

HAS THE FARMER-LABOR PARTY SWALLOWED JAY LOVESTONE?

By ANDREW OVERGAARD.

IT is significant to note that Comrade Lovestone in his last article in the discussion on the party theses, has made a new discovery, that the LaFollette swallowing has come to a standstill, and the supporters of the farmer-labor movement are again becoming visible. According to Comrade Lovestone, the farmer-labor party is reviving because certain fights took place between the labor fakery in the state of Minnesota. Let me call the attention of Comrade Lovestone to the news item that appeared in the DAILY WORKER on the same day that Comrade Lovestone's discovery appeared.

Our old friend, Robert Cramer, who was one of the farmer-laborites that we captured in our great campaign, made a motion to expell the Communists from the farmer-labor federation of Minnesota, which was carried by a vote of 25 to 11. Those 11 being either party members or sympathizers. According to all indications at this time, these elements have not only been swallowed by LaFollette, but have since the A. F. of L. convention been swallowed by the Gompers policy. This, I would call, a revival with a vengeance, and I would advise Comrade Lovestone to turn around in his chair in the research department once more and see facts as they are instead of using pure abstractions. It doesn't mean anything, as Goldberg would say.

Comrade Lovestone seems to be very much afraid of the idea that we shall rally the workers around the Workers Party in the immediate struggles, and draws the following conclusions—that therefore, the majority is against the united front. Comrade Lovestone does not seem to conceive of the idea that the united front can be established from below. His conception of the united front seems to be that of maneuvering in conferences regardless of the mass sentiment below. I am afraid that if we adopt the policy of the minority, that we shall have a greater number of disappointed Communists than we have already made thru that policy. Now let us ask you about the united front, and please let us know whether or not you have lost confidence in the ability of the Workers Party to rally the masses around itself in the immediate struggles, or must all these problems be taken care of by the farmer-labor party? Looking over the DAILY WORKER again, we find another story of Communist activity in Boston, where our comrades are leading the unemployed workers in demonstrations before the city council. Is that political action or not, Comrade Lovestone?

It is not necessary to mention other united front campaigns the party carried on under its own name. Must we, without masses moving in that direction, set up fake labor parties, based upon gymnastic organizations, literary clubs, self-advancement clubs and parlor Bolshevik associations—organizations that do not play any part in American politics—and that party, or abortion of a party, shall then take the lead in and take over the functions in the immediate struggles of the workers, while the Workers Party shall rest on the shelf and only come out at times shouting for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the

Soviet form of government? I think not, and I think Comrade Lovestone can find very few phrases that he can use in the words of Marx or Lenin for such a policy.

Comrade Lovestone uses the words "menshevist skepticism." Yes, Comrade Lovestone. Your argument smells badly of menshevism. Your skepticism of the Workers Party participating in the election campaign as Communists and not as farmer-laborites, is a bad menshevist disease. You seem to be disappointed in the fact that our party did not show a tremendous growth at once. You seem to be of the impression that, for instance, it is of no importance that the DAILY WORKER during this election campaign has increased its circulation by 5,000 new subscribers. Is it not of the utmost importance that the morale of our party members has been strengthened in this campaign? Is it not important that some of our branches that were beginning to die, have come to life again and are beginning to educate themselves in fundamental principles of Communism instead of farmer-laborism?

Perhaps your misunderstanding of the situation is due to the fact that you have not realized the necessity of studying the conditions among our membership, but have only taken a superficial view of the situation.

Comrade Lovestone, I would like to recommend to you that instead of basing your analysis on the basis of enthusiasm, you may be able to stir up in mass meetings composed of Workers Party members and sympathizers for the slogan "farmer-labor party," that you go to a union meeting, for example, in one of the most progressive ones at this time, and select two subjects.

For example, a united front with the Workers Party to organize a fight against injunctions, a united front to organize the unorganized, or suggest they participate in another farmer-labor convention. I'd like to see where you get the most enthusiasm. I am afraid they'll tell you that they have passed about 100 labor party resolutions and they are sick and tired of it at this time, but they would like to unite with the Workers Party to fight injunctions or against the unemployment, etc. Shall we then tell them that we can't fight injunctions because we have no farmer-labor party or shall we tell them that we have a Communist Party which is capable to fight their battles?

And then please, Comrades Ruthenberg and Lovestone, do not throw sectarianism against us. Communists who participate in the everyday struggle of the masses, who are leaders of strikes who are fighting against the bureaucracy in the trade unions will not so easily be let into sectarianism as those who shout from the national office dictaphones and hurl proclamations at the workers like Comrades Lovestone and Ruthenberg like to do.

The minority also tries the old stunt of theirs in accusing the majority of not trying to organize the F. F. L. P. altho Comrade Ruthenberg in the last convention explained the truth laid in between and this matter was refuted by the convention as being nothing short of an attempt of the then majority, now minority

to blame the Chicago district committee instead of blaming themselves.

Comrades Ruthenberg and Lovestone know well that the majority carried on a real fight for the policy that they were against from the beginning, it is darned poor tactics when a certain policy proves to be wrong that we attempt to turn around and hang somebody instead of criticizing the policy itself.

Comrades Lovestone and Ruthenberg and the rest of the farmer-laborites in our party would do well to again study the thesis of the Com-

munist International on the united front and also come down to earth and find out in actual contact with the workers what the real situation is and not because they like to maneuver around conference tables and speak in conventions, will we be able to rally the workers for struggle. Our duty as a Communist Party is to lead the masses in the everyday struggles against capitalism based upon the policy of the united front, if you please, Comrade Lovestone, and thru these struggles we shall become a real mass Communist Party.