

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

SPECIAL MAGAZINE SUPPLEMENT
THE DAILY WORKER

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

May 17, 1924.

THE MAKING OF LENIN

REMINISCENCES OF LENIN BY L. TROTZKY.

IT IS unquestionable that to the future big biographer of Lenin the period of 1900-03, of the old "Spark," will be of exceptional psychological interest and will at the same time present great difficulties. For it was just in those short years that Lenin became Lenin. This does not mean that he did not grow further. Quite the contrary; he grew—and by what leaps!—both before and after the November revolution. But that was already a more organic growth.

GREAT was the bound from "underground" to power on November 7, 1917. But this was, so to speak, the material leap of a man who had measured and weighed all that one could measure and weigh. The growth, however, which preceded the split at the second party convention was unnoticeable to the outside onlooker. It was the more resolute inner leap.

The present reminiscences aim to furnish the future biographer some material relating to this unusually significant and important period in the spiritual development of Lenin.

I ARRIVED in London in the autumn of 1902—it must have been in October. It was early in the morning. A cab brought me to the flat of Nikolai Lenin. The door was opened, as far as I remember, by Madame Lenin. Lenin was still in bed and his face bore an expression of welcome mixed with legitimate perplexity. Such were the circumstances in which our first meeting and our first conversation took place. Both Lenin and his wife already knew of me thru a letter from Clare (Krijanovsky), who formally introduced me in Samara into the "Spark" organization under the nickname of "Pen." And I was received as such: "The 'Pen' arrived!"

I WAS filled with tea in the kitchen-dining room while Lenin dressed. I told about my escape from Siberia and complained against the poor "Sparkist" organization at the frontier. The smugglers had mercilessly fleeced me in excess of all tariff and standards. I delivered to Madame Lenin a modest package of addresses and passes, or more probably information about the necessity of discarding several unfit mailing places. At the instance of the Samara group I had visited Kharkov, Poltava and Kiev, and almost everywhere, at least in Kharkov and Poltava, I was able to discover but a very weak system of communication.

LATER I took a long walk with Lenin about London. He showed me Westminster (from the outside), and some other notable buildings. I do not remember how he said it, but the nuance of the meaning was such: "It is they who possess the famous Westminster."

"They" signified, of course, not the English, but our capitalistic enemies. Lenin always had this slight shade, not at all emphasized and profoundly organic, in the timbre of his voice which expressed itself whenever he talked about some cultural treasures or new achievements, about the organization of the British Museum, the wealth of information of the London Times, or, many years later, about German artillery or French aviation: "THEY are capable or THEY possess, THEY have done or THEY have achieved—but what enemies THEY are!" The invisible shadow of "they"—the exploiting class—enveloped all human civilization, in his view, and he was always, aware of this shadow as unmistakably as of daylight.

LENIN took me on this long walk to get acquainted and examine me. And it was really an examination thru the "entire curriculum." In answer to his questions, I told about the members of the Lena colony of exiles, about the internal groups there, how we collectively studied in the Moscow Transient prison his book, "The Development of Capitalism in Russia," and in exile we labored over "Capital" (Marx), but stopped at the second volume. Apparently it was pleasant to him that the young comrades devoted attention to his most important economic work.

ovna which has a moral, an emotional foundation," Lenin said to me once.

It is not difficult to imagine what a contrast Vera Ivanovna, with her vague radicalism and subjectivity, with her slovenliness, made in comparison to Lenin. It is not that there was no sympathy between them, but there was a sense of difference, of natural incompatibility. But she, as a fine psychologist, felt the power of Lenin, not without a certain subtle hostility, even in those days. It was this that she expressed in her phrase about his "deadly grip."

I began to perceive, but gradually

in such a literary method a bit of "ego-centricity," but in reality the emphasis in his articles, even those that were not signed, was a way of fixing his own line of thinking, because of his uncertainty about a line taken by his close collaborators.

HERE there is before us on a small scale that steady, persistent tension towards a goal which breaks down all conditions, which stops before no formalities, and which is the fundamental characteristic of Lenin, the leader.

THE political pilot of the "Spark" was Lenin, but the main publicist strength was Martov. He wrote easily and endlessly in the same way as he talked. Lenin, on the other hand, spent much time in the library of the British Museum where he pursued theoretical studies.

SEVERAL months later, already in the weeks preceding the second convention, there burst forth an editorial difference between Lenin and Martov on the question of the tactics of street demonstrations, more accurately about conflicts with the police. Lenin said:

"It is necessary to form small armed groups, and it is necessary to teach fighting workmen to combat the police."

But Martov was against this. The controversy was taken up by the editorial staff. "Will not something like group terror grow out of this?" I said about Lenin's proposal. It should be recalled that at that period the struggle against the terrorist tactics of the Socialist-Revolutionists played a big part in our work.

SELDOM came across Lenin and Martov engaged in a private conversation, outside of meetings and conference. Lenin disliked even then long arguments, vague conversations which always turned into gossip and twaddle. This greatest engineer of revolution, not only in politics, but also in his theoretical labors, and of foreign languages, as well as in his conversation with people, was unfailingly possessed of the same idea—his nature was perhaps the most utilitarian which the laboratory of history ever produced.

Alongside of Lenin, his nearest co-worker at that time, Martov, already felt himself ill at ease. They were still addressing each other as "thou," but in their relations a coolness was clearly manifesting itself. Martov was more vitally interested in the current day and its sensations, in current literary work, in public and polemical activities, in news and conversations.

LENIN, allowing today to pass beneath him, penetrated tomorrow with his thought. Martov made innumerable and frequently brilliant hypotheses, suggestions which he frequently forgot himself. Lenin took that which he wanted when he wanted it. The embellished fragility of Martov's ideas caused Lenin more than once to shake his head anxiously. Not only were there at that time no different political lines in existence, but they were not even in sight. Only now, looking backward, can one trace them.

LATER, before the split in the second convention, the "Sparkists" divided into "hard" and "soft." This appellation was at first much used, testifying that if there was no clear dividing line as yet, there was already

(Continued on Page 8)



Lenin in Childhood.

I WAS quartered by Madame Lenin several blocks away in a house where Vera Ivanovna, Zasulich, Martov and Blumenfeld, the manager of the "Spark" printing shop, lived. The lodgers occupied rooms one on top of the other. There was another large common room, which Plekhanov christened, after his first visit, "The Dive." In this room there always reigned great disorder. Here coffee was taken and people dropped in for a talk and smoke. Hence, the name. Thus the short London period of my life commenced.

DURING the London sojourn, as well as later in the Geneva period, I met Zasulich and Martov much more frequently than Lenin. Living in London in the same flat, and in Geneva usually dining and supping in the same little restaurants, Martov, Zasulich and I met several times a day, whereas each meeting with Lenin, who lived with his family, was in the nature of a small event.

VERA IVANOVNA was an individual person and peculiarly fascinating. She wrote very slowly, living thru genuine pains of creation. "There is a great deal in Vera Ivan-

and not without difficulty, the intricate relations which existed among the members of the "Spark" staff. I arrived in London, as already said, being very provincial in every respect. Up to that time I had never been not only abroad, but even in Petrograd. In Moscow as well as in Kiev I lived only in the Transient prison. The Marxian writers I knew only thru their articles.

I REMEMBER my attention was attracted by several leading articles and sketches in "The Spark," which, altho unsigned, were written with the pronoun "I," as, for instance, "in such an issue I said," "I already wrote about it on such a date," etc. I inquired whose articles they were. It appeared they were all by Lenin. One day I remarked to him that it was in my opinion literally inconvenient to employ the pronoun "I" in unsigned articles.

"Why inconvenient?" he asked with interest.

"Somehow, it is so," I replied vaguely, for I had no definite ideas on the subject.

"I do not find it so," Lenin said and laughed a little enigmatically. At that time one might have discerned

JAMES CONNOLLY

By J. T. MURPHY

SOMEDAY a Marxist must write the life of James Connolly. We shall never get a true appreciation of Connolly's place in Irish History and the revolutionary Socialist movement of Britain and America until someone, armed with the guiding philosophy of his life, has turned it upon his work and appraised his thoughts and actions accordingly. Desmond Ryan has brought together "a record of facts, opinions, and recollections of James Connolly" which will be exceedingly helpful to whoever undertakes the work, but insofar as he attempts to place Connolly, he enters into the same partisan claims which he condemns in others. "One inclines upon the whole" he says, "to define his probable attitude as that of the official Irish Labor Party," begins an argument to justify his claim, and suddenly drops it as, "perhaps, a profitless conjecture." I doubt this. The controversy and speculation have a significance, which, if properly appreciated, would do much to indicate the right line of approach to an understanding of Connolly.

Why the rival claims for the soul of Connolly? Why the quotation and counter quotation to justify the support or non-support of action? Why still move Connolly's own dying exclamation, "The Socialists will never understand why I am here. Does not the answer lie in the fact that Connolly is among the few great figures of the international working class movement which belong to the transition from the epoch of imperialist expansion to the epoch of social revolution, that he felt himself surrounded by reformism, narrow nationalism, doctrinaire Socialism, none of which had been brought face to face with the task of revolution? I think McManus struck the key to the situation when he observed that Connolly was "the one Socialist that he had ever met who judged every public situation or political crisis with an eye upon revolutionary possibilities." Where were the others to be found at that time? Certainly we do not find them in the British Isles, nor America. We are compelled to turn our eyes eastwards and bring him into alignment with the small Bolshevik group led by Lenin. Desmond Ryan says, "Broadly speaking, James Connolly must be classified as a Workers' Republican and Communist. The doctrines and methods that the Russian Revolution has since familiarized, were his. He would certainly have been at one with Lenin in destruction and construction alike." Ryan is right in this, but the trouble is that Ryan himself does not understand Leninism and consequently, cannot apply it to the understanding of Connolly. He does not understand the great changes that were coming in the ranks of Marxists, the cleavage that was imminent when those who had been transforming Marxism into an apology for reformism were to be separated from those who grasped Marxism as the philosophy of revolution. Nor does he understand the difference between those who marched with Lenin under the banner of Communism and those who under the leadership of De Leon, most of whom at least kept much of their revolutionary powdering and saved themselves in the hour of International Crisis from becoming the abject creatures of imperialism, such as Kautzky, Vandervelde, and reformists of the Second International. He writes with a mind which seems to be a long way back amidst the old controversies between nationalism and internationalism, industrial unionism and the ballot box, talking about peaceful periods and war periods. And yet these are only incidentals to an appreciation of Connolly's position. Connolly's place in history is among the heralds of a new epoch and he must be placed and understood accordingly.

Ryan vividly sketches his struggles. Born in Ulster in the same year as Lenin, "Connolly was 'dragged up' like most proletarian boys . . . Of his parents we know little beyond the

fact that the father was a laborer . . . In 1880 Connolly's family became exiles and arrived in Edinburgh where his father obtained work as a corporation dustman. James became a printer's devil in the office of the local "Evening News." He was then under legal age, but his employer for a year defeated the law . . . Then the sack. "But he was lucky enough to find work soon afterwards in a bakery . . . later . . . two years in a mosaic tiling factory. . . . The company of his uncle, an old Fenian, kept vivid in his memory the glamour and agony of the national struggle. Mitchell too, he read, and much Irish history. Brooding, intense, silent, outwardly cold and inwardly aflame, a spirit of adventure called him to new scenes. Leaving Edinburgh at eighteen Connolly was in turn tramp, navy and peddler, spending a roving and eventful life in different parts of Britain. He was married in Perth at the age of twenty-one. An accident to his father recalled him to Edinburgh. His parent was permanently disabled and James Connolly took up his work as dustman in the cleansing department of the corporation . . . But many tomes of ancient and modern history had he handled, the revolutionary phases of Irish history in particular. . . . Marx, Engels . . . Association with British Socialists, Morris, Hyndman, Leslie . . . Then to Dublin in 1896 as Socialist agitator and to start the Irish Socialist Re-

publican Party and edit its organ, "The Workers' Republic." Revolt against the Boer war, Anti-Jubilee Empire Demonstration . . . writing "Labor in Irish History" . . . representative of the Irish S. P. at the International Social Congress, in 1900. In at the split of the S. D. F. in 1903, the formation of the Socialist Labor Party in line with De Leon, later in the year he departed for America. Back again in 1910. The organization of the I. T. W. U. . . . The great industrial revolt of 1913. The final martyrdom after Easter Week, 1916."

Here was no complacent trade union leader, but a working class warrior with heart aflame. What could be the use of talking about the philosophy of gradualism to this man steeped in revolutionary lore and compelled to do battle at every step. Once the goal of social revolution becomes his consuming aim and he has grasped the Marxist method of reading history, his evolution towards Leninism becomes a certainty as the years sweep us onward towards the great crisis of 1914. His divergence from the Kautskys in the revolutionary purpose but turned Marxism into a fatalism which saw Socialism emerging thru the gradual transformation of capitalism. What to them was a paralysing blow was to Connolly the great opportunity. Ryan's account of the effect of the Imperialist War on Connolly reads like Zinoviev's ac-

count of its effect upon Lenin. "His whole being cried out against it and where Lenin called for the transformation of the Imperial War into the Civil War of the Classes, Connolly called the subject nation of Ireland to war upon the Empire.

"We shall continue in season and out of season to teach that 'the far-flung battle line of England is weakest at the point nearest its heart, that Ireland is in that position of tactical advantage that a defeat of England in India, Egypt, the Balkans, or Flanders, would not be so dangerous to the British Empire as conflict of armed forces in Ireland, that the time for Ireland's battle is now, the place for Ireland's Battle is Here."

Both watchwords were fundamentally sound in relation to the war on Imperialism. Both men with tireless energy pursued their tasks, but there is a difference in the means of operation. Both agreed in that they must call into operation the sum total of the forces they could muster against the imperialist, but one had a highly developed party as an instrument to gather the forces and maintain the proletarian hegemony, the other had no such revolutionary party understanding the role of the proletariat in a predominantly agricultural country. Lenin was farther ahead than Connolly and with the Bolshevik Party not only led the workers as the vanguard of the mighty revolutionary movement of workers and peasants, but crystalized and expressed the experience that the world should see and hear and read and understand. Connolly had not such a party. He appealed to the I. T. W. U., the citizen army. He led his recruits to the very forefront of the national struggle and by these acts stamped upon the pages of Irish history the role of the proletariat of Ireland in its war of liberation. But, altho he created the impression that he would not hesitate to turn against some of his colleagues in the national war if they would not proceed to carry out the socialist measures for which he fought, I do not find any clear defining of the role of the proletariat or his aims as that of the dictatorship of the proletariat or what part a revolutionary party must take in relation thereto. His deeds proclaim the answer and one feels convinced that had Connolly not been murdered by the Asquith-Henderson combination and had he lived to see the Russian Revolution and the emergence of the Communist International, he would have completed his writings in full accord with the declarations of the Communist International.

It is this incompleteness which gives rise to the claims of partisans. Ryan speaks of his departure from "his original Marxism" when in reality he was manifesting a firmer grip of its essentials in contrast to the formal expression passing in the name of Marxism whether via Kautzky or De Leon. This was the case on more than the struggle of subject nations. He grasped the essentials of working with the peasantry, and of using the co-operatives whilst the followers of De Leon were concentrating on industrial unionism and the ballot box. He learned his industrial unionism in the industrialized countries of England and America, but he had to apply his philosophy in an essentially agricultural country dominated by a powerful nationalist spirit because of its subjection to England. Fearlessly he faced these problems which did not press upon the De Leonists of Britain and America and as he grappled with them he felt the big differences that lay between him and his old associates. That is why he exclaimed, "The socialists will not understand why I am here." Could he have seen the succeeding years—welcomed the Russian Revolution and felt the quaking foundations of capitalism, he would also have heard an answering cry. The revolutionary Socialists do understand and greet James Connolly as one of the valiant few who by their deeds rescued Marxism from sterility and led the way into the epoch of social revolution.—J. T. Murphy.

THE WORKERS' FLAG

Unfurl our banner to the breeze
On mountain heights and distant seas;
Where the poor are trodden down
In the country and the town;
Where the children toil all day,
Robbed of sunshine and of play;
Where our sisters earn their bread
In work from which all joy has fled;
Where our brothers give their life
For masters' gain, in bloody strife.

It shall challenge tyrant wrong;
It shall make the weak, the strong;
It shall clasp in brotherhood
Men of every race and blood.

'Tis the flag whose gleaming red
Strikes the workers' foes with dread;
'Tis our flag, we workers, here;
Rise and greet it with a cheer.

James H. Dolsen.

An Italian Communist Daily

By Antonio Presi.

THE battle initiated by the Italian Federation for an Italian Communist daily in America is near its triumph. It was a hard, formidable battle.

We were like a little group of sailors fighting in a terrible storm at sea. A desperate fight.

We possessed only the indomitable determination to arrive at the goal, to give to the glorious and immortal Communist International a new fighting flag, a new impregnable trench defended by a few ardent Communist soldiers.

Only a few months ago our "Alba Nuova" started to come out every week. The atmosphere which surrounded us was full of antagonism, hatred, aversion. But we never cared. The Communist soldiers cannot fear its enemies; we know them very well. Opportunists, reformists so-called, libertarians of the Makhno type, in the center of the anti-Fascist stragglers, all of them with their publications, launched a relentless offensive against the principle which we stood for. But we never shrank before the rattle snake. We remained immovable, like a rock of granite. We followed our course.

Today the sympathies of the Italian workers are with us, the victory of establishing a daily paper shows that we were right. Those who assail us belong to the category of the impotent, the pusillanimous, good only to fight against the workers' cause rather than the capitalist regime. For more than a quarter of a century that element, because of its sectarian and narrow mind in the class struggle, has continuously divided the workers into various factions. Not in the name of a party, an ideal, a principle, but for their own personal ambition. And for this only reason the Italian working class in America, numerous as it is, is not yet one of the main

factors in the organized labor movement of this country today.

And when we look over this great army of more than 3,500,000 workers speaking our language, without a daily paper, without any labor institution, we know how great was the damage done by this gang of demagogues dressed up in the regalia of "proletarian saviors." It is for this reason that our Federation decided to concentrate its main forces to achieve the realization of a daily paper, a paper which can reach the toiling masses and teach them the Communist principles, give them an ideal to defend, to propagate, to realize.

Tomorrow we know what will be the result of the propaganda for the daily paper. We know that thousands of working men and working women will understand their duty in the great field of the class struggle.

Our paper will be a great weapon against the Fascist movement, it will give in this country among the Italian working class. And besides that it will be a great help to the American workers because it will fight to dissipate racial and national hatred between the workers of the world, so as to eliminate the ignominious nationalistic teachings so dangerous to the working class interests. Only the enemies of the workers, Americans or Italians, can tremble before this new step made by the workers toward their emancipation; but the working class all over the world can sing the hymn of joy in this movement, because it shows that Fascism cannot succeed in crushing the hope for a new day of the workers of Italy.

Yes, the publication of "Il Lavoratore" is the beginning of the new and triumphant resurrection of the Italian proletariat. The day will come when we will celebrate the downfall of Mussolini and his pretorian army to give birth to the Italian Soviet Republic. It is inevitable. The Italian proletariat is still marching.

Revival of Alien Seditious Laws

By J. RAMIREZ.

APPARENTLY "Silent Cal" Coolidge does not know his American history very well. And it is perhaps best for his peace of mind. Otherwise he might see what happened 74 years ago to John Adams, the second President of the United States, of what is going to happen to him.

Adams was like Coolidge in many ways, altho a far bigger man from whatever angle you look at him. Like Coolidge, he was a tool of the moneyed interests. He was almost as taciturn as "Silent Cal," and he had the same mean-looking mouth.

In the year 1798, the reactionary Adams Administration forced thru Congress a series of laws known as the Alien Seditious Acts. These measures looked so much like our present-day "Criminal Syndicalist laws" and "Anti-Alien bills" that it is clear they belong to the same family tree. Two years later, the Adams Administration fell with a crash, dragging down the whole bloated structure of "Federalism" with it. Thomas Jefferson and the "Democrat-Republicans" were swept into power on the crest of what has become famous in American history as "the great Democratic revolution of 1800." Jefferson's principal slogan was: "Down with the Alien and Seditious Acts!" and the American people rallied to this slogan en masse, notwithstanding the lying propaganda of the kept press of the day. There were other important, and perhaps more fundamental, conditions in Jefferson's victory over the Federalists, but the Alien and Seditious Acts were certainly a potent factor.

The Federalists were the Sinclairs and Denbys and Senator Falls of President Adams' day. They represented (and practiced) "high finance." They stood for what Adams described as government by "the educated and propertied few." They had no faith in the common people. The Federalist Party ruled the country from the establishment of the Constitution to the so-called Jeffersonian revolution of 1800.

"The predominance of the Federalists in Congress, and in the country," says the noted historian J. S. Bassett, "suggested to the leaders of the Party that they might do what they pleased. It was a temptation of power to which the wisest of them yielded. Their idea that government should be in the hands of the capable classes might now, for the first time in the history of the new government, be put into operation."

They planned a concerted attack against the farming and poorer urban classes and, naturally, they did not fail to make use of the bogeyman of "un-Americanism" to further their dark, aristocratic, un-American, purposes.

Restrictive laws against the workers and farmers always seem to go hand in hand with special legislation against the foreign-born. The association is not accidental. A measure which might be too unpopular if labelled frankly "anti-labor" may win a certain degree of acceptance when fixed up as "anti-alien." No "anti-alien laws" have ever been passed which applied to Wall Street manipulators or the agents of capitalism in general.

First the Federalists took up the question of naturalization. Previous laws had given this privilege to aliens resident in the country 5 years. It was now enacted that foreigners who wanted to become citizens would have to prove they had been in the country 14 years, and would have to make a declaration of intention 5 years before sending in their final application.

By means of the vicious Alien Acts, the foreign-born masses were discriminated against in many ways. "Selective immigration" was proclaimed, as well as other similar schemes that are being revived now.

There was also the Seditious Act. "The Seditious Act," says Bassett, "was intended to deal with citizens

or aliens who, too severely criticized the government." Like the Alien Acts, it originated in the Senate, where Federalism was rampant.

In reading over John Adams' Seditious Act, one is struck by the startling resemblance to the Michigan "Criminal Syndicalist" Law, under which W. Z. Foster and Charles E. Ruthenberg have been persecuted—and, indeed, to many other State Criminal Syndicalism Laws thruout the country. In its final shape, it made it a high misdemeanor "unlawfully to combine and conspire" or "to commit, advise, or attempt to procure any insurrection and riot, or unlawful assembly, or combination."

Under such a law, the powers that be could jail a class-conscious worker for almost anything—which is also the case under our contemporary assortment of Criminal Syndicalist laws. Ten persons, all of whom of course, belonged to an opposition party, were tried and convicted under the Seditious Act. Many others were indicted but not tried. The political effect of these cases was to make popular martyrs of those whom the government was persecuting. The state legislators of Kentucky and Virginia passed strong resolutions of protest, the Kentucky Legislature declaring that it would refuse to recognize the law. On all sides, the abhorrent Alien and Seditious Acts were denounced as un-constitutional and as a violation of the elementary rights of free speech and free assembly. In-

signation among the enraged people ran high.

The Federalist Party tried to destroy the effect of the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions by insinuating that they were all part of a French plot—the French plot theory being an expedient which the adroit Federalists could employ on any occasion. But, Bassett tells us, "The imputation of a French plot could not be sustained by the Federalists. The public realized that the issue was the Alien and Seditious Laws and back of them was the consolidating tendency of Federalism."

The results were seen in the outcome of the election of 1800.

"Silent Cal" Coolidge is in high favor in the Republican Party today. He is without peer, as a servant of Wall Street and consequently, he is without peer as candidate for the Republican presidential nomination. He has given his approval to Mr. Johnson's "Alien Bill" and has expressed himself as decidedly pleased with Mr. Sterling's "Seditious Bill." It was as a leading member of his Cabinet that the underworld character, Harry M. Daugherty planned his brutal raid on the convention of the Communist Party in Berrien County, Michigan, indicting Foster, Ruthenberg, Dunne and 29 associates. Ruthenberg's appeal, which is being financed by the Labor Defense Council, will soon be heard.

For precisely the same reasons that the leaders of the Republican Party

are so unanimously back of Coolidge for President, the workers and poor farmers are solidly against him. The toiling masses of today are no less determined to fight for the elementary rights of free speech and free assembly than their ancestors were in 1800; they will refuse to allow their unions to be weakened by a "selective immigration" which would "select" those docile workers making good scabs, and exclude all those who might add to the fighting power of the American labor movement.

There may well be a "revolution of 1924" comparable to "the great democratic revolution" which put an end to Federalism. I do not, of course, refer to a thoroughgoing revolution, in the sense of a complete overturn of society; Jefferson's triumph in 1800 was not that either. Nor do I wish to draw any serious parallel between 1800 and 1924, except the obvious one of the Alien and Seditious Acts—altho other points of similarity might well be urged.

The anti-alien (Johnson) and anti-labor (Sterling) bills before Congress typify the present period of Wall Street rule. They are not specifically Coolidge's, for they follow on the heels of the Espionage and Criminal Syndicalist Laws of Woodrow Wilson's term. Opposition to the resurrected Alien and Seditious Acts heralds the downfall of Republicans and Democrats alike. Already the Farmer-Labor forces are forming everywhere.

MAY DAY, 1924

By ERNST ETLINGER.

ONCE more May day is here.

Once more the earth will tremble with the sound of the march of the working masses all over the world. May Day is here. The Workers' Day of Freedom has come. May Day, what hope it brings forth, how great is its significance. The day of the revolutionary working class the world over. From China to Russia, from America to the farthest corner of Europe, May Day will see the proletariat marching with its slogan, "Down with International Capitalism," "Up with the rule of the Workers."

The working masses of Europe, Asia and America are completely under the heel of international capitalism which is grinding them down to lower levels. The capitalist structure has collapsed economically and is only able to exist by the naked suppression of the workers, and forcing them to accept living conditions which means for them a life of starvation and misery.

Capitalism which slaughtered ten millions of workers in the last world war, which made of European civilization a holocaust of misery and which has released all the forces of violence against the masses, is now endeavoring to saddle the cost of the war upon the back of the workers. By increasing hours and cutting wages in all directions, it hopes to increase the exploitation of the workers and wring from them profits in ever greater volume. In order to do this it is trying to smash the unions, the organizations of the workers which have been built up by so much struggle and sacrifice.

All of the illusions of democracy are now gone. Democracy which could be used to delude the workers during the days of the peaceful development of capitalism now no longer functions as the working masses are becoming ever more conscious of their destiny. Gone is all the talk of peace, democracy, freedom. The capitalist classes have only one message for the workers and that is armed force to break any resistance to their program.

Under the banner of fascism an orgy of violence and terrorism is directed against the masses in every country with the object of breaking all resistance and completely sub-

jugate them to the capitalist program. That is the meaning of the Dawes report, which is so heartily supported by the capitalist press. This report which has so readily been approved by the liberals and the yellow socialists the world over, the traitors who have so long deceived the workers is nothing but a program to force the German workers to greater exploitation so that they will provide not only profit for German capitalism but also pay reparations to the Allies. If the German working class can be smashed politically and their organizations annihilated, a great step towards the enslavement of the world working class will have been achieved.

The White Terror is triumphant and reigns supreme over the fallen body of the proletariat. In Germany, Finland, Roumania, Poland, Italy, Spain, Hungary, Greece, and other European countries, the naked dictatorship of the capitalist class is openly exercised crushing every attempt of the workers to maintain their conditions. The social democrats, the heroes of the Second International, as well as the trade union bureaucrats, have openly sold out to the capitalist class. In spite of the misery of the masses, in spite of their poverty and wretchedness, they openly preach submission to the capitalist regime, and crush any attempt to organize resistance.

Yes, the White Terror is supreme at least on the surface, but the workers are stirring everywhere and are again beginning to fight the capitalist class openly. A new wave of militancy is sweeping the world, and the working class is once more preparing its forces for battle.

In Great Britain mass strikes swept the country, which have been partially successful and which were prevented from realizing their full demand by

the action of the trade union leaders and the Labor Party. In Europe and America the ferment is at work, and the masses are desperately trying to unite forces against the common enemy.

With the approach of May Day, the workers are once more showing their militancy and their determination to overthrow capitalism. May Day 1924 in spite of the White Terror and reaction rages spells hope to the workers and death to the capitalist dictatorship.

In one country, however, there will be a May Day different from that of any other country, a day of rejoicing, a day of real celebration. In Russia there will be a May Day which will symbolize all the hopes of the workers the world over. May Day this year will find Russia well on the road of economic reconstruction. When the Russian workers and peasants celebrate this year, they will, with pride be able to point out to the world their achievements, and how in spite of suffering and sacrifice they are laying down the foundation for the Communist society. Russia having smashed capitalism is now turning all her energy to build up her economic system and raise the material well being of the masses. In spite of having no aid from the outside, Russia is today the most stable country in Europe, and the only one where the position of the workers is constantly becoming better. Yes, there will be great demonstrations in Russia this year, demonstrations symbolizing the achievements of the past year as well as embodying the hopes of the future. Great meetings will take place in that country pledging the energy and strength of the Russian workers to aid the revolutionary workers the world over in their struggle against capitalism.

HERALD COMMUNE

Dairy and Poultry Enterprise on a Collective Basis to be established in Soviet Russia.

Our delegates are in Russia now to arrange for a suitable farm for this Commune.

Competent workers of the various trades may join us now, as the first group is expected to leave soon.

We meet every second and fourth Sunday at 3 P. M. at the Society for Technical Aid to Soviet Russia, 1902 W. Division St., 2nd floor, Chicago.

For further information call or write to our Secretary, S. Miller

1243 N. Claremont Ave.

Chicago, Illinois

Foster's Reply To Nearing

DEAR COMRADE NEARING:—I must take issue flatly and fundamentally with practically all the points developed by you in your letter of Jan. 28th relative to the policies of the Workers Party and the Trade Union Educational League. As I understand the situation, your analysis of social conditions is faulty, your facts are inaccurate, and your conclusions are wrong. The four main points you would establish, and which I shall consider one by one, seem to be about as follows:

1. There is no revolutionary sentiment among the working masses of this country, save in a few localities and among the foreign-born workers.
2. The reactionary state of the labor movement, especially as it is expressed in trade union conventions, is a true reflection of the state of mind of the broad rank and file of labor.
3. The militant program of the W. P. and T. U. E. L., carrying with it an active participation in all the struggles of the workers, is not only wrong in principle and futile in operation, but also actually harmful to the left-wing movement in general.
4. The program of the left-wing should not be to plunge into the workers' struggles but to carry on a careful and systematic campaign of educating and organizing the scanty revolutionary forces in preparation for the struggles of the future.

1. The weakness of your whole conception is that it is based upon the false assumption that there is no considerable mass revolutionary sentiment in this country. Thruout your letter, and as the very heart of your tactical considerations, you estimate the body of revolutionary sentiment as being expressed solely by the small number of conscious, clear-sighted, revolutionaries. You overlook completely the revolutionary significance of the prevailing discontent among the working masses. And by ignoring this tremendous factor you naturally draw conclusions which are valueless for our movement.

UNDENIABLY there is a great volume of discontent among the masses of American workers and farmers. This arises inevitably out of the clash of class interests within the frame of capitalism. This discontent, it is true, is mostly unconscious, blind, stupid, timid, and easily misled. But it is essentially revolutionary, nevertheless. It is the raw stuff of which revolutions are made. Revolutions are not brought about by the type of clear-sighted revolutionists that you have in mind, but by stupid masses who are goaded to desperate revolt by the pressure of social conditions, and who are led by straight-thinking revolutionaries who are able to direct the storm intelligently against capitalism. Never mind how stupid the mass discontent now is in America; never mind if the workers think, as you say they do, that "times will pick up again under the present system." The unrest is basically revolutionary, notwithstanding. Capitalism cannot allay this discontent by granting the demands of the exploited. It must increase in volume, intensity, and intelligence until finally it culminates in the revolution. You make a fundamental error when you conclude that the only revolutionary discontent is that of the handful of class conscious militants, and when you ignore the far greater factor, the general discontent of the masses.

THE W. P. and the T. U. E. L. do not assume that there exists a large body of consciously revolutionary sentiment. On the contrary they merely "assume" the unquestionable, deep (even if vague) discontent of the masses. They know that the real function of the conscious left-wing is to educate, organize, intensify, discipline, and direct this discontent until it develops sufficient clarity, volume, and militancy to precipitate the final struggle with capitalism. You

say that radical sentiment must be created by education, while we add to this that above all it must be developed out of the existing mass discontent. Your conception that the conscious elements are the only revolutionary force leads straight to the isolation of our movement and to its degeneration into a studious, sterile, cloistered Communist sect. The W. P. and T. U. E. L. conception, in direct contradiction to yours, makes inevitably for a broad mass movement of revolt and for an increasing participation in the ever-widening, ever-deepening class struggle; it makes for a real fighting Communist movement.

IN this article Comrade William Z. Foster takes issue with Scott Nearing on the question of policies and tactics to be pursued by the Workers Party. It is a reply to an article by Nearing published in this magazine Saturday, May 10th, 1924.

Our readers will do well to carefully examine and study the two points of view expressed by Nearing and Foster respectively, because the matter dealt with in these articles are of supreme importance to the revolutionary movement of the American workers.—Editor.

2. In your letter, as part of your general case that there is no real mass revolutionary discontent in this country, you make the rash assertion that the rank and file of the unions are as reactionary as their leaders. You even go so far as to say that Gompers is probably to the left of the general mass of unionists. Then, to support this broad contention, you cite the indifference of the organized masses at the expulsion of Wm. F. Dunne, the rejection of amalgamation and a labor party, and the repudiation of Soviet Russia at the A. F. of L. convention, as well as the continued imprisonment of Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, the discrediting of Alex Howat, the expulsion of left-wing militants in the needle trades, and various other outrages by trade union officials and capitalists. You claim that the views of the leaders on these matters are shared by the rank and file because both have gone to the capitalist schools, they read the capitalist papers, belong to the churches, vote the old party tickets—in short, the rank and file have been "taken into the camp by the enemy" just as much as their leaders have.

SUCH a contention, especially coming from one undertaking to use the Marxian method of analysis, is inexcusably erroneous. It runs counter to the truth on every side. The fact is the rank and file of the unions are far and away more radical than their leaders. And naturally so, for their economic position compels them to be. The trade union leaders are actually and ideologically part of the petty bourgeoisie. They draw large salaries; they live the life of the middle class; they are tied by a thousand and one filaments to the employers themselves; they have only a secondary interest in the struggle between the workers and exploiters; they feel no urgent and immediate interest in the building and militant utilization of the workers' organizations; they are content to let well enough alone, so long as their own economic position, as expressed thru the regular receipt of their salaries, is assured. Like the rest of the petty bourgeoisie, they are active defenders of capitalism.

ON the other hand, the workers are engaged in a direct struggle against the employers. For them the most vital consequences depend upon a successful prosecution. Despite their capitalistic training thru the newspapers, churches, political parties, etc. (which it would be idle to deny) they almost instinctively rally to the support of practical movements making for the strengthening—numerically, structurally, ideologically—of their political and industrial organizations. The tremendous spread of the amalgamation movement is proof of that. Between the petty bourgeoisie leaders and the working class rank and file, a struggle goes on constantly over the revolutionizing of the labor movement, with the leaders desperately resisting, by every means at their com-

mand, all attempts at fundamental improvement, which attempts almost always disturb the leaders friendly relations with the employers or their control over the unions.

THIS struggle between the rank and file and the leaders of the trade unions is now at a most critical stage. Innumerable instances of it might be cited, taken from every union in the country. Whoever does not perceive it knows nothing of the real forces at work in the labor movement.

STRANGELY enough, practically all the incidents cited by you to show the "consent" of the rank and file to the acts of their leaders are, when

viewed properly, striking illustrations of the greater degree of radicalism among the actual workers in the shops. Consider the Portland convention of the A. F. of L.—what expression did the rank and file get there? Practically none. That was almost entirely a gathering of officials. Fully 150 of them violated their instructions when they voted against amalgamation, the labor party, and recognition of Soviet Russia—a flagrant but typical case of official suppression of rank and file radicalism. Or consider the case of Tom Mooney—have not the rank and file surged again and again, with their limited means of expression, in his behalf. And have not the leaders always broken up their movements of protest? The same is true of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. And in the case of the International Ladies' Garment Workers; if the left-wing had demanded such support the rank and file would have split that organization in two.

BUT let us conclude with the Howat case. How you can get any comfort out of that for your theory is a mystery. It is one of the most flagrant cases on record of violent rank and file suppression by a reactionary officialdom controlling the organization machinery. At the recent Miners' Convention, Lewis did not dare to give the rank and file a chance to express themselves on the matter, so, like trade union leaders generally, in handling radical movements, he used the full power of the organization to crush the Howat movement, arbitrarily adjourning the convention to prevent a fair vote being taken. Fully two-thirds of the delegates were in open protest but could do nothing. Then, because the rank and file have no effective means to counteract such outrages by their officials, you conclude that they acquiesce in them. Such conclusions, which are typical of many in your letter, completely invalidate your analysis of the situation.

3. Following logically upon your contentions that there is no mass revolutionary sentiment in America and that the rank and file of the labor movement are as deeply reactionary as their leaders, you condemn the W. P. and T. U. E. L. policy of maneuvering the masses on a large scale as is expressed in our various campaigns. Your objections would seem to fall under two general heads: (a) that we waste our strength because the non-revolutionary masses are unprepared to accept our program, and, (b) that we demoralize our own forces by carrying on maneuvers too complicated for them to follow. Now let us see what there is to these contentions.

THE mistake you make in this matter is to tacitly assume that the left-wing movement is going to the masses with a program so advanced that they cannot understand or accept it, and that therefore we cannot enlist them under our leadership. This would be true if we were to confine ourselves simply to the advocacy of

the dictatorship of the proletariat and other revolutionary Communist concepts. But such is not the case. In addition to the ultimate revolutionary program, the W. P. and the T. U. E. L. have a program of every-day work, attuned to the prevailing discontent and the backward state of the working class. The latter can and do understand the need for amalgamation and the labor party, and they are following the left-wing lead in the campaign for these and other measures. With such a program of practical work, coupled to our general revolutionary teaching, we can say, yes, the sentiment is here, what we have to do is to organize and lead it. The proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. The fact that hundreds of thousands of workers are following the lead of the W. P. and the T. U. E. L. on the political and industrial fields is the best possible proof that they are ready for our program and leadership.

AS for your second objection, that our rank and file cannot keep pace with us, your fears are groundless. If a third party is formed with LaFollette or some similar at its head, and the Workers Party has to support it, the latter will not demoralize itself thereby. Quite the contrary would be the case. The best proof of this is our practice at present. Look at Minnesota. There the W. P. is deeply involved in the Farmer-Labor Party, which is a third party, as we understand the term. But, is it weakened or demoralized by this fact? Not at all. The W. P. has more real power and influence in Minnesota than in any state in the Union, and its members are intelligently following the struggle. Altho supporting the third party, they are pointing out its weaknesses and limitations. The same will be done in the coming national campaign if the W. P. co-operates with the third party thru an alliance. The tactic is not complicated. The time was when revolutionists held the notion that they could not participate in the mass unions and still maintain their revolutionary purity, but that has been thoroughly exploded. The same fate awaits the idea that they cannot safely take part in the mass movements of the workers on the political field. If the W. P. and the T. U. E. L. cannot function and prosper in the every-day political and industrial struggles of the masses, then they have no right to life.

4. As a natural consequence of your conception that the only available revolutionary force in the American labor movement is the small body of conscious revolutionists, you outline a plan for the careful education, organization and development of this precious little nucleus. You say, "our task involves first, education and second, organization." You say almost nothing about utilizing the organization in the struggle. This is because you can conceive it fundamentally as an educational group, standing apart from the great masses and dealing largely with the theoretical aspects of the struggle. You would build it up slowly and cautiously. You would make of it, if your program were followed, simply a Communist sect.

NOW, with such a conception, the modern Communist movement has nothing to do. Above all, the left wing is a fighting organization. We are soldiers in the class struggle, not merely students of it. The left wing is the vanguard of the proletariat, not simply in a theoretical, but also in an actual sense. It must not stand aside performing mental drill stunts and awaiting the great day, but it must participate increasingly in all the struggles of the workers. Education we must have; likewise organization; but both are futile without action. The struggle is the breath of life to every Communist organization.

IT is the function of the W. P. and T. U. E. L. to plunge into the struggles of the workers and by the example of practical leadership to secure control over the masses. The necessity for the left wing to do this, is

(Continued on Page 8.)

Two Elections That Tell a Story

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN.

WITHIN the past two weeks Germany and France held elections to their respective national legislative bodies. Each of these elections has a story to tell, which is pregnant with meaning and promise for the future. A story of decay among the ruling classes. A story of the millions who are oppressed, rising in anger against things as they are. A story of a splendid spirit of rebellion that is once again taking hold of the working masses of the world, steeling their determination for the fast-approaching day of reckoning.

YES, that day is coming despite all the efforts of Morgan, Dawes, Poincare, Ludendorff, Ebert, Gompers, etc., etc. The end of capitalist misrule is coming on much faster than even the optimistically inclined could believe. Is not that apparent from the elections in Germany? In France? And even in Japan tho it still finds itself in the clutches of a feudal-militaristic oligarchy?

THE Communist International did not always calculate right, particularly where dates were involved. But there is one Communist assumption which today stands as fast and impregnable as on the day it was made, an assumption which is the very soul of the international Communist movement. And it is this: That the time we happen to live in, also happens to be capitalism's last phase of development. That since the last war, the world has entered a period of social revolution, and that the end of this period will see the triumph of working class power in most of the capitalist countries of the world.

Germany—The Crucial Point.

IN the development of the proletarian struggle for power, Germany plays the most important role. Events in Germany have a determining effect upon events the world over. It is really the crucial point for ourselves just as well as for international capitalism.

When capitalist statesmen speak of saving Germany by a proper solution of the reparations problem, they really mean saving capitalism. They wouldn't admit that in so many words. They prefer speaking in terms of industry, commerce, peace, international unity and what not? But it all comes down to the same thing, which is to save capitalism all over the world.

GERMANY is the problem. If you can work out a proposition whereby German industry and commerce can begin functioning normally and freely, without at the same time hurting and crippling the industry and commerce of France, England and America, if you have got that, you have gotten hold of something which nobody has been able to devise as yet.

MANY had tried their hands at it. Just to mention a few: Woodrow Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Orlando, Briand, Poincare, and all of them went down in defeat. The job was beyond their powers, beyond the powers of capitalist statesmanship in general.

Now Morgan is making an attempt. Backed by the enormous resources and wealth of American capitalism, the House of Morgan is trying to impose upon European capitalism a new life-saving scheme, the Dawes plan. What is this plan? Nothing more than a new variation of the old theme. An attempt to enable German capitalism to live without injuring the capitalist foundations of France and England. An impossible task, to be sure. But the intentions of Morgan and Co. are good, the theory behind these intentions being, let's try, anyway. And having power enough to impose their will the American bankers may succeed in putting their scheme over. But what of it?

IF they succeed in reestablishing the economics of Germany, they will thereby ruin England and France. If, on the other hand, the Dawes plan will be made to work in the interests of England and France, then German

capitalism is doomed, its final end being only a matter of months.

The Elections in Germany.

BEFORE we proceed to drawing conclusions from the elections in Germany, let us analyze the figures of the vote. We shall first compare the results of the election to the old Reichstag with those to the new one and see what we can learn from that.

In the elections to the old Reichstag the following vote was cast:

Deutsche Nationale	3,740,000
Deutsche-Folkische	1,200,000
Folkspartei	3,610,000
Centrum	4,779,000
Democratic	2,202,000
Social Democratic	10,512,000
Communist	441,000
Various	800,000

The new elections produced the following result:

Deutsche Nationale	4,500,000
Deutsche Folkische	2,000,000
Folkspartei	2,000,000
Centrum	7,500,000
Democratic	1,600,000
Social Democratic	5,000,000
Communists	4,000,000
Various	760,000

WHO were the losers? First comes the Social Democratic party with a loss of 5 million votes, or nearly one-half of what it secured in the elections to the old Reichstag. Second comes the Folkspartei with a loss of over a million and a half, or nearly 40 per cent. Third and last, comes the Democratic party with a loss of over half a million, or nearly 25 per cent.

In other words, more than seven million voters, about one-fourth of the electorate, have changed allegiance. What sort of people are they? What social classes do they belong to? It can be safely assumed that these people consist of two social elements: working class and petty bourgeois, the proposition between the two being much more difficult to arrive at. We might, however, reach an approximate figure by finding out where these more than seven million votes went to, and here we find: That the Communists secured about one-half, that is, 3,500,000; the Centrum, over 2 million; the Deutsche Nationale and the Deutsch-Folkische, about 800,000 each.

Now, it stands to reason that the three and one-half million votes gained by the Communist Party of Germany are working class votes. It is also reasonable to assume that very few, if any, working class votes were cast in this election for the Catholic Centrum or for the monarchist-reactionary Deutsche Nationale and Deutsch-Folkische. If this is so, then a further assumption can be advanced that of the five million votes lost by the Social-Democratic party, about 3½ million were working class and the rest (1½) petty bourgeois.

AND here, let's stop for a while to realize the significance of these figures. Three million and a half of German workers, who have voted for the Social-Democrats to the old Reichstag, have refused to do so this time. They have decided to give their allegiance to the Communist party, the Party of the social revolution. All in all the Communist Party received 4 million votes.

NOTE also the significance of the fact that most of this vote came from the industrial centers of Germany; the Ruhr, the industrial Rhineland generally, Silesia, Saxony, etc. In other words, the workers of the heavy industries and of the concentrated industrial regions, the strategic points which are most decisive in the proletarian struggle for power, have in their mass accepted the leadership of the Communist Party.

THUS is the German Social-Democracy paying for its betrayals to the working class. Of the 5,600,000 votes secured by the Social-Democrats in this election, the bulk belongs to the well-paid and corrupted labor-aristocracy and to the poorer sections of the middle classes. The proletariat, the real working class is leaving the betrayers in disgust. This is one of the main lessons of the elections to the new Reichstag.

Middle Classes Turning to the Right.

THE second large social group that shifted positions in the recent elections are the middle classes. One million and a half of this group broke with the Social-Democrats. About the same number parted company with the Folkspartei, the party of the heavy and concentrated industry. And over ½ million left the Democratic party, the party of merchants and manufacturers. What's become of them? More than one-half (over 2 million) went to the Centrum, the party of the well-to-do farmers and the Catholic middle classes generally. The remainder divided itself almost equally between the Deutsche Nationale and the Deutsch-Folkische, the two parties which represent the great land-owners, the reactionary junkers and the old military caste.

THESE facts are full of significance. They show that a large portion of the poor middle classes is totally disgusted with the present republican regime and with the so-called parties of the Republic which include the Social-Democrats, the Democrats, and the Folkspartei. That is why so many of the middle class voters have now cast their votes for the monarchist parties of the reactionary junkers and the military, and for the nominally-republican Centrum. The middle class elements of Germany have lost faith both in the parties of capital and in what they believed to be the party of Labor (Social-Democracy). Instead they have turned to the parties of the rich farmers and large land-owners. Clearly, a turn to the right. It remains now for the working class of Germany, under the leadership of the Communist Party, by deeds and action to convince the oppressed middle classes that their salvation lies not with the monarchist reaction but with the successful struggle for the proletarian dictatorship.

THE result of the elections in Germany can be summarized as follows: The working masses have moved to the Left. The middle classes—to the Right. The Social-Democratic party is beginning to decay and will soon be relegated to a position of very small importance. The leading role in the proletarian class-struggle is being assumed by the Communist Party.

A dictatorship of the Right (big industrialists, junkers and military) or the dictatorship of the proletariat—this is the line-up in the class-struggle of present day Germany. The recent elections and the still more recent events in Halle are proof sufficient.

Big Capital Repudiated in France.

THE defeat of Poincare means the repudiation of the rule of Big Capital—the heavy industrialists and large bankers. Poincare ruled in the name of these two capitalist groups. He ruled openly and brutally in their interests.

HIS entire German policy was nothing more than an attempt to put into effect the will of the industrial and financial magnates of France to get possession and control of the wealth of Germany and Europe generally. This, Poincare and his Black National did their best to accomplish. And they have failed, mainly because of the jealousies and intrigues of the capitalists of England and America.

Furthermore, in his attempt to achieve what turned out to be the impossible, Poincare has brought France to the verge of bankruptcy. His financial policies, dictated by Big Business and designed to make the poor classes carry the entire burden of war, rehabilitation, have antagonized against Poincare and his government all classes and groups except the small clique of big financiers and industrialists. The result is the electoral defeat of Poincare.

WHICH, however, does not mean the defeat of Big Business. The heavy industrialists and international bankers of France are still in power just as much as their brethren in England are still in power, altho Britain is supposed to be ruled by a labor government. Nothing has changed

in France as far as actual power is concerned. Let's have a glance at the figures:

Composition of New Parliament.

Conservatists	19
Block National	208
Radical Socialists	186
Republican Socialists	20
Unified Socialists	111
Communists	24

WE hope our readers will not be deceived by the label "Socialist" which appears so frequently in connection with French parties. Over there everybody is a Socialist. The truth is that the "Radical Socialists" and the "Republican Socialists," which together, have secured 206 seats in the chamber of deputies, are not Socialists at all, not even in the sense in which the parties of the second international are. These two parties are the political spokesmen of the merchants, manufacturers, part of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie generally. The party of the second international in France are the "Unified Socialists" which secured 111 seats.

WHAT do the above figures signify as far as the state of mind of the masses are concerned? These figures show that the bulk of the working class and of the poorer middle classes no longer believe in the leadership of Big Capital (which is represented by Poincare's Block National) and have now placed their faith in the parties of petty bourgeois liberalism and socialist opportunism represented by the Radical Socialists, Republican Socialists and the Unified Socialists. These three parties have together 317 seats in the new chamber of deputies, as against 208 of Poincare's Block National. It is very probable that these three parties, which are spoken of as the Left Block, will form a coalition government, and then we shall have in France almost a duplication of the political situation that prevailed in Germany on the morrow after the election to the old Reichstag. Or we may have a coalition between the left wing of the Block National and the parties led by Herriot, which again would duplicate a phase in the development of Germany between the old and new Reichstags.

France is One Step Behind Germany.

THE old German Reichstag was practically in the hands of the Socialists and middle-class liberals with the Catholic Centrum wavering between these and the monarchist reaction. Practically the same combination will rule the new chamber of deputies in France.

NOW, the Socialists and Liberals of Germany, have had their chance and failed. Why? Because they could not and would not break and destroy the power of Big Capital. In fact, they were doing the very thing that Big Capital wanted them to do. The boss of the old Reichstag was Stinnes. With the result that the masses lost faith in these parties, the workers moving over to the Communists, and a large section of the petty bourgeoisie having gone to the monarchists.

THE oppressed masses of France are now passing thru a period of liberal reformist illusions the same as the English masses are. The same as the German masses were at the time of the elections to the old Reichstag.

BUT the masses of Germany have by now partly learned their lesson. The same will happen with the masses in England. The same will happen with the masses in France. The new Liberal-Socialist coalition in France, if such is formed, will in practice serve the same master that Poincare did, i. e., Big Capital. This new coalition will bear another name, will use a different language and will, perhaps, apply different tactics, but in matters that are really vital for capitalism in France, it will differ not one iota from the old government of Poincare. The masses of France are headed toward a great dissatisfaction and also toward a great awakening.

Politically, France is just one step behind Germany.

Pacifism In The Universities

By ELSA BLOCK.

A SENSATION is sweeping the land—or sweeping the newspaper presses. Bolshevism is entering the schools! The Star-spangled Banner is being dragged in the mud of systematic slackerism! Pacifism is eating at the heart of the nation.

SO says the press of America.

THE phenomenon of pacifism is, in fact, to be found in the American universities. It is not what the newspapers say it is. It is not Bolshevism—God save the mark! But it is a serious phenomenon, and whatever weak and watery futility there may be in the pacifism theory, the phenomenon of a wide-spread pacifist movement, as a revolt against the great military caste system which is now the dream of the American imperialist, cannot escape the serious consideration of American Communists.

PACIFISM, in all of its pitiful futility and at the same time in all its significance as a social phenomenon of the time and place, is well shown in the findings of the student conference of Northwestern university, held on February 5 and 6. The report of the findings of the conference is worth publishing as a whole:

THE Northwestern Student Conference was composed of 147 representative students of the University.

The findings were voted on at the last meeting of the conference.

WAR.

CONSENSUS OF OPINION: We should abolish in ourselves the attitudes that make for war; such as hatred, fear, suspicion, race prejudice and rivalry.

Propositions voted on:

1. We believe that the United States should join the League of Nations. Passed by 80 votes.

2. We believe that the United States should enter the World Court. Passed by 96 votes.

3. We believe education which will develop international thinking should be encouraged. Passed unanimously.

4. A. That a policy of preparedness should be supported. Voted down by 94.

B. That we as individuals, refuse to participate in another war. Voted down by 58. 38 students in favor.

THE ECONOMIC ORDER.

CONSENSUS OF OPINION: The standard by which the social order is to be judged is whether or not it provides a means for every man to be reasonably happy in his work. The present order does not provide happiness or even the barest necessities for many. The evils of such a system would perhaps, be remedied by an adjustment to include these suggestions:

1. Production and natural resources for use and not for profit.

2. Workers should do work attractive to them; an additional remuneration should be given for those tasks that are unattractive.

3. Human values should be recognized above efficiency in production.

4. Every able-bodied worker should be employed.

5. There should be a fair division of profits and an equality of opportunity.

Propositions voted on:
1. The student should realize his social obligation to all his fellowmen who have made possible his education. Adopted by a unanimous vote.

a. This realization should be evidenced in application to his work at school.

b. It should also be evidenced in preparation to help those who by their labor for wages, have made possible profit enough for other men to endow a University.

2. The student should make an effort to get information that will enable him to appreciate his social responsibility. Adopted by a unanimous vote.

a. By insisting in the class-room on a fair presentation of both sides of controversial questions; such as History, Economics, and Social Sciences.

b. By making an attempt to get

all the information available on both sides of such question.

3. Some students believe that their inability to get both sides of a controversial question is due to three things, and that they therefore have a responsibility to protest against those things, which are:

a. (Protest against) Trustee control that says what a student may and may not study. Adopted by a vote of 82.

b. (Protest against) Endowment by great accumulations of capital when such accumulations result from exploitation of the workers. Adopted by a vote of 56.

c. (Protest against) Control which prevents a faculty member from expressing his own opinions. Adopted unanimously.

RACE RELATIONS

CONSENSUS OF QUESTION: All races should have equality of opportunity. At present, equality of opportunity does not exist as is evidenced in some cases by

a. Unequal per capita public expenditure of education.

b. Unequal representation in student affairs.

c. Discrimination against certain races in athletic opportunity. The situation should be changed to allow all races equality of opportunity.

Proposition voted on: What does equality of opportunity mean?

1. There should be parallel development of the races, each race keeping to itself, yet each assisting the other in its development. Voted down by 70.

2. There should be complete intermingling of the races, including social intermingling. Adopted by 72 votes.

3. There should be intermingling in a casual and limited way, but not complete intermingling (no social intermingling). Voted down by 63.

If the position taken by these "pacifist" students could be regarded as reflecting a static condition, the American Teapot Dome oligarchy need not be worried. For the students, with all their emotionalism, have here given a one hundred per cent endorsement of the greatest and most ambitious scheme that the two-fisted militarists have ever tried—the League of Nations. Their rebellion against such evils as unemployment and racial inequalities is as helpless and unconstructive as it is obviously sincere.

THE publicity given this comic-opera bolshevism is a perfect example of how the telescope of modern journalism change details into stupendous events. By means of forced draft news stories and strained editorials, careless remarks have been turned into utterances pregnant with impending catastrophe to the respectable proprietor class of the world. Irritated youngsters have become the generals of a world revolution.

UNTIL policy dictated a need for news of this kind, the phenomenon of pacifism went unnoticed. Then, by a process of artificial inflation, it was made to assume an importance and a character entirely different from its real significance.

PACIFIST feeling among the students of our middle-western universities is not a sudden growth. Had the American newspapers been genuinely interested in the state of public opinion, they would have found in the student activities of the past year ample excuse for a display of patriotic indignation. But such matter as the attendance of members of the Young Workers League at the student conference at Waukegan last June, or the forcible injection of pacifist discussion into the program of the student conference at Indianapolis during Christmas week or the bitter attacks of Sherwood Eddy, before a body of students, on the Ku Klux Klan, the American Legion, and militarism—all these events the metropolitan press passed over without comment, or else dismissed with a brief summary. And yet these matters were certainly as "treasonable" as those which later provoked such heated discussion.

THEN came the conference of February 5 and 6, out of which the "pacifist-bolshevik revolution" has

been made with printer's ink. The event received little attention from the press. The declaration of thirty-eight of the students that they would "refuse to participate in another war" was treated, it is true, with indignation, but it was the amused indignation that is usually felt for a cause conceded to be hopeless.

SO it happened that when the meeting occurred which first aroused alarm—the meeting at which John R. Fletcher, conscientious objector and political prisoner of three different countries—was to address the Liberal League of Northwestern, not a single reporter from the big metropolitan newspapers was present. The newspapers simply did not have their eyes on the situation. The meeting received notice only accidentally, thru the interest of a student reporter of the militarist camp. The story was given the Chicago Herald-Examiner in garbled form, and from then on no pacifist utterance was too innocuous to receive first place in the news.

THE reason for this sudden reversal of news values is not far to seek. The pacifist demonstration added just that touch of dramatic relief so badly needed by the newspapers in the middle of February. The investigation into the Teapot Dome scandal was becoming a matter of concern to political leaders. It was assuming the aspect of something more serious than a public melodrama, graphic enough to supply material for clever cartoons and vivid enough to command a strained attention. People were beginning to grasp the tremendous implications of the thing. Radical newspapers were making capital of it. And election time was drawing near.

WHILE pacifism was making a dramatic entrance, the Senate investigations were being stealthily bundled out of the back door. The newspapers have gradually relegated them from the right to the left-hand columns, from the first to the inside pages. At this rate, it is probable that within a few weeks we shall begin to wonder mildly what became of the whole affair.

AND would it be rash to suggest that another, and a more insidious motive actuated the press? Mexican politics has of late been turning rapid somersaults. Subsidized revolutions and counter-revolutions, tending to weaken the Mexican government to an extent that would "justify" the "intervention" of the United States; the establishment of claims in Mexico by capitalists whose business methods have received too much unsavory notice to need description; the nullification of Mexican laws inimical to American interests—these and other factors point to Mexico as the next victim of American imperialism.

IN such a crisis, a favorable state of public opinion is a factor of no mean importance. Once the newspapers had attracted the proper attention to the pacifist movement, they

took care to bracket it with other activities against which they wished to arouse popular indignation. Pacifists became the "tools of the Third International," entrusted with the disarmament of capitalist nations so that the Soviet government of Russia might be in a position to help the proletariat take over state power unhampered!

BECAUSE pacifism is not a definite economic remedy for the evils of capitalism, but simply a primitive reaction to an immediate phase of capitalist life, the union of pacifism and communism is a marriage of incompatibles. The action of these students shows, certainly, a groping in the direction of revolt which, however blind, is still encouraging. But pacifist activity, no matter how sincere, is hardly revolutionary. It is really an exasperated rebellion against an obvious evil—a perfect example of emotionalism untroubled by intelligent analysis. What pacifists seem alone to have grasped is the single fact that economic rivalry is the cause of war. In such a cause they refuse to fight. Of what will come after disarmament—of this they know nothing. Question them as to present methods and ultimate results, and you will find an utter lack of comprehension. These students have been sacrificing themselves to uphold, not a definite economic policy, but the right to a state of normal indignation.

BEYOND a state of precarious peace, the pacifist hope for nothing. The mere cessation of war is to him the final goal. To the Communist, the destruction of the means whereby capitalism exists is merely a method with a further end in view. Communism is more than a negation of capitalism. It is a definite economic plan proposing a definite economic system to be adopted in place of the present one.

CARRIED to its logical conclusion, pacifism means a policy of non-resistance in the class struggle as well as in international wars. The Communists, so bitter an opponent of wars in which the proletariat of one nation fights the proletariat of another nation so that their masters may obtain more power, is an equally militant partisan in a war that transcends national boundaries. It is all very well for the pacifist to argue that social and economic equality should be attained by peaceful means. The fact remains that social and economic equality cannot be so attained. Where pacifism would hold water in a sieve by attempting the cure of economic ills with sentiment, the Communist realizes that the only cure for economic ills is militant economic. . . .

MAC'S BOOK STORE

27 JOHN R STREET
DETROIT

Full line of Sociological and Labor Literature.

Periodicals and Newspapers

SOVIET RUSSIA PICTORIAL

EACH ISSUE

An invaluable record of Labor's progress in Soviet Russia and the world over.

Authentic information and feature articles from the pens of the best writers—made more interesting by

NUMEROUS AND SPLENDID PHOTOGRAPHS

SUBSCRIPTION

\$2.00 a Year

\$1.00 Six Months

SOVIET RUSSIA PICTORIAL,
19 South Lincoln Street,
Chicago, Ill.

NAME

STREET NO.

CITY.....STATE.....D.

FASCISM A MENACE

By Daniel Horsley

THE need of sounding a warning to the workers who have participated in the revolt in Ireland, was never more acute than the present moment. The issue of 1916 has been clearly forgotten, if we are to assume the last reports on education are true. There is a strong tendency toward the program of Mussolini in the boosting of his educational program. Perhaps traditions of heroic feats crowds out the memories of the basis of the revolt of 1916. It would be more appropriate if they would read the educational program of Connolly and compare it with that of this military butcher who has only autocracy as the basis of his campaign.

All thru the struggle for Irish freedom has been written indelibly, "Land and industries for the people." And the nationalist freedom of the workers, even in a political sense, this must be insecure and incomplete until they wrest from the governing classes the possession of the land and the instruments of wealth production. Labor must then fashion its weapon of attack or else submit to the will of the capitalist state.

Fascism.

Fascism first raised its head in March, 1919. The Fascisti were ex-service men, elements that remained hostile to the Labor movement. The State was impoverished by the war and the proletarian element, due to unemployment, became a danger to its existence. Mussolini's cry of "Restoration of the Authority of the State" was raised. Co-operating with the State, they succeeded in smashing the trades unions and without mercy crushing out the lives of the revolutionary workers. It was the crucible which molded together the reactionary elements, and with that power controlled the STATE. They abolished the political apparatus and set up a Dictatorship. Everything was subjected to this discipline, except the bourgeois, who still maintained the rights of private ownership of the industries. The Fascisti organized into flying squadrons, began their work of suppression.

An article published in the Avanti on the 2th of November, entitled, "From Toscana" excellently describes the situation. This article says that the activity of the Fascisti in the towns has quieted down but continues in the rural districts. From the 1st of December, the position tends to become worse and acts of Fascisti violence increase in number. Fascisti again seize municipal and trades union premises, break up and disperse the management bodies (as in Lezias) raid, burn and destroy (Tore, Annunziato, Coliari, Pola, etc.), attack the workers, beat them to death and even kill them. (The worse case that of Turin).

Communists are seized in their places of employment, taken in automobiles and killed on the outskirts of the town. Others are killed in their homes. Recently, however, not only have the Communists, Anarchists and Socialists become objects of the attack. In many places the Fascisti attacked Republicans and workers belonging to the Populist Party. In Naples they raided and broke up the editorial offices of two Populist papers etc., violence against the workers for the benefit of the capitalist class, to maintain the rights of private ownership and control of the state.

Restoration.

Mussolini was faced with the problem of restoration. While the declaration of the Irish programme calls for the ownership and equal rights to all, Mussolini's object was the building up of the industries and turning them over to private owners. In his speech at the First Fascist Congress, Mussolini made it quite plain whom Fascism was to serve. We will quote a few extracts from his speech: "We are proud of the fact that we and no others in 1915 were the first to raise the serious problem—War or a Republic. The fact that Italy, in conjunction with a few other states is today taking part in the Washington Conference, where the fate of the world is being discussed is due to the services of the interventionists of 1915."

"On the economic question we are liberal in the class sense of the word.

If it were possible, I would return the railways, the postal system, telegraph, etc., to private hands. Fascism is the fighting army of the Italian industrial capitalism. Its task is not only to combat the "Bolshevik Menace" but to solve the restoration of the bourgeois economic system."

When the late Laurence Ginnell was in Washington and explained what kind of a Republic they wanted in Ireland, a co-operative republic, did they accept the delegates from Ireland around the conference table at the time they invited the Fascisti to take part? They made it known very plainly that they did not believe in a cooperative republic, but were willing to have anyone who could be used to prop up this tottering system of anarchy and violence.

Where do we find in any of the speeches of the leaders of the 1916 revolt that it was fought to wrest Ireland from English imperialist robbers only to hand it over to other capitalists?

Fascism is the antithesis of republican principles.

Why Fascism Triumphed.

Fascism was not a lone victory of arms. The passivity of the workers and the treacherous policy of the so-called revolutionary elements led the workers in general into the yoke of industrial slavery. The movement in Ireland seems to be moving toward this same condition. At present there is no effort to cement the forces of labor with the large mass of peasants. That is a very necessary thing. The submerging of labor demands to the upbuilding of the capitalist state has created a docile movement. Parliamentarism is in its embryonic stage but thanks to the chaotic condition of the capitalist system, it will soon be obsolete. When this does occur, it will be the advent of a new power, either Fascism or workers' and peasants' control. "Less philosophizing and more fighting along the lines of the class war." Internal dissensions of personal character have clouded the issue of class solidarity. The political forces tend more and more to solidify their position. There is on the surface

a split but when the class position becomes more clear, the workers will see their organizations subjected to the will of the Fascist state. We must realize that social laws for the benefit of the workers can only be applied by men who understand, and such leaders are not found outside of the revolutionary ranks. Traditions long enough cherished will be swept into the ash can of history, to be replaced by the Octopus of Force to retain their ill-gotten gains.

A Comparison.

There have been many examples in the countries of Europe, to show what depths the capitalist will stoop to defend their power.

Mussolini is their chief representative, and embodies all of the qualities as an example for others to follow. Beware of those who boost his program, their democracy is a sham, whether they carry the name of republican or sinn fein.

Connolly in the cold dark days of his poverty, planned the lighting of the torch in the glow of which so many alleged Irish revolutionists saw their way to fame and power and many alleged Irish revolutionists saw the republic into the hands of Ireland's historic foe. Connolly, too, made the supreme sacrifice. He sealed his sincerity and abolished the stigma they sought to fasten onto the labor movement.

There appears to be a widespread and marked disposition to deny James Connolly his proper place in the historic Irish struggle, but the time will prove that he was the most capable and brilliant spokesman for Ireland and her cause. No heirarchy was needed to bolster up his words and deeds.

Mussolini defends only those who have made the world a seething hell, and blesses it with the prayers of vultures.

Labor in Ireland must organize to fight this propaganda wherever it raises its head. Down with Fascism!

Up with Communism, the hope of the Irish workers and the world's working class.

Playthings of Fashionable Society

By H. Sidney Bloomfield

A big brick building that stands on a hill in one of the principal cities of the Eastern part of the country, houses many little boys and girls that have no fathers or mothers—some of them have neither. A group of prominent business men—with much fuss and ceremony—raise money with which to pay for the upkeep of the building and for the food, clothes and general welfare of the children.

THESE rich men own factories and stores wherein men and women and boys and girls toil long hours at hard and dreary work for which they get little pay and lots of abuse . . . while the business men reap the profits from the labor of their slaves.

AT a meeting one night, these business men decided to raise more money as the funds were getting low. They decided to stage a Fashion show, to which many people would come. Most of these business men were manufacturers of women's cloaks, suits, dresses and so forth—some of them were retail storekeepers in the same line.

AGREEMENT upon a fashion show was unanimous. For, as each one reasoned to himself, "I have an opportunity to display the products of my shop and create a demand for my goods, I'll have an advertisement inserted in the program which will also boost my business." The retail shopkeepers reasoned likewise.

THE ball-room of the most exclusive hotel in the city was secured for three days and nights, and was filled to capacity at every exhibition to which many hundreds of women, young and old flocked. There were all sorts of women present. Some wore gowns that rivaled those on display. Other women and young ladies wore gowns of mediocre style and quality.

Many ladies that were present bought their gowns on the instalment plan; some spent every cent they could get together, while some bought their gowns without any intention of ever paying for them. Still other ladies induced their gentlemen admirers to foot the bill for the privilege of being allowed to keep their company.

ALMOST every lady had her face decorated with rouge, paint, powder, etc., which ranged from mild soft-brown, copper, flesh and brunette colors to the exciting, bold carmines, reds and vermillions. An Indian, in full war dress and colors would feel cheap at this gathering. These women are "Society Ladies." Millions of dollars are spent by these women on just such gatherings, balls, card games, tea-parties, operas, etc., and millions of dollars are spent by shopkeepers and manufacturers on colored and alluring advertising in the society sections of the Sunday newspapers, magazines, etc. The newspapers devote many pages and entire sections in their daily and Sunday issues and have staffs that cater to these "select people."

THE stage setting was in black, with Japanese jars and antique chairs, and gilded pedestals upon which were vases with flowers. Mellow lights illuminated the stage, and glaring spotlight played upon it. The sight was overwhelming. Six Mannikins, clothed in the most exquisite gowns strolled leisurely up and down the stage. It is hard to describe the beautiful garments that were displayed—silks, satins and brocades; evening gowns and street dresses, opera cloaks and wraps and bridal gowns of shimmering silks and pointed lace—such extravagance in the line of clothes I never saw before.

THE women craned their necks to view the material and the styles—a gorgeous, glittering spectacle of ar-

tistic creations that cost thousands and thousands of dollars. These society ladies, vanity seekers, these small social moths—insects that eat cloth, were not interesting to me as were the six models who paraded upon the stage, and walked along the aisles, to the accompaniment of slow, dreamy music, gliding and turning, with elegance and dignity, displaying every line of the gowns and suits that gave evidence of the highest skill—the workers that made them were artists.

THESE models are daughters of poor parents and got the jobs as "display racks" because they were chosen from among several hundred girls that applied in answer to the "help wanted" advertisement in the great metropolitan newspaper. They are poor working girls that spend every cent they get hold of to keep looking "beautiful." They were weighed, measured and judged by "beauty experts" just as are dogs and horses before entering the show. These working girls, with beautiful faces and delicate bodies do not own the gowns and dresses that fit them so charmingly.

THESE Mannikins display the wares that were made by the exploited shop girls in some sweat-shop so that the fashionable society women may be attracted and induced to purchase them at the department stores and the cloak and suit shops. These girls have been trained to wear such artistic creations, to walk correctly, to carry their bodies to the accompaniment of the music, and to twist and turn so as to give the gowns the best effect.

SUCH mannikins are genuine tragedians, playing a drama with a fatal ending. They are not mere "characters" of the play, but genuine victims of the hypocrisy of capitalist society. For a few dollars a day, these models are the center of attraction, wearing the marvelous creations of

their sisters, whose sweat and blood, aye, whose very lives are embodied within them . . . only to have to take them off at the end of the show and put on their graceful bodies their customary every-day clothes. Only the rich can afford to clothe their wives and daughters in the same attire as is worn by the mannikin on the stage. Only by selling herself to a wealthy man can the model expect to continue wearing such expensive gowns uninterruptedly. Such is the mockery of capitalist society.

HUMAN flesh and blood is the center of attraction and made sport of in order to collect money for the care of orphans. And who knows but what these very mannikins are themselves the remnants of what was once a home and family. Oh! how oppressive and corrupt is the atmosphere at the charity fashion show. Children, innocent victims of capitalist charity. Working girls, the playthings of "fashionable society"—for the sake of charity.

CAPITALIST society is a fake—it is false, rotten and cruel. Charity is the plaything of capitalists at the expense of destitute and suffering children and exploited wage-earners. To abolish charity means the abolition of the conditions that kill the fathers and mothers and leave their children in the hands of the murderers that have their hands stained with blood. Charity is the effect of this diseased capitalist system. It is the result of brutal exploitation. The capitalists, like blood-suckers delight in giving as one delights in feeding a puppy from the hand. The capitalist delights in seeing his vassals cringe and crawl and bow before him in grateful thanks for the crumbs he so charitably gives them.

Unite! Young Workers, for the abolition of capitalism, the curse of humanity.

THE MAKING OF LENIN

(Continued from page 1)

a difference in approach in decisiveness, in readiness to go to the end. It can be said, returning to the relations of Lenin and Martov, that even before the split and the convention, Lenin was known as "hard" and Martov as "soft." And both of them knew it.

ONE Sunday I went with Lenin and Madame Lenin to the Socialist church in London, where a Social-Democratic meeting was intermingled with the singing of revolutionary-psalms. The speaker was a typesetter who returned home from Australia. Lenin translated to us in whispers his speech, which sounded quite revolutionary—at least for those days. Then all rose and sang: "Almighty God, make that there be no kings and no rich people," or something like that.

"There is a multitude of revolutionary and Socialist elements scattered in the English proletariat," Lenin said on that occasion when we left the church, "but it is all combined with conservatism, religion, superstition, and absolutely cannot break thru and spread."

It is interesting to observe that Zasluch and Martov both lived apart from the English labor movement, entirely absorbed in the spark and in their environment. Lenin, on the other hand, undertook from time to time independent investigations in the field of the English labor movement

IT is unnecessary to say that Lenin, Mme. Lenin and her mother lived more than modestly. Returning from the London Social Democratic church, we dined in the little kitchen-dining room in their two-room flat. I remember, as if it just happened, the tiny slices of fried meat served in the small pan. We drank tea. We jested, as usual, on the subject whether I would find my way home alone. I was poor at getting my bearings in the streets, and being inclined to systematize. I called this quality of mine "topographical imbecility."

THE date fixed for the second convention was approaching and it was finally decided to move the "Sparkist" center to Geneva, Switzerland. There living was incomparably cheaper and connection with Russia easier. Lenin grudgingly agreed to this. I was sent to Paris with the understanding that I come to Geneva from there together with Martov. Intense preparations were going on for the convention.

AFTER a short time Lenin also arrived in Paris. He was to read three lectures on the agrarian question in the so-called High Insti-

tute, organized in Paris by professors exiled from Russia. I remember how Lenin was very agitated before his first lecture, but upon reaching the stage he at once mastered himself—at least externally. Professor Gamberov, who came to hear him, expressed his impression to Deutsch in these words: "A real professor." The kindly fellow thought that he was expressing the highest praise in that way.

LENIN was given to such agitation at public appearances much later, too, and the less his audience was of his own followers, the more formal the occasion for speech, the stronger his agitation grew. Externally Lenin always spoke impetuously and rapidly, so that his speeches were a cruel test for the stenographers.

When ill at ease, his voice sounded unnatural, had a reverberating and impersonal sound resembling an echo. But when Lenin felt that the particular audience which he was addressing strongly needed that which he had to say, his voice acquired extraordinary vivaciousness and elastic persuasiveness, not oratorical in the proper sense, but conversational, except that it was increased to stage proportions.

THIS was not oratorical art, but something greater than oratory.

At the conclusion of the third lecture in Paris, Lenin made a political speech on the agrarian question. I think in Rue Choisy 110, organized not by the High Institute, but by the Paris group of "Sparkists." The hall was packed. After the speech the "Sparkists" went with the lecturer, according to custom, to a cafe. Everybody was extremely satisfied and the lecturer himself was joyfully excited. The treasurer spoke with satisfaction of the receipts netted from the lecture of the treasury of the Spark. It was in all probability something like 75 to 100 francs—a sum not to be jeered at! All this happened in the beginning of 1903.

IT was during that sojourn of Lenin that it was decided to show him an opera. N. I. Sedova, a member of the "Sparkist" group, was commissioned to arrange it. Lenin went to and from the Opera Comique carrying the same brief case which he took with him to the lectures in the High Institute. Charpentier's opera "Louise" was presented—very democratic in theme. Our group sat in the gallery. In addition to Lenin, Sedova and myself, I think Martov was present.

A SMALL, absolutely unmusical event was connected with this visit to the opera which, however, I firmly retain in my memory. Lenin had bought himself in Paris a pair of shoes. They turned out too tight for him. After several hours of torment he decided to get rid of them. As if for spite, my shoes loudly demanded a change. I received his shoes, and at first they seemed to be just the right size.

(Continued next Saturday.)

Challenge to Strike.

By OSKAR KANEHL.

Let rest the hammers.
Let stop the wheels.
Let burn down the fires.
Put out the light.
Disturb the idlers' comfort.
Shut off the supplies of their larders.
Harvest, which doesn't nourish you, may rot.
Cool, which doesn't warm you, may vanish underground.
Chimney that doesn't smoke for you, may collapse.
Look here.
The bourgeois builds upon your labor's ground.
His house is rich. His bed is soft.
By your labor's favor he feeds his belly.
By your labor's favor his wife dresses.
By your labor's favor his children grow up.
Industrious, brought up to master over you.
Poisoned to hate you.
By your labor's favor.
And you? Prolets?—Labor-creatures?
And your hired barracks?—Hunger-towers?
And your wives?—Bearing-machines?
And your children?—Misery-brats?
Curse upon every slag for bourgeois-pack.
Curse upon every step into their slavery.
Curse upon their thanks. Curse upon their traitor's wages.
Yours is the Earth.
Out of the workshops!
On the street!

Transl. Paul Acel.

FOSTER'S REPLY TO NEARING

(Continued from Page 4.)

greater in the United States than in almost any other country. Here the masses are utterly bankrupt of leadership. The Socialists have nothing whatever to offer them. Likewise, the "progressives," who with unexamples, cowardice and weakness, have trotted back to Gompers' camp in the face of the bitter struggle now going on to revolutionize the labor movement. The left wing must take the lead. There is no one else to do so. To the extent of its power it must wrest the control of the masses from their misleaders and throw them into the struggle against the exploiters. This is exactly what it is doing in the great campaigns for the labor party, amalgamation, recognition of Soviet Russia, organization of the unorganized, etc. Such campaigns, instead of being a weakness to us, are our greatest strength. They give us control over great masses of workers who can thus be gradually prepared for more important revolutionary tasks. If properly exploited, they offer the best possible means for education and organization.

AS the struggle goes on, the revolutionary organizations must assemble all the proletarian elements made sympathetic. It must aim to

build a mass party. And in doing this care must be taken not so much with the workers themselves but as with their erstwhile leaders. Of course, the left wing must avoid a decisive struggle with capitalism at this time. That goes without saying. Likewise, it must not extend its battle line over too long a line. But I fail to see the point of the steel strike illustration, as it has no bearing.

THE left wing must have a balanced program with education, organization and action going hand in hand complementing and vitalizing each other. The heart of the whole movement must be militant action. This is the program of the W. P. and T. U. E. L. You say it is based upon Russian experience, but this is an error. It is in line with Communist tactics and experience all over the world. Your program of peaceful education and organization will not do. It would make of the left wing a scholastic, sectarian, non-militant group. The program of the W. P. and T. U. E. L. would make of it a genuine fighting organization, able to lead the workers in their struggles now and bearing with it the promise of eventually heading them in their final clash with the capitalist system. Fraternal yours, WM. Z. FOSTER.



THE RAIC
what people think of it—

"I am very glad to observe the progress you are making. . . . Your corporation is serving a very useful purpose and I wish it success."

C. A. Tupper, Pres.,
International Trade Press, Inc.

"This co-operating investment in the Russian clothing industry is a great help to both the Russian and American workers. We obtain the implements of production. The Americans invest their funds in a safe and profitable enterprise."

B. Bograchoff, Pres.,
All-Russian Clothing Syndicate.

Full information about RAIC may be obtained from
SIDNEY HILLMAN, Pres.

THE RAIC
RUSSIAN-AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL CORPORATION
103 E. 14TH STREET
NEW-YORK

Res. 1632 S. Trumbull Ave.
Phone Rockwell 5050

MORDECAI SHULMAN
ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
701 Association Building
19 S. La Salle Street CHICAGO
Dearborn 8657 Central 4945-4947

DR. ISRAEL FELDsher
Physician and Surgeon
3803 ROOSEVELT RD. Crawford 2655
Hours: Morning, until 10 a. m.
Afternoons, 1 to 3 and 7 to 9 p. m.

Penetrating Analysis! Burning Criticism! Sound Logic!
THE NEW AND SIGNIFICANT BOOK

ENTITLED

The World's Trade Union Movement

By A. LOSOVSKY

General Secretary of the Red International of Labor Unions

In this book, published in March at Moscow, and now made available to American readers, the leader of 13,000,000 trade unionists depicts, dissects, and measures the relation of forces developed before, during, and since the war.

The first book ever written dealing so comprehensively with this vital subject

William Z. Foster says:

"Here are described every political, economic, and organizational force of the world's trade unions, and their role in the fight, developed since the war, between Reformists and Revolutionists."

112 PAGES, STIFF PAPER COVER, WITH PHOTO OF AUTHOR.

FIFTY CENTS PER COPY.

Bundle orders of ten or more, 35 cents each, with special rate on larger orders.

Trade Union Educational League,
1113 Washington Blvd. Chicago, Ill.

A special edition of this book has also been published for the Workers Party. Branches and members of the party are expected to place their orders with the literature department at the same address.