences of his pseudo-Communist position, for, the purpose of conducting his coal business, he must have the German coal owners, whom he is imploring to return to their mines. He is also compelled, before the fruit of his nationalist revolt has been plucked, to march against the proletariat. According to the latest information a frightful white terror is reigning in the Upper Silesian coal districts. The insurgent army, composed largely of student and similar elements, has broken up into groups and is conducting a sanguinary struggle against the Communists. A large number of Communist workers, including some of the best leaders of the party, have been killed. The Upper Silesian Labor Movement is in a terrible situation. It is not yet clear whether class interests, or nationalist illusions will come out uppermost in the proletariat in this struggle, but it is clear that the solution of the Upper Silesian question will be achieved by a bloody war against the proletariat.

In the area of the revolt, as well as in other parts of Upper Silesia, and in the province of Silesia, the German nationalists under the leadership of the Minister of National Defense having organized strong forces of Reichswehr, Defense Police and the Orgesch. Recruiting sta-

(Continued on page 32)

The New Economic Policy of Soviet Russia

By N. BUKHARIN

On July 8th, 1921, Comrade Bukharin delivered a lecture to the delegates of the Third World Congress of the Comintern in Moscow on the significance of the new economic policy of Soviet Russia, from which we quote the following passages:

In order to understand the new policy and its practical importance, we should consider it in connection with the economic and social crises, which we had to go through this spring. The experience of the Russian Revolution has proved that our former notions of the revolutionary process were rather naive. Even the orthodox Marxian section thought that all the proletariat had to do to take over the technical apparatus after ejecting the upper layers of the bourgeoisie was to capture the reins of power. Experience taught us something very different from that. It proved that during the proletarian dictatorship the complete dissolution of the old capitalist apparatus is a necessary stage in the revolutionary development. Perhaps some will object that this experience does not give us a theoretical proof and that the development in other countries may assume a different character from that of Russia. They may say that Russia is backward, her proletariat is not numerous, and big industry constitutes a small proportion of the economy of Russia. In Western Europe and in America, however, the development will take quite a different direction. This idea can be refuted not only by Russian experience—we are convinced of the absolute inevitability of an economic disorganization generally during the revolutionary process.

Every revolution is a process of reorganization of social relations. In a bourgeois revolution this process is not so thorough or extensive as in a proletarian revolution, because capitalism has already been developed and only a political transformation becomes necessary. Feudal property had already become private property, and the bourgeois revolution had only to secure this private property and allow it a wider scope of action. It was mainly a question of transferring the political machine from one set of owners to another. But even in this case it was necessary to undergo a certain process of reorganization, which had to be paid for dearly. Even a bourgeois revolution is accompanied by a temporary decline in productivity. Such was the case in the Great French Revolution. The same was manifested in the American Civil War, where economic development was thrown back for a decade. In a proletarian revolution the same thing takes place on a much larger scale. During a proletarian revolution we must not only destroy the State machine, but completely reorganize the industrial relations. That is the most important point.

What are the industrial relations in the capitalist system? First of all there is a capitalist hierarchy, the subordination of one group to another; higher on the top there is the class of capitalists, then follow the directors, then the technical intelligentsia, the so-called new middle class, then the skilled workers and finally the rank and file workers. If these in-

dustrial relations are to be recognized it means that we must first of all and immediately destroy the various ties that bind these groups. The workers achieve this not by street fights only, but by struggling industrially by means of strikes, etc. The working class cannot win the army in time of Revolution if the soldiers obey their officers. It is equally necessary to bring about a breakdown in industrial discipline, if the proletariat is to gain a hold over the economic apparatus.

Once these ties between the classes and strata are severed, the whole process of production will be brought to a standstill. When the workers strike or fight on the barricades, no work can be done. When there is a sabotage on the part of the technical intelligentsia, the whole process of production is interrupted. Only when the proletariat is fully in possession of the whole government machine can it put down such attempts. Until that time the process of production will be paralyzed. Kautsky and Otto Bauer were talking utter rubbish when they spoke of the continuity of the process of production and wish to connect it with the revolution. It would be the same if an army wishing to defeat its officers were to preserve a strict discipline under their command instead of killing them. Either the revolution will win, and then there is an inevitable disorganization of the process of production, or discipline will be maintained, and then there will be no revolution at all. Every revolution is paid for by certain attending evils, and it is only at that price that we can bring about the transition to higher forms of economic life of the revolutionary proletariat. We need not be afraid of that temporary disorganization. One cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs.

Proletarian Dictatorship and the Peasantry During the Civil War

Now it becomes clear that the price to be paid for the revolutionary process is greater where there is a more stubborn resistance on the part of all the other classes and groups to the proletariat, attaining its maximum in the country which is first in adopting the dictatorship. In Russia the class struggle involved not only a civil but also a foreign war. Where civil war is transformed into foreign war against powerful States the revolution has to be paid for at an outrageous rate. This is the chief cause of our impoverishment in the course of the last few years. Nearly 75 per cent. of our small supplies and of our latest products had to be given to the Red Army. Every intelligent man will understand what this means to our economic life.

It is impossible to live without bread. The bread question is the most difficult problem of the revolution. The

process of economic disintegration during the revolution is also expressed by the severance of ties which connect town and country. When the battle of classes is raging and the process of production in towns is paralyzed, communications with the rural districts cease. The ties of finance and capital which bind the large landowners and the rich farmers to the banks are immediately severed. The same happened to the connecting links between the various peasant co-operative organizations. All exchange between town and country ceases. The credit system in particular is ruined. When towns cease to supply anything to the country, there is no stimulus to give anything to the towns. The economic equilibrium is destroyed.

As the town population must exist also in time of revolution, special means must be found to feed it. First the supplies stored in towns are consumed. Then compulsory means may be adopted against the peasants. The third expedient is the consciousness of the peasants that only the Proletarian State defends them against the landowners, the usurers, and others.

The peasants were greatly influenced by that consideration during the civil war against foreign counter revolution. Our compulsory methods found their economic justification in this circumstance. As regards the arguments of the Opportunists that the peasantry was opposed to the Bolsheviks and that the latter rule by sheer force, every Marxist will say that this is nonsense. Not even the Czar's government was capable of performing such a feat. Our compulsory actions found their economic justification in the fact that the peasants, as a class, fully understand that there is no force that can defend them from the landowners, of whose estates the peasants have taken possession. In Russia 82 per cent. of land formerly owned by large landowners was given to the peasants. The close-fisted peasant will not allow this land to be taken from him. He was wise enough to perceive that the main economic problem is to keep fast to the land, as land alone gives him the certainty of growing food. That is why he put up with our methods of requisitions and that is why we were on the whole able to maintain an equilibrium in our social structure. We felt the ground under our feet.

Of course, every war has its laws. The experience of capitalist countries has shown that the economic changes can more easily be effected in war than in peace time. The same can be observed in our country. Certain classes, especially the petty bourgeoisie, were honestly convinced that everything must be sacrificed for war. Due to this we were able to estimate our resources and regulate economy by strongly applying the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But after the war was over the contradictions in this economic system came to the surface at once, first and foremost the contradictions between the regulating tendencies and the anarchical tendencies of the peasantry.

Inflexibility of the Peasant and Declassing of the Proletariat

It was proved economically that if we take away all the surplus of the peasants' produce we take away almost all the incentive to further production. If the peasant knows that he will be deprived of all surplus produce he will only produce for himself and nothing for others. The only incentive that remains is of an intellectual kind, the knowledge that he must support the workers who defend him from the landlord. After the victory at the civil war fronts the effect of his incentive was destroyed. It was observed that the cultivated area diminished. This was also due to the drafting of the labor forces to the army, to the decrease of the stocks of cattle, peasant stock generally, etc. Agriculture was in a critical condition, and we were in danger of being left without sufficient bread.

Naturally this state of agriculture reacted on industry. It is not true that our technical apparatus is totally disorganized. In many important branches of the textile and metal industries, as well as others, we possess a good technical apparatus. But the great problem facing us is how to provide the towns with the necessaries of life. In our country the workers are hungry because the exchange of goods between town and country is paralyzed.

These economic conditions have their social consequences. When large industry is in such a miserable condition the workers seek to find a way, e. g., by manufacturing small articles of every day use at the places where they work, which they subsequently sell. By such methods the proletariat becomes declassed. When in this way the worker becomes interested in free trade, he begins to regard himself as a small producer, a petty bourgeois. This means the transformation of the workers into petty bourgeois with all their characteristics. The proletariat goes back to the village where it works as small craftsmen. The greater the disorganization the stronger the process of degeneration of the proletariat, now demanding free trade.

The proletariat as such is weakened. Moreover, the flower of the proletariat was destroyed at the front. Our army consisted of an amorphous peasant mass which was like wax in the hands of the communist, and non-party men. We have lost an immense number of these proletarians, and it was precisely these who enjoyed the greatest esteem and confidence in the factories. Moreover, we were compelled to utilize the best strata of the proletariat for the State machine, the administration of all the villages, etc. To organize a proletarian dictatorship in a peasant country meant to distribute the proletarians among certain localities like so many pieces on a chess-board, in order to guide the peasants. One can imagine how the factories suffered in consequence through lack of proletarian forces. Only the worst elements remained in the factories. And on the top of it all came the declassing of the workers. Such is the social crisis within the working class.

The peasantry had also to suffer, but not to the same ex-

tent. If we take an economic view of the subject, i. e., not in the sense of power and political rights, the peasantry has derived more benefit from the revolution than all the other classes. Economically the peasantry is better off than the proletariat, though the latter is the privileged class. The peasant feels himself stronger than ever. There are other, secondary causes. The peasants obtained a good training in the army. He returned from the war a different man. He is now on a higher intellectual and moral level than he was before. Now he understands politics very well. He says: We are the predominating force and we shall not allow others to treat us as silly children. We want to feed the workers, but we are the senior partners and demand our rights.

As soon as the war was over the peasants immediately presented their demands. They are interested in small trade. They are supporters of free trade, and opposed to the compulsory socialist system of economy. These demands were presented in the form of peasant risings in various districts in Siberia, Tambov, etc. Things did not look so bad as the counter revolutionary press tried to picture it, but these events were symptomatic. In their eyes the political solution of the economic situation consists in the motto "For the Bolsheviks and against the Communists."

At first this appears quite absurd, but though it is cryptically formulated this motto has an intelligent explanation. At the time of the October Revolution and previous to it we were the party that told the peasant to kill the landowner and to take his land. The bolsheviks were then thought to be capital fellows. They gave the peasants everything and demanded nothing in return. But in the end we became the Party which gave nothing and demanded everything from the peasants. They were consequently against the communists, who were taking away their bread and moreover preached absurd ideas of communism, unsuitable to the peasants. The second watchword was free trade. The first watchword was "For non-party Soviets against the dictatorship of a party." If there are even communists who fail to understand that a class can only rule if it has a head, and the party is the head of a class then we can easily understand the peasants failing to grasp that idea. Such is the intellectual atmosphere prevailing among the lower middle-class and the peasantry.

The proletariat, too, insofar as it was declassed, of necessity shared the same views. In some places even metal workers took up the watchwords: "Free trade," against the Communist," for class dictatorship but against Party dictatorship." Thus the equilibrium between the proletariat and the peasantry was destroyed. A misunderstanding arose which threatened the whole system of the proletarian dictatorship. The crisis found its expression in the Kronstadt mutiny. The documents which have since been brought to light show clearly that the affair was instigated by purely white guard centres, but at the same time the Kronstadt mutiny was a petty

bourgeois rebellion against the socialist system of economic compulsion. Sailors are mostly sons of peasants, especially Ukrainian peasants. Ukraine is more petty bourgeois than Central Russia. The peasants there resemble more the German farmers than the Russian peasants. They are against Czarism but have little sympathy for communism. The sailors were home on leave and there became strongly infected with peasant ideas. This was the cause of the revolt.

The Principles of the New Policy

As is known we acted with all speed; we mobilized and sent against Kronstadt one-third of our Party Congress, we lost many comrades, but we quelled the rebellion. But victory could not solve this question. We had to take certain measures. Had there been a revolution in Germany we could have brought workers from there and have made a surgical operation. But we have to act on our own. There was one principle which we had to maintain at all costs: the preservation of the dictatorship. It was clear that we were making no concessions to the peasants. We had the picture of the Hungarian affair before us. It is true we should have come into power again after a few months or years, but the bourgeoisie would try its method of reorganization, which costs something, and then we would again try ours. The disorganization of national industry would be so terrible that no one can even guess whether any tolerable state of things could ever result from this chaos.

When the State apparatus is in our hands we can guide it in any desired direction. But unless we are at the helm we can give no direction at all. Consequently we must seize power and keep it and make no political concessions. But we may make many economic concessions. But the fact of the matter is we are making economic concessions, and then political concessions. But the fact of the matter is we are making economic concessions in order to avoid making political concessions. We shall agree to no coalition government or anything like it, not even equal rights to peasants and workers. We cannot do that. The concessions do not in any way change the class character of the dictatorship. When a State makes concessions to another class it does in no way alter its class character, no more than a factory owner, who makes concessions to his employees, becomes a worker. If we look at it from a social and political standpoint the significance of the concessions lies in the pacification and neutralization of the lower middle class. Our former investigations brought us to the conclusion that the economic difficulties consisted in the lack of an incentive to increase production. Now this incentive has been offered in the substitution of a tax in kind instead of requisitions. Now the peasant knows that he will have to give up more if he produces more, but he knows also that he will keep more. Experience has already shown that such are his calculations. As soon as we decided

on this new system at our party congress the area under cultivation increased at once to that of 1916 and even 1915.

Politically a general pacification has set in. The guerilla warfare in the Ukraine has lost its intensity. These political measures succeeded in putting an end to the Makno gangs. Some will naturally doubt the wisdom of making these concessions to the petty bourgeoisie. They may say that a period of accumulation, such as existed hitherto, has been inaugurated, that usury will result which will transform itself into industrial capitalism. We are faced by the same danger as we were at the time of the Brest Peace, when we stood in danger of being wholly engulfed by German capitalism. However, such a state of things is only temporary. Our position now is that we want bread and a pacific peasantry, or else we shall go to the dogs. Even the worker will revolt against his own government if he has nothing to eat. Communism requires a certain time to mature and this process under our conditions of life is more painful than it would otherwise be. We have in our hands large industry, the coal industry, transport, etc. A whole period of history is required to transform the peasant into a capitalist. Our view is that capitalism will rise slowly from below, but we will keep under our control the chief branches of industry. Once this is achieved all the industrial processes will assume their normal course. The declassing of the proletariat will cease, we shall be able to invite foreign workers, etc. We could then pass on the technical revolution, and will be able to realize the electrification of Russia, which is now in an embryonic stage. If we succeed in realizing even a part of our program then we shall get the better of the petty bourgeois tendencies. If the peasant receives from us electric light and power he will be transformed into a social functionary and his proprietary instincts will not be offended.

If the tendencies of capitalist growth gain the upper hand over the tendencies to improve large industry, then we are doomed. But we hope the contrary will be the case—then we shall master all difficulties in the field of economics.

Paul Levi and all the Opportunists of the world say: "You see, the Bolsheviks are making concessions to the peasants and we make concessions to the masses." But this analogy is not correct. We make concessions to secure the equilibrium of the Soviet system, Levi makes concessions to maintain the capitalist equilibrium, and he does not seem to notice this little difference. We might as well say that there is an army in France and there is an army here, a police system there and an Extraordinary Commission here. The essential point is—what are the class functions of these institutions, and which class do they serve? Whoever makes an abstraction of the class lives in the skies, not on earth. And I think it would be better if our enemies remain in the skies and we remain on solid earth.

THE FEAR OF THE GREAT CLASH

By KARL RADEK

Since the end of the World War two great storm centres have been formed, the American-English and the American-Japanese antagonism. The press of the three above-mentioned countries is following with ever increasing attention the economic events, the war preparations and the diplomatic moves in the other two allied countries. Japan and England are asking against whom the United States of America are building their fleet, now that the Germany navy is resting at the bottom of the sea at Scapa Flow. The same question is being put by America to its two other allies. When Lord Jellicoe, the most prominent of English naval officers, published his report, demanding the construction of a great fleet for the defence of Australia and India, not even the greatest English fabricator of lies, Lord Northcliffe, could make the Japanese believe that the English Admiralty was planning to build such a fleet for the support of Japan. The navy discussions in the English press in December of last year were completely influenced by the American danger, and the basis of this American danger was found to be not only in the evidences of American war preparations, but above all in the evidences of American economic competition. The increase of American export trade, not only with neutral markets, not only with allied countries, but even with England itself and its colonies, demonstrated to England that, from an economic point of view, it had lost the war. The American-Japanese friction respecting Yap Island, the friction at Tien-Tsin and Vladivostok, illuminated the situation from time to time as with a flash of lightning. Moreover, it appeared that the United States of America had withdrawn from European politics, only to be in a position to take a much keener interest in questions of the Pacific in various spheres.

It now seems as though great changes are about to take place in the mutual relations between the aforementioned countries. On the day after the Japanese Crown Prince arrived in England as the guest of the King of England, and was received with great pomp, indicating a closer relationship between Japan and England, the new American ambassador, Harvey, arrived in London and delivered an important speech, in which he first of all made known America's intention to return to European politics. Although the American Government would not recognize the League of Nations, it was nevertheless prepared to lend its assistance, side by side with England in the Allied Council, in the solution of European problems. This turn of affairs simply puts into words what has already taken place. The United States of America, in co-operation with England, prevented the occupation of the Ruhr territory by the French, and at the same time succeeded in imposing a duty on the German export trade. Both steps point to what the question hinges on. Under the pressure of the world crisis, which is shaking both Anglo-Saxon countries most severely, they are attempting to save Germany as a market for their products

Review of the Month

I

From Versailles to Washington

Harding's proposed conference of the principal allied and associated powers for considering the limitation of armaments and Pacific and Far Eastern affairs promises to be no less ambitious than the Versailles sessions. In fact, the conference to be held in Washington on November 11th will be concluding the work of Versailles.

The speedy acceptance of the invitation by France, Italy and Great Britain portrays the universal recognition of the might of American imperialism. No world problems can today be settled without America's participation in their consideration and "solution." Should this Washington Conference materialize not the "Association of Nations" the latter body will surely supplant the decrepit "League of Nations." Already the "League of Nations" is marking time and awaiting the results of the Harding Conference.

Japan's hesitancy in accepting the invitation is due to the fact that her imperialism sees no gain in view from such participation. Of course, it is ready to discuss disarmament. Such talk does not prevent any Power from being prepared for war. But for Japan to entrust decisions concerning the problems of the Pacific and Far East to nations that are at the mercy of American finance and industrial capital would be foolhardy. To America, of course, the Pacific problems are the crux of the world issues. The Pacific will very likely be the scene of the next imperialist conflagration. The Pacific is becoming the battle ground of *weltpolitik*. American capitalism, realizing full well its

and at the same time to protect themselves against German competition. Lloyd George responded to Harvey's speech by issuing a warning to the capitalistic world. He declared that if the late world war were not the last world war, the world would then be completely ruined. He greeted the return of America into the Allied Council as a ray of hope. It is in this declaration by Lloyd George that the basis may be found for the reports about impending negotiations between America and England concerning the limitation of armaments.

All these reports and combinations give birth to the hope expressed in a part of the capitalistic press, that the imperialistic pirates will succeed in coming to an agreement about the division of the spoils, after which peace and quiet shall descend upon the earth. We, however, consider these negotiations and reconciliations rather as a symptom of the great danger which the capitalistic statesmen discern but are unable to disperse. Grey, Haldane and Bethmann-Hollweg discerned the dangers no less clearly after the Morocco crisis of 1911, than Lloyd George senses them to-day. They at-

tempted to banish them by Ententes and Detentes. But in the anarchistic, imperialistic world, founded on competition, the diplomatic web proved weaker than the piratic instincts of the separate groups of capitalists. The capitalist world slid into the world war, in spite of the statesmen. But although we are of opinion that the capitalist world is absolutely incapable of overcoming the antagonisms which are rending it asunder, that does not at all mean that the efforts of the governments will not yield moments of relaxation, of the creation of a common front against the proletariat, of the diminution of the antagonisms. It is for this reason that the endeavors of the capitalist statesmen to secure reconciliation among the capitalists, should call forth still more energetic endeavors on the part of the revolutionary proletariat for the attainment of its unity if the attack upon the capitalistic world, in a situation in which the attempts of the capitalist governments at conciliation and consolidation, merely results in prolonging the suffering of the masses of the people.

strategic political and economic position, has no hesitancy in discussing these urgent problems with weaker Powers.

That the Washington Conference will have a most vital bearing on the renewal of the Anglo-Japanese alliance is evident. The Anglo-Japanese treaty was especially designed to secure "stability" in the Far East. China was invited to Washington because America is particularly interested in maintaining the "open door." As against the Nipponese imperialists the United States is determined to fight for "free and equal opportunities" to exploit China. England is interested in American naval power and in maintaining Japan as the gendarme over Asia in general and India in particular. France and Italy are interested in disarmament and Far Eastern problems because these issues involve the future of world peace.

The primary force which is driving the imperialist powers to consider disarmament and peace is the bankruptcy which they are facing. The leading nations are spending annually billions for armies and navies. They can ill-afford such huge expenditures at this time. Hence, they would welcome an agreement allowing a respite from arming in order to invest all their energies in rebuilding the structure of their industrial and financial organizations. The capitalist world is on the edge of a precipice and the imperialists are seeking to right-about face temporarily in order to extend capitalism's life.

How little faith the participants in the Washington Conference have in its outcome is shown by their continued intense military preparations. The last annual naval appropriation of the United States is nearly a half billion dollars—the largest peace-time naval budget any country has ever

tempted to banish them by Ententes and Detentes. But in the anarchistic, imperialistic world, founded on competition, the diplomatic web proved weaker than the piratic instincts of the separate groups of capitalists. The capitalist world slid into the world war, in spite of the statesmen. But although we are of opinion that the capitalist world is absolutely incapable of overcoming the antagonisms which are rending it asunder, that does not at all mean that the efforts of the governments will not yield moments of relaxation, of the creation of a common front against the proletariat, of the diminution of the antagonisms. It is for this reason that the endeavors of the capitalist statesmen to secure reconciliation among the capitalists, should call forth still more energetic endeavors on the part of the revolutionary proletariat for the attainment of its unity if the attack upon the capitalistic world, in a situation in which the attempts of the capitalist governments at conciliation and consolidation, merely results in prolonging the suffering of the masses of the people.

had. And American experts are feverishly at work preparing 4,000 lb. T N T bombs "that will make themselves heard around the world." France has set aside one and a half billion francs for her navy and is now maintaining a greater army than when Germany was at the zenith of her military power. England is keeping a careful eye on American navalism. The other Powers are all arming themselves to the teeth "in order to make war so terrible that no nation will want to engage in wars." Yes, the imperialist "peace-makers" are marching to Washington but only to the tune of military airs and to the roar of the cannon.

II

The World Crisis

The capitalist world is in the throes of a gigantic economic crisis. The very men who were, a short while ago, yelling for more production and more work are now shutting factories and workshops. Even America, the gourmand of world plunder, is hard hit. It is experiencing a terrific slump in both its domestic and foreign trade. Its unemployed are counted by the millions.

It is not for a lack of demand that America's "surplus" goods are not consumed. As a matter of fact, the world's lack is far greater than its present capacity to supply. Nor can we attribute the underconsumption to an unwillingness to pay or a refusal to give credit. There is but one thing that is most uncertain and seriously doubtful—and *that is the world's ability to pay.*

The industrial depression throughout the world manifests itself in a general decrease of trade and industries shutting down everywhere. The dollar continues to so outweigh the pound, lire, franc and mark that none can afford to deal with it. Capitalist inflation continues unabated. The total par exchange value of the currency of the fourteen most important countries amounts to \$37,243,537,000, but under the present exchange depression the notes and currency are worth only \$11,376,437,000. And this is so only with America's \$2,804,980,000 included in the total figures. The most wretched victim of this tragedy is Germany. Its seventy billion marks which at pre-war parity would be worth \$17,778,640,000 are worth at present exchange rates only \$1,084,063,000.

The war has brought about an increase of 221 billion dollars in the world debt. To-day the total world debt is approximately 265 billion dollars. On this giant sum the annual interest charge alone is nine billion dollars. Europe owes the U. S., in government and private debts, from 16 to 20 billion dollars.

Expenses are piling up and the huge debt is further increased by systematic marauding expeditions into Siberia, Ireland, Russia, Silesia and Mesopotamia. Such is the quandary in which the capitalist world finds itself. Will it weather the storm? The answer to this question rests largely in the hands of the world proletariat.

III

Congress of the Comintern

The Third Congress of the Communist International has just adjourned at Moscow. We have not yet received any authoritative reports of its sessions. But from what we have already learned it is evident that the Communist International has had a year of remarkable growth. The Comintern is already the greatest revolutionary organization that ever existed.

At last year's Congress there were only two Parties of tangible strength—the Russian and Italian. The mettle of the latter was questionable as shown by subsequent events. The furious drive of the imperialists, social-traitors and opportunists has broken down before the irresistible growth of the revolutionary parties. To-day Communist Parties exist in every large capitalist country. Communist groups of growing size and influence are to be found wherever capitalism has shown its head. In France, Germany and Czechoslovakia the Communist International counts its members by the hundreds of thousands. The Italian Party is now rid of its reformist and centrist elements. In England the Communist Party is growing despite intense persecution. And in America the unification of communist forces is proving itself a great stimulus to activity and growth.

The Third Congress has made short shrift of the centrists who attempted to undermine the virility and revolutionary energy of the world proletariat. The last vestige of "Leftism" was rooted out. Problems of immediate struggle and organization development consumed most of the sessions. The deliberations have undoubtedly produced greater communist clarity and will therefore prove a source of immeasurable strength to the proletariat of every country.

What appears to some a recession of the revolutionary wave, what appears to others a series of defeats at the hand of the counter-revolution, is only a precursor of new gigantic battles.

IV

American Oil Politics

American imperialism is engaged in an intense campaign of democratizing Haiti and Santo Domingo. Of course, no Power dares to-day challenge the nefarious American doctrine of "self-determination" of the western hemisphere.

But the prey in Central America is small compared to the potential booty in Mexico. Despite Obregon's readiness to do the bidding of American Capital, the relations between the United States and Mexico are becoming more strained. The American oil companies in Tampico have shut down as a protest against the Mexican oil tax. Thousands of workers were thus thrown out of employment. Then, with its characteristically sharp political "foresight," Washington dispatched warships to Tampico in order to prevent possible "labor troubles" in Mexico—a foreign country.

The fact of the matter is that Mexico is resisting American

The American Socialist Party

By THOROLD ROGERS

The Socialist Party of America has at last come into its own. At last have our good Americans, Berger and Hillquit, become the undisputed masters of Yankee Socialism. Assured of a genuine, home made, "Socialist education and organization," the American working-class will soon be well on the way toward the Elysian Fields of "normalcy."

The recent Socialist Party convention was truly epoch making. It marked the end of all official Socialist Party pretense of revolutionary plan or purpose. This convention was a most fitting climax to the dilly-dallying, hedging, and evasion of the last few years. Today the American Socialist Party stands unmasked, totally devoid of all revolutionary potentiality. The development of the world economic crisis, the consequent intensification of the class war, and the activities of the Communist International have driven the American Socialist Party to embrace openly and definitely the wretched philosophy of opportunism.

A Shadow of the Old

Under the aegis of red, white and blue bunting, delegates representing a reported membership of 17,000 met to devise ways and means of avoiding the class struggle in America. Most of the delegates present were "comrades" of renown who had "gallantly won their spurs" in strenuous campaigns for American class-peace. "Democracy"—a la American Constitution and Declaration of Independence—was on almost everyone's lips. Of the "foreigners," there was not a vestige left. Even the small Bohemian Federation had one foot in and the other foot out of the Socialist Party. Three or four stray Finns found their way in. The "dictatorship" of the Jews was not directly evident, for the several hundred Jewish workers on the membership list had already practically bade farewell to the paltry few thousand left of what was once the Socialist Party.

capitalist violation of her Constitution. What happened to Haiti when she refused to turn her Constitution into a scrap of paper at the behest of the American exploiters and oppressors will undoubtedly happen to Mexico. The vanguard of American "democracy and law and order"—the marines—will be the arbiters of the difficulty in the last resort. Mexico is particularly now at the mercy of American capitalists because of her difficulty in getting credit. The few creditors from whom she might be able to borrow dare not give her a loan for fear of antagonizing the United States. Thus is the most "unselfish" and "liberty-loving" capitalist class—the American bourgeoisie—trampling upon the national freedom of its weak neighboring countries.

Report of the National Executive Committee

The great moguls of the American Socialist Party gave a report which speaks volumes for the organization's record of remarkable retrogression. In the last year alone, the Party succeeded in losing only 10,000 members. This decline is not only not abating, but is progressing at an accelerated pace. More and more is the true character of the Socialist Party becoming known to the laboring masses.

The report is a conglomeration of apologies, eulogies, and confessions in bankruptcy. Apology is piled upon apology in the attempt to account for the failure of the Party's Russian "truth-hunting mission" to come into life. The "unbiased and impartial" investigators were either too busy or too frail to stand "the inclement weather" of Russia. The epic of "Comrade" Schwartz further chilled the ardour of the American "missionaries" to Soviet Russia. The Executive Committee then tried, but it was all in vain, to have the delegates baptized in the Vienna cesspool of international opportunism, The Union of Working Socialist Parties.

All powers of eulogy were called to the rescue in the story of the amnesty campaign. The wonderfully successful conferences with Palmer and his agents are recounted in truly heroic fashion. A melodramatic touch is given to the report by the painfully vivid account of the dire straits in which the Socialist Party finds itself financially.

International Affiliation

Whither shall the Party drift? This was the first question considered by the convention of American "business" socialism. To now go to the thoroughly discredited Second International of Major Weil, Premier Branting and Herr Scheidemann was patently suicidal. As far as floundering into the Vienna International was concerned, most of the delegates felt that they did not know enough about this field of investment. After all, as "Marxians," they felt that the world progresses through "evolution" rather than "revolution." Why hurry then? It is never too late to come to Vienna.

A good number of delegates would perhaps be ready to plod their weary way to Moscow. But the Twenty-one Points were to all of them like twenty-one bayonets at their hearts. Almost three delegates professed readiness to attempt to break through this cordon sanitaire of the revolutionary proletariat against opportunism. A handful was willing to take a chance if the Socialist Party were permitted to arm itself with reservations.

Being "practical" socialists and having nowhere to go, the delegates decided to remain at home—to have no international affiliation whatsoever. Unfathomable shallowness

and dismal lack of perspective marked the debate on this question. Isolation from the rest of the world's working-class was defended by the "socialist" solons on the specious plea that it is necessary to first build a strong party at home. The fact that membership in an International of revolutionary action is of inestimable aid in the building of a strong party was never even hinted at. The fact that the leading struggles of the proletariat of every country are to-day international in character is of no concern to the American Socialist Party since it is not a party of revolutionary struggle, but a party of "peaceful penetration" of capitalism. Why bother about co-ordinating and unifying the class-struggle when the capitalists the world-over are united internationally to crush the proletarian revolution? Such problems are of importance only to a party of action, only to a party of revolutionary plan and purpose—only to a proletarian party that aims to be in the van of the class struggle in the country in question.

Of course, the Communist International was attacked most savagely. The "brains" of the convention called to their rescue that colossal humbug of world imperialism—the Wilsonian subterfuge of "self-determination." "Every party must be given full freedom to determine its own tactics!" The Comintern was branded as a "wrecking crew"! "Down with the Muscovite dictatorship!" was the battle-cry of our hundred per cent. American Socialists. The latter could see no reason for an International's passing upon the principles and tactics of its affiliated Parties. To them everything is secondary to the so-called "national autonomy" of a party. Finally the Socialist Party, aping the European Centrists, attempted to hide its denunciation of the Comintern by half-heartedly expressing friendship and solicitude for the Soviet Republic.

The Class War To-Day

If ever an organization was guilty of flying in the face of reality, the American Socialist Party is now so convicted beyond any doubt. Capitalism has entered upon a new stage of development—imperialism. Imperialism is not an "immoral," "vicious" form capitalism takes on and drops at its will, but a positive, inevitable stage of its development. Imperialism is the highest and most complete phase of capitalism. Capitalist exploitation is becoming ever more international. Textiles are no longer the pawns in the world market. The era of peaceful competition for world trade is over. The struggle for new markets and sources of raw material manifest itself to-day in competition between highly organized imperialist states. The pawns of the world-market are now coal, iron, steel, and banking, railway and oil concessions. Capitalism now speaks in terms of "spheres of influence" and mandates. The very life of nations and groups of nations is at stake in the control of such pawns.

The problems of the American working class have not been born in heaven. They were born in the hell of capitalism. Imperialism, the present stage of capitalism, is international in scope. American, English and Japanese capitalism are not quarantined, like the Socialist Party, within national bound-

aries. Their commercial campaigns and exploits are international. Hence, the underlying features of the class struggle, which grows out of the material conditions of capitalism, are essentially international. The fundamental problems of no revolutionary working class Party are to-day national in character. Of course, the immediate application of the guiding principles of the class war is, in every country, determined in great measure by the economic, political and social conditions at hand. The details of Communist tactics are not only not prepared in advance by the Comintern but not even by its sections. Such details cannot be determined beforehand. They are mastered only in the course of the actual struggle.

Economic degradation, ruthless exploitation, capitalist dictatorship, unemployment, militarism, war and socialist-opportunism are among the leading problems facing the working-class of every capitalist country. These problems may appear in different forms in different countries, but they are the same in essence. Here the wages may be lower; there the capitalist dictatorship may manifest itself through a "democratic republic"; in one country the "socialists" may already populate bourgeois cabinets; in another they may be doing their level best to; here the army and navy may be dominantly mercenary; there they are conscripted. So we may go down the line. Degradation, oppression and exploitation are rife in every capitalist country, and the class war is to-day fought on an international front by the proletarian armies of the various countries.

A revolutionary working-class political party must prepare for, and lead the workers in the struggle for political power. Such a party, the Communist Party, must actively participate in the every-day struggles of the proletariat. It must wage unrelenting warfare against the bourgeoisie and their henchmen, the trade-union bureaucrats and social patriots. Mass action, growing out of the very conditions of capitalism, may assume different forms in different countries, but it is to-day a universal tactic of the class-war. The Party of every capitalist country must show and prepare the workers for its inevitable culmination into open armed conflict with the bourgeois state. Party nuclei must everywhere be formed in organizations where the exploited masses are found. Opportunism must be fought everywhere, though the immediate steps to be taken may vary with time and place. Hence, the fundamental problems and policies of the revolutionary proletarian movement are international, though the struggles may take on many forms.

The class-war to-day demands the highest unification and centralization of the proletarian forces to overcome the bourgeoisie who are consolidating themselves internationally. The Communist International is the response to this demand. It is the General Staff of the army of the revolutionary proletariat the world over. The Communist International joins the revolutionary forces of every country into one vast fighting army in order to hasten the overthrow of the entire capitalist system. The Communist International does not "dictate" to its various sections, but only serves as a

guiding center and leads its affiliated Parties to more effective struggle against the bourgeoisie. In the Comintern there is room only for revolutionary, that is, Communist, Parties. The Communist International will brook no vacillating, cowardly, opportunistic organizations. Consequently, the American Socialist Party cannot find itself in the Communist International.

Proletarian Dictatorship

The world political and economic crises make the question of proletarian dictatorship the burning tactical problem of the hour for the revolutionary movement. To refuse at this time to take a definite stand on the necessity of the proletarian dictatorship is a feat that could be accomplished only by most unspeakable opportunists. The resolution of Hillquit says in part: "The Socialist Party of the United States aims at the political ascendancy of the working class for the purpose of substituting the private ownership of the means of wealth production by a system of socialized industries. The question of the form which the political rule of the workers will assume in the United States and the methods it will adopt is for the present time is largely one of academic interest. The Socialist Party is committed to democracy and majority rule, but this principle is not inconsistent with energetic measures for the defense of the established working class government."

Here we have intellectual bankruptcy of the worst sort. Aiming at "political ascendancy"! What does that mean? More vote-catching? More miserable compromise? Again evasion of the struggle! Again boundless faith in the ushering in of socialism through nose counting and congressional wire-pulling!

Intellectual honesty yells for help when the role of the state in the class war is turned into a question of "academic interest." To have the slightest hope for the utilization of the parliamentary bourgeois state machinery as a means of achieving working class freedom after the experiences of the Russian, German and Hungarian revolutions is the height of confusion or at best intellectual dishonesty. All talk of abstract or "pure" democracy, when the bourgeoisie own the means of production and exchange and have the press, schools, social agencies, church, army and navy and governmental bureaucracy under their thumb is obstinate stupidity. A party that is at this date committed to the worship of the most efficient form of capitalist state-power—bourgeois democracy—belongs on the scrap heap of the proletarian movement.

No revolutionist rejects the advantage of having as many workers as possible won over to the side of the proletariat in the class war. It is a most important task of a revolutionary party to continually increase the number of its adherents. This holds true not only before the seizure of power but even after the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. The history of the Communist Party of Russia affords ample proof of this. But to make a fetish of the abstract principle of majority rule, to reject all plans

for developing and organizing the revolutionary proletarian forces until you have the assurance of the majority of statistical experts that more than 50 per cent. of the adult population is willing and able to revolt against a minority—their bourgeois exploiters and oppressors—is asinine with a vengeance. When the conditions for a revolution are ripe it is the business of a revolutionary working-class party to organize and direct the struggle in such a manner as to win over the largest number possible, and thus make more secure the victory over the bourgeoisie. It can, however, never be the task of a revolutionary proletarian party to lull the workers to sleep until a numerical majority mechanically falls into its lap. Such tactics will not only tend to prevent the working class from revolting but will also seriously endanger the revolution should it come in spite of such a party.

The Socialist Party promises us to resort, if compelled to, to "energetic measures" for the defense of the established working-class movement." Marvelously complex technique in putting the cart before the horse! The revolution will, manna-like, fall into the hands of our "comrades," and they will then use "energetic measures" to see to it that it does not fall to heaven! It is all good and well to talk of the necessity of protecting the revolution. But how about fighting first to get the revolution? Not a word about this from the American Socialist Party.

Apparently the Socialist Party is still in a trance of sweet pipe-dreams as to a peaceful revolution in America. Indeed, these dreams have become the very thoughts and plans of the Socialist Party. Whether the Proletarian Dictatorship will take on, in America, the same form as it did in Russia is of no concern to us at this moment. But the necessity of a Proletarian Dictatorship to crush and expropriate the bourgeoisie in order to introduce communism is a foregone conclusion to all except those who delight in throwing sand into their own and others' eyes.

The Paris Commune, and the Russian, Finnish, German and Hungarian Revolutions have shown that the working-class cannot employ the bourgeois state machinery as the organ of its liberation. The working-class must set up its own state machinery for this purpose. The basis of this proletarian state machinery must, in every country, be the organizations of the broad laboring masses and not the parliamentary forms of the capitalist state. This is the meaning of the Proletarian Dictatorship on the basis of Soviet power. Of course, this basis may take on different forms in various countries. The degree of industrial development, the importance of the agricultural masses, the strength of the labor movement and the kind and size of army all play a most important part in determining the form of the Proletarian Dictatorship. Yet, in no country, whether it be dominantly agricultural like Russia or industrial like Germany, can the Parliamentary system be the basis of the Proletarian Dictatorship.

In the Proletarian State the legislative and executive functions are merged. The workers now vote as workers en-

gaged in productive pursuits unlike in the bourgeois parliamentary elections, where they vote as individuals of an amorphous mass of classless citizenry. The proletariat now determines the country's policies on the basis of his class interests. He votes as a member of the working-class and not as one of the whole people. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Only through the Proletarian Dictatorship on the basis of Soviet power can the working-class exercise such vigilance as will enable it to be free. Only then do we have real democracy—a democracy of the proletariat, by the proletariat and for the proletariat.

Co-operation and Isolation

It has been well said that the importance of the Socialist Party convention was to be found chiefly in its unimportance. That the Socialist Party recognizes the truth of this is evident from the acceptance of the following resolution of Hillquit:

"The task of reconquering and maintaining our civil rights and liberties and securing substantial measures of economic relief can be accomplished only through the united and concerted action of all progressive, militant and class-conscious workers, industrial and agricultural, in the United States. Be it, therefore,

"Resolved, That the incoming national executive committee be instructed to make a careful survey of all radical and labor organizations in the country, with a view of ascertaining their strengths, disposition and readiness to co-operate with the Socialist movement upon a platform not inconsistent with that of the party, and on a plan which will preserve the integrity and autonomy of the Socialist party.

"Resolved, That the national executive committee report its findings with recommendations to the next annual convention of the Socialist party."

Is this something new? In many ways there is nothing new in the above resolution. The Socialist Party has more than once fused with non-socialist parties for the mere sake of winning legislative or executive seats. Ex-Mayor Van Lear's case is a notable incident of this kind. Besides, the Socialist Party has consistently waged a campaign for civil rights and liberties on an entirely non-class basis. It has attempted to win their "restoration" in a manner which not only would not broaden and deepen the class struggle but which actually would blur it. To talk of and work for civil rights and liberties as if they were rights and liberties above and independent of the class struggle is to sink into the worst mires of opportunism. In its plan to secure substantial economic relief under capitalism, the Socialist Party is guilty of no innovation. It has always tried to win votes on the basis of promises to attain such relief. Revolutionists must actively carry on the struggle for measures of economic relief. But only the centrists and opportunists hold that substantial economic relief for the broad laboring masses can to-day be attained under capitalism. In fostering such false hopes among the masses, these misleaders of the pro-

letariat strive to hide from the working class the intense economic world crisis, the ever-mounting taxes, the huge national debts, the breakdown of production and exchange, the high cost of living, the persistent menace of new world wars, the increasingly brutal capitalist dictatorship and the rising hordes of millions of disemployed.

What is new in the above plan is the proposal to have "all radical and labor organizations co-operate with the Socialist movement upon a platform not inconsistent with that of the party." This is an attempt to pull the chestnuts out of the fire. It even smacks of an effort to steal something from Communist tactics. This resolution portrays a lamentable misunderstanding of the role of the political party in the proletarian revolution. Such terms as party, mass and class are used most confusingly. When dealing with progressives and radicals Hillquit wants co-operation with "the socialist movement" on a common platform; when dealing with the Communist International, however, he wails over the "self-determination" of his party. To Hillquit the Party and the movement are one and the same. The error in this is obvious. The Party, if it really be a revolutionary proletarian organization, is the guiding, unifying and directing center of the proletarian movement. In the Party are to be found only the most class-conscious, disciplined and trained workers. The movement, however, is a much more inclusive term. In it are found also the supporters, sympathizers and near-sympathizers of the Party. In order to develop a strong revolutionary movement it is necessary to avoid the entrance into the Party of all unclear, undisciplined and non-class-conscious elements. Numbers are of aid towards the realization of a purpose only when they are of the proper kind. A strongly centralized, well-disciplined and well-trained Party—a Party which does not contain the unclear elements which are unavoidably found in the movement—is the only kind of a party which can develop a powerful revolutionary movement. The existence of such a Party is a prerequisite of a successful proletarian revolution.

It is good revolutionary strategy for a Proletarian Government to compromise, if necessary, with bourgeois governments for the sake of maintaining the revolution. Again, it is good tactics for a revolutionary Party to co-operate with genuinely radical and progressive labor bodies for the realization of specific aims as they arise in the class-struggle. In such special campaigns the Party must always be the guiding, leading and controlling force. With the realization of the end involved, the alliance, which is only temporary, ends. But for a workers' political party to enter into permanent, general fusion on a common platform with all political organizations that happen to be opposed to the dominant political parties is "tactically suicidal." Such a policy is characteristic of the most degenerate centrism and opportunism. This is true regardless of the number of "protective" pledges exacted by the Party guilty of the compromise.

Besides, mirth overcomes us when we think of such an outfit as the Socialist Party deciding upon the militancy of

the organizations with which to co-operate. The Non-Partisan League, The Committee of Forty-Eight, Prohibition Party, Single Tax Party and Public Ownership League are unquestionably among the "radical, progressive, militant and class-conscious" workers' organizations with which the confused, dilapidated Socialist Party plans to form a permanent merger on a common platform. Only a highly-disciplined and well-trained revolutionary Party may embark upon a course of even temporary co-operation for special objectives, let alone permanent, general co-operation. This temporary co-operation must then be only with genuine labor bodies and not with disgruntled, disappointed or excited bourgeois organizations.

Away With the Class Struggle

Having both nationally and internationally shed every vestige of revolutionary character, the Socialist convention proceeded to make short shift of the most vital questions of the class struggle. Resolutions dealing with mass action and the immediate struggle of the workers were tabled in double-quick time. The problem of preparing the workers for a more effective and more general use of the strike as a weapon in the class war was dealt with in a sophomoric resolution replete with made-to-order history as to the limitations and short-comings of the General Strike. As to a policy of preventing and fighting against bourgeois wars the Convention dared not take a stand. The future of the Socialist Party on this question was rested securely in a motion to table.

The Socialist Party To-Day

What are the outstanding characteristics of the American Socialist Party to-day? What is the task of the Communist Party of America in relation to it?

The Socialist Party cannot win the laboring masses of America. It has been tried in the struggles of life and found wanting. Its record of cowardice and treacherous compromise cannot inspire the American proletariat with confidence in its courage and prowess to be the vanguard in the class war. In their desperation arising from their being deserted by the masses, the leaders of the Socialist Party have developed a philosophy that may properly be called "business" socialism—a virtual counterpart of American "business" unionism.

The features of this "business" socialism are first of all a narrow national viewpoint. This outlook corresponds to the craft outlook of some of our unions. Secondly, the Socialist Party has to-day, in the main, narrow aims. It does not actively concern itself with broadening and deepening the struggles of the workers. Its philosophy is soaked in vulgar pragmatism. It runs after all immediate results regardless of their ultimate effect. In the formation of its policies it is animated primarily by the likelihood of success. We need but cite the Socialist Party's tragic farce at Albany and the calling off of the proposed demonstration of amnesty pickets before the White House.

Thirdly, the Socialist Party is preparing to avoid calling

into play the revolutionary energy inherent in the proletarian masses. It is doing all in its power to avoid direct, non-delegated action by the workers. This feature manifests itself in a most dogmatic insistence on the efficacy of parliamentarism in the class war. In this respect the Socialist Party is like the reactionary union that only occasionally, and then under unavoidable conditions, resorts to the strike. Collective bargaining, executive conferences with the bosses and petty insurance schemes are the characteristic weapons of the reactionary unions. Petitions, votes, and parliamentary offices are the characteristic weapons of the American Socialist Party.

Finally, the Socialist Party, in fact, if not yet openly in word, accepts the capitalist system as it is for a very long time to come. It is laying plans to fortify capitalism's existence through its proposed fusion with liberal bourgeois organizations. In an editorial of self-defense the *Call*, mouth-piece of American constitutionalism under the guise of Socialism, recently said: "Socialists refuse to substitute hysteria for history and emotion for science. *They stand for a complete reorganization of capitalism in the interests of the producing masses*, but they do not believe that great social changes will follow a law of imitation and universal uniformity." (Italics ours.) *Stripped of hysterical verbiage this statement means that the Socialist Party rejects the class struggle and spurns the fight for the destruction of capitalism.* It has resigned itself to strive for the impossible—"a complete reorganization of capitalism in the interests of the producing masses." The American Socialist Party has decided to go back to the days of peaceful capitalist development—"back to normalcy." Indeed another impossible task!

Our Task

The American Socialist Party is to-day bankrupt in every sense of the word. Its existence is evident only through the fact that it is continuing to make mischief. Whatever "left" or near-left elements remained in its fold after the wholesale expulsions and exodus of 1919 are leaving in disgust.

The Communist Party of America must utilize every opportunity to mercilessly expose the Socialist Party to the laboring masses of the United States. Our participation in the election campaigns will afford us splendid opportunities for the realization of this end. The Party speakers should unmask the "Socialist" representatives wherever workers gather. In the progressive unions especially should we fight and counteract the pernicious influence wielded by the Socialist Party through union bureaucrats. On every field of labor-life—political, industrial, social, economic and educational—must we carry on our propaganda and activity.

The passing of the Socialist Party as an organ of working-class struggle affords the Communist Party an added opportunity for becoming a live force in the American labor movement. We must not let this opportunity slip away from us. Every member of the Party must strive to win the con-

George Hardy's Report to the I. W. W.

By GEORGE MOORE

In the June number of the *Industrial Pioneer* there appears an account of George Hardy's report to the thirteenth convention of the I. W. W. as written by H. Van Dorn. Hardy's original report covers thirty pages and takes up in detail everything that transpired at the Berlin Syndicalist Conference and relates his experience and activities in Russia. Out of this mass of material contained in Hardy's report, Van Dorn selects and interprets but a few passages. At this time the writer cannot know whether Hardy collaborated with Van Dorn in presenting this version of the report and is therefore equally responsible for it or not, but as it stands the whole spirit and contents of the article as written by Van Dorn is in direct contradiction to the principles and policies of the Communist Party of America and of the Communist International. This is especially disappointing since we had hoped that the I. W. W. would have profited by their recent bitter experiences with such leaders as John Sandgren & Co., and that the I. W. W. was prepared to work in close co-operation with the Communist Party, which is the American section of the Communist International, through their affiliation with the Red Trades International. The I. W. W. owes it to their membership and to the working class of America to publish George Hardy's report in full, and until they do so, the account of this report as it appears in the *Industrial Pioneer* must be taken as the official expression of the I. W. W. toward the questions raised therein.

Let us then proceed to an analysis and discussion of these questions and of the attitude of the I. W. W. toward them.

The twelfth Convention of the I. W. W. (which was dominated by the reactionary syndicalists, Sandgren & Co) decided to ignore the overtures made to them by the Comintern, and to call a world conference of all syndicalist organization for the purpose of creating an Industrial International "free from all political domination." At about the same time the Comintern had issued a call for a conference of delegates of the trades and industrial unions from all over the world. This conference was held in Moscow during the months of June and July, 1920, and resulted in the formation of a provisional Council of the Red Trade Union International which drew up a tentative program and made plans for gaining the support of as many unions as possible which

confidence of his fellow-workers in the shop, union, labor center and school. This can be done only through a display of courage and ability in guiding the workers in all their struggles against their betrayers and oppressors. On with the Communist task!

accepted the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and Soviet power. To this conference the I. W. W. sent no official representative, but sent its General Secretary-treasurer, George Hardy, as the official delegate of the I. W. W. to a conference held in Berlin by the Syndicalist unions of the United States, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Argentine, France, Holland, Sweden and England. The Berlin Syndicalist Conference met December 16-21, 1921. This conference at once saw the futility of trying to create a syndicalist international in opposition to the Communist International and the Red Trade Union International which had already won the support of the majority of revolutionary industrial and trade unions in the various countries and so they unanimously voted to join the R. T. U. I.

A resolution embodying a program containing six points was presented and discussed in the Berlin Syndicalist Conference. We are interested, not in the program as such, but in Hardy's attitude towards the questions raised by them. For if the position of Hardy in the Berlin Conference is the position of the I. W. W. on these questions, it will show conclusively that the I. W. W., in spite of the recent experiences of Italy and Germany, has not yet abandoned its syndicalist prejudices and still adheres to the Utopian plan of overthrowing capitalism by the direct seizure of industrial plants (by "direct economic action,") ignoring the role of a revolutionary political party in the proletarian revolution.

The first point in the program of the Berlin Syndicalist Conference reads as follows:

"That the Revolutionary Industrial International be based upon the class struggle and THE DOMINATION OF THE WORKING CLASS." (Capitals ours).

In Hardy's report to the I. W. W. Convention he has this to say regarding this point:

"The German Syndicalists are idealists and the Swedish Syndicalists were backing the Germans. They thought that a dictatorship of the proletariat is too ruthless a method to carry on a revolution. That is a peculiar thing to say, but nevertheless there were arguments put up to me by prominent men in the German movement as to why free speech should be allowed in Russia and why Russia should not imprison people . . . I personally said this for the I. W. W.: 'The I. W. W. has not officially gone on record for the dictatorship of the proletariat, but the spirit of the I. W. W. favors it. However, we would be opposed to ANY political party getting into control and fastening upon

the workers some system that they do not want.' Franz Severin of Sweden moved the amendment: 'The domination of the working class.' Seeing that he could not support 'the dictatorship of the proletariat,' so, the domination of the working class' was accepted, with Jack Tanner, delegate of the British Shop Stewards, voting against it and in favor of the 'dictatorship of the proletariat,' because he was instructed to do so by his organization."

According to this Hardy voted AGAINST "The dictatorship of the Proletariat," but in his report he does not give his reasons for so doing.

The second point of the Syndicalists' program was as follows:

"That the Revolutionary Industrial International shall fight for the destruction and removal of the economic, political and moral system of the capitalist regime and THE STATE, and stands for the creation of a free communist society."

Upon this clause Hardy makes the following comment in his report:

"All I. W. W.'s will agree that this is all right. I think that it is absolutely in harmony with I. W. W. principles. We are trying to create a condition which shall make it possible for the workers to take over control of the industries; we also know that if we get control of the factories we would have to create some means of protection against the capitalist class. Finally, however, society would be in such a condition that a state power would not be necessary. Even in Russia, with its present powerful political state, the workers admit it will ultimately disappear."

In his interview with Lenin, Hardy frankly admitted that he was not a Communist, but that. . . . "The I. W. W. is an Industrial Communist organization, just the same as we used to say that the I. W. W. is an Industrial Socialist organization, but that now we are Industrial Communists and are working for the establishment of Communist Society."

The I. W. W. conceives the society of the future as a gigantic industrial organization, concerning itself with the administration of industry, freed from the domination of THE STATE, because THE state is the coercive machinery of class rule, and in Communist society there will be no classes and therefore in such a society the state would have no function and would disappear. With this conception the Communists are in agreement with the I. W. W.

But the whole controversy between the I. W. W. and the Communist Party revolves around the question, BY WHAT MEANS shall we arrive at the Communist society?

Hardy rejects the idea of building up a one hundred per

cent organization on the economic field as ridiculous, and states: "There is no official of the I. W. W., or even any of its members, who think that we can build a one hundred per cent organization, even though we state in our preamble that we must 'build the new society within the shell of the old.' In fact the working class of no country can be organized one hundred per cent before the collapse of capitalism, and in America the chances of doing so are less than in any other country."

If this is the viewpoint of the I. W. W., then they, like the revolutionary French Syndicalists, agree that the industrial unions alone are not sufficient for the revolution, and that an "initiative minority" is necessary to educate the masses and to give the workers in each concrete case a definite program of action. But it is the contention of the I. W. W. that they can form such an initiative minority. Says Hardy, in reference to the revolution in highly developed industrial countries, "Those who control the economic organizations will control the revolution, and these workers will not submit to a bureaucracy. This latter would have to be driven out of existence. ECONOMIC ORGANIZATIONS AIMING AT CONTROLLING INDUSTRY WILL BE THE ONES TO UPSET THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM AND TO INSTITUTE A PROLETARIAN STATE." (emphasis ours).

In other words the I. W. W. is opposed to ANY political party while at the same time trying to function as a POLITICAL organization and an industrial union. Hardy's report, in common with most I. W. W. literature, is filled with amazing contradictions. In Berlin Hardy votes against the formula, "the dictatorship of the proletariat," in Moscow Hardy tells the E. C. of the Comintern, that "the I. W. W. is in favor of the dictatorship of the proletariat, since the capitalist class of America has always used force and it is reasonable to expect that the workers will have to do likewise in order to defend themselves." In Berlin Hardy supports the syndicalist statement to ". . . fight for the destruction and removal of the economic, political and moral system of the capitalist regime AND THE STATE . . .", in Moscow Hardy pledges the I. W. W. to ". . . upset the capitalist system and institute the proletarian state."

The I. W. W. claims that as an economic organization it can lead the exploited masses in America and establish the proletarian state, that it can function as a political and economic organization, and that there is no need for a political party—the Communist Party of America. Let us see.

Hardy, in his report, admits that it will not be possible to organize into industrial unions the majority of the workers before the collapse of capitalism takes place. The I. W. W. must therefore function as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. After 16 years of activities the I. W. W. has not more than 30,000 members and is separated from and hostile to the 4,000,000 workers in the A. F. of L. and the other millions in similar organizations. It has failed to "organize the unorganized" of which there are some

15,000,000. As an economic organization the I. W. W. is a negligible quantity. How about the I. W. W. as a political organization—as the revolutionary vanguard of the working class?

It must be clear to the merest political tyro that such a revolutionary vanguard cannot be organized upon the basis of trade, industrial or local distinctions. We are here not concerned with grouping the more advanced lumber-jacks, carpenters, railroad workers, etc. The question here is of organizing the MOST CLASS-CONSCIOUS proletariat of the whole country. These must be brought together into a political party with a definite program of action, maintaining a firm internal discipline, and by their active participation in the every day struggles of the workers, secure a leading influence over the whole struggle of the working class in all its organizations INCLUDING THE INDUSTRIAL UNIONS and the I. W. W. Such an organization will be the advance guard of the proletariat and its policy will at all times be directed toward the overthrow of the capitalist state, the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship based upon Soviet power and the abolishment of the capitalist system. It must find expression in all working class activities; in all organizations and institutions which its members must penetrate; in the trade unions, no matter how reactionary, in the I. W. W., in mass meetings, in the workers' educational, co-operative and sporting organizations, in the army, yes, and in the legislatures and Congress of the United States, when the workers will elect Communist representatives.

The I. W. W., in common with all syndicalists, depend upon the general strike to overthrow the rule of the capitalist class. But the general strike, unless it develops into mass action, is a weapon of defense, not of offense. In order to defeat the capitalist class it is necessary to tear from their hands the machinery of the state, destroy it, and establish organs of working class power—the Soviets. The bourgeoisie is supported by the army. Only by meeting the armed forces of the capitalist state with the armed forces of the proletarian revolution will the proletariat be able to defeat and destroy the opposition of the Capitalists. For such an armed uprising of the workers much intensive preparatory work is needed. In every trade and industrial union, in every shop and factory, every regiment in the army, trained, disciplined, organized groups of revolutionary workers must penetrate, and there carrying out a common program of action they can at the decisive moment carry the masses with them, point out their mistakes, and insure the victory of the proletariat. Such groups of revolutionary proletarians must be organized and can successfully act, only as the nuclei of a highly centralized, well organized, and firmly disciplined POLITICAL PARTY of the working class. Such a party is THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA.

Without the Communist Party the proletariat of the U. S. cannot gain possession of the state power and without this state power the proletariat cannot suppress the counter-revolution of the bourgeoisie nor do away with the

private ownership of the means of production. The industrial unions cannot be organs of state power. Legislative power cannot be vested in the economic organizations—the industrial unions—because these unions organize certain strata of the workers according to trades and industries. This power must voice the revolutionary interests of the working class as a whole. Not the industrial unions but the Soviets must be the organs of the proletarian dictatorship, because they are elected by ALL the workers, millions of whom never belonged to any unions and who have become class-conscious as a result of the revolution.

Even the Soviets by themselves are not sufficient. In order to successfully struggle against the capitalist counter-revolution, to be capable of decisive and relentless measures in the interests of the proletarian revolution these Soviets, elected by workers of different degrees of class-consciousness, must have a definite communist program of action. Only a well-disciplined, closely organized and trained political party composed of the most advanced, experienced and class-conscious workers can keep the Soviets in the path of the revolution and guide them under the difficult conditions which will obtain during the trying period of the proletarian dictatorship.

George Hardy told the Executive Council of the Communist International that "it was impossible for the I. W. W. to co-operate, under the circumstances, directly or indirectly, with the Communist Party of America, for the reason that they had rendered their organization illegal, whereas the I. W. W. is an economic organization operating legally."

There can be only one answer to this sort of statement, and that is that it constitutes a cowardly evasion of revolutionary duty.

Leon Trotsky, in his "Letter to a French Syndicalist," says:

"A bona-fide revolutionary syndicalist, like a bona-fide revolutionary socialist, must become united in the Communist Party. They must cease to be in the opposition within other organizations. They must, as an independent organization, adhering to the banner of the Communist International, stand face to face with the broader masses, give clear and precise answers to all their questions, be the leader of their struggle, directing it on its way to a Communist Revolution. Syndicalist organizations, co-operative stores, the parliamentary tribune, municipalities, etc., etc.—all these are only organization forms, practical methods, different points of support. The struggle remains the same as to its substance whatever branch it may occupy. The bearer of this struggle is the working class. ITS LEADING ADVANCE GUARD IS THE COMMUNIST PARTY. IN WHICH THE BONA-FIDE REVOLUTIONARY SYNDICALISTS SHOULD OCCUPY A PLACE OF HONOR."

The Third Congress

By KARL RADEK

The *first Congress* of the Communist International was a call to arms issued by the Russian working class, that besieged, first section of the world revolution which for a year and a half had held power and defended it with arms against a world of enemies. In the moment of its greatest danger the besieged Russian working class called out "Workers of all countries unite! Follow our example! Arise to the struggle! Only the hammer of the dictatorship can break the chains of capitalist slavery. Only a Soviet Republic can express the power of the working class." Small groups of representatives of the proletariat of Germany, Austria, Poland, Lettland and Finland rallied round the banner of the Communist International which was then formed. Its opponents laughed when they received the news of its formation. They were convinced that the armies of the Entente will succeed in overthrowing the Soviet Government and that the call of the Communist International was its last testament.

When the *Second Congress* of the Communist International met in the summer of last year, the main armies of the counter-revolution in Russian territory were defeated. The last detachments to be sent into battle, the legions of White Poland and the bands of Wrangel, were being steadily pressed back by the Red Army. While the Congress was proceeding the Red Army was approaching Warsaw. At the Congress there were not only representatives of the Communist vanguard of all countries of the world, the West and the East, the North and the South, but also the representatives of great mass parties like the Independents of Germany, and the French Socialist Party, who, having come as a *result of the pressure of the members*, were compelled to negotiate on the questions of the affiliations to and the conditions of the Communist International. The Communist International grew into a mass power and its influence spread far over its organized ranks. It sought to organize and to strengthen its ranks in order to point out concretely to the proletariat the road to power. In the resolutions passed at the Congress on the Trade Union, on parliamentarism, and on the role of the Party, it showed, on the basis of the experience of the Russian Revolution and the Proletarian Revolution of Central Europe, and on the basis of Marxian teaching, the path along which it could rally the masses of the proletariat for the struggle. While it rejected all sectarian tendencies which posing as preachers of the pure milk of the words, isolated themselves from the masses, it at the same time, laid down the *dividing line between itself and the opportunist mass parties*. It frankly and clearly stated in what the revolutionary work of the Party consists and said it would form revolutionary mass parties which would conduct a popular agitation to convert the masses to Communism, which would unite the struggle

of these masses and extend the struggle for power. It appealed to the revolutionary elements of the proletariat to rally round its banner. In order to ease the path of these revolutionary proletarian elements who were not yet communists, the Congress of the Communist International resolved to form a Red Trade Union International which should rally around the nucleus of the class conscious Communists, those sections which are not completely communist.

The *Third Congress* of the Communist International is gathering at a moment when the *world economic crisis* and the incapability of capitalism to reconstruct the world is strikingly apparent. It is gathering at a moment when millions and millions of workmen in the richest countries in the world are *unemployed*. It is gathering at a moment when not one of the great political crises has been solved, when all the crises have merely been postponed. Thus, the task for which the Communist International was built lies untouched before us, the task of leading the *advance of the onward marching World Revolution*. The Communist parties are the instrument of this leadership. In many countries the Communist parties are still in the process of formation. There the first task of the Communist International is to urge on these communists to increase their efforts tenfold, to draw the masses to themselves and spread Communist influence among them.

This is the position in *England* and in the *United States of America*. In other countries like Italy, Sweden, Tchechko-Slovakia and France, the Communist International has more or less the mass parties on its side, but either owing to the predominance of *centrist tendencies* in this leadership or to its passivity, are not yet in a position to reach the broad masses or to lead them to their struggle. In Italy the opportunist policy of the Serrati group *led to a split in the Party, and to break with the Communist International*. In the other countries mentioned opportunism is not so prominent, but the weakness lies in the incapacity to adopt a popular method of Communist agitation and action. The Communist International must openly combat these centrist tendencies and clearly point out to the workers in their respective countries how they can be overcome.

In *Germany* these tendencies exist in a certain section of the leadership and are clearly similar to that of the policy of Serrati. The exclusion of the representatives of these tendencies from the leadership of the party has given it an impetus to the left. But owing to the fact that the party had to enter the battle before it was prepared for his new policy of revolutionary action, its connection with the masses became weakened as the result of its isolated action. Making a virtue of necessity, it constructed the theory of the "offensive of the isolated Communist Party" which if consistently developed and carried out in practice must endanger

the development of the Communist Mass Party. The leading comrades of the Left Wing of the Germany Party will themselves realize this danger. The Communist International will have the task of showing to all the Communist parties on the basis of the March rising in which way *they can insure to the Party the leading role in the mass party.* They must take part in the everyday struggle of the masses and take over the leadership in these spontaneous battles of the proletariat. They must enter the battle alone, and isolated only under pressure of necessity when the honor and the future of the Party demands it.

In the discussions concerning *partial demands* and *partial actions*, the Communist International will prove to its affiliated parties, beyond the shadow of a doubt and on the basis of their own experiences, why no party may content itself with mere communist agitation and propaganda, but must inevitably participate in every struggle of the proletariat, and how each party, while continuing its organizational activities, should take the lead in such proletarian struggles, forcing these conflicts to develop from ordinary strikes into rebellions. The problem of the Red Trade Union International and its battle against the Amsterdam lackeys of world capitalism, is the organization complement to the problem of partial struggles and of the progress of the Communist parties towards the conquest of power. The Third Congress of the Communist International will have much preparatory work to accomplish for the congress of the Trade Union International which will follow directly in its wake.

There are, further, two "foreign" questions on the agenda

of the Congress, i. e., the Russian question and the problem of the Orient. The leading party in the Communist International will report to the Congress regarding its efforts to safeguard and reinforce the power of the working class in a country for the far greater part agrarian, and in a most difficult period of transition from war to peace. The Congress will have to express its opinion on the policies of the first isolated proletarian state. At the same time it will have to decide how the struggle for power of the world proletariat can be promoted by the increase and reinforcement of the revolutionary movements in the Orient. Hundreds upon hundreds of delegates, hundreds upon hundreds of guests have hastened from all corners of the earth to attend this congress of the Communist International. Already it represents a colossal power. The work of the congress will increase and purify it. And if all the omens are not deceptive, the C. I. will in the near future become involved in such struggles, that it will be compelled to give evidence of its power in great revolutionary conflicts.

Revolutionary passion is requisite for these battles; but it must be accompanied by clear insight, and proper estimation of all situations. The Russian Communist Party, under whose aegis this congress is being held, has proved, throughout its history, that such a combination is very well possible. It welcomes the delegates to this Third International Congress and calls to them: Forge your weapons for the victory, which shall be gained not in the heroic exertion of a single moment, but in the ever-fiercer daily struggle.

Class Divisions in America

By ROGER B. NELSON

INTRODUCTION

What is the numerical strength of the industrial wage-earner in the United States? What is the numerical strength of the rural wage-earner? What of the capitalist class? Who is the "public"? What is the relative industrial strength of the entire rural population? What of the tendencies manifested in industrial class alignments? How much room is there at the top? How do the various industrial groups tend to line up in an election campaign? What are the alignments in the great industrial disputes and strikes? Which of these groups offers a fertile field for communist propaganda and activity? Which is the least susceptible to our influence? These are all pertinent questions for the Communist. Many vital tactical questions are involved here.

Our data is based on U. S. Census Reports and the investigations of Alvin H. Hansen of the University of Minnesota. The 1920 Census figures are not yet ready. But on the basis of the 1910 Census and the percentages of

growth shown by the related items that have already been published, we may estimate the total gainfully employed in the United States today at no less than 45,000,000. In 1910 there were 38,167,336 gainfully employed. These were classified as farm-laborers, farmers, proprietors and officials, professional class, lower-salaried employees, servants and industrial wage-earners. A small proportion of the total gainfully employed could not be classified in any of the divisions enumerated. We will call this part the unclassified.

FARM LABORERS

In this division in 1910 there were 6,143,998 or 16.1 per cent of the total employed in gainful occupations. At least 50 per cent of this group are under 21 years of age. More than half of this number are farmers' children working on the farms. The others are hired laborers working out. The rapid increase in the number of farm tenants, who often have large families, accounts, to a great extent, for this condition. Until 1890, the proportion of the rural popula-

tion that were farm-laborers decreased rapidly. Since then the tendency has taken the opposite turn. The farm laborers' proportion of the total gainfully employed has been increasing steadily as shown by the table below.

Table I, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of Farm Laborers

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	23.1	19.1	13.2	15.2	16.1
Numerical					
Strength	2,885,996	3,323,876	3,004,061	4,410,877	6,143,998

With the disappearance of free land, the proportion of farm-laborers began to rise. Prior to this, there was a tendency toward independent farming. Capitalism is growing more and more dominant in American agriculture. There is growing up a "factory system" in agriculture, as the Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations (1912) said. Along with this process there is developing a rural proletariat. In 1910 there were 2,832,383 hired farm-laborers, or 7.4 per cent. of those engaged in gainful occupations. Assuming the same rate of increase for 1910-1920 as for the previous decade, the farm-laborers are to-day about 7.7 per cent. (over 3,000,000) of the total engaged in gainful occupations.

The hired farm-laborers are largely migratory and have neither property interest nor outlook. They are highly susceptible to revolutionary propoganda. To date the only attempt at organizing them has been made by the I. W. W.

FARMERS

Farmers, planters, fruit-growers, stock-raisers and dairymen are found in this group. Farmers include farm-tenants and farmers who own their land. Until 1890 the farmers held their own. With the disappearance of free land, however, they declined rapidly. In 1880 75 per cent. of the farmers owned their land, but in 1910 only 63 per cent. owned their land. On this the Report of the Commission on Industrial Relations says: "The most alarming fact in American agriculture is the rapid growth of tenancy. In 1910 there were 37 tenant-operated farms in each 100 farms in the United States, as compared with 28 in 1890, an increase of 32 per cent. in twenty years." This tendency toward land-expropriation is strengthened by the increasingly higher requirements for carrying on agriculture.

Table II, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of Farmers

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	24.0	24.6	23.6	19.8	16.3
Number	3,000,229	4,282,074	5,370,181	5,770,738	6,229,161

PROPRIETORS AND OFFICIALS

Manufacturers, officials, proprietors, superintendents, engineers, bankers, brokers, realty and insurance agents, commercial travelers, hotel and restaurant keepers, and wholesale and retail dealers are in this division. The table following shows the growth of this group.

Table III, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of Proprietors and Officials

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution'	4.6	4.6	5.9	6.2	7.5
Number	581,378	807,049	1,347,329	1,811,715	2,879,023

This increase should not be misunderstood. First of all, the numerical and relative strength of this group has been very likely under-estimated for the early decades as shown by the large number then placed in the unclassified group. Many of the latter have been later properly assigned to the proprietor group. Considering this early under-estimated strength, the increase of the proprietor-official group is not as much as it appears to be. The development of large industry, technique, and great organizations of finance-capital accounts for the growth of this group. With the perfecting of capitalist organization, the number of managers, superintendents, mechanical engineers and commercial agents increases. A mass of other connecting agents between corporation and bank, corporation and corporation, company and worker develops. That the concentration of industry goes on apace can be clearly established by an analysis of the development of American industry and commerce, income tax figures, and the distribution of the country's wealth.

PROFESSIONAL

Besides the members of the recognized professions there are included in this group detectives, sheriffs, policemen, municipal, county, State and Federal officials, soldiers, sailors, marines and life-savers. This group has been merely holding its own strength.

Table IV, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of Professionals

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	3.3	3.8	4.9	5.4	5.4
Number	414,708	666,338	1,114,507	1,565,686	2,074,792

THE LOWER-SALARIED

In this category are found clerks, bookkeepers, accountants, sales and ticket agents, collectors, inspectors, mail-carriers, chauffeurs and foremen. The relative strength of this group has grown steadily.

Table V, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of the Lower-Salaried

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	2.5	3.0	4.3	4.6	6.3
Number	309,413	529,473	965,852	1,329,928	2,393,620

SERVANTS

With the development of capitalism, much of the work that was formerly limited to the home has been taken over by outside agencies. Besides the restricted life of the serv-

ant repels many a worker to-day. Thus, the servant-group has been declining rapidly since 1890.

Table VI, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of Servant Group

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	7.8	6.2	6.4	5.0	4.1
Number	975,734	1,075,655	1,454,791	1,453,677	1,572,225

UNCLASSIFIED

In industrial classification it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between worker and proprietor. We may cite as examples some watchmakers, shoemakers, barbers, butchers, bakers, milliners and blacksmiths. The tendency toward industrial specialization steadily cuts down the number of unclassified.

Table VII, Showing the Number of Unclassified

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	8.1	8.2	9.3	8.5	6.0
Number	1,010,114	1,420,795	2,118,498	2,467,043	2,317,538

INDUSTRIAL WAGE-EARNERS

This group includes all workers except servants, farm-laborers, and those inaccurately falling into the unclassified group. The table below shows that the industrial wage-earners have been increasing steadily both relatively and absolutely. The United States is being proletarianized.

Table VIII, Showing Relative and Numerical Strength of Industrial Wage-Earners

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	26.6	30.4	32.4	35.3	38.2
Number	3,328,351	5,286,329	7,360,442	10,263,569	14,556,979

Assuming that the industrial development for the period 1910-1920 has progressed at the same rate as the preceding decade, the industrial wage-earners constitute to-day 42.8 per cent. of the total engaged in gainful occupations.

II

INDUSTRIAL INDEPENDENCE

We have thus far divided the total gainfully employed only according to categories of economic function. Let us now analyze the status of industrial independence of the various groups. The size of income is not always a measure of economic independence. Our criterion, our standard of judgment, is now the social-economic outlook which the group, as a group, develops from its place in the industrial system. Investigators have been unable to thus classify accurately only about 6 per cent. of the total gainfully employed.

THE INDEPENDENT GROUP

Proprietors and officials, professionals and farmers and

their children working on the farms constitute this group. It is independent not so much from the standpoint of income as from the point of view of industrial freedom and ideals. The industrial life of the proprietor or bank official is free from boss-domination. Hard as the life of the farmers and their children may be, they individually feel more free than the factory workers or even the "white-collared" worker. The professional feels that he is "a boss unto himself." Many of this group have an income lower than some wage-earners. Yet, it is here that we find the old type of Yankee individualism, of American industrial ideals based on individual proprietorship and industrial independence.

On the whole, the industrial status of the members of this group may afford opportunities for economic freedom. The professionals hope to and may still become proprietors or corporation executives. Somewhere in the brains of even the tenant-farmers there lurks the idea of private ownership of land. However, the opportunities for economic independence are continually growing fewer for the large mass of people. The room at the top is becoming ever-smaller. The development of capitalism has given us gigantic organizations of industry and finance and an increasing bourgeois domination of agriculture. In this development thousands of business-men and farmers are being sent to their economic graves, and the hopes of thousands of others are only still-births. The last fifty years have witnessed a steady decline in the relative strength of the group whose members may, with some justification, be said to have an opportunity to get to the top in the capitalist system.

Table IX, Showing Steady Decrease in Relative Strength of Industrially Independent Group

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage					
Distribution	44.3	43.3	41.5	39.6	37.9

THE DEPENDENT GROUP

This group includes the industrial wage-earners, the hired farm-laborers, lower-salaried employees and servants. The capitalist system condemns these, as a group, to industrial dependency. Means of production are not owned by members of this group. These are bread-winners by virtue of permission from others. Here very few feel themselves unbossed. Their industrial outlook is entirely different from that of the proprietor-official, farmer and professional group. For them there is very little, if any, room at the top. In spite of the fact that some members of this dependent group have a higher income than some classified as industrially independent, their economic freedom is at best fluctuating. As a class the city wage-earner, hired farm-laborer, servant or even "white-collared" worker is far less afflicted with and susceptible to the old American ideal of individual proprietorship.

Since 1890 this group, which is the working class, has grown both numerically and relatively. To-day at least 60 per cent. of the total engaged in gainful occupations are compelled by the very structure of industrial society, the

capitalist system, to remain in the working-class. The opportunities for the average individual to rise to a position of comparative independence as proprietor, executive or professional are decreasing rapidly.

Table X, Showing Steady Increase in Relative Strength of Industrially Dependent Group

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage Distribution	47.6	48.4	49.2	51.9	56.0

III

THE DYNAMIC VIEW

A real understanding of the currents of the working-class movement and struggles cannot be gotten from a mere industrial classification. This task requires a dynamic point of view. The objective or mechanical point of view must be supplemented by the subjective or psychological point of view. Motive, belief, attitude and sympathy are vital to an adequate appreciation of our problem. In this consideration, the criterion of Hoxie is invaluable. He says: "Those who feel that their interests are identical with those of the employers, whose motives, habits of thought, social attitudes and sympathies are in harmony with the mass of employers, belong to the employing class." With the development of machinery and technique the number of gainfully employed that cannot be thus classified accurately is steadily diminishing. In 1910 the unclassified group was only 6 per cent.

"CAPITAL" GROUP

In strikes and industrial or political disputes one hears a good deal about the interests of "capital." Of course, it is the interests of the capitalist that are here in question. Socially and politically the lower-salaried employees fall into this group with the proprietors and executive officials. The "white-collared" workers, especially in the United States, still consider themselves a part of the "business" world. These have "positions" and go to "business." Jobs and work are unknown to them. In strikes they are, as a group, vociferously anti-union. In politics they work and vote almost invariably for the "best men"—of the capitalists. The experience of such highly developed countries as England and Germany has shown that in time of general strike or civil war this "white-collared" group serves as a strong recruiting center for the organized strike-breaking or military system of the bourgeoisie. In short, the lower-salaried group, as a group, takes its cue from the business-world and is not susceptible to revolutionary propaganda.

Some investigators maintain that the capitalist group has declined from 14.5 per cent in 1900 to 13.8 per cent. in 1910. Disregarding, however, the officially under-estimated strength of the proprietors and executive officials for the early decades and taking the entire lower-salaried group into this category, one will find that the "capital" group has increased. This does not at all mean that the number of capitalists is increasing relatively.

Table XI, Showing Relative Strength of "Capital" Group

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage Distribution	7.1	7.7	10.2	10.8	13.8

In so far as the voting strength is concerned, this group is proportionally the strongest. It has few aliens and negroes. The disfranchised are found among the lower-salaried, of whom only 16.0 per cent. are minors.

"LABOR" GROUP

The industrial wage-earners fall in this category. Some investigators do not include the hired farm-laborers in this group. There is no basis for such a classification. Neither the objective nor the subjective view can justify placing the hired farm-laborers in the so-called neutral or "public" group. Before the disappearance of free land such a classification might be proper, but it cannot be so to-day. The fact that there has not yet arisen among the rural proletariat a definite expression of class-consciousness carries no weight in this issue. Many of the urban proletariat are not class-conscious and will not be for some time to come. Some even partake of their employers' anti-labor campaigns. The hired farm-laborers are also susceptible to Communist influence, though the field is newer and may appear more difficult. The American rural proletariat has already shown many signs of class-consciousness and revolutionary potentiality. It is the duty of the Communist Party to further their organization and lead them in their struggles.

In the table following the hired farm-laborers are included in this group only in the census figures of 1900 and 1910. From the subjective point of view there might be some reason for their being included in the "public" group prior to 1900. Therefore, in our table the relative strength of the "labor" group, for the census periods 1870-1900, includes only industrial wage-earners. In this period the hired farm-laborers are placed in the "public" group as will be shown subsequently.

Table XII, Showing Steady Increase in Relative Strength of "Labor" Group

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage Distribution					
Indust. Wage Earners	26.6	30.4	32.4	35.3	38.2
Hired Farm Laborers	—	—	—	7.0	7.4
Total Relative Strength	26.6	30.4	32.4	42.3	45.6

Assuming the same rate of industrial progress for 1910-1920 as for 1900-1910, the "Labor" Group is to-day about 50.6 per cent. of the total employed in gainful occupations. In voting strength this group is proportionally weaker than the others. At least 20 per cent. are minors. There are also many aliens and negroes in this group.

"PUBLIC" GROUP

Whenever the American capitalists are face to face with huge strikes, the bourgeois press howls for "the interests of the public." The "public," gradually becoming a fiction, at times appears to be a fetish worshipped by many. The "public" consists of those not directly involved in the class struggle. Farmers and their children working on the farms, professionals and servants fall into this group. Before the disappearance of free land, the hired farm-laborers could properly be considered part of the "public." The opportunity for land purchase then placed them outside of the pale of direct class struggle. In 1870 this group was a good-sized majority of the gainfully employed. Since 1890 this group has declined rapidly, even if the hired farm-laborers be included in the "public" category. In the table below, the actual relative strength of this group for the period 1870 through 1890 is inclusive of hired farm-laborers, but the figures of 1900 and 1910 are exclusive of hired farm-laborers.

Table XIII, Showing Steady Decline in Relative Strength of "Public" Group

Year	1870	1880	1890	1900	1910
Percentage Distribution Inclusive of Hired Farm Laborers	58.2	53.7	48.1	45.4	41.9
Exclusive of Hired Farm Laborers or Actual Strength	—	—	—	38.4	34.5

The servant, because of his isolated, personal work, does not feel himself directly involved in the class-struggle. Though many professionals line up either with "capital" or with "labor," they, as a group, are not directly involved in the struggle.

The voting strength of the "public" is usually over-estimated. There are many minors, non-voting negroes and aliens in this group. Twenty-five per cent of the rural gainfully employed are under 21 years of age, and 10 per cent. are adult male negroes. Among the servants 30 per cent. are minors, 22 per cent. adult negroes and 25 per cent. foreign-born unnaturalized.

CONCLUSIONS

The above analyses lead to many conclusions of vital import to Communist tactics in this country. Class lines are persistently being sharpened. The number of those indirectly involved in the class struggle is growing ever smaller, as the class lines become more distinct.

THE PROLETARIAN MOVEMENT

More and more do we see the proletarianization of the country. Anent this tendency it will not be out of place to briefly deal with a statistician refuting Marx in the *Socialist Review*. Scientifically speaking, this refutation of Marx is more of alchemy than chemistry. The critic quotes the following from the Communist Manifesto: "All move-

ments heretofore have been movements of minorities or in the interests of minorities. The proletarian movement is an independent movement of the enormous majority." He proceeds to poke statistical fun at his "cornerstone of orthodox Marxism" by means of figures showing that, in 1910, the industrial proletariat, exclusive of hired farm-laborers, constituted only 38.2 per cent. of the total gainfully employed. Adding the hired farm-laborers we would find that the urban and rural wage-earners were only 45.6 per cent. of those gainfully employed and, therefore, not a majority. Our expert announces that he has long ago figuratively exposed the fallacy of Marx and Engels as to the proletariat constituting a majority of the population in every capitalistic country. He admits, however, that it required a Bolshevik revolution to completely undermine this "cornerstone of orthodox Marxism." What magnanimity!

Let us, for a moment, consider the analysis of this gentleman. Such terms as proletariat and proletarian movement must not be inter-changed indiscriminately. The industrial proletariat must be limited to the propertyless urban wage-earners, who are the vanguard in the revolution. The working-class, the whole proletariat, on the other hand, is a much broader category. In it are included properly the servants and lower-salaried workers as well as the urban and rural proletariat. The American working-class was in 1910 at least 56 per cent. of the total gainfully employed; that is, it was a good-sized majority. To-day this majority is no less than 60 per cent. of those engaged in gainful occupations.

The proletarian movement is a movement of the working-class against the capitalist class. The proletarian movement, is therefore, unlike "all movements heretofore," a "movement of the enormous majority." *The industrial proletariat is the vanguard of the entire working-class movement. And in the transition period from capitalism to communism it is the proletariat that is to be the ruling class.* We have, then, THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP. *It is the PROLETARIAT, whether its industrial and rural section be a majority of the gainfully employed or not, that must dictate to the entire population. This alone is the cornerstone of the Marxian concept of the class-struggle as laid down in the Communist Manifesto.*

MAJORITY AND MINORITY

Furthermore, it is surprising to see that this critic, who is a statistician of very great repute, should so mix statistical bases without a word of explanation. The fact that the industrial and rural proletariat constituted, in 1910, only 45.6 per cent. of the total gainfully employed does not at all necessarily show that the whole proletariat constituted then only 45.6 per cent., or a minority either of the gainfully employed or of the entire population of the country. The fact of the matter is that the proletariat, more than any other, is blessed with families that are often not too small. Besides, no expert can, figuratively, statistically or otherwise, prove that when Marx spoke of the proletarian

movement he had in mind only those classified as gainfully employed by the United States Census Bureau. When Marx spoke of the interests of the enormous majority he did not exclude the interests of the non-employed women and children of the working-class. Hence, in so far as the total population, not limited to gainfully employed, is concerned, the proletariat, was, even in 1910, a majority of the country's population. To-day, the industrial and rural proletariat alone being a majority of those employed in gainful occupations (approximately 42.8 per cent. industrial wage-earners and 7.7 per cent. rural wage-earners, or at least 50.5 per cent. of the total gainfully employed), the whole proletariat is surely a majority of the entire population, which includes non-employed women and children. We see, then, that the proletarian movement, the movement of the working-class, is a movement in the interests of the enormous majority "of the community."

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS

Capitalism is driving ever more people to a propertyless condition, as shown by the steady growth of the dependent class. The chances for getting to the top of the economic ladder are becoming as rare as a Mussulman in the Christian heaven. This condition makes the broad masses susceptible to revolutionary propaganda. American economic conditions afford the Communist plenty of opportunity to bring home to the masses the hopelessness of the conditions to which they are condemned by capitalism. The conditions which gave rise to what is popularly known as the American psychology—the ideals of individual enterprise and proprietorship, of the "overalls to the presidency philosophy"—are disappearing rapidly.

America is a highly industrialized country. More than a third of the total population (37,770,114) live in cities of 25,000 or more inhabitants (1920 census). Yet the agricultural group plays a very important part in the political and economic life of the country. The rise of a rural proletariat and the rapid growth of farm-tenancy furnish new channels for Communist propaganda and activity. "Capital's" hand is making itself strongly felt in all agricultural enterprises. We should develop such tactics as will enable us not only to promote the organization of the rural masses but also to merge their struggle with that of the industrial proletariat. Our tactics for winning over and leading the rural working masses must positively respond to their immediate needs. The rural masses are more backward culturally and less conscious politically than the industrial wage-earners. Our immediate task here is not so much to broaden and deepen the struggles as to promote a desire for and develop organs of struggle. The importance of the broad rural masses in the American war cannot be overestimated. The Party must make its effort to meet this need.

SUMMARY

Our analysis of the class divisions in America shows that the capitalist system of production and exchange brings about:

1. An increasing proletarianization of the masses.
2. Sharpening of class lines and the class struggle.
3. A steady decrease in the opportunities for comparative economic independence and security.
4. A growing domination of capitalism in agriculture.
5. An increasing number susceptible of being won over to revolutionary activity.
6. The necessity for its (capitalist system's) destruction in order to avoid countless burdens of economic dependence and in security for the broad masses.
7. The impossibility of any other class but the working-class winning economic and social freedom for all society.

(From Theses on Tactics, Third Congress of Communist International.)

"The Communist International draws the attention of the Communist Party of America (united) to the fact that the illegalized organization must not only form the ground for the collection and crystallization of active Communist forces, but that it is their duty to try all ways and means to get out of their illegalized condition into the open, among the wide masses, that it is their duty to find the means and form to unite these masses politically, through public activity, into the struggle against American capitalism."

NATIONAL WAR AND CLASS WAR IN SILESIA

(Continued from Page 11)

tions have been opened in all the large towns of Germany, which in spite of denials and prohibitions are working feverishly and are sending masses of volunteers to Upper Silesia. The Socialist Party of Germany, and the Independent Socialist Party obstinately ignored this recruiting until it was found that the warning of the United Communist Party of Germany, to the effect that counter-revolutionary army was being organized in Silesia, was confirmed. In fact, the Orgesch in Silesia succeeded in securing the leadership of some of the groups and from the first declared that it has no desire to go against Korfanty, but was preparing for a new counter-revolutionary offensive. The conduct of the Orgesch is so provocative that it has frightened even the social patriots, and after the Communists by their propaganda had prepared the minds for arming also the German proletariat and the sabotage of the concentration of military forces, the Railwaymen's Union was compelled to call upon its members to prevent the transportation of men and munitions. Besides this, it became known at the end of last week that the workers in Breslau were arming and were forming workers' troops against the Orgesch.

The action which began as a nationalist undertaking is growing into a tremendous trial of strength between the working class and the counter-revolution.