

UPON ONE POLICY WE ARE ALL UNITED

and that is to

Insure The Daily Worker for 1925

A MOST complete discussion upon future party policy is possible today because we have the DAILY WORKER. Every party member who reads the DAILY WORKER, yes, and every one that does not because he cannot read English, will understand this to be an advantage of prime importance to the theoretical development of our members.

But the DAILY WORKER serves the party in many other ways. It is an all the year around weapon against the foe, it is an educator, it is a propagandist—and also, it is a bond, a chain, which ties member to member, city to city, district to district. It is the DAILY WORKER that helps to centralize our party into the effective machine it should be.

We must keep the DAILY WORKER and make it safe for 1925. To do this we must give our dollars generously today. If we expect to win, then the DAILY WORKER must live and prosper. With the DAILY WORKER, forward to victory, or—nothing. It should be easy to choose.

INSURANCE POLICIES are in the hands of the branches. They are priced \$10, \$5 and \$1. The Central Executive Committee has decided that every member shall buy. Every member should buy no less than a \$5 POLICY.

And while the party seeths with discussion over our future policy and tasks, there is one Policy upon which there must be unanimous agreement. That is the POLICY to BUY A POLICY to INSURE THE DAILY WORKER FOR 1925.

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

William Z. Foster, Chairman,

C. E. Ruthenberg, Executive Secretary.

ILLINOIS EXPERIENCE SUBSTANTIATES THE MAJORITY POSITION

By ARNE SWABECK.

AT the height of our farmer-labor maneuvers, we organized the Illinois labor party. It was made to order like most of such parties were. Altho, even at a time when there was a movement making toward the formation of such party, the Illinois labor party never succeeded in rallying great masses of workers despite the sincere efforts for a united front displayed by our comrades. Nevertheless, it became recorded in our annals as another "conquest."

To our party the dangers were great in this experiment; the advantages were nil. Farmer-labor parties without mass support do not offer a field for maneuvering to broaden and deepen the struggles of the workers and our participation therein tends to seriously obscure the Communist aim in the class struggle, even from the view of our own comrades.

The Illinois labor party had to be extremely carefully nursed for fear that it would remain still-born. The provisional committee launched to form the party invited all labor and fraternal organizations of the state to participate. Some 3,000 local organizations were invited. About 30 local unions responded, of which 25 were of the United Mine Workers, some workmen's circle branches and other fraternal groups. With few exceptions the delegates who attended the Peoria convention, at which the party was formed, and who had also fought in their locals to put the response across, were either Workers Party members or close sympathizers. The fact that this convention was arranged simultaneously with, and in the same city as the convention of the United Mine Workers, District 12, helped to bring the delegates there. And naturally, great care had to be used to retain these few non-sympathizing elements, in order to maintain the farmer-labor appearance, which was destined to rally the masses.

Care became so much more necessary because immediately upon the issuance of the call for the formation of the party, it became branded by the reactionary trade union officials as another attempt to split the labor movement and to form another "branch of the Communist Party," and one Chicago carpenters' local union even withdrew its elected delegates. The situation was delicate. To really interest the delegates—exceptions as well as party members and sympathizers—and the unions which had responded to the necessity of the labor party it became necessary to attribute to it the qualities of fighting the battles of the workers and to make it appear the real leader in the class struggle. It was a natural opportunistic outcome of our general opportunistic method of applying the united front tactics in this movement.

We were faced with a practical problem. We attempted to form a state farmer-labor party and the outcome corresponded with the material conditions available. The program adopted, altho an improvement over the many which our party at the time was manufacturing wholesale, expressed not only the dangerous illusion of a parliamentary emancipation of the workers, but also the possibility of the farmer-labor party leading the struggle for emancipation.

One delegate at the convention made the statement in a committee that, in considering the program, one vital point was overlooked, namely, that of proposing an amendment to the United States constitution which would provide for the enactment of the laws demanded. Undoubtedly, this delegate, with many other workers, was led to believe helped along by our policies, that emancipation by way of parliamentary activities thru

a farmer-labor party was quite a simple matter.

Our immediate practical experience amounted to this. Our farmer-labor party united front was at its very best a parliamentary unity. The Illinois labor party was organized while the old farmer-labor party (Fitzpatrick group) was still in existence. There could be little difference between the two as long as the farmer-labor veneer had to be maintained. The rank and file workers could discern no difference, except that the Illinois labor party had been branded Communist and we appeared as the splitters of the labor movement who had to have our own little labor party the same as the Fitzpatrick group. The old farmer-labor party was discredited. The Illinois labor party never succeeded in rallying the masses of workers and farmers; it did not give our party connection with the wide masses. The only active section keeping the Illi-

OPPORTUNISTIC CONCEPTION OF POLITICAL ACTION

By JOHN WILLIAMSON.

WHERE are the minority members of the C. E. C. leading their followers with their confused theories? We find an illuminating example in the article of Comrade Karl Reeve, printed in the Dec. 4, issue of the DAILY WORKER. Let us quote a few of its gems:

"The C. E. C. majority statement would lead us to believe that we must have faith in the Workers Party only on the industrial field." And again:

"For the C. E. C. majority thesis . . . broaches no effort to win the leadership of these misguided workers and poor farmers thru the united front on the political field." And in conclusion:

"The majority emphasizes 'the united front from below.' We must have a united front to combat child labor exploitation, 'the Dawes' plan,' for nationalization of mines, etc., we must have a special C. E. C. sub-committee to restate the old ways and to ferret out new ways of applying the united front. But we must desert the united front on the political field."

The most illuminating thing about Reeve's article is his utter misconception of political action and what comprises political demands. We find him stating that attempts at forming the united front on such issues as "child labor, the Dawes' plan and the

nationalization of mines" is limiting our united front tactics only to the industrial field. Anyone with the slightest conception of Marxism or the elementary concepts of Communism knows that the greatest international political issue facing the world proletariat today is the attempt of American capitalism to enslave the German working class thru the Dawes' plan.

Need we go further to show the utter bankruptcy and misunderstanding of the minority thesis when such particularly obvious political issues as those the C. E. C. majority thesis puts forward as concrete issues upon which we can form the united front, are termed "deserting the united front on the political field"? The C. E. C. majority thesis states very definitely that our united front efforts must be from below and it does not behoove Comrade Reeve to sneer at this statement as this is the basis of the united front as expounded and understood by the Comintern. This is only another indication of the idea of the minority that the farmer-labor party slogan is the only form of the united front on the political field. This theory leads directly to a mere parliamentary conception of political action, a very opportunistic and dangerous tendency, that wants to limit our conception of political action to a farmer-labor party or such a slogan.

UP WITH COMMUNISM! DOWN WITH FARMER-LABORISM!

By J. B. WIRKKULA.

NEVER since I have been in the labor movement, which has since I was old enough to actively participate in it, have I been confronted with such a contrast as the present controversy in our party, or Communism vs. farmer-laborism. It is so ridiculous. I cannot fathom it in any other way than that in our party there exists a certain element which is utterly non-Communist. This is being demonstrated in the discussion.

Now, when we once have the Workers (Communist) Party, even to think of us advocating some liberal or any other party but our revolutionary party, is a step aside from the correct route—let alone to actively participate in such foolish "maneuvers."

I, as a rank-and-filer, look to any advocate of coalition government (a party is a basis for a government) as an utterly dangerous political opportunist for our party. I maintain that

there can exist only two kinds of governments and they are: a government based on proletarian dictatorship or a capitalist government based directly or indirectly on capitalist dictatorship. Mid-way governments are out of date. "Big biz" is too strong for them. We can't go back to '76, thus no midway government can serve the workers.

Should we, therefore, kid ourselves and the working class with some other form of working class rule than the dictatorship of the proletariat? I say: No! We must build up the Workers (Communist) Party to a Communist mass party by carrying on united front campaigns "from below," i. e., to secure influence and members from among the actual wage workers and poor farmers and not maneuvers "from the top" by trying to capture some political party from the hands of professional politicians. Such adventures are too hard on the poor workers' purses and we have very