



## The United Affront

==

*"Hans Breitman giv's a barty."  
Where is that barty now?*

I now admit and announce to the pop-eyed palpitating world that I'm dumber than I act and foolisher'n I look—I can't understand the Workers party. (Neither do I forstay other political parties or political revolutions). I cannot see why the Workers party press is "knocking" the Russian revolution that resulted in a change of bosses in that tormented country and at the same time knocking the tormented I. W. W. that is trying to do something for the working class in these tormented states of industrial slavery?

Fellow workers hand me their literature, in hopes that I may overcome my ignorance and be like the secondhand dealers and other petite buzz-saws—alas, all to no avail! My ignorance grows denser and denser, as I read their heartfelt apologies for capitalism: "That it is progress; (that puts progressives in jail) "That it has merit; "That it was bound to come in Russia"—as else where—like fleas to a dog. Zinovev discusses it in the "monthly," and "Zino" is the nozzle of the conduit of communist (?) rhetoric when Krassin or "Tchick" Cheering hasn't the floor. He lets out a wail, incidently, about former brave revolutionists, (that can be heard from Moscow to Hammond, Indiana) and explains—explains—as how those former revolutionists are now in reactionary camps but does not mention if, or why, they were kicked out—he merely, and in a most scholarly manner, points out where they landed and the shape they were in before and after. . . . "Struve," he moans, etc. (he reads the whole "backsliding" or catapulted roll call) without honoring the effect environment played upon the mental processes of those estimable gentlemen: denied a "team to drive" in the bureau-racy of the reborn political Russia.

I'm not belittling the Russian Rebellion, as I would call it, not being prepared, in view of the dearth of development, to dignify it with the name of revolution, in the higher sense; since, as they themselves say, "capitalism was inevitable"—hence, evolutionary; aided by an armed insurrection unhorsing Nick and mounting Lenin.

It was no inauguration of "new" in any sense worth going into hysterics over. It was the feudal Russia breaking its bonds, as Vic Hugo would say. It was Russia desperately trying to catch up with and embrace the "inevitable" want, torture and despair of capitalism, that we know so well. It was Russia trying to learn for herself the price of retarded progress, under capitalism.

I only hope—fervently hope—that Russia may not suffer long and as meekly as I . . . "What thou dost do quickly," since thou art "inevitable." Let not her agony be long.

. . .

I am enabled to understand Russia, not detracting from her new found misery nor overestimating the glory of her achievement. But the Workers party I cannot understand—it is so revolutionary. It admits itself and if it was more revolutionary it would mention it without further ado. It uses words that curdles the blood in the veins of rulers great and small the like of which has not been heard since stools and agent provocateurs quit paying dues in the I. W. W.

In conclusion: word comes direct from Moscow through Workers Monthly to the effect that "further wage-increases will now depend upon increased productivity" only it is said more politely—I cannot bring my pencil to observe all the niceties of revolutionary speech; it wants to put it more bluntly—speed-up. "Hurry up, Ivan."

Why is the Communist mouth piece exposing the shame of Russia so guilelessly? What is behind it? It gets 'em nothing.

Why have they tuned in with the master to "knock" the Industrial Workers of the WORLD—why?