

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

SPECIAL MAGAZINE SUPPLEMENT
THE DAILY WORKER

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

SATURDAY, OCT. 3, 1925. 230

SAKLATVALA'S CRIME

British Imperialism in India

SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

That was used as the basis of the charges on which he was barred from entering the United States to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union at Washington.

By SHAPURJI SAKLATVALA.

In the House of Commons on Thursday, July 9th, Mr. S. Saklatvala, M. P., speaking in the Committee of Supply on the Vote for the Indian Office:

"That a sum, not exceeding £76,000, be granted His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1926, for a contribution towards the Cost of the Department of His Majesty's Secretary of State for India in Council, including a Grant," said:

I am thankful to the Noble Lord that towards the close of his speech he told the Committee that I am bound to take a different view from both Front Benches, who are more or less alike in their policy and their outlook on Indian affairs. I would not take the Noble Lord's certificate that both Front Benches are identically and absolutely alike, but he is entitled to believe that there is a general agreement on certain main questions. What I say here is not in any mood of anger or hatred, but positively with a view to speaking the truth, when sometimes truth, though unpleasant, is ultimately better than diplomatic statesmanship and political thought. I pay homage to the British spirit of hypocritical statesmanship. It is a wonderful sight today. We are talking of the Indian Empire just in the same strain of common agreement, with that very placid attitude of mind and phraseology of speech as if we were discussing some matters relating to the renewal of the furniture of the library or the cooking utensils in the kitchen of the House of Commons.

I assure the Committee that my whole object taking the line I do is to place before the committee, as well as before the country, not only the Communist party point of view, but the general international point of view, the overlooking of which in the near future is going to bring serious calamity of many European countries, and especially to Great Britain. We are debating here as if the Bengal ordinances were never promulgated as if the shooting of Bombay operatives during the cotton strike had never taken place, as if the great strike of thousands of railway workers is not even now going on in the Punjab, with men starving and the Government, the controller of those railways, taking up a hard-faced attitude, as if all these things had not happened, as if a great controversy is not raging, not only with the people of India, but with the people all over the world, whether British Imperialism, whatever its past history, is at all permissible to exist now for the benefit of the citizens of Great Britain herself. There are great problems pertaining to India and Britain which ought to have been discussed on an afternoon like this. I agree that the commonness of parties and the commonness of policy between the late Government and the present Government has taboed all these important questions from being uttered in the House. The main question is of Imperialism and the existence of the British Empire in its present form.

India's Place in the Empire.

It is rather unfortunate that from the earliest time you have called this agglomeration of different peoples and different races the British Empire. I wish you had from the first designated it as the Indo-British Empire, so that what we may say about the Indian subjects in the Empire may not be taken as a reflection by our Colonial friends in Canada, Australia, and elsewhere. The conditions are entirely different. Rules and regulations, formulae, political remedies and experiences which apply to that part of the British Empire which is composed of Great Britain and her white Colonies are not at all applicable to the other portions of the Empire, such as India and certain portions of China and Africa. I disagree even with those of my own Indian friends and compatriots who would take a sentimental view of British Imperialism as it exists today. I take it for granted that if it is admitted that the Imperialist relationship of one dominant nation guiding the destinies of another bigger and vaster nation, directing all her social, economic and political—forces in channels of her own choosing, to suit her own convenience—if that tie is to be taken as a justifiable tie my Indian friends have no right to come and dictate to the British nation how to hold on to that tie. If for diplomatic purposes, or if once India herself, or the Socialist friends of India undertake to keep up the position of one dominating nation in an Empire controlling the destinies of another nation, then it becomes a contract, and I believe that Great Britain as the contractor should be the best

judge as to how to carry out the contract. I do not take the view that there are progressive ways of self-government, of Dominion Home Rule, of Indianization of the Army and all those things just as possible as there are certain progressive measures for cultivating apples in Canada, cattle markets in Australia and bringing the fruit and meat to this country from the distant parts of the Empire.

I take the view of the reality of life, that if genuine self-rule is in the hands of the Indians and if there exists a genuine Indianization of the Indian Army, no Indian will be so despicable, just as to say that they would hold that country and that army for the benefit of some people other than their own. I do not want to deceive myself on that point. The talk of the Constitution, and the alteration of the Constitution, of a 10-year limit or a 15-year limit, are nothing but little details in the art of governing another nation by a sort of hypnotization. I am not interested in such problems. I tell my Indian friends as I tell to my British friends, that the same principle of life is in every European or Asiatic nation. I put that to the Committee and to the Noble Lord and his party quite seriously.

Take the problem as a human problem. India is a large country with over 300,000,000 people. You talk of 10 per cent of the people being educated today. That 10 per cent in that large country represents 30,000,000 people and you admit that those 30,000,000 people—which means a much larger population than many other smaller European countries—are educated and as fit as other similarly educated persons in several parts of Europe. Then you style yourselves the trustees of the whole of India, and as trustees you take jolly good care to see that the other 280,000,000 of people remain ignorant, illiterate, uneducated, with no freedom to call their souls their own. You tell those 30,000,000 people that although they may be educated, and although they may be fit—and in a short time those 30,000,000 will become 40,000,000 or 45,000,000; as big a population as the whole of Great Britain—because Great Britain, to suit her own purpose treats those 280,000,000 persons as so many animals or beasts of burden, these 40,000,000 or 45,000,000 of educated people will have to lead an unnatural life and will have to believe one thing and practice another.

Is there a single British man or woman today, is there a person in any country in Europe, in any of the backward countries, in the Balkan States, in any of the small nations which are not yet so fully developed as Great Britain who should tolerate for one day a power so despotic and arbitrary as the Crown, under the Imperial system, is insisting upon enjoying in India? There would not be man or woman who tomorrow would not rise and fight to the bitter end to claim their rights of monarchy claimed one-tenth of the privileges which in the name of the Crown are exercised over the people of India. Because you keep the other 280,000,000 people back, you are asking the 30 or 40 millions of educated people there also to swallow such an indignity and such an impossibility in public life.

Monarchy in the East.

It may be said, indeed it is said, for it is a Western idea, that the Asiatic people always allow a good deal of latitude to their monarchs. That is Western ignorance. The Eastern people have never tolerated anti-democratic rights and privileges in their monarchs. You see in the 20th century the Chinese people have overthrown their monarchy, which was 3,000 years old, because the monarchy did not square in with the democratic opinions of the people. The Persians have overthrown completely one monarchy after another and have put their monarchs under lock and key for not obeying the people's wishes. You see the same thing in Turkey. No Eastern country would tolerate as the British people have tolerated the humbug and nonsense from the governing classes; they have overthrown them and established the people, the peasants in power. It is an untruthful statement to say that the people of the East are tolerating high privileges in monarchy and in their ruling castes and classes. It is a false notion. It is the Western conceit; it is the Westerner admiring himself, as though the Westerners have the highest consciousness of human life.

How does the Committee reconcile the idea of telling 30,000,000 people that they are British, that they have British culture, that they have received British education and yet they must put up with the privileges and rights that have been claimed under the British Crown by their rulers in India and which the people in this country would fight to the bitter end rather than they would accept. Human feeling, the human heart and the human mind are just the same in India as here or elsewhere. You tell the Indians seditious to have the protest against the things, but when you rise in revolt in this country against the ruling classes it is called the spirit of democracy. In India it is sedition, conspiracy, subversive propaganda. Is it the intention

(Continued on Page 4)

Communist Letter to the Communist Party Germany

Editor's Note.—Here is the concluding installment of the letter of the Communist International to the Communist Party of Germany, the party's installment in the question of trade union work, the Comintern and the leading groups in the German Party central also took up the question of the relations of the German Party to the Communist International, of which the opening of this installment is a continuance:

(Continued from yesterday)

EVERY delegate to the party congress received from the Comintern a special number of the Berlin "Funk", the main contents of which were a "diplomatic" attack by Maslow on the Comintern. In the article, entitled: "Some Observations on Our Tenth Party Congress," Maslow wrote as follows:

"The subsequent part of the German C. P. before the Fourth World Congress, raised the demand of 'back to the Second', not quite rightly. Comrade Zetkin, in her above mentioned book of memoirs, relates that Lenin laughed at this 'back to the Second'. I do not doubt it, for I can easily imagine how this slogan was spread and interlarded with it. It is not for nothing that the Fourth Congress, despite Lenin's derision, expressly continued the conditions, and it is not for nothing that the Fifth World Congress was compelled to return deliberately and emphatically to the principles of the Second. . . ."

Here again Maslow attempts, by means of demagogic contrivance of the Second, Fourth and Fifth World Congresses on the one hand, and the Third, on the other, to destroy ideologically the political direction of the Comintern, and to discredit the principles of Communist policy at the present period. Maslow also makes the untrue assertion that: "The Levites, unfortunately, have received the actual support of the Russian comrades."

"This agitation against the 'Russian comrades' is followed in Maslow's article by the equally dangerous and that 'the Levites riskily regard themselves as victors at the congress in Moscow (1) . . ."

"The Third Congress," proceeds Maslow, "had above all the effect of preventing the German C. P. from finding clearness for itself. The Third Congress . . . exercised a similar effect upon the German C. P. as the Heidelberg Party conference two years previously, despite correct decisions. . . a harmful effect."

"If the principles of the Second Congress had been propounded without the bogey of 'left' dangers being raised. . . then in all probability the crises in the German and French Communist Parties would have been considerably shortened."

"But the executive too, and the Russian comrades (!) were not at all agreed. . . . Maslow writes further that not his group, but the executive 'has for a long time prevented the German Party from entering into satisfactory relations with the executive.'"

He relates with complete approval the following incident:

"When the executive endeavored, after Jess, to correct its completely unjustifiable attack by inviting a Berlin delegation to visit Moscow, it was too late; the delegation unhesitatingly declined the invitation to a feast already over, and Friedland, already right, wrote the letter of refusal at the request of the organization."

THIS last paragraph is an unexampled attempt at lowering the Communist International in the eyes of the German workers. The anti-Bolshevist alliance in Maslow's group is in itself the best proof that Lenin was not merely "getting on the bogey of left" as he is charged in the Third World Congress, but that these dangers still exist today, four years after the Third World Congress, and are hampering the development of the

German Party, hindering its participation in sound political work, and poisoning its ideology. The most exposed result of the cutting off of the party by rather Levitical dangers, is Maslow himself with his conception of the Third World Congress.

The whole German Party, above all the best comrades of the German left in all the party organizations and districts, are factually endeavoring to exert their utmost efforts to break with the non-Bolshevist system of relations between the party and the Comintern promoted by the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group.

Another thing which must be broken with—definitely broken with, is the system of "bookkeeping by double entry" employed by the above mentioned comrades for a full year in their relations to the Comintern. Instead of sincerely carrying out the correct lines laid down by the Comintern, this group has made constant attempts at side-tracking, substantiating their action by their own party members by references to an alleged "tendency" on the part of the executive; at the same time they have offered systematic resistance to the right course, by referring to an alleged "ultra-left tendency" among the members of the German party.

THIS experience gained during the last year, is not the first, since the Frankfurt Party conference, have proved to every German Communist that the Comintern has never acted unconditionally right in every disputed question with the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group. It has been the case at the party conference and in the trade union question. It was as right in the question of the presidential election it has been in its warnings—disregarded for years—as to the ultra-left dangers in the German Party.

It is only convinced that the Communist workers of Germany will speedily recognize that in the present struggle for the inner party course to be pursued by the German C. P. for its relations to the Comintern, for its relations to the workers, for its relations to Leninist theory, the Comintern is absolutely in the right, whilst the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group is unconditionally wrong in all these questions.

THE leading group of the party central has not showed itself capable of adopting the right measures for gaining success in the masses. Another reason for this failure has been the wrong line of inner party policy pursued by this group.

As already mentioned, the questions concerning inner party life were discussed in detail with the representatives of the German central at the session of the enlarged executive. These representatives of the executive pointed out that the ultra-centralism, the mechanical pressure, the predominantly administrative measures, the lack of propaganda and of any methods for spreading conviction, instead of fresh forces etc., were bound to be absolutely disastrous in effect. At this consultation it was decided to strengthen the inner party democracy. We were of the opinion that after the victory over the right has been won, and the left has the upper hand in the party, the organizational guarantees for an all round correct general policy are given, and the problem of party education comes into the foreground. On the other hand, we believed that the circle of the new cadre of leaders was to be widened. The possibility of making a wider selection of party functionaries should be guaranteed, and this cannot be done without discussions, eligibility for election, and a conscious policy towards attracting and leading new workers. In this connection we further demanded that fresh forces should be employed, among the best members of the former opposition, who have resumed trust to the Comintern and to the party. This is the only correct line of action, on the other hand, this question formed for us a part of the question of the relations towards the non-party and social democratic workers. For purely administrative methods are

employed in the party, the same policy is applied on a larger scale to the workers outside of the party, and the result is the cutting off of the possibility of winning over fresh workers. We believe that unless the party and the inner party reforming group, it will not be capable of carrying out a correct policy among the masses. For the reason that the executive demands reforms to be made in the direction of "normalizing party life." During the session of the enlarged executive the German delegation, headed by Comrade Ruth Fischer, accepted these proposals.

These problems were discussed once more with the German delegation before the party conference. The executive proposed that the central should be enlarged by a number of party workers closely connected with the masses. Among other points, the Russian comrades pointed out that since Lenin's death the Russian C. P. has greatly increased the number of members in the central, the strength of the central, establishing its authority more firmly, and at the same time improving its communications with the mass of the party which—in combination with the inner party democratisation—created better connection with the masses of workers outside of the party (Lenin recruitment).

THE German Party conference however, was prepared and carried out in such a manner that, in spite of all promises, the contrary was attained although there exist strong wing groups in the party (ultra-left and right), this fact was not reflected in the report at the party conference itself. There was no political discussion, any party delegation had discussed in detail beforehand what was to be said; even at the party conference itself—the highest instance of the party—freedom of discussion was annihilated. How scanty were the preparations made for the party conference may be seen from the printed motions made by the districts. Only seven motions were proposed, only referring to Resolutions (1), few to subscription and to the question of comrades and one to courses of comradal instruction.

Analogous phenomena are to be recorded in the sphere of ideology. Never in the labor press has one witnessed such advertising as that accorded Comrade Maslow's pamphlet. As a matter of fact this pamphlet consists solely of correct questions and thereby incurred observations furnished by Comrade Maslow. It was according to this pattern that it was attempted to develop the mental life of the party.

This would not matter so much if the personal authority of the leaders stood very high. But this authority must possess some prerequisites, and not merely be mechanically acquired. Unfortunately, these prerequisites are lacking, and this is a danger for the whole party.

In this there is a lack of control from below, that is, from the members of the party. At the same time the leading group has been carrying on a perpetual struggle against control from above, that is, from the executive of the Comintern. In this manner such a state of affairs was created as led to a loss of sense of responsibility, which leads to various and quite intolerable things.

Such a structure of the party renders it impossible the development of its recruiting. Such a system as this destroys the party itself. This system must be done away with, in order that the party should not be ruined by a crisis which might be really catastrophic in effect.

5. The Danger of Lack of Principle.

PRACTICAL Bolshevism consists, among other things, in acting upon theoretically acknowledged, hence the most correct line of action. In the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group the inner conviction, the inner estimate of the situation, is in obvious conflict with the line accepted. The underlying basis of this group is extremely pessimistic; it lacks revolutionary energy and is filled with the conviction that the masses are complete-

ly passive, fleeing from everyday life, playing at soldiers, etc. The task of winning over the masses is impossible of accomplishment, not on the other hand the Comintern "demands" that the masses be won. Here already the contradiction is obvious: the inner group, its pessimism leads to its contending with the ultra-left. The demands of the Comintern are not to be carried out on paper, of these demands, and with an endeavor to realize them in life, but without the necessary inner conviction, the inner attitude and political firmness of this group, a flabbiness combined with a diplomacy of the word description in its relations to the Comintern.

A typical example of this is the tenth party conference. We have already referred to the "institutional" preparations made for the conference: Comrade Maslow wrote the articles, the sole purport of which was to discredit the importance of the Third World Congress, to deprive the whole tactics of the inner party reforming group, to deprive at the same time to lay the foundation for the ultra-left group.

FORMALLY, however, the fight was against the ultra-left at the conference. But as soon as the political line was immediately forgotten and the bloc with the ultra-left formed with conditions. In Moscow Comrade Ruth Fischer declared that the party conference had tended to the ultra-left, and that he could not support it, although anxious to do so. On the other hand, support is lent to ultra-left tendencies, and on the other hand to the right. We found ourselves in a state of emergency.

These "tactics" already possessed the conditions. In Moscow Comrade Ruth Fischer declared over and over again that the "masses" hinder her in carrying out the policy recommended by the executive, while Berlin has also stated the C. I. Bureau an incorrect policy upon her.

This has also found expression in Comrade Schaeffer's speech in Moscow—Comrade Schaeffer has since adoped the same line which he declared (in order to defend pressure) that the left was bankrupt. We consider this assertion to be wrong. It is not the ultra-left, but the right, and some of the leaders of this left, and the left itself will hold its own along with the ultra-left. We must increase numbers of the party members, and developing energetic and positive work against the ultra-left.

THE fundamental contradiction between the Comintern and Maslow at a great part is played by the argument that we are constantly wanting to "drive the German Party to the right."

We once more here expressly point out that in all important problems subsequent experience has completely justified the standpoint of the Comintern. This is now clearly understood by the entire party, and is completely limited mind could fail to grasp that without these tactics we would not have been in the place of the party, merely a small group of Communists, and of very bad Communists at that.

THE one of the constant "driving" by the Comintern must be completely in the direction of the ultra-left, and not towards the right. Any argument based upon the fact that at the present moment the executive is not criticizing the leading group from the "right," but from the left. Any argument based upon the fact that we as a deliberate lie. It is precisely in order to extricate the left, and to save the whole party, from of the bog that we insist upon the proposed reforms.

6. The Tasks of the Party.

THE criticism of the errors of the inner group which has been leading the party up till now will only be of real value if this criticism leads to a better and more determined fulfillment of the positive tasks of the party towards winning over the masses.

(Continued on page 6)

THE PREDICAMENT OF AMERICAN "INTELLECTUALS"

By EARL R. BROWDER

AMERICA is the land of the greatest factories, greatest fortunes, and greatest fools. But it is not the land of the greatest "intellectuals," those prize exhibits which receive so much attention in Europe; and the greatest efforts to establish "intellectuals" in contact with the labor movement in America become lamentable farces.

These reflections are occasioned by reading an article in the "Intellectual Laborer," the National September 30th. This "intellectual"—for so he seems to class himself—says every thing thru very dark glasses, and yet he is at the same time optimistic to the point of Pollyannism. He is for everyone and every class, and against them at the same time. He is the intellectually tolerant superman, above the battle, examining with a Jovian contempt the struggles of the insects down below in the labor movement.

BUT Stolberg's superior attitude, amusing and entertaining as it may be, becomes hollow when we analyze what he has to say and trace his ideas to their source. For Stolberg, the "intellectual," has contributed nothing to the ideas with which he deals. He has brought a miscellaneous collection of them from the four corners, picking out the brightest colored, the shiniest ones he could find, and he has to say and do in which to take them to market. If he is satisfied with the role of market-boy, no one can complain, but it should be clearly understood that he is not.

What are the ideas in which Stolberg deals? There is the "new union-

ism" of labor banks, labor insurance, & C. Stolberg tells us something new for or against or about it. What is his contribution then? It is contained in the phrase: "The new unionism is a road to freedom only to the degree to which it is militantly vigilant of the protective character of the labor movement."

What a profound idea! The so-called new unionism is a new technique of surrendering the labor movement. Stolberg, a true "intellectual," must and all sides of the question, so he agrees that it is a "road to freedom" with a qualification that sets it free only to the extent that it is not a road to slavery. But do you really mean, Brother Stolberg, that it can be both?

Such an idea, of course, stretching the "dialectical contradictions" beyond the breaking point. The reasonable conception that the resistance of the "new unionism" will produce an opposite movement is not Stolberg's idea; he qualifies his endorsement of the "new unionism" only in order that he may get into his basket, alongside the gaudy garbles of class-collaboration, also a collection of brilliant fragments of Communist criticism, which he has ruthlessly clipped away from their setting to help make his commodity.

THE Section I of Stolberg's collection is filled in by his observations: Labor banks are all to the good, only the engineers should not have invested so heavily in a certain kind of railroad building and capitalist production with Union funds as laudable, only Warren Stone made a mistake in buying coal instead of a new union field. The only thing wrong in "labor education," as it exists, is the tendency of "merely contributing

to the escape of their students from the labor movement," schemes of technical collaboration with the employers in the shops are prize-worthy, only they should avoid the raw surrender of the B. & O. plan which rescues the workers to opposition, etc., etc.

And in this manner does Stolberg make it possible to fill his second section with miscellaneous banalities to appease the tired readers of the Nation. Having shown that the "new unionism" is a "road to freedom" which, somehow, leads simultaneously in the opposite direction, and that the labor movement is traveling in both directions at once, Stolberg proceeds to tell us "The Real Story." He says: "The truth is that American labor has never been, relatively, so weak, so utterly deflated and yet restless spiritually, so vitally endangered economically as in the past, and is being repressed politically, so torn and bruised by factional bitterness and worse, since the early thirties, if there be."

THEN follows a detailed and gloomy picture of the near-wreckage that makes up the official labor movement of the U. S., with all its brutal and unscrupulous and blundering misdeeds. Stolberg evidently obtained his bill of particulars from the DAILY WORKER or the Freiheit, glaring the obvious facts showing the degeneration of labor's officialdom, which the Communists have made public and which Stolberg repeats. Yet, after our criticism, he speaks of the "Communists who are irresponsibly disruptive in their attack on the present leadership." This is an exhibit of the typical irresponsibility of the American "intellectual."

The gem of Stolberg's collection

comes in Section III. "The cause of the bankruptcy (term) as well as ideas are borrowed from Foster and the Communist press, so far as criticism goes) of the officialdom lies, according to Stolberg, not in any of the larger policies, but in their subordination of the "intellectuals." The "intellectuals" argue the defect socialist party, he says, "would not limit the children's crusade of the American Bolsheviks." And so they go on in the manner of the radical intellectuals, ran under the protecting wings of the labor officialdom.

With what result? The labor movement is today more hope-ridden than ever before. The protesting wings were not so hospitable as expected by the "intellectuals."

And here we find the kernel of "class interest" which we expect to locate in all writings on the labor movement. Stolberg argues the case of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, who have been crowded out everywhere, who are who are loudly protesting from the floor of the bureaucracy, offering their brains for sale as instruments of warfare against the ruling bourgeoisie. Stolberg is at the root of the "arguments" and the solution of their contradictions.

The predicament of the American intellectual is that the revolutionary labor movement they either do not understand, or they shrink from the sacrifices that it demands. The reactionary bourgeoisie, who do not wish to serve, is to get behind their value as allies against the Communists. And so they must need steal their names from Communist pens, denounce, wherewith to force their way late at least the usual sanctuaries of the official labor movement.

LENIN AND TROTSKY

By N. Krupskaya

The Facts About Lenin's "Testament" Set Out by His Widow.

YOU have, I see, found it necessary to give some attention to Max Eastman's book, "Since Lenin Died." As Mr. Eastman in his book attempts to depict me as a violent opponent of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party vainly endeavoring to protest against its actions, I shall be obliged if you allow me to explain the situation in English readers of this book.

Eastman throws no light on the work of the Russian Communist Party. History has imposed upon this party a most responsible and difficult task. They have to build Communism in an economically backward country during a period when capitalism in countries more advanced economically is temporarily stabilized. Eastman's book shows nothing of this. It is a collection of petty gossip. There is nothing of what is actually happening; there is no mention of economic achievements, or of the cultural awakening of the masses; or of the tremendous work of laying a secure foundation for the success of the November revolution.

The author is only concerned to gather up and smack his lips over every scrap of gossip he can collect with his petty-bourgeois anarchist leanings.

The most monstrous thing in Eastman's book is his treatment of the "Lenin Enrollment." When Lenin died hundreds of thousands of workers flocked into the Communist Party to help carry Lenin's work on to a triumphant end. The whole working class rallied round the party and its Central Committee. The new applicants for membership were examined, at open meetings in the factories and workshops, and candidates who were not workers decided whether applicants known to them were fit for the honor of membership. Never has there been such an expression of confidence in any party as was given by the Russian workers in selecting their best to go forward as units in the "Lenin Enrollment."

Lenin's dearest wish was realized. The Russian Communist Party became, not only in its ideology, but in its composition, overwhelmingly proletarian.

Eastman knows nothing of this. In his eyes the workers are, merely his passive, understanding tool; waiting to be led by any leader. To him the "intellectuals" is the salt of the earth.

The Bolsheviks understand the work quite otherwise—to us the more workers in the party the better. An entire working class is in the Central Committee consists of comrades who during years worked with Lenin, deliberated with him every step, and with him built up the party. In goal and in exile his work was theirs and theirs his. The working masses know their leaders better than any passive writer forming conclusions from the outside.

These old Bolsheviks have since Lenin's death felt the weight they could not have borne without the confidence and support of the masses. Lenin's death realized them and the masses still more closely by the obvious need to carry his work to a successful conclusion.

I was in this frame of mind that I wrote to Trotsky the personal letter which Eastman has misrepresented. Lenin considered Trotsky a talented comrade of the revolution and to the working class. That was his view to the end—and such an appreciation calls for responsibility. That is what I was thinking of when I wrote to Trotsky.

Trotsky, of course, could not draw from this letter the conclusion that Lenin considered him his successor, or regarded him as understanding his views better than anybody else.

I could not possibly write anything to Trotsky, for Lenin was always at one with Trotsky. Everybody in the Russian Party knows otherwise. Trotsky's various "actions" about Lenin's letters to the party congresses—calling them "testaments"—Eastman finds absolutely to denigrate the spirit of our party. For us a congress is not a matter of

bureaucrats but a supreme party occasion upon which every member must express himself with the utmost frankness regarding the merits and demerits. It was thus that Lenin thought about them. He knew that the party would understand the merits and demerits, and that they would be read and considered only by those about whom there could be no doubt that the interests of the revolution stood above every thing.

If in these letters there is criticism of certain comrades, and an indication of their faults, there is also tribute of far larger degree, praise of them. Of this praise Eastman says nothing. The letters were intended, and understood as, help to organization—to the allocation of tasks. To call them "testaments" is folly.

The real testament of Lenin is contained in the last articles he wrote and relate to fundamental questions of party and Soviet work. All these articles have been published. But Eastman finds nothing of interest in them. He is too busy helping the

members of the Russian Communist Party to calculate and allocate the "Central Committee by disregarding the responsibility (meaning the letter above-mentioned) which has been "concealed."

Finally, the part of Eastman's book which deals with Trotsky himself seems to me extremely insulting to Trotsky. It is needless for me to unravel the network of lies Eastman has woven around the question of Trotsky's differences with Lenin. Others have done that. Suffice to say that the whole question took an acute form solely because the whole party lately the need, after Lenin's death, for ideological unity. Personally I was not in agreement with Trotsky and spoke accordingly on several occasions. I also criticized his "Lessons of October" in detail in Pravda.

I was thrust in agreement with the views of the Central Committee. Eastman perverts the truth on this point as he does all thru his book.

N. Krupskaya.

They Admit Russia's Strength.

To the DAILY WORKER: The capitalist reports are trying to scare the American wheat farmers against Bolshevism. The Russian Soviet government is beginning to export wheat which the American capitalist government interprets as a willful means of causing a new dislocation among the wheat farmers because of a lower competitive price. The cause of the beginning of the world war, Russia did not export wheat. This caused a reduction of nearly 300 million bushels on the world market. During the war period and after, United States, Canada, Argentina and Australia increased their wheat export to 327 million bushels.

Now that the Russian Soviet government has succeeded itself to nearly a pre-war basis and is beginning to supply the world market again with wheat, the American government is fearing for its own interest of being one of its own wheat buyers. Helms Schreter, Chicago.

Scandinavian Stage Fall Festival. A fall festival and dance arranged under the auspices of the Scandinavian Lakeriver Communist Club No. 9, will be given at Workers' Lyceum, 2732 Birch Street, Saturday, Oct. 3, at 8 p. m. The music will be supplied by Jensen's orchestra for the dancing and Communist "Bolsheviks" will play new songs about Soviet Russia. All comrades and members of the Young Workers' League are invited. Tickets: locally the need, after Lenin's death, for ideological unity. Personally I was not in agreement with Trotsky and spoke accordingly on several occasions. I also criticized his "Lessons of October" in detail in Pravda.

The Walden Book Shop
307 Plymouth Court
(Between State and Dearborn
Just South of Jackson)
CHICAGO

SAKIATVALA'S CRIME--His

(Continued from page 3)

of the Government, and in their claim, that the people in India should call themselves British citizens, having acquired themselves fully with education and historical facts, and having received fully the ideas of the progress of the world, and yet put up with an out of date form of government? Day by day they see that the Chinese people, the Persian people, the Turkish people, and other Oriental nations are asserting their rights, the right of the people before the ruling classes.

Do you seriously propose that India should put up with a form of Crown government which was possible 100 years ago, but which today not even the people of the smallest Balkan States would put up with? I put it to my Indian friends that no sensible persons expect them to submit to such an unnatural state of mind and do such hypocritical expressions in their speeches. They are fully entitled to strain every nerve to carry on what is called seditious propaganda, what is called a revolutionary movement, and to fight with all their might and main such iniquities and unjust and brutal privileges as are claimed by the Crown, through their Agents, in India. It is perfectly right. You will all do it. No one doing it in this country would be condemned for doing it. That is the position which has to be viewed in the first place.

The Noble Lord was very angry with my Hon. Friend the Member for Dundee (Mr. Johnston) because he tried to scratch the surface. I do not say that he was angry from any personal motive, but through the habit of mind that believes that certain human beings are better than other human beings. He took part in the debate spoke of weekly wages in Bombay, and said that in Bombay there had been monthly wages from time immemorial. The Hon. Member forgot that hand loom weaving was the only institution known in Bombay from time immemorial; and that those who had been in the country and his fellow investors from starting factories there. They forgot all about time immemorial then but when it comes to applying to their men the principles of modern rights and privileges, then they speak of time immemorial.

A School-Boys Theory.

The Noble Lord, if he will forgive me for saying so, stood up in a school-boyish fashion, and referred us to the lessons of history for the last 700 years. As I read English history for the last 700 years, it is more ignominious record than ours. He says, "you have always had a foreign monarch, always an invader coming from outside to rule you." Since my childhood day, when I was studying English history I have known that England so far never has had an English monarch. She has always had a foreign invader. Never has her monarchy been a home-grown product. Monarchy is a sort of family privilege. A few families supply monarchs to Europe just as a few biscuit factories supply biscuits all over Europe. We sent an English Prince to Norway to be called King Haakon.

The Chairman: We are dealing with the affairs of India and not with those of Europe or Norway. The Noble Lord, the Under-Secretary of State for India cannot be held responsible for the Government of Norway.

Mr. Sakiatvala: No; but the Under-Secretary trotted out a theory which is a school-boyish theory, and I am simply showing the want of logic the position which he took up in reproaching India as a country which was always governed by a foreign monarch, and thereby trying to establish the right of himself and his family and future generations to go on governing India. May I point out that monarchs may be foreign? We do not quarrel with an Englishman who went to India and settled there, and became a king. We shall become reconciled with him, but a foreign monarch never meant a foreign ruler. An Arab, a Turk, a Mongol or a Chinese invader, or anybody may have come in India and may have himself become an Indianized monarch, and lived in the country and become a ruler of the country. But never did the people of China, Turkey, Central Asia, Persia, or Greece, remaining in their own homes, call themselves the rulers of India, and continue to send out their advisers to rule.

It was entirely a futile argument, and if you go back 200 years your education, sanitation, and social arrangements with bishops burning people, and with persecution and religious terrorism, you had nothing much to be proud of. You had your struggles, and we have ours, and shall still have them. I put it to the Noble Lord as well as to his own party, not to take the narrow-minded side it became India set up by caste, or because of Hindu and Mohammedan hatreds, or because there are suppressed classes." With just the same case, comfort and confidence here, you start factories, mines, railroads and dockyards there. Nothing stands in your way then. But when we tell you, "See here, you pay too much in head taxes"—not that you pay willingly, for it was extorted by the workers fighting inch by inch against you—and we say to you that if you apply these modern instruments of treating human life, you must also

apply other conditions, you say, "We must never try such experiments."

A Cowardly Game.

One Hon. Member interjected the Indian workers never work more than four or five hours. We are ready to compel them and to compel you to work eight hours a day. But the position is that when we ask you to work under the modern conditions of life, then you begin to talk to caste and of Hindus and Mohammedans and the suppressed classes, and you say, "Oh, no, let the Indians educate themselves," which for the last 150 years you have never permitted, and "let them organize themselves" which for the last 150 years you have not been anxious to permit. "Let them sit at their roll-top desks with their monthly circulars, and then in the next 150 years they will have the same rights as the workers of Lancashire." I put it to you that that is a very cowardly game. I do not impeach your intention, but do impeach your habit of mind. It is a very crooked habit of mind to take in the case of human beings. It is a cowardly game.

If you were setting the Indian worker the same equal race with his employer as you have in this country, your argument might be at least logical, even if it were not humanitarian. But here you have a fully developed master class, who with their struggles of 100 years with the working classes in Europe, are experienced, well informed and well-equipped with all the methods of enslaving and grinding down human life. That ready-made master does not bring slow. He goes to India, to Bengal, Bombay or somewhere else, and pitches his camp there and applies his up to date knowledge and his full blast methods of controlling labor and grinding down human beings. His informed mind, well-equipped with experience, devises schemes. You do not hold his hands. You see a group of British merchants going to India. Immediately they found a Chamber of Commerce, a Cotton Association and this association or that association. I do not blame them.

The Government from time to time says, "We are the trustees of the people, the protectors of the undefended." Where are you when it comes to defending the people against the robbers of your own country? Then your custodianship vanishes. I put this matter to the Government seriously. They talk of labor legislation. The Hon. Member of Dundee (Mr. Johnston) got a whipping in his absence from the Noble Lord the Under-Secretary. At the same time there were jocular remarks and insulting hints against the Indian Swarajists. There were round-about aspersions on the fitness of the Indian councillor to administer his own country. Before the Indian councillors got so nominal power in their councils, these acts, had not been passed 50 years, I could allow the Noble Lord to take credit to himself as an honest man. These acts have been done for 50 years ago. This plan of life, the Factory acts, the curtailment of hours and of child labor, were known by the British ruler for 50 years, and though the British rulers in India were acting as trustees for the people they have not made the slightest effort to use them. At the activity took place because of the push that we gave from here and because of the co-operation of the revolutionary men in India who demanded a fight on behalf of the workers.

We are told by the man in the street how well the British merchants who go out to India take care of the poor people and are always anxious to grant them their rights. Yet two years ago, when our Indian friends wanted to hold a Trade Union Congress in the mining area, to draw the attention of the whole country to the most hideous and most brutal conditions prevailing in the Bengal mines, the Merchants' Association, the European Mineowners' Association asked the Government to stop the Congress. They demanded the presence of a Gurka regiment. Machine guns and soldiers, with bayonets ready, were in the mining areas. That is the part they played in granting the rights of the workers. When these tactics did not succeed, and when the Indians who devoted themselves to work on behalf of the miners, showed their determination to work and stand up by 50,000 to 60,000 miners laying down their tools and attending the Congress, the Chairman of the Miners' Association wrote a letter of apology and presented himself and said he would now agree. I appeal to my British friends that if they are so proud of being Britishers, for goodness sake let them remind Britishers when they go abroad. If they want to take credit for everything that somebody else does and refuse to take discredit for everything they neglect to do, the least I can say is that they are a very funny people. But remember that all other people in the world are not so funny; they see you through and through.

India's Infantile Mortality.

Take another matter—the infantile death rate. My Hon. Friend from Bombay spoke in magnificent terms of the £10,000,000 to be spent upon the homes of the workers. If it were so, I would give credit to the Englishman or Scotsman who did it. But it is not so. It is a case of contracts and contractors. They are handling this £10,000,000 scheme. I remember that over my own signature, four years ago, I had to take the place of the Bombay housing scheme. £10,000,000 are not to be spent on the workers' housing scheme. The money is to be spent mainly for contractors' profits, for the dwelling houses of the rich, for showy shop fronts for increasing the land values of the landlords. There are to be 100,000 dwellings included, but the original scheme was for dwellings of one room, eight by ten feet, with an average calculated family of 8.3 persons in each room.

"Br
Ru
In
Ind



Spe
B
Sha
Saki

Delivered in
Comments, A
quoted by K
reason for U
the Union

America
sides British
by keeping
who made

You can bet
hands of ev
this brilliant
Imperialist

16 page
photograph
speaker in

Price
Single copies,
25 copies,
100 copies

DAILY
= 6 CENTS

Speech on "British Imperialism in India"

I communicated with an architect in this country, I submitted to him the whole plans, and I asked him to draw up a scheme which would not be extravagant. He was an architect belonging to your Army, but at the same time he belonged to the labor party. He drew the scheme most minutely and gave me to you a design where we could have one anteroom, one back room and an open verandah (porch). We calculated the cost and printed 5,000 copies, and I sent some out to the Governor of Bombay. He had the scheme most minutely acknowledged, and with the usual statement that the proposal would be borne in mind and would be carried out some day when possible, followed by an admission, "At present our hearts are with you, but our money is with us." There was human touch in that letter. The Bolsheviks cannot work. They are bound to bring in the long run a painful fall which will be heavier for Humpty Dumpty in proportion to the long Rise of life that he has. The Noble Lord, the Under-Secretary, has entirely evaded the issue of the Bengal Ordinances, seditious movement, suppression of the Communists and so forth.

Communist Body.

It may be that you are honest incompetents, and that you say this in your incompetence and incapacity, but why not learn from others? Our Russian Bolshevik friends have in five years been able to give the political franchise to the agriculturists of Russia, who are as a class parallel with the agriculturist population of India. They are also people of diverse religions, including Mohammedans, Jews, Greek Church people, and others. The Bolsheviks cannot do this in five years, yet in the Czar's days these people were treated with the same callousness and brutal cruelty as that with which you have been treating the Indian peasant for 150 years. In five years after the Communist revolution in Russia, 65 per cent of the agricultural population have received education and you have today the testimony of half a dozen British men and women that in spite of the bloodcurdling articles in your newspapers, the Russians have done their job well. Why play a dog-in-the-manger game with the Communists to obstruct the admission of Indians to go to Russia to study and to find what the British have failed to discover—the way of granting to the people of political franchise and education, scientific laboratories, institutions, technical education, and allowances for industrial workers. If Russia, a country of agriculturists could find the way out, how is it that you with your world-proclaimed cleverness as administrators have failed to find it, which are modern, progressive and let us do the job, and we shall do it on an international Communist basis? Why are you turned inside out at the very thought of Communist propaganda in India? If as an industrial nation with your Western mind you have failed to discover a humanitarian cure for the ills of an agricultural Eastern country, why play the dog-in-the-manger? Why not permit the Russian nation, which has actually discovered the way out of the darkness, to come and help you?

The Noble Lord delivered himself on a previous occasion of his views on Russian propaganda. Today we have to review his actions during the last 12 months with regard to the Cawnpore trials. Why does he consider himself entitled to suppress Communist propaganda? He says other propaganda or subversive propaganda. That is another contradiction. Every propaganda must be subversive. If it is not subversive then there is no need for propaganda. The Hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Scrymgeour) is carrying on prohibitionist propaganda. That is propaganda to subvert the drinking system, and if his propaganda were not subversive it would not be worth anything. Every propaganda, if it is effective and sincere, means something new, and if those who carry it on have the courage of their convictions and want to put what they feel to be right in the place of the old system, that propaganda must be subversive. You are talking to the 20th century in the terms of the 18th century lawyers when you refer to subversive propaganda of the 18th century and revolution. They are the birthrights of modern nations, and they are the birthrights of the Indians just as much as they were your birthrights. I for one, will not yield to terrorism, and I am not in any subversive propaganda, revolutionary propaganda, Communist propaganda with the assistance of the Russian, and the Chinese and the Germans and the British. I am not alone in that. The Government has kept quiet about the great Indian railway strike. The Government says all kinds of things about the strikers being kind, but the Government of India forgets that they themselves are the largest employers of labor in the world, taking their postmen, public men, railwaymen, miners in Government mines, workers in Government factories, and so on, and I put, it quite definitely before the Government that they themselves can be found taking a comparison with any other country, you pay the most miserable wage, and give the most miserable conditions, and deprive the population which works for you and for the prosperity of our great Empire of their rights and induce them political indignity and punishment worse than can be found in any part of Asia. You could improve things if you meant to do so, but you would not be able to stay there after the improvements had taken place. You know it and I do. But the international factories will, so on, and I put, it quite definitely before the Government that they themselves can be found not retreat gracefully. I am not talking of the Communist comrades, but about my British comrades. I know the difficulties of the Front Bench among my British comrades. We must treat them as a section apart. But I think even the Noble Lord knows that the Government is struggling with the most inhuman, callous oppression the railway worker, and imposing on them a negation of their rights to such an extent that the

Summary of Saklatvala Exclusion.

SHAPURJI SAKLATVALA, Communist member of the British House of Commons, upon making arrangements to enter America as a British delegate to the International parliamentary union congress, at Washington, D. C., was granted a visa.

This visa was later revoked by the state department following a conference in Washington of Coolidge, Kellogg and Burton of Ohio where the protest of two British Tories and Home Secretary Hicks, who did not dare to bar Saklatvala from leaving England, was discussed.

The state department gave as an excuse for its action a garbled account of a speech made by Saklatvala in parliament for Indian independence.

United front mass meetings and demonstrations have been held and are being held through the United States demanding the admittance of Saklatvala with the Workers (Communist) Party taking the leading role.

general council of the trade union movement in this country has telegraphed £100 assistance.

I touch on one more point, and that is the death rate to which the Hon. Member for Dundee (Mr. Johnston) referred. He asked the Committee to look at other reports besides the one to which he referred in regard to infantile death rate. You say you went to India because the Rajputs were killing their daughters, and you wanted to save human life, because suttees were being burnt, and you wanted to save human life, but tell you, you are there to destroy human life. It may not be your intention, but that's part of the game, and without it you cannot play the game. I ask Hon. Members to analyze the infantile death rate a little more closely. The rate mentioned by my Hon. Friend for the City of Bombay was 411 per thousand. That is the normal rate, though it has been 834 in one year. Even this, however, is a mistaken figure. The City of Bombay, is a rich city. My own community if one of the richest communities there, and they do not present a death rate of 411. Their infantile mortality is very near your own. There is also the European population and the rich Hindus and Mohammedan populations. But if you take the figures of infantile mortality in the municipal records before the House, it is 190, and if you study the rate in those wards where the factory women live, the death rate there is not 411 per 1,000, but from 600 to 700 per 1,000. You cannot attribute that to the climate or to unsanitary conditions, because all of India in the agricultural areas without sanitation or education and a high rate of the infantile rate is about 190. It is in the factory wards of Bombay, Calcutta, Allahabad, Delhi, and so on, wherever there are modern factories, that the infantile death rate comes to between 600 and 700 infants, and we think that, if nothing else, one inhuman item, that cannibalistic feature of your imperialism, should be quite enough to make you come away.

An Eloquent Appeal.

You went there, you say, to save the people, but you have acted in a contrary direction, and in the name of the people there—in the name of the people here, in the name of the masses, I appeal to you to Bolshevize your own minds and hearts, and to determine once and for all, that Imperialism, with all its good talking points has got behind it a trail of inhuman murder, brutality, negation of rights and degradation of human life, and must be dissolved. British Imperialism must go if humanity is to progress. I do not say that in a spirit of anger again. I say it for your own sakes, that if you want to save yourselves from future misery, from a future heavy fall, from being cut out by India in all the raw materials on which alone your industries live, if you want to save the people, if you want to take away all the armaments and military, wasteful energies of the whole of Europe, and the best of them of it all is British imperialism. Do not despise Communist Internationalism, study it from the point of view of the Indians, and you will find it of greater value.

It being Eleven of the Clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make the Report to the House. On Monday, 13th July, Mr. Saklatvala spoke as follows:

A Personal Explanation.

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House while I make a brief personal explanation in regard to a sentence in my speech last Thursday night. It is due not only to me and my party, but the House, and for a correct understanding of the functions and purposes of debate in this House by my Indian friends. When I said in the course of my speech that I held myself responsible for what I said at the bottom of many of the Communist manifestoes and the Communist propaganda in India I beg to explain that I unequivocally, unreservedly and without reservation associate myself with, and endorse such manifestoes, resolutions, and propagandist literature as are openly and officially propagated by the Communist Party of Great Britain.

This does not refer to documents of doubtful origin advocating crime, of whatever is alleged, which has no proven authenticity, and which, while I, on behalf of my party, as well as on behalf of my electors, will always and with the utmost fearlessness and unequivocally the sentiments and true feelings of peoples struggling for freedom and liberty in this Empire, we would not, Mr. Speaker, endorse here in this House a propaganda which advocates internationalism through religious or racial animosities, or for personal revenge.

ish

"

ch

ri
vala

1925 of
the
men from

perialism
perialism
the man
is attack.

into the
y worker
posure of
pression.

cover
of the
tion.

10c each
10c each
10c each

CKER
1925-26

The Communist Letter to the Communist Party of Germany

(Continued from page 2.)

At the present juncture the most important task of the party is to re-assert itself and to reassert its leadership in the impending political regrouping within the German working class. The most significant symptoms of this regrouping are the rising resistance among broad masses of the workers against the "western orientation" that is against the going over of the bourgeois to the side of the extreme imperialists, against the leadership of the Second International, and the orientation of these working masses towards Soviet Russia, and—by no means least—towards proletarian revolution. Without overestimating the significance and speed of this process of development, the party must accord these new symptoms a place in the center of its attention, follow their development with the utmost care, and take their full account at every step in practical politics.

Everything depends upon the increased recruiting powers of the party. In dealing with the masses of social democratic workers now leaning to the left, the party must find new formulas, another tone, fresh material for agitation. It must be fully informed upon all events in the camp of the social democracy, and must make a special study of the local conditions in the various districts, sub-districts, and local groups, in order to influence them by our agitation. The masses of social democratic workers now turning away from their center-revolutionary leaders, and beginning slowly and hesitantly, but insistently, to turn towards proletarian revolution, must be made to feel that the Communist Party is really a party of the workers, a party which fights tenaciously for the workers' interests, for their partial demands, for their daily needs, a party which does not regard the workers merely as an object for agitation, but as class brothers, and who is sincerely endeavoring to form the proletarian united front in the class struggle.

All other political steps undertaken by the party must be made from the standpoint of this main task. Above all, our parliamentary work must be carried out with this standpoint in view. On every occasion and with reference to every political question, we must seek to find the platform from which the party can speak to the masses of the workers in the trade unions and among the social democrats to the end that we may be won over for class war. This is the light in which we must place all the questions of the security pact, of the league of nations, of the trade agreements, credits, tariffs, taxation, housing policy, etc.

At the same time the combatting of the monarchist danger, the struggle against class legislation, the fight for a complete amnesty, etc. must be combined with the daily economic and labor struggles of the proletariat.

In order really to find access to the best section of the masses, the social democratic workers, the fight must be taken up against those excesses which originate from and arise through the struggle was carried out with the weapons in hand. The greatest damage is caused to the party when, for instance, mutual fighting is indulged in between Communists and social democrats (at meetings, among the youth, etc.) who are taking place even today and for which the social democrats are responsible, although the Communists are not to be blamed. Such fights are welcomed by the counter-revolutionary leaders of the German social democracy and these leaders, consequently, incite such a struggle. The Communists must take up the initiative in order finally to bring an end to such things, which of course, pre-suppose the good will of the social democratic workers.

One must understand how to distinguish not only in words but in deeds, between the counter-revolutionary social democratic leaders and the broad mass of the social democratic workers. Our program and in parti-

cular our factory newspapers (wall newspapers, etc.) must know how to conduct the agitation against the imperialist policy of the social democratic leaders, so that every social democratic worker in the factory or workshop is conscious of the fact that the worker at the bench, the simple representative elected to the factory council is regarded differently from the high "Barnard" leader, who in parliament sells the worker again and again.

The real changes of policy in this respect will be perceived by all workers, will be accomplished, when the party concentrate all its forces upon increasing our trade union work. The social democratic party of Germany must be beaten by our trade union work. The real union front must be formed by our trade union work.

The party, and its trade union fractions, must work on wide scale agitation in all unions, local branches regarding the visit of the first German workers' delegation Soviet Russia. This visit must awaken a powerful response in the whole of the German labor movement.

The urgent desire for unity felt by the workers must be crystallized as speedily as possible by the development of a left wing in the trade unions, after the pattern of the English labor movement. This is the first step forward to be taken by the German Party in the German and international workers' movement for the unity of the trade unions will win over the broadest masses, and will bring a fresh influx of members into the free trade unions if the Communist Party becomes the driving force for trade union unity. The experience of mass leaders is their best, most energetic, and concrete work in the trade unions; they are the best, most energetic, and social democratic trade union members, by means of object lessons, that they are able, in their character as Bolsheviks, to be social trade union members at the same time. This means a number of fresh tasks for our fractions in the trade unions. Real penetration into trade union life, intense study of economic and political relations, the formations of trusts, rise and fall of economic prosperity, situation in various branches of industry, peculiarities of certain spheres of work, aspects of the strategy of a clear and consistent tariff and social policy, the leading of labor struggles, especially in the sphere of the strike, the adoption of a definite standpoint with regard to all organizational questions arising in the trade unions, the struggle for the industrial unions, the accordance of special consideration to the role and tasks of the shop stewards, the emphasizing of the interests of juvenile workers within the trade unions, the safeguarding of the interests of the female workers, etc.

The organization of a competent trade union department in the central of the German C. P. must stand the proof that the leaders of the party are seriously inclined to make this their fundamental task of the party.

The carrying out of our work in the trade unions implies a determined reorganization of the party in accordance with the program decisions made by the last party conference. The new statutes and lines of organization of the party must be realized with the utmost rapidity. The new organization of the party must be closely bound up with the new political course. The line of action common to both consists of the transferring of the propaganda of all political organizational work performed by the party into the workshop and factories, to the end that the masses of the workers here employed may be won over. The following three spheres of work are to be made the chief tasks of the new organizational course:

1. The reform of the inner party course in the direction of the normalization of the organizational work, of a lively connection between the leaders and the members of the party, by means of all the organizations of the party.

2. A real and absolutely consistent reorganization on the basis of the factory model.

3. The organizational comprehensive and firm establishment of Communist instances in all non-party labor organizations, above all in the trade unions, but also in the mass organizations which are being formed among the proletariat.

The realization of an active connection between the leaders and the members of the party demands the abolition of super-centralization, and the employment of fresh forces not only in the central, but in all the leading organs of the party, especially among the district leaders; it further demands the guarantee of collective work in the entire membership, and the closest cooperation with the Comintern.

Cooperation with the Comintern is the more necessary that it enables the party to be enriched by the experience gained by the whole international.

Besides the reform of the inner party course, and the reorganization of the members of the party, another factor of greatest importance is the rapid development of a system of trade union party fractions capable of practical work on their own initiative, in every workers' organization, in every trade union in which there are Communists. The first step is by no means confined to the trade unions, but applies equally to all other workers' organizations, whether these have already existed for a long time, or whether they are just being formed. The Red Front Fighters League affords the best example of the new formation of proletarian mass organizations on the basis of the fighting experience of mass leaders in proletarian. The rapid adaptation of the party to such organizations (sport associations, tenants' league, free thinkers' league, Red women's league, etc.), and making use of the same for the development of trade union work, are necessary.

Among the errors and defects of the leadership of the German C. P. not the least is their completely wrong policy with reference to the young Communist League of Germany. The numerical weakness and the difficulties experienced by the Youth League in Germany are to be explained to a considerable extent by the fact that the party has done next to nothing to aid the Youth League to attain a very much higher standard. The main cause of the weakness of the German Youth League (line, however, in the fact that up to recently it had not the same young path which the party has been led by its leaders, and has shared all the errors of the party. It is thus the more significant that at the tenth party conference only the youth spoke up to the end defended the proposals of the Comintern. This is a certain symptom that the youth has already begun to choose the right path for itself, without the aid of the party, and even in spite of the resistance made by the party leaders. Therefore, the attitude of the representatives of the party leaders towards the youth was quite inadmissible. It found expression in the obstruction at the party conference, and the subsequent "pressure" put upon the central committee of the Youth Communist League of Germany. The party must understand the fact that the adoption of such an attitude with regard to the Youth Communist League is capable of destroying the whole of the Communist work which has been done among the youthful workers; this work is, however, one of the most important prerequisites for the real Bolsheviking of the party.

The organizations of the rural and city petty bourgeoisie require the special attention of the party. At the same time the necessary steps must be taken in Germany towards the practical realization of a Leninist peasant policy in the Revolutionary course must mobilize the increasing discontent of the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry in the direction of proletarian revolution, trade agreements, credits, taxation, and tariffs, for the purpose of a common struggle against the big bourgeoisie (Communist, Tra-

dition work in the revisualist and tenants' associations, the organization of the villagers, small holders, (tenant farmers, etc.).

These parliamentary work done by the party in the German country, in the parliaments and in the Reichstag, must be conducted in the main from the point of view of pressure and not from that of mere legislative. For this an indispensable prerequisite is the closest cooperation and the participation of the fractions and the Communist fractions in the trade unions, etc.

The party must not forget for a moment that serious right and ultra-left dangers still continue to exist in its ranks. Mechanical measures however, do not afford any safeguard against these dangers, but solely a broad, thorough system of enlightening and educative work carried out by the party, penetrating down to the last member, and comprising every organizational and political detail, is evercoming of all errors in the sphere of practice and theory is best accomplished by means of the persistence of the party with the principles of Leninism and of the Comintern, by means of the application of these principles to the concrete conditions obtaining in Germany and by means of the practical party tasks arising out of this application.

The party must pay attention to the fact that the work of the party must be consciously commenced by a broad campaign of enlightenment and education of the members, explaining the necessity and the political import of the present discussion.

7. Why Must the Change be Made in the Program and Why Must the Change be Rapid?

Many party comrades will ask why the change in the leadership of the party is necessary and why it is so necessary; in reality, however, it is not a matter of necessity which "suddenly" arose between the executive and the party. The latter is. It is rather a question of differences which have existed during the whole course of the last eighteen months and which have become more and more acute until the present state of affairs. It is noticeable for these reasons, and for the international has been reached. The executive has warned the leading group more than once against the continuation of its deviations. As early as the session of the enlarged executive the Russian comrades had pointed out the deviation under the lead of Ruth Fischer, after days of serious consultation, that the continuation of the wrong inner party course hitherto pursued would render a severe conflict inevitable. The representatives of the executive in Germany pointed out again and again the deviations and errors of the above mentioned group. But all advice and earnest comrade-like warnings remained without effect. Up to the last the executive has sought to avoid the breaking out of an open conflict by means of the usual organizational measures. It was solely for this reason that the executive had to attempt to convince the leading group in the party conference, and refrained, in the hope of regularizing the situation by these means, from submitting the accumulating antagonism to the organizations and members of the party.

It is necessary to recall the group Maslow-Ruth Fischer of its errors by means of educational methods and comradely cooperation. Despite our misgivings we avoided an open conflict, in order that we might throw no difficulty in the way of the executive, with these political line the executive has solidified more than once, at a moment when it was undertaking to convince the group Maslow-Ruth Fischer in the right and ultra-left deviations in the German C. P.

This necessary step has been rendered difficult for us by the circumstance that within the left of the German Party the center of a powerful political and organizational movement, the system of the Comrades Maslow-Ruth Fischer. The Berlin party conference, and the events immediately

(Continued on page 7)

The Comintern Letter to the Communist Party of Germany

(Continued from page 4)

Following his close, proved finally to the executive that all hopes of settling the differences in the course of normal co-operation are shattered. The attacks made by the bourgeoisie and low and Ruth Fischer force upon us the urgent necessity of laying the question of the Comintern party openly before all the members.

MAY our enemies break out into a howl of triumph, and plot their conquest of the more points of the German party. May the bourgeoisie and the social traitors of whole Germany fling scorn and derision upon the party. Lenin taught us to expose ruthlessly all the errors of our party, the sole party of the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat, with absolute openness, without considering the enemy. There is no party in the world able, like the Communist Party, to recognize and to expose its defects openly and to its logical conclusion. This is the sole pledge for the rapid and complete overcoming of these errors.

The executive is profoundly convinced that no Communist worker in Germany will permit himself to be confused or misled even for a moment by the shrieks of triumph which may certainly be anticipated from the bourgeois and social democratic press. And may all the adherents of the right and ultra-left in our own ranks too consider the right moment has come to venture forward again. May the Brandenstein declare that "the left are bankrupt." The Communist Party of Germany will none the less advance in severed ranks without leading an eye to the crimes of the right or ultra-left opponents.

We repeat once more: It is not the German left which is bankrupt, but some of their leaders.

The German left, with all its faults in the past and in the present, has never been merely a group of individuals. It has a great historical role to fulfill. It drew the lessons of October, 1923, it defeated Brandenstein, it united the torn party at the moment of its severest crisis.

THE German left must uphold and continue the best traditions of the vanguard of the German industrial proletariat, and of the best and most powerful party organizations, as those of Berlin, Hamburg, the Ruhr area, and the Rhine country. At the same time it must show itself capable of eliminating everything that is wrong, immature, and un-Bolshevik from its past and present. Then it will not only be the left, but the real Bolshevist, leading heart of the German C. P.

Lenin taught us that when we openly and ruthlessly criticize our own errors before the whole country, then these errors have already been half overcome. During the course of the twenty-five years of its history the Russian C. P. has more than once exposed and overcome its weaknesses free from all petty bourgeois sentimentality and all egotism. The German C. P. will follow this example.

The main defects are not to be found in the theory, but in the membership of the party, but among the leaders of the leaders, who have proved incompetent. The party is confronted by great new tasks. The situation is not developing against us, but for us. For some months the

class struggle in Germany is no more on the downward but on the upward line.

It is only if the whole party recognizes all the signs of the times, and if it relies upon itself, upon its own powers, upon the Communist International, and upon the unconquerable force of the German working class, then it can overcome the crisis and lead the German proletariat to victory. In this case victory is certain.

(Signed) Executive of the C. P. I.: Zinoviev, Nacharin, Manuilskii, Platinaki, Losovsky, Soviet Union; Jacob, France; Bova, Great Britain; Kustinn, Finland; Schefeo, Norway; Kilbom, Sweden; Kolarov, Bulgaria; Dimitroff, Bulgaria; Boeckhovich, Yugoslavia; Katarana, Japan; Roy, India; Mitskevitch Kapelava, Lithuania.

Delegation of the German C. P. I.: Thalmann, Ruth Fischer, Dengel, Schuman, Schneider, Seher, Kubno, Strobel, Heinz Neumann and the Central Committee of the C. P. of Germany. (Section of the Communist International.)

Resolution of the C. C. of the Communist Party of Germany on the Decision of the Executive in the German Question.

1. The C. C. of the G. C. P. approves the report on the negotiations between the delegation of the G. C. P. and the executive of the Comintern; it agrees, without reservation with the decisions of the executive.
2. The C. C. is in agreement with the open letter addressed by the executive to the members of the Ger-

man party, and recognizes the correctness of the criticism exercised by the executive with regard to the Maslow-Ruth Fischer group which hitherto led the G. C. P.

3. The C. C. agrees with the organizational decisions of the executive, and resolves to carry them out immediately.

4. In order to persuade the broadest masses of the party members in all the districts and organizations of the correctness and necessity of the decisions arrived at, the central is to organize a far-reaching enlightening activity through the whole party.

5. The Central Committee, as united body, has to carry out the decisions of the executive, and to defend them against all resistance.

6. The inner work of the Central Committee is to be organized in accordance with the new course, along the line of increased collective work, that is, of the most intense mutual co-operation among all the members and candidates of the C. C.

7. It is only possible to avoid a party crisis if the C. C. brings the whole party suitably together in accordance with the new decisions and leads it untidily forward on the path of practical positive tasks.

8. Every attack against the general lines laid down by the Comintern, and against the decisions newly made in the German question in particular, must be ruthlessly combated, from whatever side it may come, whether from the right or from the ultra-left.

Passed by all votes against one and one abstention.

Old Soak at Central Theater Well Acted But Theme Is Mushy

"The Old Soak" with Harry Mittens in the leading role, now at the Central Theater at Van Buren and Michigan Ave. is intended as a propaganda play against prohibition, and too bad it does not stick to the point. But it is ambitious. It preaches against the supposedly "bad people" who ruin the chances for happiness under the present system of society. And so it suffers the fate of being unconvincing.

This is the story. The Old Soak since prohibition chases booze and bootleggers. Previously he used to get "in" easily and everything was normal in the Hawley household. Now the head of the family devotes all his time and money to chasing "K." This brings unhappiness to his wife and two grown up children. His eldest son who outshines him in his wife's eyes because he sticks to his job is not so good a boy as he appears to be. He steals from his firm where he holds a position of responsibility to gamble in stocks. He is forced to rob his mother to make good on his theft. There is a villain in the story, the village banker. The villain abides in the village by pretending to be a church goer, god fearing person. This sort of "respectability" enables him to play his crooked deals undisturbed. But the "Old Soak" discovers his true character when he learns that he is the master of the bootlegging deals in the village.

The banker, Webster Parsons, evades the son into a deal in which he robs the boy of \$10,000. The banker and father to protect his son who is now involved in greater debt than ever, forces the banker to return the money under threat of death. The banker hands over the \$10,000. Everyone is happy.

It is to be hoped that the Central Theater will put on dramas that will be both more educational and convincing.

Ashland Carpenters Licked
SHEMANDORA, Pa.—(FP)—Ashland carpenters and joiners who have been on strike since April for \$11.25 per hour pay signed with the master builders at the old wage scale of \$1 an hour.

They're framing up on Zeigler!

**They are trying to break the Zeigler Spirit.
They removed Zeigler's fighting union officers.
They murdered Mike Sarovich.
They arrested 26 of his co-workers.
They are trying to railroad 15 of them to the penitentiary.**

FIGHT the Zeigler Frame-up!

It mine bosses, the Ku Klux Klan, Farrington's machine, and the State Power are all lined up in this dastardly conspiracy against the Zeigler miners.

Act Quickly! The Danger Is Great! Time Is Pressing! Hurry Up With

HELP!

Send contributions to

International Labor Defense

23 So. Lincoln St., Chicago, Ill.

Organization of Worker Correspondents

By A. G. BOSSE.

That the building up of a mass daily newspaper depends upon the development of hundreds of workers correspondents is now well recognized. The role they played during the growth of Pravda is also well known. The Workers Weekly, the organ of the British C. P., is built upon this basis. When a party of 5,000 can gain for their paper a circulation of 40,000-50,000, they are thinking their roots deep into mass work. We in the U. S. have a circulation of 150,000 for our entire press, in all languages, daily and weekly, which is not had for a membership of 29,000. Nevertheless, we must recognize that our English daily, THE DAILY WORKER, is not a mass paper. And we must set, about making it such. This is largely an organizational problem.

Lenin Points the Way.

Lenin ("How are our newspapers to be made into real organs of the labor movement?") showed how incapable a staff of "professional" editors and reporters was of doing the job. He "awakened to real life or capacity for continued life" unless the five or six on the staff were supplemented by from 500 to 1,000 workers correspondents. Comrade Dunne's report to the party convention on the DAILY WORKER is very enlightening in this respect. We now have 75-85 worker correspondents contributing to the paper, a fine proportion of whom (one-third) are non-party members. Next year the prospects are that two or three hundred, if not more, will be in the movement, according to Comrade Dunne.

The following is a suggestion as to how comrades can go about organizing themselves so as to cover the city. They can form a class or club to meet weekly, led by the DAILY WORKER reporter for that city, or some other capable comrade. The best basis for discussion would be Comrade Dunne's pamphlet in the Little Red Book, "Workers Correspondents," which gives the new field to be covered, the ways of writing up different kinds of material (journalistic technique), the aims of such work, and ways of building the membership and influence of the party. At the beginning, written work for every session, mutual criticism and comment, assigned topics—in short, constant practical training for each member, rather than demonstrations of how to write by the class leader.

After some of the preliminaries have been laid to revise Marxism, the organ as a staff of "reporters." One can remain at the local headquarters each evening, working on his assignment, and at the same time, he can take care of all possible news items that come in. Since at the beginning it will be impossible for the local workers' correspondents to cover all the meetings of unions, fraternal organizations, etc., committees, central labor bodies, etc., this first group will have to cover as many of these meetings as possible. Later, every effort should be made to get a correspondent in every important local union, etc., so that as much of the city will be covered as possible. These workers might attend the class, or

the comrades at the headquarters each evening could go over the articles with them, and help get the material into shape. Those who have benefited by this training can be assigned to edit or assist in editing the factory newspaper which every large shop nucleus will issue when the party organization is well on the way.

(Each Worker Get Help.)

If it is impossible to have a member of the class at the party office each evening, this might be managed by having the evening meeting one week. If that cannot be done, a bulletin board can be put up and all comrades coming in can jot down on a slip of paper a number of important meetings to be written up, and from this notice, the correspondents can choose those to be covered. Meanwhile they can look for a capable member of the local union (or whichever other body it is) and have him take care for the DAILY WORKER of the worth-while news of the union, etc. One of the best ways to build the shop nucleus or factory committee is to get a good worker correspondent on the job there, who will tell what his fellow workers are thinking and doing about working conditions (specialize, wages, hours, speed-up, accidents) and the like, locally. Then special sale and sub-division can be made on these bodies to get readers, subscribers, and party members. Every local union, every strike, every important meeting of workers can be utilized in this way. The city DAILY WORKER agent will cooperate to the utmost with this work, and his office can be made a miniature editorial office of the paper for his locality.

If the Chicago office prints a form card, saying that a contribution will be published in such and such a form, it is only the date, and making it a day or so before, the good correspondent can be ready with a sufficient number of copies for his shop, union, or local business office. In Chicago they are overwhelmed with correspondence, the Chicago corps of correspondents can always help out with editing, copyreading, summarizing, assorting, etc.

The above are just a few suggestions, which can be adapted or modified according to local conditions. If other comrades who are thinking along the same lines will write in to the DAILY WORKER their problems, suggested solutions, new devices, and successful methods in organizing this work, we shall have not only our two or three hundred worker correspondents by next year, but we shall have buried our news eggs "deep in the masses in a truly revolutionary manner."

NOTE: Regarding Comrade Bosse's suggestion that THE DAILY WORKER print a form card giving the date when the Worker Correspondent's story appears that he may order a sufficient number for his shop, the number of Worker Correspondents has already provided special Workers' Correspondence Paper which may be secured upon request. The form attached to the bottom of this copy paper should be filled out giving the number of DAILY WORKER the correspondent can use. This saves time and makes unnecessary the printing of such a card as suggested in the above article.

Worker Correspondents --- Their Function and Importance

By KARL REEVE.

THE Worker Correspondents are the steel rods which bind the working class masses to the Communist press, and hence to the Communist leadership. The Worker Correspondents blow the hot breath of the class struggle into the pages of the Communist press. It is the Worker Correspondents which stir ever large masses to contemplate the causes of the subjection to the capitalist system under which they work and live. The Worker Correspondent is the voice of the working class, and the purifier of the Communist movement.

Lenin, in his fight on the "economists" who at the beginning of the twentieth century made their last stand against the agitation among the workers for the dictatorship of the proletariat centered his organization around the newspaper Iskra. In 1900-1901, when the mass demonstrations were beginning which ushered in the 1905 revolution, and proved false beyond a doubt the position of the economists that the workers must be told to fight merely for immediate economic demands, Lenin used the letters of the workers as a weapon against the "economist."

"In the literary sources on the history of the workers' movement, one comes across fragments from letters to the editor" which the workers of those days sent to the Iskra papers. Comrade Lenin and his comrades secured these letters that they procured like gold." Comrade Zinoviev tells us in his history of the Russian Communist Party. "And Lenin related them in the course of the struggle against the 'economists' is proof of their conviction that it was the wage increases alone the advanced workers desired, but that they were conscious that they had to go out in the streets to get hold of guns and battle with the czar's police."

COMRADE Lenin, thru the letters of the Worker Correspondents of that day, felt the pulse of the movement of the workers toward the revolution. He printed these letters from the workers in the Iskra, consolidating their valuable contributions in the fight against the opportunist "economists." The Worker Corre-

spondents became a weapon against those who tried to revise Marxism, by thwarting the determination of the militant workers to seize the state power.

The Workers (Communist) Party and the DAILY WORKER can call upon its corps of Worker Correspondents as a potent aid in the reorganization of the shop nucleus, and the building up of a Bolshevik party after the re-organization. The members of the shop nucleus, already found in New York and elsewhere, that interesting their respondents in the DAILY WORKER, helping them to write up their experiences in the class struggle for the paper, is one of the best possible means of bringing fresh proletarian elements into our party.

The Worker Correspondent is a safeguard against the lies and treacheries of the bureaucratic union officials. The worker correspondent is a rank and file. His stories have nothing in common with the poisonous propaganda against the Communists regularly peddled by the reactionary union officialdom.

DURING the course of the present men's strike of local 3 and 4, against the Cuneo company, which was aided by "Major" George Berry, president of the International Brotherhood of Workers, the DAILY WORKER led, and is leading, the fight against the scabbery of Berry. The stories exposing Berry's strikebreaking activity in cooperation with the printing corporation, were supplied to the DAILY WORKER by the striking pressmen themselves.

So that when the Presseeaters Franklin Union, number 4, received the infamous letter broadcast over the country by John Fitzpatrick, president of the Chicago Federation of Labor, which slandered the Communist in the manner of a Bureau stoolpigeon, the pressmen rejected this letter in the most militant terms. Fitzpatrick urged the unions to attack the Communist, to outlaw them. But the pressmen knew of the activities of the DAILY WORKER and the Workers Party on their behalf in their strike. They knew that the Communist press is against the "open shop" drive of the bosses and against the treachery of the union officialdom. They knew that their experiences

in their very life's blood, was written in the accounts of the strike printed in the DAILY WORKER and they rejected Fitzpatrick's lying attacks in the same manner dozens of local unions throughout the country have taken similar action, just as the machinists' locals rejected "B. and O. Hill Johnson's" attack on the Communists and refused to accept it as this class collaborator's orders.

ALONG with the building up of a strong shop nucleus, goes the enlarging of the corps of worker correspondents. Workers who do not belong to the Workers Party, thru reading and writing up their experiences of their particular struggle against the bosses are drawn into close contact with the Communist press and the Communist movement. In this way they are made to understand the relation of their fight to the class struggle as a whole, and are gradually made familiar with the Communist program.

The corps of Worker Correspondents can be enlarged by developing the self confidence of the workers, by showing them that their everyday

struggles are important bits of history in the class war. The fact that a worker brings out for the Communist press functions off his confidence in himself as a worker, showing him the importance of that "historically rising class."

The Worker Correspondent is the backbone of the Communist press and the number of Worker Correspondents is a measure of the extent to which the Communist press is reaching the masses.

**RUSSIAN-UKRAINIAN
PERFORMANCE & DANCE
SUNDAY, OCTOBER 11**

The Russian and Ukrainian branches of the Workers Party have arranged jointly a performance and dance for Sunday, Oct. 11, at Emmett Memorial Hall, corner Ogden and Taylor.

All friendly organizations are requested to keep this date open and not to arrange other affairs.

**BUY YOUR
BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, COMMUNIST
MAGAZINES AND PAPERS**
from the
City Literature Department
19 So. Lincoln Street Chicago, Illinois
Open from 9 a. m. to 7:30 p. m. every day except Sunday.

WANTED!
A Few Copies of
TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD
by John Reed.
WORKERS PARTY CITY LITERATURE DEPARTMENT
19 So. Lincoln Street Chicago, Illinois