

THE COMMUNIST

ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. II, No. 6

JUNE 1, 1920

PRICE 5 CENTS

Problems of The Third International

(RAMSEY MACDONALD ON THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL)

By N. LENIN

Number 5443 of the French Social-patriotic paper, "L'Humanité", of April 14, 1919, contains an editorial article from the pen of the well-known leader of the British so-called "Independent Labor Party" (but which in fact has always been an opportunistic party depending upon the bourgeoisie)—Ramsey MacDonald. This article is so typical of the position of those elements characterized as the "centre" and branded as such by the First Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, that we reproduce it in full, together with the editorial introduction of "L'Humanité".

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

By Ramsey MacDonald

Before the war, our friend Ramsey MacDonald was a popular leader of the Labor Party in the House of Commons. As a convinced Socialist and man of principle he deemed it his duty to condemn the war as imperialistic, contrary to those who greeted it as a righteous war. Therefore, after August 4th, he retired from the role of leader of the Labor Party, and, together with his comrades from the Independent Labor Party, together with Keir Hardie, whom we all venerated, and openly declared for war against war.

This required no little degree of heroism from day to day.

MacDonald, by his own example showed that courage, quoting Jaurès—"consists in not obeying the law of Triumphant Lie and not to act as the echo for the applause of fools and hisses of fanatics."

At the elections "by command" at the end of November MacDonald was defeated by Lloyd George. This need not disturb us—MacDonald will get his revenge, and that, in the very near future. (Editors of "L'Humanité")

* * *

The appearance of separatist tendencies in the national and international policies of Socialism was a misfortune for the whole Socialist movement.

There is nothing wrong, of course, with the fact that shades of opinions and differences in methods exists within Socialism. Our Socialism lies as yet totally in the experimental stage.

Its fundamental principles are established, but the method of their best application, the policies which will bring the triumph of the revolution, the organization of the Socialist State—all these are problems which require discussion and upon which the last word has not yet been said. Only intensive study of all these problems will lead us to the higher truths.

Extremes conflict with each other, and this conflict may assist in the strengthening of Socialist ideas, but the evil begins when everyone considers his opponent as a traitor, as a believer who has been excommunicated and in whose face the gates of the party's heaven should be closed.

When Socialists are permeated by the spirit of dogmatism, as in the early days of Christianity instigated civil war in the name of God and for the destruction of the Devil,—the bourgeoisie can sleep peacefully, because the cycle of its rule has not yet been completed, whatever big local and international successes reached by Socialism to the contrary notwithstanding.

Unfortunately, our movement at the present moment is faced with a new obstacle in its path. In Moscow has been established a new International.

Personally, this fact grieves me very deeply, for the Socialist-International at the present time is broad enough to admit of all shades of Social-

*Literally, they were called by soldiers who were ordered to vote for the government's candidate.

ist thought,—and in spite of all theoretical and practical disagreements created in it by Bolshevism, I don't see any reason why its Left Wing should have severed itself from the Centre and formed an independent group.

First of all it should be remembered that we are living as yet in the period of the birth of the revolution. The governmental forms which arose out of political and social devastation created by the war have not yet passed the test, and cannot be considered as finally established.

New brooms sweep wonderfully clean in the beginning, but how they will sweep in the end—there can be no assurance beforehand.

means sufficient to warrant a split within the International.

All Socialist Governments need the assistance and advice of the International. The International should follow their experiments with an attentive and critical eye.

I have just heard from a friend who recently saw Lenin, that nobody subjects the Soviet Government to freer criticism than Lenin himself.

* * *

If post-war disorders and revolutions do not justify a split, then is it perhaps that this split finds its justification in the position taken by some Socialist factions during the war? I confess frankly, that here may be found a sounder reason. But even assuming that there is some pretext for splitting the International, then, at any rate, the question at the Moscow Conference was handled improperly.

I am one of those who believe that debates at the Berne Conference on the question of responsibility for the war, were merely a concession to the public opinion of non-Socialist elements.

Not only was it impossible at the Berne Conference to pass a decision on that question which would have some historical value (though it might have some political value), but the question itself was not handled in the proper way.

Condemnation of the German Majority Socialists (condemnation which was fully deserved and to which I fully subscribe), could not be an expression of the causes of the war.

The Berne debates were not accompanied by the frank consideration of the position taken by other Socialists towards the war.

Those debates did not lay down any formula of conduct binding for the Socialists during war. All that has been said by the International up to that time consisted of, that when war takes on the character of national defense, the Socialists should co-operate with other parties.

Under such conditions whom can we condemn?

Some of us did not know that those decisions of the International had no real value and could not be applied as a practical guide.

We knew that the war should have ended in the victory of Imperialism and, being neither pacifist or anti-pacifist, in the ordinary meaning of the word, we adopted the policy, which, in our opinion, was the only one compatible with Internationalism. But the International never prescribed such a line of conduct to us.

This is the reason why at the moment the war began the International broke down. It lost its authority and didn't issue a single declaration, on the basis of which we would now have the right to condemn those, who were honestly carrying out the resolutions of the International Congresses.

In view of this it is necessary at present to insist upon the following point of view. Instead of splitting on account of differences about the events of the past, let us build a real active International which will help the Socialist movement during the period of revolution and construction which we may have entered.

It is necessary to restate our Socialist principles, if we cannot come to an agreement on the question of freedom and democracy, if our opinion on conditions under which the proletariat can take power into his own hands will be diametrically in opposition; if finally, it will be proved that the war has poisoned with the poison of Imperialism certain sections of the International, —then the split is possible.

But I don't believe such a misfortune will occur.

(Continued on page 7)

A G E N D A FOR THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

- I. **Reports:**
 - a) C. E. C. and National Secretary.
 - b) International Relations Committee.
 - c) Editorial Committee.
 - d) Defense Committee.
- II. **Current Fundamental Problems:**
 - a) Present world situation.
 - b) Present situation in the United States.
 - c) Soviet Russia.
 - d) Communist International and Party International Relations.
 - e) Our attitude towards Parliamentarianism.
 - f) Mass Action.
 - g) Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism.
 - h) Our Attitude towards Economic, Educational and other Legal Workers' Organizations.
 - i) Workers' Councils Before, During and After the Revolution.
- III. **Revision of the Program and Manifesto.**
- IV. **Organization Problems:**
 - a) Communist Party Centralization and Discipline.
 - b) Underground Organization and its forms.
 - c) Communist Party units and C. P. Shop Committees.
 - d) Functions of Language Federations in the Communist movement of America.
 - e) Propaganda, Agitation and Other Forms of Communism Education.
 - f) General Propaganda and Agitation.
 - g) Classes for Propagandists and Other Communist Study Classes.
 - h) Party Press and Literature.
 - 1) Policy.
 - 2) Party.
 - 3) Technical.
 - i) Communist Unity vs. "Centrist Unity."
 - j) Defense and Relief Work.
- V. **Revision of Constitution.**
- VI. **Resolutions.**
- VII. **Election of Party Officials.**

Russia is not Hungary, Hungary is not France and France is not England and therefore the one who introduces a split into the International taking as a guide the experience of only one nation, demonstrates a criminal narrow-mindedness.

What is the real worth of the experiences of Russia? Who can answer? The Allied Governments are afraid to give us the opportunity for procuring full information. But there are two things which we know.

First of all we know that the revolution was accomplished by the present Russian Government without any preconceived plan. It developed in connection with the trend of events. At the beginning of his fight with Kerensky, Lenin demanded the calling of the Constituent Assembly. Events brought him to the dismissal of this Assembly. When the Socialist Revolution flared up in Russia, nobody suspected that the Soviets would play such an important part in the Government as they did.

Later, Lenin, quite rightly, counseled not to slavishly imitate Russia, but to let the Hungarian Revolution develop freely, according to its own spirit.

The development and variation of those experiences which we are witnessing are by no

THE COMMUNIST

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF AMERICA
PUBLISHED BY

The Central Executive Committee

VOL. II. JUNE 1, 1920 No. 6

"CONTACT WITH THE MASSES"

We are not yet sure whether the confusion which exists on this question in the ranks of the leaders of the "minority" and the C. I. P. is deliberate or unconscious; perhaps, true to their Centrist character, it is a mixture of both. For, it seems that the syndicalists from those groups both agree in their confusion on this question, and in their attack upon the Communist position, as enunciated by the C. E. C. of the Communist Party of America. In the May 15th issue of the "Communist Labor," a particularly stupid article appeared which frankly taking the Centrist position, first attacked the S. P. position and then the C. I. P. ("majority") position. That it failed dismally in both its goals goes without saying. Perhaps that was why the "minority" theoretician came to the rescue in the latest number of the fake "Communist" issued by Damon & Co. in an editorial entitled "Lenin vs. the 'Majority' Group."

There is nothing like trotting out Lenin when you wish to prove yourself an honest-to-good Communist, or rather, when you wish to prove your opponent is not. With this in mind, their minds, Damon & Co. carefully search for some phrase or sentence of Lenin which, taken by itself, may tend to prove their point. They tried it in Mass Action, but it proved a boomerang; this time they try it in a sorry attempt to prove that "contact with the masses" at the expense of sacrificing Communist principles and policies is in line with the teachings of Lenin. When this fails, no doubt they will say to themselves that Lenin also agrees with them on "shop branches" or their attitude to syndicalist organizations like the I. W. W., which do not, as yet, accept the basic principles and policies of the Third International. Who knows? Centrists are a peculiar lot, leaning now to the Right and now to the Left, never long enough in one position to get an even tenor with either.

"Principles, to them, in any concrete situation, are either to be held in reserve or to be bartered for certain 'concessions.' Therefore the 'minority' take a purely 'barter and exchange' point of view with regard to Communist principles and tactics. In the Left Wing split last year with the S. P., their attitude was, sacrifice Communism for the moment, split with the S. P.; in the consequent split between the remnants of the Left Wing (C. I. P.) and the Communist Party, the 'minority' were and are willing yet to sacrifice principles in order to effect immediate 'fusion' in the present split between the 'majority' and the 'minority' of the C. E. C. of the C. P., they 'hold their principles in reserve,' but split on the principle of 'negotiations' refusing to obey a decision of the C. E. C.; because certain members of the 'majority' of the C. E. C. were "crooked," "self-seekers," "international politicians," etc., etc., ad nauseum. Principles only developed after they were smoked out of their hole. And as they are developing the cleavage becomes wider and wider.

In the present situation of theirs it is instructive to note the manner in which they distort the very basis of the discussion and then go on to prove that Lenin agrees with them. Incidentally, in order to prove that Lenin is diametrically opposed to the "majority" they necessarily distort the position of the latter.

The editorial in question nowhere holds that contact with the masses has to be spurned, as the "minority" phrase-mongers try to make out. On the contrary, it points out, sufficiently clear to anyone who has eyes to see and a mind to think with, that no contact with the masses is both undesirable and fatal to a Communist Party. We quote:

"The accessionists believe that subscribing to the three fundamental and basic policies of the Third International, namely—Proletarian Dictatorship, Mass Action and Soviet Power, is sufficient in itself upon which to build a Communist movement in this country. The next step in their opinion, is to procure 'contact with the masses'—to give the Communist Party a mass character—thus ate it up with the immediate and everyday struggles of the working class."

"With which we quite agree. The difference comes in when the problem is tackled, when the manner of adapting Communist tactics is applied to the given situation. No Communist is foolish enough to want to keep the party detached and isolated from the masses. That way lies stagnation and failure. The S. L. P. is a striking example of such decay. But, likewise, one must beware of the danger that lies in trying to come to the masses at a time when the masses are too stampy and inert, when the initial reaction to capitalist appearance are not receptive to the message of Communism. This is the very rock upon which the Second International was smashed to pieces. This is the lesson which the Third International has learned—and learned it guides its course away from this dangerous shoal."

The above is a real extract from the above editorial, not merely a sentence torn from its context which may be twisted this way and that by phrase-mongers and adventurers of the type of the Centralists of "minority" group."

Here we predicate the very "question" at issue between the "majority" and the "minority." Not "contact with the masses" is the issue, but the kind of contact—that is the issue. The "minority" by deliberately distorting the issue convict themselves of ignorance of international communism. How can there be any question of the desirability of getting contact with the masses? Why, the very organization of the Communist Party, its "illegal" character in the eyes of the law, its underground machine, is based upon contact with the masses. For the entire membership, with a few isolated exceptions, are workers, class-conscious workers, engaged in industry, and who carry Communist propaganda in the shops, factories and mines, to whom the masses belong. What can go to if not the masses? For whose consumption is it intended, if not the masses? Every act of a Communist Party is related up to the every day struggles of the masses."

Such a charge against the "minority" is the silliest kind of rot, intended to conceal or ob-

scure the real issue.

We repeat again, for the benefit of the Centrists, the only question at issue is the KIND OF CONTACT WITH THE MASSES. There we disagree and fundamentally.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party must remain silent on the question of "fostering systematically among the masses" the tactic of Mass Action and the "inevitability" of a violent revolution.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party should "unite" with the elements who are not able to accept the principles of the Third International but refuse to accept its policies; in other words, those who accept principles IN WORDS but reject them IN ACTION.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that "unity" and "large numbers" are necessary and essential in order to have "contact" with the masses."

We are opposed to that "contact" which is based upon fusion with elements who differ with us in principles and tactics.

We pointed out in our editorial in question that this cry of "contact with the masses" was just an American Centrist adaptation of the old social-patriotic cry of "we must not isolate ourselves from the masses." Every compromise, every betrayal perpetrated by the Second International was always justified on the ground that "we must not isolate ourselves from the masses." We pointed out the danger of such a policy in the Communist movement, and cited some European examples of to-day.

Needless to say the policy of our Centrists of the "minority" and the C. I. P. is instinct with compromise and opportunism, which will lead eventually to betrayal. They are not seeking "contact with the masses" in order to win them over to Communism. They are seeking "contact with the masses" in order to make Communism palatable to the masses,—to "sugar-coat" it; to make it palatable to the syndicalists, mensheviks and anarcho-mensheviks,—alike to those of them who are opposed to it consciously, as well as to those who do not understand it as yet, but who, if they did, would have nothing to do with it.

And like their prototypes of the Second International the "minority" are already justifying their present conduct and method of propaganda by claiming that they seek "contact" with the masses."

As if the C. E. C. does not! But the kind of contact the C. E. C. seeks is that based only upon uncompromising Communist principles and tactics. All other "contact," no matter how nicely it may be camouflaged carries the seeds of compromise, opportunism and betrayal with it.

POLITICAL ADVENTURERS AND CHARLATANS

As the split between the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party and the "minority" develops, more and more proof comes to hand that Damon & Co. are nothing but a set of political adventurers and charlatans—Centrist in character and tendency, and unprincipled in their actions.

One important fact comes to light through the printing of unity negotiations in the "Communist Worker" of May 15, which is typical of all of Damon & Co. actions throughout—both before and after the split.

On April 22, the "minority" sent a letter to the C. E. C. requesting the opening of unity negotiations, for the purpose of holding one convention of both factions. No mention was made of holding this convention together with the C. L. P. In fact, in this letter and the subsequent one on May 5 (both printed in the last issue of The Communist), there is only reference to "one party convention." Also, in verbal conversation with our Acting Secretary Bunte, Damon explicitly stated in effect, that for the present the C. L. P. Comrades' question, relative to the "three-cornered" convention, was settled.

That the above letters were merely so much dust thrown into the eyes of the membership is now definitely proven. They never intended to agree to one party convention—THEY DID NOT WANT TO COME TO ONE CONVENTION WITH THE C. E. C. On April 22, Damon & Co. sent simultaneously a letter to the C. L. P. also requesting the holding of a joint convention in which the inference is contained that the "minority" represents the whole party and that the C. E. C. no longer exists as an official body. To this letter the C. L. P. responded immediately, although two letters from the C. E. C. requesting information concerning the status of the negotiations were entirely ignored. What transpired afterwards between the "minority" and the C. L. P.: "Several meetings were held between representatives of the C. L. P. and representatives of the "minority" group as represented by . . . At these conferences agreement was reached not to proceed with the "minority" group of the C. E. C. those who attempted to continue their control in opposition to rank and file desires" (italics ours).

A more brazen piece of trickery could not be imagined on the part of so-called "Communists." This is the third dimension with a vengeance. Damon & Co. have evidently taken a leaf out of Soviet Russia—an olive branch in one hand and a dagger in the other. Obviously, the latter is aimed with the "minority," but we were never intended to be carried out.

Even assuming the possibility of a three-cornered convention from the "minority" point of view, the C. E. C. considers this absolutely impossible and impractical in view of the split in the Communist Party on principles, and the necessary identification of the party position both in the convention and in the membership after the convention—how could such a condition be met? It could be held when the "minority" and the C. L. P. WITH THE "MAJORITY" GROUP OF THE C. E. C.?

The only logical conclusion we can draw from this mess of chicanery, lies in and double-dealing from the C. I. P. to sell out the "minority" with the most elements led by Eugene V. Debs into a united Centrist Party of America. That is what we have to expect.

INTERNAL AND FOREIGN POLICIES OF ENGLAND*

By KARL RADEK

The English bourgeoisie is preparing for a campaign against the working class. The cleverest and most far-sighted bourgeois statesman of England—Lloyd George—understood that not by bribery and not by petty concessions would he be able to keep the workers from revolution, but that the bourgeoisie cannot agree to the workers' demands. He understood that any concession granted by the government to the working class at this stage of the movement becomes a starting-point not for sops of one kind or another but for the possession of the means of production. If men of the kind of Admiral Fisher, former Secretary of War, Lord Eiden, are still clinging to hold back the working masses with the assistance of Hendersons, MacDonalda, and other leaders of the opportunist Labor Party—Lloyd George obtained the power would find itself captive of these radical working class elements which would compel it to go further than it really wants, will some of the Liberals still carry the hope of holding the masses back by concessions—the great majority of the bourgeoisie is uniting under the banner of the most merciless resistance to the working class.

The barometer of English social life indicates storm. The magnates of industry are preparing to resist the workers' demands by lockouts, they are organizing White (technical) Guards for break-up strikes, for service in the necessary enterprises, and in case of great riots. This is openly spoken of in the leading bourgeois papers in London and in the industrial centers. Experts all this will lead to an open conflict after a series of economic conflicts beginning with a general strike which may take the form of a general battle between Capital and labor in England, or, at the critical moment of danger the tendency of concessions will once more bring the upper hand—the Labor Party will take again the helm of government in order to pacify the workers. Only to the extent that the masses leave the opportunist Labor Party will the issue come to great collisions between the two contending forces.

Which ever of these two possibilities we consider the more probable does not change the problem in substance. In any case the acuteness of class antagonisms in England has developed to such an extent that they speak of revolutions already.

That being the case, there arises before us the question of the significance of that turn in the foreign policy of England which manifests itself toward Soviet Russia. How can it be explained that at the very moment when the English bourgeoisie is preparing itself for the decisive struggle with her own working class she should be ready to compromise with the birth-place of "revolution"—with Soviet Russia? Is it not contradiction, shown in the statements of English peace talk? Is it not another instance of English perfidy? Concerning the question as to whether the capitalist government of England intends to conclude a permanent peace with us, there is no doubt that we have to deal with a maneuver—the English government is not preparing for peaceful relations with Russia. But when we come to the question, not of England's distant plan, but whether it wishes to live in peace with us during the present period of its policy—this question must be answered in the affirmative. There is no doubt that the English Government is trying to come to an agreement with the Soviet Government and to establish "peaceful" relations with it. This policy by no means contradicts the internal policy of England directed against her working class, but, on the contrary, is closely connected with it. During the split of England against Soviet Russia, between the parties of the October Revolution and the breaking up of German Imperialism, predominated the social aspect but the desire to crush a power in which English Imperialism saw a possible ally to German Imperialism. However absurd it should appear, there is no doubt that the English Government had seriously shared the fear of the advance of Russia by German capitalism, with the tacit or open connivance of the Soviet Government. The English bourgeoisie did not believe in the permanence of the Workers and Peasants' regime in Russia. Only when the victory over German Imperialism had freed English Imperialism from those fears, when the end of the war and the (Continued on page 8.)

* Italics are ours.—Compare this point of view with the similar point of view on the "capitalist peace" with Soviet Russia, expressed by the Amsterdam Bureau of the Third International in several of its statements reprinted in The Communist (see Note 4) and by Comrade Martens in his letter to Comrade Martens reprinted in this issue. Ed.

admission made by Eugene V. Debs in The Call of May 30, announcing his formal acceptance as presidential candidate on the S. P. ticket: "The extreme Communists denounce me as a traitor. That doesn't matter; I shall not deny them. I have telegrams from Ruthenberg, Ferguson and Wasserman telling me to refuse the nomination. Margaret Prewy was here last week. She did not tell me what to do, but advised me to do as my conscience dictates."

It would be interesting to know what these telegrams contained for one thing, and when and on whose authority they were sent out together on one thing, however, we are quite certain that this entire move was a concerted plan to win the Duba and with her the "left elements" of the S. P. to bolt and join the "traitor" party of the "minority" of the C. P. and the C. L. P.

Only when this move failed for the time being did the C. L. P. reluctantly plead with their membership "whose love for Debs overshadows their loyalty to Communist principles, to please leave the party or else fight it out." But we notice that "The Toller" official organ of the C. L. P. of Ohio (the home of the "central stamp") on May 14, is still in the C. L. P. though defying the pitiful sequel of their Central Executive body. Of course, we might suggest that the C. L. P. and the C. L. P. should rejoin because of its evident divergence in views with their membership (a course they themselves suggested when such a condition arises in a party). What that would be "rubbing salt into the wound" and so we refrain.

However, the circumstances decided to prove that it was the scheme in the minds of the "minority" and the C. L. P. and the actions the otherwise utterly incomprehensible of Damon & Co. in splitting away from the C. E. C. and the party just before a convention.

A Significant Letter

(THE LETTER OF S. J. RUTGERS TO L. MARTENS)

Attorney General Palmer, who, in his anxiety to become President of the United States, leaves no stone unturned, made public recently, a copy of a letter from S. J. Rutgers, a member of the Executive Committee of the Amsterdam Bureau of The Third—Communist—International to L. Martens, the head of the Russian Soviet Bureau in America. This copy came into his hands through some mysterious, police-prosecutor means.

In view of the fact that the contents of this letter ceased to be secret, having become immediately upon Palmer's announcement the property of the whole bourgeois press, the Communist deems it permissible and necessary to break the wall of silence on this question, strictly observed by it until now, and to bring this letter to the attention of the comrades. This is all the more necessary because some previous letters from Russia, dealing with the same question in a somewhat different light—more favorable to Comrade Martens—were rather willingly and quickly made public both by Comrade Martens himself and by other official and semi-official and entirely unofficial sources of the Soviet Bureau.

It is not altogether out of place to mention here that not only some letters defending the position of Comrade Martens, but the whole question in its entirety as to the disagreements between Comrade Martens and the revolutionary Socialist organizations in America, long ago, with the able assistance of Comrade Weinstein, became the property of the street. This question was treated and "commented" upon by everybody not only in the pages of the slanderous sheet "The Socialist" (an organ of Gerber, Waldman, Tuvin and Co.) and New York "Pravda" (Russian organ of Weinstein and Co.), but even in the pages of the bourgeois press and in various Government—Senate, Lusk and other committees.

Only the Communist, Noy Mir and other Communist organs consistently maintained silence, because their position on this question was such that they could not deal with this question openly in the only dignified way—on principle and not merely in slandering of personalities—without risking the accusation of "divulging secrets of the Soviet Bureau" or "carrying on counter-revolutionary propaganda..." Now that the question is no longer a secret further silence would have no justification whatever...

* For the present we will limit our article to the reprint of Comrade Rutgers' letter with the necessary comment.

This letter is all the more interesting because its author—a noted worker in the International Communist movement, a recent co-worker with Comrade Leon Trotsky in America and together with whom he founded the "Class Struggle," the first revolutionary Socialist magazine in English published in this country, and who later occupied a responsible position in Soviet Russia under the Soviet Government—not only knew Comrade Martens personally but was instrumental in his appointment as the head of the Bureau.

It is unnecessary to add that in this letter, Comrade Rutgers expresses not his personal opinion but the opinions prevalent in the official bodies of the Communist International; not only the official and responsible position of Comrade Rutgers in the Communist International but, as the reader will see further, a resolution on this and allied subjects passed at the recent conference of the Amsterdam Bureau supports this contention.

* * *

The following is the letter of Comrade Rutgers, as it appeared in the N. Y. World of April 15th (second morning edition).

The Letter of Comrade Rutgers.

"From your activities it was clearly demonstrated that you consider commercial representation and efforts for recognition paramount, Chicherin and other comrades agreed with this position. Although in nominating you, your capacity as engineer was not even mentioned or thought of. Your supposed clear conception of uncompromising Communist principles decided that you and not Weinstein was preferable.

"As far as commercial relations go, I had the good time of my life, when you started off rattling with millions and arousing some attention and some profit lust. As a beginning it was not a bad start but in my opinion you went much too far and were carried away by concentrating on the wrong side of the issue.

"Proposing commercial deals could very well have been left off until conditions could allow actual shipping. Such technicalities do not require much time. As a method to arouse interest in commercial centers, your very presence and some vague rumors about what is required and what can be given in exchange would have been enough; you could never expect to gain more or less detailed negotiations than even from a narrow point of view would arouse special individual interests instead of more general."

"Pressure From The Workers."

The efforts for recognition were of course more important and I understand that this is the crucial point for all your deeds. For I decidedly side with N. C. Hourwich; the main force in

recognition had to be the pressure from the workers.

"All your hope either on small bourgeois individuals or parties like the S. P., artistic and political pacifists and middlemen is not only unfounded but contrary to well-established tactics. You will reply that it was not at all impossible that United States should make peace for capitalistic reasons without any pressure from the workers, and you may even have felt that in a certain situation an (insufficient) pressure to force things was detrimental to a capitalist peace. This, however, I consider opportunism of the worst kind.

"In the first place it is childish to think that if world political considerations caused the United States to make 'peace' your efforts could be of any considerable influence. In such a situation your half-baked radicals would not need your help to support and glorify Wilson, and it would be your duty as I see it, not to canvas Senators, etc., but to mobilize whatever forces there are among the workers to influence the kind of 'peace' and still more to use the situation for strengthening the American movement, because even in such a case ('peace' for purely capitalist reasons) result of peace depends upon the force of Labor all over the world.

"'Peace' may even result in killing the revolution temporarily, if this is the signal for the world proletariat to stop whatever action is under way, for 'peace' means, of course, simply another form of fighting the Soviet Republic to the bitter end, with all crimes imaginable.

"All kinds of neutral diplomatic position looks to be an impossibility and a failure, although the appearance might have to be guarded for utilitarian reasons. But I understand that you did not stick to this position of neutrality and gave your sympathies decidedly more to the 'Centrists' with animosity toward the C. P. I will appreciate to learn more about the leading principles actuating you in these unfortunate conflicts with our most consequent comrades. Although your direct relation is with the Soviet Government, the matter involved no doubt touches the interests of the Communist International.

With best greetings and wishes, yours for the cause."

(Signature of Comrade Rutgers follows.)

The above letter is the final act in the conflict that has been brewing for a long time between Comrade Martens and the revolutionary organizations in America—a conflict which began from the first day of the appointment of Comrade Martens as Soviet representative and which during the early stages was confined to differences between Comrade Martens and Russian revolutionary Socialist organizations in this country and which later developed into a great struggle on principle of supreme importance. Into this struggle were gradually drawn all Left Wing Socialist and later Communist organizations of America; this was the very first source of disagreement and friction with the Left Wing of the American Socialist Party and indirectly, became one of the reasons of its splitting into Communist and "Centrist" camps.

The substance of the struggle^a on principle, which, during the whole year agitated the ranks of the Russian Communist Federations and the Communist Party of America is well-known to our comrades; it is a question of relations between the organs of proletarian dictatorship—Soviet Government institutions and the Communist International with its organs and branches in the various countries—the spiritual leader and inspirer of the revolutionary proletariat, and which first placed before them, as an **immediate practical slogan**, the very idea of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

What should be these relations? Comrade Rutgers in his letter says: "For I decidedly side with N. C. Hourwich..." Let us see how this point of view was formulated.

More than a year ago, during the first days after the appointment of Comrade Martens, before he even started his activities, when on the political horizon of the relations between him and local revolutionary Socialist organizations everything was peaceful and harmonious, and there were no indications of future storms. Nicolas Hourwich in an article in the N. Y. Communist, April 19th, 1919 (organ of the

^a This struggle is by no means a purely local product developing exclusively under American conditions and relations, as our slander specialists would like to represent it. That this struggle has a universal character, based upon principles,—whatever the external forms of its expression are—and that it found expression even in Soviet Russia itself—is evidenced in an article by V. Sorin entitled "Communist Party and Soviet Institutions," which first appeared in the Moscow "Communist" and later was reprinted in this country in the Noy Mir and in the Communist. We urge the comrades to reread this very instructive article in the light of this discussion.

Left Wing of the Socialist Party) entitled "Problems of the Representative of Soviet Russia in America"

wrote:

"Not for a single moment do we doubt the great importance of the purely 'diplomatic,' so to say, activity here of the Soviet representative. Still less are we inclined to doubt the magic power of the Russian gold—the influence of this gold on the minds and disposition of American plutocracy has already manifested itself in a most obvious manner. But, with all due allowances, giving due justice to all this, we should like to sound a warning to the American workers—and to Comrade Martens himself—against an undue exaggeration of the importance of his purely diplomatic-commercial functions here. We would consider it a fatal mistake if purely diplomatic-commercial 'efforts' become the centre of his activity."

And further: "Comrade Lenin has stated that the final triumph or the ruin of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia depends on WHETHER THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENTS OF THE PROLETARIAT AND PROLETARIAN REVOLUTIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES WILL COME TO ITS ASSISTANCE. And in this phrase one finds the KEY FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION!"

"Under present-day political conditions, the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all countries is the main thing, is the center of gravitation, is everything—both for proletarian Russia and for the emancipation of the proletariat of all the world. The success or failure of the proletarian movement, THE STRENGTH OF THE BOLSHEVIST MOVEMENT, in countries ruled by capitalism, is at the present moment a barometer of the 'favorable' or openly hostile attitude of capitalist government towards Soviet Russia.

The establishment of commercial intercourse between Russia and capitalist countries, with all its intrinsic advantage for the economic life of Russia, is on her side to a certain degree similar to the signing of the Brest Litovsk treaty, merely a means to 'gain time.'

"All the foregoing, in our opinion, tends to indicate a 'line of behaviour' for the revolutionary Socialist organizations of the American proletariat, as well as for Comrade Martens as the representative of the Russian Soviet Government.

"The center of his attention, the ever-constant 'compass' directing his activity here, should be the interests of the revolutionary Socialist movement among the American Proletariat, the interests of the advance-guard, the hope and guarantee of the success of that movement—THE LEFT WING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY.

"We are fully aware that in his manifold activities he may not always, or even frequently, be in a position to act UNDER THE BANNER of the Left Wing; but he should take great care that his attitude does not provide 'bait' for the Right and 'Moderate' social organizations, thereby unconsciously to 'stab in the back' the only bulwark and hope of proletarian Russia—those whom it invites to its International Communist Congress—the Left Socialist Wing."

Compare the above-quoted conclusions and recommendations with those formulated a year later in Comrade Rutgers' letter and note the striking similarity...

Comrade Sorin in his article in the Moscow "Communist" previously alluded to, draws the very same conclusions, from an analysis of the very same question in substance, though transplanted from a foreign to what would appear a more favorable soil, Russia itself. But Comrade Sorin formulates his conclusions even more sharply and definitely: "The party, which is comparatively safer from demoralization, should strengthen its control over the Soviet factions and place Soviet officials under its control and supervision... The Communist Party is, always and everywhere, superior to the Soviets..."

Such similarity in opinions and conclusions is not a mere coincidence. All these conclusions and opinions, expressed by different people at different times and different places were dictated, essentially, by Communist thought. On this question, this was the only possible Communist conclusion!.

A year ago the N. Y. Communist made a "diagnosis" of the situation and prescribed for the "patient," Comrade Martens, just what his political course should be and what "diet" he should follow. A year later, another "physician"—Comrade Rutgers—is compelled to call attention to a serious "disease" which had developed because the "patient" had not followed instructions and "diet" prescribed for him.

Had Comrade Martens followed the Communist advice given to him a year ago, had he guided himself in his activities first and foremost by the interest of the world Communist movement in its entirety,—he would have escaped those fatal mistakes and errors, those humiliations and compromises, which did not help him to accomplish even those very modest and limited aims which he had set out to accomplish, but which, on the contrary, greatly harmed the American Communist movement slinging into his ranks, and into the minds of its members, the greatest disorganization and demoralization. This is exactly what we predicted and we are sure, he is himself convinced of now.

We do not mean to say that if he had adopted the Communist method that his "immediate demands" would have been accomplished by this time. Oh, no! We are far removed from such an assumption. We do not doubt for a single instant that if his (Comrade Martens') activity had been more striking, aggressive (we do not speak of its revolutionary character) and more consistent, if at times,

(Continued on page 8.)

* And certainly to the Soviet Bureaus, we must also add.

International Supplement of THE COMMUNIST

Vol. II. Supplement to No. 6.

JUNE 1, 1920.

Greetings to Communists Abroad

A Letter From N. LENIN

News from abroad is scarce and scanty. The blockade by the wild beasts of Imperialism is strangling us, and all the forces of the most powerful nations of the world are used against us for the re-establishment of the exploiters. The fierce hatred which the capitalists of Russia and of the entire world feel towards the Soviet Republic is camouflaged by high-sounding phrases about the "real democracy."

The fraternity of exploiters is true to its own traditions; it represents bourgeois democracy to be the "democracy," and it includes all the Philistines, including Messrs. Adler, Kautzky, and the majority of the leaders of the "independent socialist-democratic party" of Germany, which is independent of the revolution of the proletariat, but dependent on petty bourgeois prejudices.

The success the news from abroad, the greater is our joy in Russia at the universal and gigantic successes of Communism among the workers of all lands, and at the severance by the masses of all ties with the treacherous leaders, who, from Scheidemann down to Kautzky, have gone over to the bourgeoisie.

All we know of the Italian Socialist Party is that the Congress has decided by an overwhelming majority to adhere to the Third International, and to adopt the program of the proletarian dictatorship. Thus, the Italian Socialist Party has actually become Communist, although, unfortunately, it has retained the old name. We send out a hearty welcome to the Italian workers and their party.

All we know of the German Socialists is that the Congress has decided by an overwhelming majority to adhere to the Third International, and to adopt the program of the proletarian dictatorship. Thus, the Italian Socialist Party has actually become Communist, although, unfortunately, it has retained the old name. We send out a hearty welcome to the Italian workers and their party.

All we know of the German Communists is that a number of them possess Communist newspapers, one of which is called "The Berlin Red Flag." The Berlin "Red Flag" has an illegal existence, and is having a heroic contest with the butchers Scheidemann and Noske, who are rendering flunkey service to the bourgeoisie by their acts, as do the independents by their words and by their propaganda of petty ideas.

We are full of admiration and enthusiasm for the heroic and noble work by the Berlin "Red Flag," which shows that there are honest and sincere Socialists in Germany who remain firm, and refuse to be cowed, in spite of persecution and the foul murder of their best leaders. Communist workers in Germany are carrying on a heroic struggle worthy to be called really "revolutionary." At last the German proletariat has given birth to forces to whom the words "proletarian revolution" have become a reality.

We send our greetings to the German Communists!

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkys, the Renners and Friedrich Adlers, have shown themselves base traitors and betrayers of Socialism, and partisans of the bourgeoisie. They all signed the Basel manifesto in 1912 on the impending Imperialist war. They all talked then of the "proletarian revolution" and proposed to be the leaders of young but small-bourgeois democratic knights of bourgeois-republican and bourgeoisie-democratic illusions and helpers of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

The fierce persecution of the German Communists has made them more determined. If, at the present time, they are to a certain extent disunited, this only bears witness to the broadness and the mass character of their movement, and to the growth of Communism in the very heart of the working class. The struggle is inevitable in a movement which is being so fiercely persecuted by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and its lackeys, Scheidemann-Noske, and which is compelled to organize "illegally."

It is also only natural that a movement which is growing so rapidly in the midst of persecution should engender sharp dissensions. There is nothing alarming in this; those are only growing pains.

Let the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys express malignant joy in the "Vorwärts" and the "Freiheit" at dissensions among the Communists. These heroes of a decomposing small bourgeoisie are ready to cover up their own rottenness by sneers at the Communists, and the delineated by Lenin refuse to recognize the real truth about the situation in Germany, which is the shameful betrayal of the proletarian revolution by the Scheidemanns and Kautzkys, who have sided with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

Heinrich Laufenberg, in his admirable pamphlet "Between the First and Second Revolution," has proved and substantiated this fact with remarkable clearness of judgement. Dissensions amongst the leaders Scheidemann and Kautzky are the dissensions of decomposing and dying parties which possess leaders without followers, generals without armies.

The masses are leaving the Scheidemanns, and are going over to the Kautzkys, because of the Left wing of the latter. This is evident from the perusal of any report of the mass meeting. The Left wing combines the unimaginative, cowardly old prejudices of the small, paltry, petty bourgeoisie with the revolutionary, uncompromising, uncompromising recognition of the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the Soviet Power.

It is only under the pressure of the masses that the worthless leaders of the "Independents" pay lip service to all this, for in reality they remain small-bourgeois democrats of the type of Louis Blanc and other foolish persons of 1848, whom Marx so mercilessly branded and ridiculed.

All these dissensions are quite irreconcilable. There can be no peace between proletarian revolutionaries and the small bourgeoisie, which like its proto-type of 1918, worships bourgeois democracy, oblivious of the latter's bourgeois character. These two cannot work together. Haase and Kautzky, Friedrich Adler and Otto Bauer, may turn and turn they may fill reams of paper and discourse to end of speeches, but the fact remains that, in reality, they are irreconcilable. Understanding the dictatorship of proletariat and the Soviet Power, and understanding the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the small-bourgeois democrats, "Socialists" à la Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollin. In fact they are, in the best case, tools in the hand of the bourgeoisie, and in the worst—its conscious lackeys.

The "Independents," the followers of Kautzky and the Austrian Social-Democrats, at a seemingly united party, but in reality large proportion of the members are sincere with the leaders on everything which is essential. The communists will engage in the proletarian revolutionary struggle for Soviet power as soon as a new crisis arises, but the leaders will remain then, as now, counter-revolutionaries. Verbally, it is not difficult to sit between two stools, and Hilferding in Germany, and Friedrich Adler in Austria, are proving themselves past masters in this art.

However, in the thick of the revolutionary struggle, when it comes to reconcile the irreconcilable, will be like so many soap-bubbles. The "Socialist" heroes of 1848 proved themselves to be such, and the same may be said of their brothers—the Mensheviks and social-revolutionaries in Russia in 1917-19, and of the Knights of the Berne yellow Second International.

The dissensions of the Communists are of a different nature, and it is only the wantonly blind who ignore this fundamental difference. Those are the dissensions of those, the representatives of a mass movement of a惊人的 quick growth. Those are dissensions which have a common, solid, fundamental basis: the recognition of the proletarian dictatorship and Soviet power.

On such a basis dissensions have no terror; they are growing pains and not senile decay. Bolshevism has also experienced dissensions of this kind and split the Party on account of them, but when the decisive moment came for the conquest of power and the establishment of a Soviet republic, Bolshevism became united. It attracted all the best elements of Socialist thought, nearest to it in conception, and gathered around itself the entire vanguard of the proletariat and a gigantic majority of the workers.

The same thing will happen to the German Communists.

(From "Workers' Drednought.")

(To be continued.)

Greetings to American Communists

FROM THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST

Amsterdam, March 20th.

Comrades:

We have learned with utmost indignation how ruthlessly the ruling class of America is persecuting you. The brutality with which it strikes at the best workers for the cause, flogs and tortures, imprisons and deports hundreds of brave men and women, fills our hearts with the same bitter feeling of being powerless to assist you against your cruel oppressors, as we so often experienced when, in former days, the sad stories reached us of the suffering of the Russian revolutionaries.

But at the same time, the heroic way in which you are bearing up under the blow, fills us with admiration and with confidence in the future of the American working class. We know you are as yet only a vanguard; we know how American capitalism, by combining the brutality of the former Russian autocracy with the hypocrisy that is the proper gift of the Anglo-Saxon bourgeoisie, has succeeded till now in misleading the masses of the workers.

But we also know that persecutions have always been in the great epochs of the proletarian class-struggle "the seed of the church." So it was with Chartism, so after the promulgation of the anti-socialist law in Germany under the rule of Bismarck; so in Russia after the terrible reaction of the years 1907-1910. Socialism always arose triumphant out of all persecutions. And so will Communism in our own days. Far from striking fear in the hearts of the fighters pledged to the revolution, the White Terror in America will arouse in thousands of workers a new consciousness of the realities of the class war, and the true nature of bourgeois democracy. It will turn the thoughts of thousands and thousands to the principles of Communism and make them realize that there is neither freedom, nor justice, nor any hope of a better life for the masses as

long as the capitalist class owns and controls the machinery of production.

The Social Revolution is making great strides in Europe; the light that has arisen in Russia floods the West; the ideas of the mass-struggle, the Soviet-system, and the dictatorship of the proletariat as means of realizing the reorganization of production on Communist lines gain daily in strength and sweep onward like an irresistible flood. In the whole of Central Europe capitalism is waiting for its deathblow; in the Latin countries—France, Italy and Spain—it is considerably weakened, being undermined by economical and political difficulties. Till now Anglo-American Capitalism stands almost unshaken, powerful and strong. Great Britain still relies on her colonial empire; she hopes to be able to avert the revolution by affording to the masses some slight betterment of their lot by lightening their chains a little through the exploitation of hundreds of millions of their brethren of the colored races. Well, we think these hopes will soon be disappointed. Revolt already raises its head in Egypt and in the Indies. As for the United States, the employing classes hope to retain their power by widening the chasm between a small aristocracy of labor, led by treacherous leaders, and the masses of the workers. They hope to retain it by fooling and byying the minority, by coercing and victimizing the vanguard of the masses.

It is the glorious task of the American Communists to carry on, on broader lines the task that the I. W. W. first took in hand, to lead the masses to the assault of capitalism; to become the nucleus, the heart and the brain, of a strong and determined working-class movement.

The arising of such a movement is of the utmost importance for International Communism and for the cause of the Social Revolution. We all know that the world revolution cannot triumph,

as long as Anglo-American capitalism remains in power, and we have reason to believe that the decisive struggle between capitalism and Communism will be waged on the American continent. Nothing short of the fall of American capitalism will mean the end of that gigantic historical drama of which the world war seems to have been the prologue. The ruling classes of America know this, and that is why they crush Communism before it has deeply struck root into the American soil. But you, comrades, will not let them commit this crime; you will not let them destroy your organization or compel you to desert it; you will find ways and means to shift your methods of action, you will place your organization beyond the reach of your enemies and carry on, undaunted, the agitation amongst the masses. You will rally these to the flag of Communism, that is of world-wide, uncompromising class-war. And when the economic crisis that is spreading over the world, reaches your country—when the revolutionary storm kept back neither by mountain ranges nor broad oceans, rages over the American continent—when millions of starving workers no longer, like in former times, cry out for bread, but fight for power, then you will lead the way to the general attack on the capitalist system. Your persecutions, your martyrdom to-day, your heroic struggle against fearful odds, all of this will design you for leaders of the masses just as the fortitude and determination of the Russian Bolsheviks designed them to take the lead in the revolutionary struggle of 1917.

Yours for the International Revolution

The Executive Committee of the Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of the Communist International,

D. J. Wynkoop.

S. J. Rutgers.

Henriette Roland Holst.

GREETINGS TO THE HUNGARIAN WORKERS

By N. LENIN

Comrades,

The tidings which we are receiving from the Hungarian Soviet workers fill us with joy and enthusiasm.

The Soviet power in Hungary is in existence for only a little over two months and it seems that the Hungarian proletariat has already surpassed us in organization. This is comprehensible because the general cultural standard of the population is higher in Hungary (the percentage of the industrial proletariat to the whole population is about 40 per cent. Russia—three millions in Budapest to eight millions of the whole population in present Hungary), and, finally, the transition to the Soviet order, to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat was, in Hungary, far easier and more peaceful.

This last circumstance is especially important. The majority of the Socialist leaders in Europe of the social-chauvinist and Kautskian schools are so sunk in the mud of philistine superstition, pure and simple, brought on by tens of years of comparatively "peaceful" capitalism, and of bourgeois parliamentarianism that they cannot conceive of the Soviet power and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The proletariat cannot accomplish its world-historical liberating mission without removing these leaders from its path without pushing them completely aside. These leaders did not live entirely or in part the bourgeoisie lies about the Soviet power in Russia, and could not differentiate between the nature of the new, proletarian democracy, the democracy of the workers, the Socialist democracy, incarnate in the Soviet power, and bourgeois democracy before which they servilely bend the knee, and their "pure democracy" or "democracy in the abstract."

These blind ones, stuffed up with bourgeois superstitions, cannot conceive of the universal historical turn from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. They lead us, either another of the peculiarities of the Russian Soviet power of Russian history and its development with Soviet power in its International aspect.

The Hungarian proletarian revolution helps even the blind to recover their sight. The form of the transition to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Hungary is far from being the same as in Russia, namely, the voluntary resignation of the bourgeois government, the momentary restoration of the unity of the working class, the unity of Socialism on a Communist program. The essential point of Soviet power appears now as follows: the working class is the only possible now anywhere in the world—except Soviet power supported by the working masses with the proletariat at their head—except the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

This dictatorship presupposes the application of force, of a severe, swift and resolute to suppress the resistance of the exploiters—the capitalists and landowners and their henchmen. He who does not understand this is not a revolutionist and should be removed from the post of leader and counselor of the proletariat.

For violence alone is not the essence of proletarian dictatorship nor is it mainly violence. Its main function consists in the organization and discipline of the proletariat, the vanguard of the working masses, its only vanguard and leader. Its aim is to create Socialism, to destroy the division of society into classes, to make workers of all the members of society. It must do away with the possibility of the exploitation of man by man. This aim cannot be accomplished at once, it requires a pretty long transition period between capitalism and Socialism—and for that reason the reorganization of production is difficult task; for that reason there is required fundamental changes in all branches of life; for that reason the tremendous force of habit to petty-bourgeois and bourgeois management can only be overcome by a long stubborn struggle. That is why Marx always talked about the whole period of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as a period of transition from capitalism to Socialism.

During this transition period resistance to the revolution develops not only from the capitalists but also from their numerous retainers and sycophants among the bourgeois intellectuals who remain conservative, and a large mass of workers too much stupefied with petty-bourgeois habits and traditions (including the peasants) who, very often resist unconsciously. Fluctuations in these spheres are unavoidable. It draws the reactionaries to toller, to Socialism, and he prefers the dictatorship of the workers to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The peasant, who is a seller of bread, sides with the bourgeoisie, with freedom to trade, which means—back to the "traditional," "ancient," good old capitalism.

It is necessary to have dictatorship of the proletariat, the dominance of one class, the predominance of its organization and discipline, its centralized power, based upon the conquest of culture, of science, of the technique of capitalism, of the productive forces, of the psychology of every worker. Its authority over the bourgeoisie is less developed, less-versed in politics, torn in the village or in small industry—it requires all this in order that the proletariat should be able to beat the peasants and all the petty-bourgeois elements in general. At this point we shall have all sorts of phrase-mongering about "democracy" in general, about "unity" or about "units of the working class," about "democracy," about "equality" of all those who toil, and so on—all the phrase-mongering to which the philistine social-chauvinists and Kautskians are inclined—but phrase-mongering will not help.

This babbling only serves to throw dust into the eyes, dulls the consciousness, fortifies the old stupidities, inertia and routine of capitalism, parliamentarianism and bourgeois democracy.

The destruction of class struggle—a matter of long, difficult and tenacious class struggle which—after the overthrow of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat—does not disappear (as they think in the old Socialism and the old social-democracy believe), but only changes its forms, becoming in many respects more obdurate.

Only by way of class struggle against the bourgeoisie, against the inertia, the routine and indecisiveness of the petty-bourgeoisie—can the proletariat defend its power, strengthen its organization, achieve the "neutralization" of those elements which are trying to break with the bourgeoisie and are following, reluctantly, the proletariat, strengthen the new discipline, especially the discipline of the working class, their iron bond with the proletariat, their concentration around the proletariat, their discipline, the new foundation of the social bond in place of the chattel discipline of the middle ages. In place of the discipline of hunger, the discipline of the "free" wage-slavery of capitalism.

Political Parties in Great Britain

REPORT TO THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BRANCH OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Political assimilation is proceeding in Britain with a rapidity most remarkable in view of the vast amount of machinery through which energy can be dissipated and crises forestalled. Social patriotism reached its climax during 1916. It had swamped almost every section of society. Even a large proportion of those who had been professionally pacifist and anti-war were now social patriots.

The class war was forgotten by the working class except by those to whom we shall refer later.

The political thought of the country was reflected by the following parties:

Tories or Conservatives—Tory Party, Liberalism—Liberal Party, Labor-Labor Party (Trade Union Fabians, I. L. P., B. S. P., Co-Operative Society).

Labor—outside the Labor Party: Socialist Labor Party, South Wales Socialists, Workers Soc. Fed., Socialization Socialist Party G. B., Anarchist groups, Guild Socialist groups.

The two parties, Tory and Liberal, reflect respectively the landed, financial and manufacturing interests. Labor and Socialist Parties reflect proletarian interest, both agrarian and industrial. The Labor Party is yet young, the 1918 elections having marked its definite advent into British politics and indicated the proletarian drift away from the Tory and Liberal parties, the latter having prided itself for many years for its capacity to express the interests of the workers as well as the capitalists. It is a peculiar conglomeration of persons and interests and parties which has led to much confusion in estimating its capacity to express proletarian interests.

It is necessary to gather together again the elements which could lay claim to be focussing the workers' interests in order to express them in united form. Its organization was loose of necessity and its platform equally indefinite. Hence in actual experience it dominated by the heaviest forces within it, the trade unions. Most of the organized trade unions affiliated and put forward candidates at elections under the Labor Party banner. It has thus in spite of what may be termed the more radical elements within it, become the political reflex of trade unionism. The intense development of the last few years has compelled it to shape a policy and program which now overshadows all the other minor political party elements such as the I. L. P. and S. P. C. A.

Its program is essentially a reformist program, aiming at state control under capitalism, the development of the political democracy of capitalism and the industrial democracy of joint control by workers and capitalists. It supports the League of Nations and is affiliated with the Second International. It gives lip service to the abolition of capitalism, to the nationalization of the capitalist industries, to the right to work, to the right to strike, to the right to organize, to the right to self-government, to the right to receive from the capitalist class what they have earned. It is affiliated to the Socialist International. As it grew in strength trade union leaders such as Hendson, Clynes, Thomas take their place. These are the sons of patriots of the deepest dye.

The party's original program, originally retained actually steadily disappears and leaves the Socialist elements to function as protest voices.

It has not become a party with machinery equal to the traditional party machinery of Liberalism and as it is informed by the middle class elements of the Liberal Party the voice of revolt within it is not very strong. It strengthens the hands of reactionaries who lead the party in the movement of the middle class elements referred to and the adjustment of the Labor Party machinery to accommodate bourgeois and labor driving them from the coalition. The principal parties which was formed for the conduct of the war.

In that coalition Liberalism was lost by the centralizing and oligarchical control demanded by the war. After the climax of nationalism of social patriotism had been reached in 1916, labor began to assert itself and as the class conflict became more manifest in the internal affairs of the nation the coalition was compelled to move away from the coalition. It moved away with a clear class-conscious purpose, but under pressure with all the petty bourgeois thoughts of traditional trade unionism. Hence Liberalism having been completely overwhelmed by the war, the Labor Party appears to be the only refuge of the lower middle class. The cessation of hostilities with the Central Powers and

In order to abolish classes—a period of the dictatorship of one class is necessary, precisely one of the oppressed classes which is able not only to overthrow the exploiters, not only to smash their resistance, but also—to free themselves mainly from all the bourgeois-democratic ideology, from all the phrase-mongering about liberty and equality in the abstract. (In fact, as Marx has shown, this phrase-mongering dominates the "liberty and equality" of the ownership of commodities, not the "liberty and equality" of the capitalist and the worker.)

What is more, only the class of the oppressed classes is able to destroy class, only its dictatorships which is trained, united, hardened by tens of years of strike and political struggle with capital—and that class which has mastered all the urban industrial and big-capitalistic culture—which has the revolutionary and ability to defend popularize them with all the people, to conquer, with the only that class which will be able to withstand all those hardships, reverses, pitfalls, placed by history on the shoulders of those who break forever with the past, to break with those qualities which are most full of hatred and contempt for all the petty bourgeois and philistine bourgeois clerks and "intellectuals"—only that class which has "passed the hardening school of labor" can impress respect for its ability to work upon every toiler, upon every honest Comrades, Hungarian workers, you gave the world a better example than Soviet Russia in Socialism on a platform of real proletarian dictatorship. Ahead of you is the severest task of all—to defend it in a terrific war against the Allies.

Be firm! If wavering will appear among the Socialists who have previously joined with the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, or among your petty-bourgeois—suppress these wavering ones pitilessly. To be shot—is the fate of the coward in war.

You are leading the only legitimate, just, real, revolutionary war—the war of the oppressed against the oppressors, the war of the workers against the exploiters, a war for the victory of Socialism. All over the world, everyone that is left in the working class is on your side. Every month brings the universal proletarian revolution nearer.

Be firm! The victory will be yours!

the demand of economic readjustments, is driving the big interests to care for a further continuation of the war, and the petty and free trade interests for the revival of liberalism.

The shadow of the revolution has been thrown across their paths and all of them are calling for salvation.

Meanwhile the same intensification of the class struggle has had its effects upon other parties. The I. L. P., the I. S. P. of Socialist parties, were largely pacifist sentiment. Its lack of clarity in the revolutionary economics led it to social patriotism in practice. Traditionally reformist in character its leaders are strenuously endeavouring to lead it in the direction of the Labor Party and the increasing intensity of the class conflict and the lessons of the revolution in Europe are driving it rank and file towards the Third International. In this there is great danger of an organized body accepting new principles whilst their leaders think in terms of the old.

The B. S. P., much less of an organization, the lineage descendant of the D. F. P. has also undergone a variety of changes, even though it clings to the Labor Party. The first effects of the war was to create split between the social patriots, Hyndman and Co., and the anti-war elements.

Its next important change occurs subsequent to the Russian revolution. Up to this time it had carried with it the traditions of parliamentarianism from the S. D. F. and organized unionism. Its opposition to the latter being not so much as it possessed an alternative theory of organization as opposition to the idea of building organizations external to the trade unions. Its national conference of 1918 showed a greater sympathy to Industrial Unionism, whilst the national conference move towards the Third International led to the resignation of two of its leaders and it stands much clearer towards a revolutionary policy both in personnel and tactics than at any time in its history. Its membership is estimated to be about 600.

Turning to the parties external to the L. P. the most important is undoubtedly the S. L. P.

Formed in 1903 it has steadily and persistently focussed the class struggle, revolutionary parliamentarianism and industrial unionism, following on the lines of De Leon. American Socialists never been in a leadership but its influence has been felt in every Socialist party in the country. It has an apex from which has emanated much good work. Vigorous and uncompromising, a pioneer of revolutionary educational classes, its lecturers and literature have penetrated I. L. P. and B. S. P. alike. It had least to adjust when actual revolution compelled all parties to review their policy and program. Even prior to the great events of 1917 a movement had made itself manifest within the party for a new orientation of the party's policy suitable to the conditions of Britain. It ran candidates in the 1918 elections on a Soviet program. It is affiliated to the Third International. Its membership will be about 600 and its principal center is Glasgow.

The Workers Socialist Federation is of recent growth out of the Women's Suffrage movement. It is now definitely pro-parliamentarian and pro-socialist, the pro-socialist dictators, and the Soviets, the only means of achieving the triumph of the working class. It is also affiliated to the Third International. Its activities are principally in London.

The South Wales Socialist Society is a small party akin to the W. S. F. and accepts the same principles and policy.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain is an insignificant group noted for their anti-industrial policy and being the only true interpreters of Marx. There are a number of anarchist groups doing much active propaganda work in sympathy with the Russian Revolution although their numbers are not large.

The Guild Socialist Groups are also doing much propaganda for industrial unionism, whilst their theoretical particularism relation to the State is receiving much sympathetic attention by the I. L. P. Much of the organization is numerated with the exception of the S. W. S. S. have their own paper. The I. L. P.—"The Labor Leader," the B. S. P.—"The Call," the S. L. P.—"The Socialist," the Workers Socialist Federation—"The Workers Dreadnaught," the S. P. of Gr. B.—"The Socialist Standard," the Guild Socialist—"The Guildsman."

Since the beginning of 1919 there have been efforts to fuse a number of these parties together into a Communist Party.

In February of March the I. L. P., B. S. P. and S. L. P. met in conference to discuss unity. On this occasion the S. L. P. alone stood on the basis of the Third International. The Conference proved advisory, the S. P. delegation agreeing with the S. L. P. who said no reason to depart from the policy they had pursued up to that time.

Later the S. L. P., B. S. P., W. S. F. and S. W. S. met in conference several times and have arrived at an agreement to the Third International, dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviets. But despite of parliamentarianism and affiliation to the Labor Party.

The W. S. F. and S. W. S. are against parliamentarianism and affiliation to the L. P. The S. L. P. is for revolutionary parliamentarianism but against the L. P. The B. S. P. is in agreement with the S. L. P. on parliamentarianism but for affiliation to the L. P.

A recommendation from a recent unity conference to the effect that there should be a Communist Party formed on the basis of things agreed upon and the points of difference on the L. P. be submitted to a ballot three months after the party has been formed, has resulted in the S. L. P. refusing to accept the proposition of a vote on affiliation to the L. P. and after the three months referred to the B. S. P. remains not yet declared though it is anticipated the party will vote yes.

Without the S. L. P. agree to fusion the W. S. F. and S. W. S. will certainly not join the B. S. P. The B. S. P. apparently will now have to choose between unity and affiliation to the L. P.

The intensification of the conflict and the extended propaganda following the Russian Revolution has had its effect on the L. P. Quite aside of its official declaration at the Scottish Conference of January 1920 declared in favor of the Third International, it is doubtful whether this will be ratified by the annual conference of the party. It may be that a move will be made away from the Second International and encouragement given to the Longuet policy.

Summing up the position therefore we find the class demonstration line becoming more clearly defined in politics as in industry even though clothed in social patriotic the British Labor Party is becoming overwhelmed by the trade-unions and the machinery the Socialist parties into the background, while the Socialist parties move steadily towards the revolutionary left. This movement with and really reflects the same tendencies in industry.

(Continued on page 4)

PEACE WITH RUSSIA

MAY 1st PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF
THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

STRIKE ON MAY DAY 1920!

Peace with Russia? What does it mean? Is there such a thing as peace between a Soviet Republic and a Capitalist Government?

No! a real peace is impossible under capitalism.

A real peace for Russia means the victory of the world revolution and nothing else.

Therefore, revolutionary action of the Workers to force peace has to be a struggle to develop power to such a degree, that World Capitalism will be prevented from making war upon Russia in one form or another.

First, open warfare must be stopped, by refusing not only to fight, but also to make or transport arms, munitions, equipment, etc., for those who might use them to fight Soviet Russia.

Second, the Workers must prevent and counteract all machination, plotting and underground action against the proletarian cause or exposing those responsible for it, by preventing money to be expended in such work and by **not believing any of the lies in the capitalist press.** This latter is very important. If we pledge ourselves not to believe any capitalist statement with regard to Soviet Russia, any report about alleged barbarities, any so-called facts about internal troubles and chaos or external policy of conquest, etc., we are not likely to be fooled again just as most of us were fooled in 1914.

Third, to strive in other countries towards Soviet Republics as the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This inspiring aim we must always bear in mind, in all our deeds, all our actions. We must fill our minds with revolutionary thoughts—we must dare to hope in the midst of our misery—we must understand more and more that the downfall of Capitalism is in full process, we must be willing to destroy the weapons of our enemies, we must have confidence in our constructive power. All this we can achieve in a constant fight with our exploiters by giving this fight a general revolutionary character. It means a complete break with bourgeois civilization, bourgeois morals, bourgeois supremacy—it means LABOR AS THE BASIC PRINCIPLE OF SOCIAL AND MORAL LIFE.

What about the peace proposals of the enemies of Labor?

They have become methods to destroy Soviet Russia from within and may be supplemented at any time by methods from without. If the workers should weaken for a moment, Russia is willing to accept such a peace, knowing full well what it means. But they need railway material and machines so badly that are willing to take a chance upon the Russian Republic. They are willing to plot and murder, confident that the workers in Western Europe will draw power from a closer contact with the Russian Revolution, confident that capitalism will break down before it can strengthen itself from the treasures of the Russian soil.

Russia might feed Europe, might supply it with the most valuable raw materials and it will, no doubt, give some immediate relief to the exhausted nations of Central Europe. But from the point of view of the workers, Russia is in the direct interests of the workers. But if a capitalist peace with Soviet Russia really meant the recuperation of capitalism throughout Europe, this would be detrimental to the interests both of Soviet Russia and the World Revolution. We are confident that the relief will be of such a character that it will not give capitalism a new chance for temporary recovery and preparations for the next world war, that it will be of such a character that it is our duty, not only salvation to back up Russia by our action, to such an extent, that it can secure a peace that will strengthen the first proletarian state more than it will her enemies.

If a new attack is forthcoming, we have to fight this new crime; if peace is on the way we have to fight even harder, for the results will depend upon the kind of peace and the willingness of the workers to use this temporary truce for their own revolutionary purposes. And remember well: What is true for Russia, to-day, may become true for Soviet Germany or any other Soviet Republic tomorrow.

Therefore, under all circumstances, the action to support Soviet Russia must be uppermost in our minds, must form part of all our proletarian action. And to make it clear to the world, this is a paramount demand. The idea of an international demonstration strike must be propagated and prepared in all countries.

Such a demonstration cannot be successful unless the class struggle creates and intensifies a feeling of international solidarity, unless in all our mass movements we include Peace with Russia in our

TO THE COMMUNISTS OF

GREAT BRITAIN

COMMUNICATION OF THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Sub-Bureau of the Communist International is under the impression, that some misunderstanding prevails about the attitude of the Bureau towards affiliation of Communist groups and parties to the British Labor Party.

It was decided at the February Conference in Amsterdam and two letters written to comrades of the L. P. have been interpreted differently. It is for this reason, that we wish to accentuate our opinion briefly as follows:

In accordance with the resolution mentioned above, in our opinion, that Communists should not be affiliated either directly or indirectly to political organizations that negate the principles of the Second International. For England such an organization no doubt is the Labor Party.

II. We are convinced that the policy of the Labor Party especially if this policy should be successful will lead to a betrayal of the cause of the workers similar to the betrayal of Ebert-Noske, mutatis mutandis.

III. We have stated that affiliation with the Third International of groups that participate in the Labor Party is possible, as is shown by the L. P. so far as they accept Communist principles and tactics, which involves a persistent struggle within the Labor Party against the policy and tactics of this body. We are convinced, that participation in the L. P. if accompanied by Communist criticism and action will only be temporary.

IV. Since we agree with those Communists in England, that object to participation in the Labor Party, we of course do not insist that they should not give up their attitude on the side of unity. Much as we would like to see a united Communist Party in England it may be better to postpone this ideal than to compromise on important issues.

V. We strongly appeal to our English friends to unite on the basis of no affiliation to the Labor Party, as we clearly see the catastrophe that will follow, as the coming into power of a parliamentary Labor Government. We know in our opinion help to unite the workers after the failure will become evident under the banner of Communism. To achieve this result it is necessary however to clearly define our attitude towards the methods of the Labor Party. A compromise in such a way that local organizations are allowed a policy, that is, a policy objectionable as a general method, must lead to confusion when accepted by united Communist Party.

For The Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of
The Communist International
D. J. Wynkoop,
H. Roland Holst,
S. J. Rutgers.

* Italics are ours.—To this particular paragraph we call special attention of all our advocates of "unity at any price." The general principle underlying this paragraph is, in our opinion, applicable and must be applied to the Communist movement in any country, including also the United States. ED.

new society, whilst they restore order, start anew the public services, organize the first Red Army in Western Europe, the chargé d'affaires of Britain and France congratulate the Ebert-Noske Government on its victory over the reaction, and offer their support towards the destructions of the nascent Communist Republic, even as Bismarck, all but half an age ago, offered his support to Thiers toward the destroying of the Commune.

In face of the common enemy, the social revolution, conquerors and conquered forget their disjunctions. The antagonism of their interests disappears before the universal interest of the capitalistic system, before the instinct of self-preservation.

Already Lloyd George, MacDonald and Vandervelde have wiped out the score of their differences with the German bourgeoisie. Nay more: In order to save it they are prepared to shed the blood of the British, the French and the Belgian people.

Already British troops at Solingen have helped to crush he Spartacist insurrections.

Already the commanders of the Entente troops have declared at Mayence, Foch presiding, on the measures to be taken against the Communist movement in the Ruhrl valley.

Already the British chargé d'affaires has informed the German Vice-Chancellor Schiffer that the Entente would not furnish any food-stuffs or raw materials to a German Soviet Republic.

Already the Entente has allowed the troops of the government to traverse occupied territory on the march against the Communist insurrection, and to make use of this territory as a base of operations in the concentrated attack against the Red Army.

The solidarity which unites all bourgeoisies, all militarisms is proclaimed openly, cynically, without any attempt to gloss the matter over. It behoves to proclaim as openly as energetically solidarity of the proletariats.

British, French and Belgian proletarians, will you let your ruling classes make use of you to trample to death the German revolution?

The German revolution—that is just a way of speaking of traditional expression. To speak the truth, there is no German revolution, no more than there is a Russian, or a British, or a French, or an Italian, or a Spanish revolution.

There is only one Social Revolution, as there is only one capitalist oppression, as there is only one Social Capitalism, home of the oppressed and exploited of all countries.

Our rulers know that the Republic of Workers' Councils established in Germany means the accord of Germany with Soviet Russia, that is, the marvelous development of the industry and the technique of the one, and the immense resources in agriculture, particularly in the Rhine district, and in Westphalia and the Ruhr district, the main heart of the German Revolution, where by the hour it is gaining strength and splendor. It is there that the battle between Past and Future will be decided. It is there that either German Capitalism will receive a mortal stroke, or the grand attempt of the working classes to seize the power will be drowned in a deluge of blood, and whilst the remnants of the army and agrarian disturbances break out in Pomerania and in Mecklenburg, whilst part of the army, some naval divisions and part of the police refuse to fight against the revolution.

APPEAL TO THE BRITISH, FRENCH, AND BELGIAN PROLETARIAT

COMMUNICATION OF THE PROVISIONAL BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Proletarians!

In a magnificent outburst the German proletariat has swept away the counter-revolution of the Kappes and the Lüttwitz. The reaction of the Junkers has been crushed by the dauntless courage of the masses who rose like one man. These working masses, divided against themselves starved and miserable, thrown down by the Reactionary regime, lacking arms, deprived of their tribal leaders, have united in a superb fighting movement and have displayed in the decisive instant the most splendid courage and initiative. Without an instant's hesitation the German proletariat has left the factories and the means of transport and the public services; it has armed itself the arms it needed and by means of guns as hammers, picked up combining the two great methods of the class struggle at the disposal of the working class, it has achieved victory. From the first day, in the midst of the battles against the counter-revolution of the Junkers, another battle defined itself like a flame of which the fierce glare in the core of a vast blaze. This flame, which will burn the bourgeois regime served by the social-democratic government, the war against capitalist tyranny and oppression, the war for the deliverance of labor from exploitation, for the Soviet system and the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the suburbs of Berlin, in Silesia, in Thuringia, in Wurtemberg in Bavaria, in all Germany, but especially in the Rhine district and the Westphalia, working-class cells spring up and endeavour to seize the power. The proletarian arm, and form Red Guards. The industrial cities of the West change into many fortresses. As the social revolution organizes and increases its forces, at the same time the revolutionary wave sweeps upon the rural areas, agrarian disturbances break out in Pomerania and in Mecklenburg, whilst part of the army, some naval divisions and part of the police refuse to fight against the revolution.

The Ebert Government mad with fear sees the real enemy, sees Spartacus overthrown, decimated,

French, British and Belgian proletarians, will you once more suffer yourselves to be gulled by your

(Continued on page 4.)

International News

RUSSIA

The Ninth Congress of the Communist Party.

A soviet radio of April 7th, quoted in "International," on April 13th, gives the following messages from Trotsky's speech at the final session of the Party Congress on the previous day: "The Soviet Army reflects the transitional character of the Soviet régime. The latter is entering to-day upon a new period of its existence in which the principal weight of its forces will be transferred to the military front. Consequently the Red Army must modify itself to correspond to the new phase of development of the Soviet Republic. Obviously, while the country was obliged to carry on a desperate war on all fronts, there could be no question of reforming a regular army; the service, that system exists to-day only in its embryonic form of universal military training."

The idea of the militia arose at once amongst the bourgeoisie and from the Socialists of the Second International. They asserted that the "Liberation of Labor" would afford that a military army, in a democratic republic, would little by little come to transform and socialize the mobilized citizens. But the imperialist war, the Revolution, and finally, the creation of our Red Army, have shown that the character of the army has not developed and modified in its form. It was suggested that the militia system would assure the defense of the country at much less cost: on the contrary, a well-organized militia will be much more costly than a standing army, if only for the reason that it covers infinitely wider areas. The essential factor in this is that the militia system has been simply forced upon the nations by the march of events: this was seen during the late Imperialist war, which forced all States to call up class after class, and, in some cases, to multiply tenfold their peace effectives. But the principal argument for the militia system is that it is an instrument of production, and in order to produce we must retain the necessary man-power in the workshops and the fields. The trade unions will certainly play a considerable part in the organization of the army.

If we speak of militarization of labor, we must also set before ourselves the idea of industrializing our army. A militia, necessary of a territorial character, must therefore transform its present administrative areas in such a way that they will have as pivot an industrial center. In short, in every area the industrial proletariat will be the basis of the militia. In the present period of revolution, the two processes of demobilizing the Red Army and then to create a militia, these two processes will take place simultaneously, and the defensive powers of our Republic will not be weakened for a single day for a single hour.

Finally, thanks to the militia system, our country will be able at the same time to solve the problems of our economic reconstruction and to defend of the Revolution. Trotsky's thesis on this subject (printed in the London "Call" of April 15th) were unanimously approved.

The Congress was closed by a speech in which Lenin reminded delegates that it was a spirit of strict party discipline which had up to the present assured the Republic of all its miraculous successes. All success must be concentrated on one essential task at a time. The socialist ideal and spirit must now be introduced into economic life. This would be a difficult task, but gradually, day by day, and inch by inch, stocks of corn could be replenished, machines repaired, factories going, and the economic problem would be solved just as the military one had been. The workers of all countries were watching Russia and awaiting new victories.

After this speech, on the motion of Preobrazhensky, Lenin's oldest friends—Kamenev, Bukharin, Kulinin, Radek, and Riazanov—addressed the Congress on the subject of the life and work of the leader of the world Revolution, who would on April 10th attain the age of 50. Bukharin called him the most perfect type of logical Marxist theoretician and statesman. Lenin is exempt from all narrowness of view. His universal spirit is in every period the characteristic tendency and gives clear, exact, and considered replies which are always to the point. He has always struggled against the least manifestation of opportunism and has always attacked the last traces of bourgeois spirit." Kulinin attested the affection and respect which all workers cherished towards Lenin, both national, in the Russian working-class movement, and international, as is shown by the revolutionary murmurings which agitate the whole world in reply to Lenin's words.

In spite of Lenin's protests, these speeches were greeted with a great ovation.

The new Central Committee, elected on the 8th day of the Congress, comprises: Andreley, Bukharin, Dzerzhinsky, Zinoviev, Kulinin, Kameney, Krastinsky, Lenin, Preobrazhensky, Rudzutak, Radek, Rakovsky, Rykov, Serego, Serebriakov, Smirnov, Stalin, Tomsky and Trotsky.

GERMANY

The Communist Party.

Boris Souvarine, in the course of an article in "L'Humanité" of April 19th, replying to certain statements made by Caussy, the "Humanité" correspondent in Berlin, states that in October, 1919, at its Heidelberg Congress, despite the mass persecutions and suppressions it had suffered, the K.P.D. (Communist Party of Germany), numbered 103,000. At the beginning of March, when he left Berlin, he was told by Taakeimer, editor-in-chief of the "Rote Fahne" and collaborator of the "Internationale" (the review founded by Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg) that the terrorized printers refused to print the Communist organs even after a short break in the state of siege had given them, for a few days, the opportunity to do so. Therefore the last suppression of January 13th, one of the two "Rote Fahne" (each of the two Communists anti-parliamentarian and syndicalist, as well as orthodox party, has its own), printed by the best printing methods, had a circulation of 24,000 copies when there was no material possibility of printing more. Taakeimer declared that without boasting, the circulation would reach 100,000. If access to modern typographical establishments were not forbidden.

A Fifth International?

The "Vorwärts," April 19th, has a leading article in which they bewail how misunderstood they and the majority parties are abroad. They note with pleasure the series of articles written by Mirel in "Centre Socialist" after his return to Germany during the Kapp coup in "Humanité" in which he approves in the main of the majority socialist tactics, but even then has not the desired effect on the French and other Socialist parties as a whole. "Everyone in France and abroad," he writes, "where they could make their views and ideas known, and as no one is prepared to help them, they, the majority Socialists, must act on their own. To call together an International, we presume. Whether the second or a 'fifth' is not clear from the article. But truly the plight of the

THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST PARTY AND THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Editor's Note: This letter from our International Secretary has just reached us in time for publication. Comrade Fraina is abroad making contact with the Communist movement there and participating in the work of the Third International.

TO THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SUB-BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

Comrades:

The Socialist Party of the United States has decided to affiliate with the Communist International, and to apply for admission accordingly to G. Zinoviev. In considering the application, the following points should be born in mind:

1.—The mere decision to affiliate with the Communist International is in itself of small value; the decisive factor is acceptance, in theory and practice, of Communist fundamentals.

2.—The resolution of the American Socialist Party in favor of affiliating with the Communist International is silent concerning acceptance of the principles and tactics of the International. At the Moscow Conference of the Party, August 30, 1919 (at which, incidentally, the expulsion of 40,000 Communists from the Party was unanimously approved) mass action, Soviets and proletarian dictatorship as means of Revolution were rejected, the Socialist Party evading every actual problem of revolutionary theory and practice.

3.—The policy of the Socialist Party is completely dominated by the conception of a temporary conquest of Capitalism. The party is not revolutionary; on the contrary, it is shamelessly opportunist; its tactics are comprised in dependence upon petty-bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism, reformism, and co-operation with the liberals and reactionary traditions.

4.—The revolutionary elements in the Socialist Party have either been expelled or have succeeded in the former party membership, approximately 50,000 are now in the Communist Party, 8000 in the Communist Labor Party, and only 30,000 are still in the Socialist Party. The Socialist Party now consists wholly of the Right and the Centre, opportunists and traitors. The dominant personages in the Socialist Party are: Morris Hillquit, an unprincipled refined opportunist of the Longuet type; Victor L. Berger, a social-patriot who, in 1913, urged that the United States should conquer and annex Mexico; Seymour Stedman, a typical party bourgeois radical, who, upon the expiration of his term in Congress, left the party, declared in a capitalist newspaper that the Socialist Party has been purged of its Bolshevikism; Meyer London, who, as a member of Congress, supported the war and was not expelled from the Party; Algeron Lee, who, while a member of the New York City Board of Aldermen, voted to promote the sale of Liberty Bonds, and urged war against Germany; in order to save the Belgian Revolution. All the leaders who represented the Socialist Party as a typical party of the old International are still dominant; there has been a purge of the Communists, but not of the opportunists, of the Right and Center.

5.—The Socialist Party prides itself upon having declared against the war. a) The reasons largely responsible for the anti-war declaration are now out of the party. b) The party's official policy, as expressed by the leaders who are now still dominant in the Socialist Party, was one of petty bourgeois pacifism and miserable opportunism.

6.—The Socialist Party wages a strong campaign against the German Republic and for recognition of the Russian Soviet Government, but this campaign is scarcely distinguishable from the campaign of the petty bourgeois radicals. Moreover, the Socialist Party neither emphasizes nor appreciates that aspect of the Russian Proletarian Revolution which makes mandatory the revolutionary reconstruction of Socialism.

7.—The Socialist Party representatives elected to the Legislature of the State of New York have been denied their seats by the Legislature. The Socialists' defense at their trial had three aspects: a) That constitutional government and democracy are manifested by the act of the Legislature; b) that the Socialist Party has no connection with the Communists; c) that it is not true that Socialists' Party aims to establish a Soviet Republic in the United States since favoring the Russian Revolution does not mean proposing, or even dreaming, that a system which develops naturally from Russia's political conditions is adaptable to a highly complex economic system such as that of the United States.

8.—The Government's savage campaign of repression against the Communists does not involve the Socialist Party. In a declaration issued on March 23rd, 1920, justifying the repressive campaign of the Department of Justice, Attorney General Palmer said: "Certainly such an organization as the Communist Party of America and the Communist Labor Party cannot be construed to fall within the same category as the Socialist Party of America, which latter organization is pledged to the accomplishment of changes in the Government by lawful and rightful means."

9.—The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, in a session of March 8, 1920 (two months after the decision to affiliate with the Communist International), revealed three significant facts:

a) That a number of trades-unions had been invited to send delegates to the Party Convention of May 8th—indicating that the Socialist Party is merging more completely in reactionary craft unionism.

SWITZERLAND

The "Internationale" Dead and Stillborn.

A brief message to "L'Humanité" of April 18th, states that the American S.P., although affiliated with its recent party to the Third International, has signified its approval of the Swiss International's proposal. The same message states that Camille Huysmans has convoked the 10th congress of the Second "International" for July 1st at Geneva.

A Communist Conference Forbidden.

The Yand Cantonal Government has forbidden the holding of any meeting within its jurisdiction, of the conference of Communist organizations which has been summoned for April 17th-18th at Yverdon by the Communist group within the Swiss Socialist Party. ("L'Humanité," April 18th, 1920.)

b) That a demonstration for political prisoners was being arranged together with the Freedom Foundation and the National Civil Liberties Bureau—indicating the Socialist Party's co-operation and affiliation with petty bourgeois radicals.

c) That Jean Longuet was to speak in the United States under the auspices of the party—indicating the opportunist and revisionist character of the Socialist Party's international affiliation.

10.—Historically, the Socialist Party developed as the American expression of the opportunism and reformism which became dominant in the Second International at the close of the XIX century; the party refrained from and still proclaims moderate party bourgeois Socialism. The decision of this party to affiliate with the Communist International is the product of two factors: a) Undefined sympathy of the party membership with the Russian Revolution and the Soviet Republic; the Communists, in general, being sympathetic with the Soviet Republic and a means of assisting this Republic. Instead of as a means of revolutionary struggle and the reconstruction of Socialism. b) The diplomacy of miserable Left-Center in the Socialist Party, which considers it a "clever stroke" to affirm that this might impair the power of the Communist Party of America.

The admission of the American Socialist Party to the Communist International would be a serious blow to the American Communist movement and to the International itself.

11.—The existing situation now prevails in the Communist International. The Old International has performed a magnificent task of destruction, but the Communist International has not yet performed the constructive task of organizing a new definite basis. All sorts of parties and groups are affiliated with the old International, and which have not passed the extremes of the Center and Right, are asking admission to the Communist International; for our International to admit these undesirable elements would merely constitute the Second International under the name of Communist International. The situation is dangerous, and requires immediate and uncompromising action. The Communist International must double-hold its doors against undesirable elements, it must do nothing to impair its own revolutionary integrity or to hamper the conscious Communist movement in any particular country.

In the name of the Communist Party of America, accordingly, I call for the rejection of the application of the American Socialist Party for admission to the Communist International; and that, pending final action by the Executive Committee in Moscow (or a Congress of the International), the Sub-Bureau of the International shall not enter into any relations with the American Socialist Party.

March 30, 1920.

Louis C. Fraina,
International Secretary, C. P. A.

APPEAL TO THE BRITISH, FRENCH AND BELGIAN PROLETARIAT

(Continued from page 3.)

ruling classes? Will you be your brothers' murderers? Will you by your acts commit the abominable deed prepare your own destruction for tomorrow?

Or will you profit by the lessons of six years of unheard of sufferings of heart-rending experiences? Have you beheld the light that shines out of the East? Has the dawning of a new immense hope scattered the mists of your unconsciousness? Has it cleansed your soul, and strengthened your heart?

If so, you know what you have to do: to do immediately, to-day; to-morrow might be too late.

You must, on a large scale, repeat for tomorrow with infinitely greater firmness and vigor, what you attempted to do for your Russian brothers, and, what however is insufficient and weak still has contributed to their salvation.

British Proletarians! Remember the stormy militant meetings of the Hands-off-Russia Committee. They were a ford for the raising of the blockade.

French Proletarians and Soldiers! Remember the men of the Black Sea Fleet, the dockers of Brestau. Their courage has contributed to the defeat of the partisans of military intervention.

Workers of the Entente! Loudly proclaim your solidarity with the German revolution!

Exact from your Governments the withdrawal of all troops from the occupied territory.

Railwaymen, refuse to effectuate the transport of any troops or any arms or munitions to Germany.

All of you answer any attempt on the part of your Governments to strangle the German revolution by extending and intensifying your own revolutionary activity. Make it plain to them, that if the international bourgeoisie is one in the defense of old and rotten social order, the international proletariat is one in the heroic struggle for deliverance.

Boldly forward, Comrades!

At this instant the fate of the European Revolution depends on you, on your initiative, on your farsightedness.

Hurrah for the Communist Revolution in Germany!

Hurrah for the World Revolution, the Universal Soviet Republic!

The Executive of The Amsterdam Sub-Bureau of The Third International.

D. J. Wynkoop,
Henrikette Roland Holst,
G. A. Rutgers.

POLITICAL PARTIES IN GREAT BRITAIN

(Continued from page 2.)

as indicated in my industrial report is of the utmost importance not only to the British movement but to the International. The leftward movement is to the good but the danger of accepting it uncritically is most marked. Without the international leftists and the rightists of the International, the International drifts and emphasizes the need for clarity and the acceptance of the full responsibilities of its policies; they are now witness to the swamping of the Third International by the muddle-headed leaders of the Second International.

Probably nowhere is there greater danger of this than in Great Britain where social sentiment gives place so much to clear thinking. It is a welcome sign to see the Socialist movement being forced to take to task where it has been as sentimental as partisans.

A Communist Party or two Communist parties may be formed in Britain therefore at an early date. There is a tremendous task before them even though history is urging things along at a rapid pace.

J. T. Murphy,

S. S. Workers Committee.
Amsterdam, March 1920.

"Bolshevism," raised by the Communist Labor Party and by other "particular voices" within the Communist Party. His only retort is that these protests were "confused"—so far as the Communist Labor Party was concerned, and that they were "completely stifled" within the Communist Party. "He longs for the Left Wing, dreams of that blissful time when he will be 'back again in the Left Wing'." His whole article, in fact, is a confession, meaning for the Left Wing.

The language federations of the Party—particularly the Russian Federation—were instrumental in the organization of the Communist Party in the United States. This is a well-known and established fact by this time. Comrade Zinov'ev, the Chairman of the Communist International, in one of his official communications to the Russian Communist movement in the United States, "promulgators of the Com-

Y. F. undoubtedly also knows and recognizes this fact. But just because of this—he, a sentimental bard of the Left Wing—bitterly hates and attacks the Russian Federation. "The net result of the Federation's activities has been an absolute putting backward of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States," he indignantly exclaims.

Of course, since the Communist Party has already been organized in this country—"it is assuredly not the desire at this date to quarrel with the fact of the starting of the Communist Party," he goes on to say—but "the so magnanimous statement that he does not even mention 'at this date'—that the Convention at which the Communist Party was started, had been 'packed.'

But he "accepted" the Communist Party simply and only because it seemed to him a good "forum in which to fight against domination of an aggressive, active, hopeful membership by a small clique of vain politicians."

To the way, Comrade Reader, does this not have a familiar ring to you—this charge of "a small clique of vain politicians"? Isn't this the very same charge flung against "Lenin and his gang" by the reptile press in "dominating and suppressing the good, kind and generous but simple Russian people"?

he accusation that "an aggressive membership" could easily be dominated by a small clique of politicians? It certainly sounds like absurd against the Bolsheviks by the capitalist press.

While virulently attacking the Federations for their "flight to conquer the Left Wing"—in order to transform it into the Communist Party—our virtuous Left-Winger confesses, however, his aims as well as his adherents in the Communist convention and subsequently in the Communist Party was "Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party"—in other words, the formation of the Communist Party back into the Left Wing:

"Once in Communist Convention (in other words—once such a 'catastrophe' had happened), there appeared no escape from the dilemma except a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party!"

S.

The Federations, and especially the more experienced Russian Federations understood very well, and said through the tricky plans of the "Left Wing," they realized the danger of "Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party" and acted accordingly. But Y. F. and his adherents did not understand and did not know that they and their plans were discovered and warned against—and this is precisely why he so "sarcastically" accuses (in his naivete not suspecting even how *comically* it really sounds) the Federations of applying an "arbitrary calendar test" in the process of the formation of the Communist Party.

No, dear Y. F.—though you are a "learned statesman" and "political scientist"—you did not understand then, and still do not understand, that it was not a "calendar test." The question was not of a date, but of the method of formation of the Communist Party. Substantially, there was no difference whether to start it officially on June 22nd or on September 1st—and as matter of fact the Federations shifted the date from the former to the latter—but it was important, and it made *one* difference as to *how to start the Party*. It had one thing to start with a clearly defined, real Communist Party from, and with a membership, *already consciously Communist*,—who in fact were already Communists,—and it is quite a different thing to invite to participation in its formation, and in the formulation of its program and tactics, elements—large numerically but poor in "Communist quality..."

But, we realize, of course, that such considerations are beyond the understanding of our learned statesman and author.

10.

Having failed in an attempt of a "Left Wing" conquest of the Communist Party at its first Convention, and in several similar attempts (in fact—it was one continuous attempt) at the subsequent seven months of the Party existence, our "Lord Varney" and his followers were not disconcerted; they found their consolation in the sentence: "Disunity is only disastrous when we fail to acquire a new wisdom and a new determination out of them."

And so they decided to arm themselves with "a new wisdom and a new determination" in order to save the Party, and incidentally "liberate" it from the "exotic (read: foreign) domination" by Federations.

This "new wisdom" soon prompted them a proper course of action while a "new determination" made them ready and willing to accomplish "something really big, something extraordinary."

The Communist movement in the United States has gone backward since June 1919, "having been dramatically declared by the Don Quixote 'theorist' of the 'minority group'—his administrative Sancho Panza—Damon—to interpret this statement into action." And, since "the Communist movement has gone backward"—it was only natural that he decided to push it "forward" to—June of last year.

His recent "coup d'état" in the C. E. C. and the C. P. was clearly an attempt to carry out that plan and that decision. It was a deliberate attempt to accomplish the longing desire of the "minority" and to return the Party to that delightful, primitive stage of "Left-Wingism." Had their plan succeeded, there would be—just as in June of last

* Not being a "theoretician" and unscrupulously branding as "great theorists" all those who "constantly talk about principles," Damon, as is well known, is a "man of action" and a "great administrator and organizer." His administrative and organizing genius found its expression in the following profound sentence in his statement to the Majority of the C. E. C. (See Convention). "The Chicago District Organizers... is the most capable mass in such a position.... He has turned over to the National organization... more funds... than all the other districts combined.... The officials of the S. P. are called 'vote-catchers'—Damon may well be called a 'good money catcher.' And he certainly knows how to catch money. He 'appropriated' more than seven thousand dollars of party money and 'got away with it.'

APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

(Editor's Note: A part of this call was omitted by some error in the last issue of *The Communist*. Since it is impossible to reprint the omitted part by itself we are reprinting the entire call as this is an important official document.)

THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE C. P. COMRADES:

The Central Executive Committee recognizes the necessity of the party convention in order to settle finally the differences that have been settled within the party for so long a time, which came to a climax at last in the form of the present "secession movement" led by the former Executive Secretary and two members of the C. E. C.

The C. E. C. recognizes that the membership also demands a convention for the same reasons. Therefore, this being the earnest and general desire of the party, THE PARTY CONVENTION MUST AND WILL BE CALLED.

However, in order to make the convention a success—in order that the convention shall accomplish the necessary task of clarifying the fundamental issues at stake IN ORDER THAT THE COMMUNIST PARTY SHALL FUNCTION FOR THE PROPAGATION OF COMMUNISM IN HARMONY WITH THE PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES LAID DOWN BY THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL without internal dissension paralysing its activities—and what is most important—in order TO GIVE THE MEMBERSHIP THE TRUTH AND FAITH—the opportunity to express their opinion on the issues before the party, this convention

must be well-prepared and carefully arranged. The time, place, and the method of electing the delegates, and above all, **INSTRUCTION TO THE DELEGATES** are essential prerequisites in order to make this convention accomplish its purpose.

This means, first of all, that before the convention is called, the membership must be given the opportunity to discuss all the issues so that when the time comes for the election of delegates, they will not elect them blindly. BUT INTELLIGENTLY AND ELECT ONLY THOSE DELEGATES WHO ACTUALLY REPRESENT THEIR OPINION ON THE ISSUES IN THE CONTROVERSY.

All this requires time for preparation—preparation for the process of elections in the various states and the technical arrangements connected with these, and the convention itself, both by the former Executive Committee.

If called too soon without the proper time for preparation as stated above, the convention would only result in failure and necessitate the calling of another convention a few months after this convention to settle the issues which a hurried convention will inevitably fail to accomplish.

Moreover, this convention should be called only by the Central Executive Committee of the party, as the only legally elected body with authority to convene conventions, can speak with authority in the name of the Communist Party and its membership as a whole. This is the only meaning of revolutionary communism and discipline upon which a real strong Communist Party can be built.

Therefore, we call upon the membership to repudiate the so-called convention called by the former Executive Secretary Damon, which, as we will show, is nothing but a trap set for the rank and file. The date set, as fixed in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary implies no real desire to have any convention at all.

In the first place, the former Executive Secretary had no right or mandate to call this convention. The duty of the Executive Secretary, as defined by the Convention, is to work only under the supervision and control of, and in conjunction with, the Central Executive Committee. He is only the executor of the decisions of that body, or where no division exists, of the majority of that body, and is responsible only to the Central Executive Committee, which is, in turn, responsible to the convention.

Secondly, the date set in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary, May ... for elections of intermediary units and May ... for national convention, even were it technically possible, would give no time to the membership to discuss the issues involved.

Thus, while pretending that they represent the membership and that they want to give them the opportunity to express themselves at the convention, the "minority" in fact, is deliberately arranging the convention so as to prevent the membership from any possibility of expressing themselves. The date fixed by them implies that they are deliberately arranging their convention so as to force the membership to elect their delegates blindly. In other words, they are simply deceiving the membership.

But it is obvious that it is physically impossible to have the elections and the convention on the date set in the call of the "minority." Conventions are not called at a week's notice! This is so self evident that even the "minority" however ignorant on party questions they may be, cannot pretend to be unfamiliar with it. Most assuredly they knew it, but still they purposefully fixed their impossible date as a sort of "bribe" to the membership in an attempt to swing them away from the Communist Party and its Central Executive Committee, over to their side by offering them an "earlier" date. The very fact that in their letter to the C. E. C. requesting joint action on the question of a party convention, the "minority" expresses willingness to change the date and other details already fixed by them indicates clearly that they themselves did not take their own call and its fixed date for the convention seriously.

In the meantime, the "minority" do not hesitate to use the party funds in the possession of the former Executive Secretary, entrusted to him by the C. E. C., to appoint paid District Organizers in every District and world District Organizers appointed by the C. E. C. are still functioning in order to build up rival organizations in all the party units—TO CAPTURE THE DELEGATES FOR THEIR SIDE. In other words, to break the very foundations of the Communist Party—ITS REVOLUTIONARY DISCIPLINE.

But we know that the membership will answer the "minority" and in no uncertain terms. They will not be led into the trap set for them. They will return to go to a convention called by these "secessionists" and disruptors. They will dismiss as irrelevant and hypocritical the cry of "factional control" raised by the "minority" against the C. E. C.

The rank and file will, first of all, carefully discuss the issues involved—WILL TAKE SIDES and elect their delegates accordingly IN ORDER TO PREPARE THEM FOR THE CONVENTION CALLED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. At present, the "next order of business" before the membership is to take up those issues, discuss them and understand them. And the C. E. C. urges every party unit to this "order of business."

It is necessary that every group should have this discussion, before the sub-district and district conventions are held, not after them. For it is exactly these preceding conventions that will determine the CHARACTER AND COMPOSITION OF THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTION!

DO NOT ELECT SUB-DISTRICT AND DISTRICT DELEGATES NOW.

The call for the party convention will be issued by the Central Executive Committee; setting the time for the sub-district and district conventions, details and methods of elections.

The C. E. C. will set a date for the convention after inquiries from, and consultations with, the District Organizers and the Executive Committees of the language federations so that the date finally fixed will be physically possible and convenient for all party units to participate.

DO NOT ELECT SUB-DISTRICT AND DISTRICT DELEGATES NOW.

SIGNIFY THAT YOU STAND BEHIND THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY BY REPUDIATING THE CALL ISSUED BY THE FORMER EXECUTIVE SECRETARY.

SIGNIFY THIS CONCRETELY, BY ALIGNING YOURSELVES WITH THE DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONS UNDER THE CONTROL AND DIRECTION OF THE C. E. C.

WAIT FOR THE CALL TO BE ISSUED BY THE C. E. C.

IN THE MEANTIME DISCUSS THE ISSUES TRY TO UNDERSTAND THEM SO THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO ELECT THE DELEGATES WHO REPRESENT YOUR POINT OF VIEW. ONLY

(Continued on page 5)

THE MINORITY HAS BEEN SMOKE OUT

(Continued from last issue)

Federations.

The question of the federation issue is a puzzling one to the membership because the "minority" still camouflages its objective—the abolition of federations. To prove this we will have to analyse what they aim at—not what they say. First, the "minority" believes that dues—stamps should be sold to the federation branches only through the District Organizations and not through the Central Executive Committees of the Federations. Second, the "minority" holds that the future development of the party lies in the direction of "shop units."

The first plan the "minority" claims would make for more efficiency in the administrative work of the party. Let us see. What strikes us first is that this method is THE ONE ACCEPTED BY THE C. L. P. the most rabid anti-federationists we have come across. What strikes us next, is that this plan is now being advocated by the very ones who have been opposed to federations for years. The former Executive Secretary has never made a secret of his opposition to federations and at every opportunity he has attempted to limit or circumscribe their authority and autonomy. At the C. E. C. meeting he made the motion to change the method of paying dues with the explanation that "this was the first step in the process of the abolition of federations." So, if we take all these factors into consideration, we find that this is not simply an administrative detail BUT BEHIND IT LURKS A DEEPER AND DEADLIER PURPOSE.

When this fact is recognized, the next question that arises is, can the process of abolishing the federations be begun at this time? Especially when this step is undertaken by Centrists and opportunists who do not really belong in the Communist Party and who are taking a short cut out by "splitting" away themselves. Admitting as the "minority" has always maintained, that the future organization of the federations and their relation to the party must be built on a more centralized basis, it is undeniably true, that the time has not yet arrived when this process can be effected. The federations, as at present constituted, are the carriers and promulgators of Communism in this country and they have not yet completed their function in the American Communist Party in this regard. In the process of fulfilling this function the Federations will gradually "die out" thus making it unnecessary to destroy them artificially.

The language federations—especially the Russian Federations—are the foundation stones of the Communist Party. Without them there would be no Communist Party in this country at the present time.

In this pre-revolutionary epoch, while the American working class is as yet hostile or indifferent to Communism, while the economic and political conditions have not yet awakened the revolutionary spirit in the masses, the only elements who are making supreme sacrifices to keep the party functioning and spread its propaganda are the "foreign comrades" of the language federations. It is the "foreign comrades" who, working through their federations, bear the brunt of the struggle and strife. They give of their time, energy and money unstintingly. This no one can deny.

The "foreign comrades" cannot, most of them, speak or understand English. Abolish the federations and their machinery for keeping their units functioning, and these "foreign comrades" are cut off from their only expression and articulation; they become easy prey for any English elements who wish to carry on their own kind of propaganda without hindrance from any organized "foreign elements" who know what Communism really means and can exercise control over those who attempt to work contrary to their conception of Communist principles and tactics.

Now as to the "shop units" which the "minority" only hint at, but for some reason or another, best known to themselves, are afraid to elaborate. Perhaps when we expose this second proposition the readers will understand the reason too.

The innocent term "shop units" carries with it an idea which aims at the complete transformation of the Communist Party as at present constituted into "shop branches" only as the future form of the Communist Party.

This would destroy, not only the Federations,

but the very political composition and character of the Communist Party itself. What the future of the party would be, organized on this industrial basis, we can leave to the imagination of the rank and file. Those comrades who know of the shop branches in the Bolshevik movement in Russia, and their function and their utility in the Bolshevik organization, know the great danger of the purely trade-union psychology predominating over the larger political perspectives in their shop-branches. Rather were they elementary branches, so to speak, whose contact with the political organization was similar to the idea of Communist Party shop branches as advocated in the program of the Communist Party and adopted at the last convention. Such shop committees, composed of members of the Communist Party, to carry on Communist propaganda and agitation in the shops and industries directly, must be under the control of the party. But, to transform the entire party into shop branches, destroying completely the political organization, is a Centrist conception that could only have been born in the minds of Centrists, casting about for a way of getting "contact with the masses" at any cost, even at the expense of destroying the conservers of Communism itself,—the political organization of the Communist Party.

Naturally, with such an object before them, the necessity of beginning the process of destroying the federations can be understood when emanating from the "minority."

This proposition is the clue to the "minority's" attitude toward federations, even were all other signs ignored. And all their smooth phrases to the contrary notwithstanding, they DO INTEND TO FORCIBLY ABOLISH THE FEDERATIONS.

Qui regi membra sicut regi sibi to let the federations decide for themselves at the convention what the future form of federations shall be, that is so much poppy-cock. The Federations did decide at the last convention and the "minority" later raised the charge of "packing" the convention. Should the federations again decide at the next convention—and their decision run counter to the "minority's"—they will again raise the cry of "packing" the convention.

But the Federations will not be so foolish as to entrust their future into the hands of its enemies, particularly, when those enemies are Centrists at the same time, who have no clear, consistent conception of Communism or its application.

The examples of the Hungarian and Jewish Federations do not speak well for the "minority's" position. Any federation membership that permits itself to be led out of the Communist Party by its Executive Committee is not a Communist membership AND DOES NOT BELONG IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE FIRST PLACE. (This holds true for that part of the membership which is following the "minority" out of the Communist Party.) The Jewish comrades, on the contrary, are not following the lead of their Executive Committee in remaining "neutral" (suspended in the air) but are taking their places according to their composition—Communists lining up with the C. E. C. and the Centrists with the "minority."

Summary

To sum up. The "minority" have been smoked out into the open and forced to expose their conception of Communist principles and tactics upon which we disagree so fundamentally. Having done this, they have revealed themselves to be opportunists and Centrists with a bourgeois-Socialist ideology.

On the question of Unity with the C. L. P. we have proved—and the facts as printed in the previous issues of the Communist have borne us out—that the "minority" are mere whining sentimentalists who, Centrist-like, always seek unity with Centrist elements, but cannot tolerate or work together with real Communist elements as represented by the C. E. C. They sought to effect immediate amalgamation with the C. L. P. on April 16th, that the general strike had just ended and attributed its origin to the railwaymen. The railwaymen, in agreement with the Unions and the Party, have organized factory councils (commissioni interne) everywhere; the employers have consequently begun a struggle against the new organizations with the object of divesting the strength of all economic authority—as the strength of the Turin workers is so great that in many factories they have actually been able to control production.

To bring about the limitation of the powers of the Works Councils, the employers proposed a system of contracts which would set a basis to their future development. This actually brought about the conflict, in which the railwaymen have spontaneously joined. The workers have published in "Avanti" a conciliatory statement of the conditions under which they wish the principle of factory councils to be applied.

Morris Hilquit and the conceptions of the Second International. We have also proved that they disobeyed the decisions of the convention on this question.

On the question of Mass Action, they have a confused Centrist conception which in no wise differs from that of the C. L. P. or the I. W. W. or even the S. L. P. and S. P. insofar as propagating the idea of the inevitability of a violent revolution to the workers is concerned.

As for the charge that the "majority" have carried on a campaign against Lenin as a compromiser, that is such a low, contemptible lie, that we do not even deign to answer it. There is a limit to which even Communists can descend to answer the slanders of an opponent!

On the question of federations, we have proved that their object is the complete abolition of them despite their smooth evasions and indirect insinuations to the contrary.

On the question of Shop Units or Shop Branches we have further proved their desire for the elimination of federations as well as pointing out the Centrist, opportunist character of such a project.

On the question of legality, as they call it, we have proved that they lack the very first element of Communist understanding of revolutionary centralization and discipline.

On the question of splitting the party we have developed the facts sufficiently in the last statement and the present article to disprove their evasions and lies as well as their mechanical conception of splits in general and this one in particular.

The "minority" stands convicted on every count.

They have proven themselves to be a set of revolutionary charlatans, cowardly compromisers and ignorant Centrists. They have merely taken advantage of a temporary and unusual situation where the former Executive Secretary, having all the funds and property of the party in his possession, have carefully prepared a coup d'état on a flimsy pretext hoping to crush the C. E. P. whom they hated bitterly, and drive them from the party before the convention, or to force such terms upon them as would make the next convention a farce insofar as settling the real fundamental issues between the "minority" and "minority" were concerned.

This also explains their hasty call for their convention, set for a ridiculously early date, in order to make it impossible for the membership to discuss and understand the issues and elect delegates on the basis of such intelligent understanding.

But their coup failed. Without funds and party machinery the C. E. C. immediately set to work and has built up a strong organization that will be able to withstand the splitting away of some Centrist elements that never really belonged in the party at all; at best, they should have been in the C. L. P.

The Communist Party is gaining and will gain immeasurably from the lessons taught it by this split.

News From Europe

R U S S I A

More "Missions" to Russia.

The Czechoslovak Government, according to "L'Humanité" of April 17th, has replied to Chicherin's last note, and the Soviet Government of the Czechoslovakia, to the Russian people. It has decided to send a special mission to Russia to study the question of economic relations "as well as many other problems."

The "Imparcial" announces that a commission, composed of three delegates—one on behalf of the Government, one for the employers, one for the workers (a Socialist, M. P., Fernandez Rios)—will shortly leave Spain for Russia to study the "social, political, and economic situation" of the Soviets.

White Guards Negotiating?

According to the Stockholm paper, "Folks Dagbladet," says "L'Humanité" of April 15th, the White General Vrangel has opened negotiations with the Soviet Government.

I T A L Y

The General Strike in Turin.

The Turin correspondent of "L'Humanité" stated, on April 16th, that the general strike had just ended and attributed its origin to the railwaymen. The railwaymen, in agreement with the Unions and the Party, have organized factory councils (commissioni interne) everywhere; the employers have consequently begun a struggle against the new organizations with the object of divesting the strength of all economic authority—as the strength of the Turin workers is so great that in many factories they have actually been able to control production.

To bring about the limitation of the powers of the Works Councils, the employers proposed a system of contracts which would set a basis to their future development. This actually brought about the conflict, in which the railwaymen have spontaneously joined. The workers have published in "Avanti" a conciliatory statement of the conditions under which they wish the principle of factory councils to be applied.

PROBLEMS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

By N. LENIN
(Continued from page 1.)

And therefore I was so deeply grieved by the Moscow Manifesto, which was at least premature and certainly useless. And I hope that my French comrades, who have been buffeted about during the last four hapless years by so many slanders and misfortunes, will not succumb to a fit of impatience, and will not also help to split the International solidarity.

Otherwise your children will have to reconstruct this solidarity if the proletariat are ever to rule the world.

JOHN RAMSEY MACDONALD

The author of the above article, as the reader can see, is attempting to prove that a split is not necessary. On the contrary, just its inevitability follows from the line of argument of Ramsay MacDonald; this typical representative of the Second International, worthy colleague of Scheidemann and Kautsky, Vandervelde and Branting etc., etc.

The article of Ramsey MacDonald is the best sample of those smooth, well-sounding stereotyped phrases, Socialist in appearance, which in all advanced capitalist countries have served for a long time to screen bourgeois policies within the working class movement.

1

Let us begin with the least important but peculiarly characteristic. As Kautsky (in his pamphlet "Dictatorship of the Proletariat") the author repeats the bourgeois lie, that in Russia nobody foresaw the role of the Soviets, that I and the Bolsheviks began the struggle with Kerensky only in the name of the Constituent Assembly.

This is a bourgeois lie. As a matter of fact, on April 4th, 1917, on the very first day of my arrival in Petrograd, I already introduced "theses" demanding the Soviet, and not the bourgeois, parliamentarian republic. I repeated this many times during the Kerensky premiership both in print and at meetings. The Bolshevik Party emphatically and officially announced this in the resolutions of their Conference on April 20th, 1917.

Not to know this means—not to want to know the truth of the Socialist Revolution in Russia. Not to understand that the bourgeois parliamentarian republic with the Constituent Assembly is one step forward as against the same republic without the Constituent Assembly, and that the Soviet Republic is two steps forward in comparison with it,—means to close one's eyes to the difference between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

To call oneself Socialist and not to see this difference, two years after the introduction of this question in Russia, one and a half years after the victory of the Soviet Revolution in Russia,—means that one remains stubbornly in absolute enslavement to "public opinion of non-Socialist elements," i. e. to the ideas and policies of the bourgeoisie.

With such people the split is necessary and unavoidable, because it is impossible to carry on the work for the Socialist Revolution hand in hand with those who are pulling on the side of the bourgeoisie.

And men such as Ramsey MacDonald, Kautsky and others, did not want to overcome even such a really insignificant "difficulty," for such "leaders," as of informing themselves from the documents on the attitude of the Bolsheviks

NEWS FROM EUROPE

FRANCE

To the Strains of the International." Recently, a member of the 1920 class wrote to "La Vie Ouvrière," of April 16th, as follows:—From Metz: "The departure from the Gare de l'Est took place amidst the noise of the International. The crowd had been seen in a Nancy paper that the 1920 class was joining up with enthusiasm. This is a little too strong. All the time our captain was saying that all the Parisians were Bolsheviks. On Thursday, while we were passing through Nancy, our officers wanted to make us sing 'Madelon.' We all said we didn't know it." Another writes: "We are singular, certainly, but not the Metzellaire. On our arrival and departure, in all the stations—Chateauroux, Châlons, Bar-le-Duc, Commercy, the 'International' was chanted, broken, every now and then by cries of 'Down with the Army!'"

SWITZERLAND

The Young Socialists in Congress. At the recent Congress of the Young Socialists of Switzerland, held at Aarau, it was decided to proclaim the complete autonomy of the organization and to affiliate immediately to the Young Communists' International—"Le Populaire," April 17th, 1920.

to Soviet power and on the treatment of this question before and after November 7th, 1917, would it not be ridiculous to expect from such men the readiness and ability to overcome the incomparably greater difficulty connected with the present struggle for the Socialist Revolution?

None so deaf as those who will not hear.

2

Let us proceed to the second lie (out of countless lies with which Ramsey MacDonald's article is full of, for in this article there are perhaps more lies than words). This lie is perhaps the most important.

John Ramsey MacDonald claims that the International before the war 1914–18 said only that "when war takes on the character of national defense the Socialists should co-operate with other parties."

This is a monstrous, repugnant deviation from the truth.

Everybody knows that the Basle Manifesto of 1912 was unanimously accepted by all Socialists and that this is the only one of the documents of the International which deals exactly with the very war between the English and German groups of imperialist beasts, which, as known to all, was being prepared in 1912 and finally broke out in 1914. Just in reference to this war the Basle Manifesto expounds three points, upon which MacDonald remaining silent, commits the greatest crime against Socialism and proves that with men of MacDonald type the split is necessary, because they actually serve the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat.

These three points are the following:

The impending war can find no justification by even a shadow of interest of national freedom;

It would be a crime for workers to shoot each other in this war;

The war leads toward the proletarian revolution;

These are the three fundamental truths, "forgetting" which (though he subscribed to them before the war) MacDonald ACTUALLY goes over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, proving thereby that the split is necessary.

The Communist International will not unite with parties, which do not wish to recognize these truths and are not capable of proving by their deeds their determination, readiness and ability to inculcate these truths into the minds of the masses.

The Versailles Peace has proven even to fools and blind people, even to the mass of shortsighted, that the Entente was and remains the same bloody, bullying, Imperialist beast as Germany. Only hypocrites or liars, deliberately introducing bourgeois policies, direct agents and tools of the bourgeoisie, labor lieutenants of the capitalist class (like the American Socialists) or, men who have fallen under the spell of bourgeois ideas and bourgeois influence so that they are Socialists only in words but actually are petty-bourgeois philistines and sycophants of the capitalists could fail to see this. The distinction between the first and second categories is important only from the point of view of personalities, i. e. for the appraisal of John or Peter in the social-patriotic ranks of all countries.

From the political point of view, i. e. from the point of view of the relations of millions of people, of the relations of classes this distinction is of no importance.

The Socialists, who during the war of 1914–19 did not understand that on both sides, a criminal reactionary, robbers', imperialist war,—are Social-Chauvinists, i. e. Socialists in words and chauvinists in fact; friends of the working class in words, but in fact lackeys of "their" national bourgeoisie, helping them to deceive the masses by picturing as "national," "liberating," "defensive," "just," etc., the war between the English and German groups of imperialist plunderers, who are equally rotten, corrupt, bloody and criminally reactionary.

Unity with Social-Chauvinists is a betrayal of the revolution, betrayal of the proletariat, betrayal of Socialism, desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie,—because, it is a "unity" with the national bourgeoisie of "their" country against the unity of the international revolutionary proletariat—it is a unity with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat.

The war of 1914–18 has finally proven this. Whoever cannot understand this can remain in the yellow Berne "international" of social-traitors (From the "Communist International", No. 4)

(To be continued.)

A LETTER FROM CHICAGO

Editor's Note: This letter was received soon after the split, but for lack of space was not printed in the last issue. The inference drawn in this letter about "unity" with the "left elements" of the S. P. together with the C. L. P. is more than a wild guess. Certain facts recently come to light and touched on editorially, make this more than a mere conjecture of the editor. When all the facts are in we have no doubt they will prove that the plot to split the Communist Party was hatched in the office of the C. L. P. between their representatives and the representatives of Damon & Co.

Scarcely eight months have passed since the Communist Party was founded. The formation of the organization not yet finished—the paths of its activities still new and untried—and already a crisis is at hand. A SPLIT is here.

This, no doubt, is agitating the mass of the membership, and is observed with satisfaction from the camps of our enemies.

Naturally, everybody wants to know the cause. Is it really impossible for those who appeal to all workers in all lands for solidarity and unity to do what is necessary to recognize proletarian dictatorship and armed insurrection—to live and work together in harmony?

Very important reasons must be shown by those who stand for a split at this moment: who take upon themselves this great responsibility at the moment when the Third International comes out with a proposal for unity into one party even those Communist elements which stand outside—chiefly in the ranks of the Communist Labor Party.

The National Executive Secretary together with two other members of the Central Executive Committee have taken upon themselves this responsibility as regards the "minority" of the S. P. —as regards the overwhelming majority of the S. P. Yet the Secretary had the funds of the party, the addresses and other connections, which were all seized by the "minority" and helped them greatly in the disorganizing of the party.

The Secretary claims to be acting quite properly, because, elected directly only by the Convention, he says, he will be responsible only to a convention. But the funds were entrusted to him not by the Convention, but by the Central Executive Committee—for the sake of greater efficiency. Why doesn't he return them where they belong? Well—because the "minority" has enough—from the Language Federations remittances..." (as stated by the Secretary himself.)

The split is still more unjustified because the next convention of the Party was right at the door. The split was brought about for an obvious purpose—the "minority" on their hook attempted to arrange this convention in order to turn over the Communist Party into hands of the Communist League.

The "minority" claims that the break was forced not by any theoretical or tactical differences—but by minor details, which taken separately were quite a big heap during the last eight months; for example, the Secretary questions the right of the C. E. Committee to remove District Organizers whom he had appointed. He is satisfied with the sending of delegates to Europe (to meetings of the Third International), although such delegates were elected at the September Conventions; and other minor matters.

But, neither individually, nor all together, can they justify the split. What kind of a Central Executive Committee would it be which could not appoint or remove its agents (the District Organizers) entirely according to its own discretion and necessity? How could such a Committee discharge the tasks placed in it by the Convention if it should only pay salaries of the District Organizers, but would let them work each according to his own will and sometimes against the decisions of the Central Executive Committee?

A mistake was already made at the September Convention, when the Central Executive Committee was elected another independent executive power in the person of the Secretary. It appears that there has been more or less friction right along between these two powers.

Just now the split is in the process of developing fully—from the top down to the bottom—to the sub-districts, branches and groups. Good wishes, good intentions, hysterical mobilizations cannot stop it—the split has a logic of its own and it must run its course.

It is very possible, that together with the Secretary of the Communist Party will leave those elements, who by their sympathy and stand towards the C. L. P. in the majority of the party" (for example, a man who took part in the so-called Anarcho-Menshevik Russian Conference (Jan. and Feb. 1919), and who was so characterized even by Gregory Weinstein—at that time, editor of the *Nowy Mir*).

A similar division is noticeable in the branches. If discussions should be conducted on the real issues, it is possible that the "minority" will fortify in advance that the Communist Party of America will emerge from this crisis clarified and strengthened. If Centrist elements split off, it is only a desirable process.

Let us not forget the concessions arrived at by the International Conference in Holland, namely, that the Centrists to which belongs all Centrists without exception—S. P. are the most dangerous enemies of the proletarian revolution when their tendency they lean toward the Left."

Therefore, it is well that they are. It would be a bad thing if the movement only infests by various books and cookbooks the Centrists should pull away with them some really Communist elements. That would be a real loss.

This argument about Centrists is not an invention but an actual fact. One of the members of the C. E. C. a close friend and partner of the Secretary, had resigned some time ago from the S. P. and could not get back into the new conditions in the Party. He represented the so-called "leftist" group, and he is with the "minority."

Further, the Communist Labor Party in their official organ expresses its desire to merge with the "minority" into their ranks. They write in their May issue, among other things, as follows: "Unity between this (the splitting-off minority) and the C. L. P. should come very shortly."

And so, the right wing of the Communist Party will unite with the left wing of the Communist Labor Party and we shall have something like the Independent Socialists in Germany. The right wing of the C. L. P. however, in all probability, obeying the invitation of Dube, will go back to the S. P. and the Centrists, whom you know, who also decided to join the Third International and has applied for a charter. In the extreme left there will remain the Communist Party—the S. P. representative of Bolshevism in the revolutionary working class movement of America.

St. R.

PARTY MATTER

SOME DECISION OF THE LAST C. E. C. MEETING

JEWISH FEDERATION QUESTION (EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES)

1. Not being opposed to the Jewish branches which are on the side of the "majority" holding convention of their own, we instruct these branches not to participate in any convention together with Jewish branches which have taken a definite stand with the "minority."

2. To appoint a provisional committee to organize the "minority" group of the Jewish Federation with instructions to issue in Jewish translations of the statement and other important C. E. C. communications relating to the present split in the party.

3. To instruct the Jewish Provisional Committee to call as soon as possible and practicable, a convention of all those branches of the Communist Party who will re-affirm their affiliation with and adherence to the Party as represented by its C. E. C.

4. That the Jewish Provisional Committee work under the supervision and control of the C. E. C. of the Party, and that its members cannot be members of any official body of the former Jewish Federation at any time; and, if they are now, they should immediately upon acceptance of their appointment withdraw.

QUESTION OF FORMER EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

That we instruct the Executive Council to issue and publish a resolution branding former Executive Secretary Damon for all his treacherous acts against the Party or the seizure of Party funds and records, for continuing to sign as the Executive Secretary without any authority, for issuing his paper under the Party name and Seal, etc., etc.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. To write to the Amsterdam Bureau repudiating as entirely unauthorized, the participation of N. _____ in the Feb. 3-5 International Conference at Amsterdam, in the name of the Communist Party of America. T. L. Fraina thesis on "The Coming Elections," proposed for discussion and action by the Communist Party.

After some discussion the following resolution was adopted unanimously:

"Whereas, recommendation in the letter of Comrade L. Fraina of March 14, 1929, to nominate and campaign for a presidential candidate is contradicted to Communist principles and tactics as contradicted and incorporated in the Communist Party program and tactics adopted at the First Convention of the Party; and, Whereas, besides being against a change in the program along the line suggested by Comrade L. Fraina, the C. E. C. of C. P. has no authority to make such a change."

Therefore, be it resolved to refer Comrade Fraina's letter to the coming P. C. Convention for consideration in the order of business.

COMING PARTY CONVENTION

Tentative order of business (Agenda) drawn up for the coming convention (printed on first page), to be submitted through regular party channels for discussion among the groups, branches, sub-districts and district electors meeting.

Note: Other decisions pertaining to the coming Party convention must be referred to member-ships through regular Party channels.

REPORT OF DISTRICT ORGANIZERS AND FEDERATIONS

District 1. (New England.)

Entire District Committee with exception of Jewish, with the C. E. C. Lowell, Haverhill and Lawrence English groups with the C. E. C. Polish comrades with C. E. C. Com. Smith (former District Organizer) now organizer for English working-class, working under supervision of District Organizer. About twenty four Letts with "minority" and elected 7 electors to "minority" district convention. C. L. P. in Mass. knew of split even before the District Comm. "Minority" statements and papers are distributed in this District through C. L. P. channels. All other party units with C. E. C.

District 2. (New York, New Jersey, Conn.)

District Committee with C. E. C. Sub-district Committee of N. Y. City, Upper N. Y. State, Conn.

POLICY OF ENGLAND

(Continued from page 2.)

demobilization of the armies had put socialist problems as the "next order of business" when revolutionary fermentation among the workers had subsided to the English Government that the victorious countries were themselves not free from the menace of Bolshevikism—then the struggle against Soviet Russia took on primarily a social character.

The capitalist class of England decided to crush Soviet Russia as the center of the world revolution. Even then Lloyd George doubted the possibility of a final victory over Soviet Russia, but the majority of the English bourgeoisie, blind to their hatred and fear, took the point of view expressed by the first counsellor of the British Embassy at Petrograd, Mr. Linley, in his letter to Curzon in these words: "They should be treated as pariahs."

The crushing defeat of Kolchak, Yudenitch and Denikin by the Red Army proved to the English bourgeoisie how right was Lloyd George when he opposed the military adventure. The English bourgeoisie understood then that it would not succeed in crushing directly the revolutionary center of the East. She then decided to turn her energies to crushing the revolutionary elements at home. Succeeding there, she would have time enough to turn her attention to Soviet Russia later.

From this point of view, the change in the English policy toward Russia in 1920, which signifies the following: Still to a great extent the offensive on Soviet Russia failed because an ally of Soviet Russia was working in the rear of English Imperialism—the English working-class. English imperialism decided to strengthen its rear for the present through a victory of the English workers.

To attain this victory—and here we are dealing with the peculiar flexibility of English politics—English Imperialism decided to make friendly relations with Soviet Russia. Establishment of peaceful relations is intended to pacify the English workers and under the slogan "Hands off Soviet Russia" and is also intended to lay the foundation for a lasting participation of the English proletariat.

The main factor of the powerful character of the English labor movement during the last decade has been the low prices for the means of existence. Parallel to the growth of high cost of living during the years before the war was a growing fermenting of the masses and the English workers. The main source of the present revolutionary fermentation in England is the rise of prices after the conclusion of peace. One of the

and New Jersey with C. E. C. membership in Conn. Upper N. Y. State and New Jersey solidly with C. E. C. About 60% of English groups in New York City with C. E. C. and of the remaining 40% many are still neutral with a few groups for "minority" Estonian branch and with the German branches with "minority" in New York City. No information about Polish branches, as there seems to be split in the Polish Federation C. E. C. Jewish br. 50-50. Remaining membership with C. E. C. comprising about 90% of the district.

District 3 (Eastern Penn.)

Out of nine hundred members only a little over one hundred (mostly Jewish and a few Germans and Lithuanians with "minority") Russian District Convention with C. E. C. Baltimore Sub-district sent in resolution against "minority." Lithuanians also with C. E. C.

District 4A and 4B (Pittsburg and Cleveland).

Pittsburg 26 branch organizers solidly with C. E. C. at meeting where Damon spoke, with exception of one South Slavic organized but South Slavs are splitting. Cleveland, Damon's stronghold, Letts turned back to C. E. C. after hearing report of Federation representative, 30 Lithuanian groups withdrew their delegates to "minority" convention. Germans not all lost. About 80% in Cleveland with C. E. C.

District 4C (Detroit).

District Committee including Jewish with C. E. C. Fisher ("minority") was able to get only 12-Estonian, 20 German, 15 Armenian members and Lithuanian representative to go with him in entire district. But Lithuanians are all with C. E. C. All others with C. E. C.

District 5 (Illinois, etc.).

Membership led into split blindly—did not know any facts. Letts in Chicago solidly with C. E. C. Russians will stand with C. E. C. in Chicago; at their Sub-district conference they voted 5 for C. E. C., 3 for neutrality and 5 not voting. None for "minority."

Lithuanians and Ukrainians O. K.: stronghold branch of Jewish Federation in Chicago with C. E. C. Polish Federation C. E. C. decided against taking part in the "minority" convention (4 to 3); Kenosha, Milwaukee and Racine with C. E. C. Minneapolis Letts with C. E. C. Kansas City not with "minority." Defense Committee of Chicago, with about \$1300.00 in hands of Isaac.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

All District Conventions (except Boston which is neutral) in principle with C. E. C. Chicago District Convention not yet held but in process of coming back to their Federation with the C. E. C. Milwaukee, Kansas City, Kenosha and St. Louis with C. E. C. Central Committee of Russian Federation issued ultimatum to all branches to take definite stand with C. E. C. or would be expelled. Initiated Federations Conference with the result that Russian, Lettish, Ukrainian and Lithuanian Federations adopted strong resolution for C. E. C. and against the "minority."

LITHUANIAN FEDERATION

Solid with C. E. C. Some branches elected delegates to "minority" withdraw their delegates when informed of the facts.

LITTSISH FEDERATION

All branches solidly with C. E. C. and fighting the "minority." In Cleveland they withdraw from "minority" upon report of their Federation representative, Chicago same.

UKRAINIAN FEDERATION

Representative uninvited absent (missed address). But report from Federation is excellent. Whole Federation solidly with C. E. C.

"MAJORITY" ELEMENTS OF JEWISH FEDERATION

A representative from the "majority" elements of the Jewish Federation was present unofficially and reported that Jewish Federation is splitting despite neutrality of its C. E. C. In New York, only the Harlem and West End Branch with "minority." The other New York branches (2 or 3 branches) "minority." Detroit and Paterson with "minority." Chicago largest and best branch with "minority." In Philadelphia most of Jewish members with "minority." Prospects good for a strong Jewish Communist Federation.

reasons for this rise in prices is the American monopoly of bread and flour materials. Should English Imperialism succeed in disintegrating the Russian transportation system and in receiving cheap bread from Russia in exchange for industrial products, it hopes to master the revolutionary crisis at home.

But does it not raise before the leaders of English Imperialism the question of the possibility of strengthening Soviet Russia by coming to an agreement with it? To this question asked of Lloyd George by a portion of the bourgeoisie press he gives an answer which reduces itself to the following: "It is impossible to build anything stable on the basis of Communism; Society can exist only on the basis of private property and private initiative. The Communist danger lies not in the Communists, but in the destruction of capitalist society but in the destructiveness of revolutions. After the period of destruction, however, each country returns to capitalism. And Russia will also return to it, and return the sooner it will enter into commercial relations with the capitalist world. Through the 'concessionnaire' factor, foreign capital will dominate the Russian workers that capitalism is better than Communism. Should the blockade be lifted, commerce will be carried on not only with the Soviet Government, speculators (profiteers) will be able to build a more apparatus of commerce with foreign capitalist world which will dominate the whole economic policy of the Soviet Power. And should the Soviet Power—unconquerable by force of arms—have crumbled in a peaceful economic struggle, it may regenerate itself as a power, reconciling the interests of the worker on the basis of exchange economics. Thus, by concluding peace with Soviet Russia, it is possible to hope for success in the struggle not only against the English, but also against the Russian revolution."

This is the trend of thought of the leaders of English Imperialism while entering into relations with us. Not only is it our duty to enlighten the English ministers, we may decline to criticize their opinions which we only cited in order to show our readers the reasons of the English imperialistic policy toward Russia.

ENGLISH PEACE IN CONTINUATION OF ENGLISH WAR AGAINST SOVIET RUSSIA WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF ECONOMIC WEAPONS

The possibility of a victory or defeat of this English policy depends upon the degree of disorganization of the capitalist economic system of England and the organization of the Communist economic system of Russia.

(Translated from the Moscow "Pravda" No. 81 of April 17, 1929.)

After the S. P. Convention no one need be in doubt as to what Hilquist meant when he once said: "We will fight like tigers on the barricades." For further particulars apply to Ernst Scheidemann-Neske & Co., Berlin.

Seven thousand dollars is a high price to pay for getting rid of Damon, Isaacs, Langley & Co.—but the members must bear in mind the High Cost of Splitting this year.

Except for Damon's stealing of party funds and property the whole affair would be "side-splitting."

The only difference between Harold Lord Varney and Isaacs (Y. P.) is—Varney got ten cents a word for his.

"The Toiler," official organ of the C. L. P. of Ohio, invites Engdahl, Kruse, Tucker & Co. to unite with them; the "Communist Labor," official organ of the C. L. P. of the C. L. P. invites Damon, Isaacs, Langley & Co. to unite with them. Which reminds us of the watchword of the Independent of Germany: "Widest possible fraternity to Right and Left, but preservation of principles." The P. in preservation is silent, of course.

Members of the Communist Labor Party whose love for Debs overshadows their loyalty to Communist principles should, in justice to our party and to themselves, resign from the Communist Labor Party. Extract from a declaration adopted May 1st by the C. E. C. of the C. L. P. Suggestion to the C. L. P. for their next convention: Elect Debs on their N. E. C. and preserve the membership of their party.

The funny thing about these unity fiends is that the only thing that they can agree upon is unity, and in order to have "unity" as a constant issue, they can never "unite," since no two of them agree upon anything more fundamental than "unity." (From the Cleveland District Organizer.)

CONVENTION CALL

(Continued from page 2.)

in this manner, and AT THE CONVENTION CALLED BY THE C. E. C. can all real Communists forces be brought together into one party convention.

DON'T BE FOOLED BY THE BRIBE OF AN "IMMEDIATE" CONVENTION THE PURPOSE OF WHICH IS TO CONFUSE THE ISSUES.

Wait for the convention call to be issued by the C. E. C. giving all necessary data as to time, place and method of elections consistent with the proper secrecy which must be maintained in order to make the convention a success. The party units will receive full information through the regular party channels.

WAIT FOR THE CONVENTION CALL OF THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

(Signed) Central Executive Committee of The Communist Party.

D. Hunte, Acting Secretary.

A SIGNIFICANT LETTER

(Continued from page 2.)

It had not a purely mendicant character, then both Comrade Martens and his Bureau would have become the center of proletarian spirit and sympathy (though undoubtedly, he would have lost a great deal of sympathy of liberals and highly-situated personages); the activity of the Bureau would not go on so listlessly and colorlessly with such deep indifference to it from the even more conscious elements of the masses of the working class (we are not speaking here of the party elements). True, it is quite possible, that he might have been deported much earlier than he may be under the present circumstances (if at all)—but then, his deportation, and the very preparations for it—his examination, trials, etc., etc.—would not have passed so unnoticed and so quietly as is now the case...

But also! Instead of the uncompromising Communist way, Comrade Martens chose the humiliating way of compromise and back-stairs diplomacy. Instead of listening to Communist organizations, he selected as his political advisers and guides such "opportunist of the worst kind" as Comrade Hilgers puts it, as Nuorteva, Hilquist and others (we are not referring in this instance to non-partisan "experts," whose work in the Soviet Bureau is limited by the more or less narrow sphere of their specialties and who do not interfere with the political activities of the Bureau). Those—pardon the expression—"political advisers" were directing the whole activities of the Bureau, spoke in the name of and for Comrade Martens, showed him off to Senators whenever they found it necessary—in word, conducted themselves in the Bureau as if everything in it, including Comrade Martens himself, was their property...

And lately, these "political advisers" becoming bolder, openly (secretly they were doing this all the time) used their prestige and connections with the Bureau in the service of a contemptible, slanderous campaign carried on by the Right Wing Socialists—in approved Scheidemann fashion—against the Communist Party and its leading figures, contaminating whatever they touch, these advisers from the camp of the putrescent Socialist Party of America, are poisoning with their breath (even the Soviet Bureau, putting it in danger of becoming the center of Scheidemannism of the worst kind).

Whether the Soviet Bureau will escape the dangers threatening it, whether it changes its "line of behavior"—we don't undertake to predict. Only the future will show. This will depend to a great extent upon whether or not the same "political advisers" and pilots will remain at the helm of the Bureau.

As to the question of a "capitalist peace" between the United States (and other capitalist countries) and Soviet Russia, to which Comrad Bullock refers in his letter, we reserve this for a special article at some future date.

* * * The reader will find references to this question in the International Secretary's report published in the last issue and in the Tribune on May 11 which due to lack of space will be published in the Supplement.