

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 Taurès—"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 emancipated 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.

AGENDA FOR THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

- I. Reports:
 - a) C. P. 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 Parliamentarism.
 - 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 Communist Education.
 - 1) General Propaganda and Agitation.
 - 2) Classes for Propagandists and Other Communist Study Classes.
 - 3) Party Press and Literature.
 - 1) Policy.
 - 2) Literary.
 - 3) Technical.
 - 4) Communist Unity vs. "Centrist Unity."
 - 5) Defense and Relief Work.
 - f) Revision of Constitution.
- V. Resolutions.
- VI. 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

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 world, 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 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-provocateur means.

In view of the fact that the contents of this letter ceased to be a 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 precious 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, Tuvim 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, Novy 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 stunt 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 that 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 Nic. 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 capitalistic 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 within 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 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 Nic. 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 15th, 1919 (organ of the

* 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 Novy Mir and in the Communist. We urge the comrades to read 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 interests 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 Bureau, 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 British against the German stragglers, 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 Phillips, including Messrs. Adler, Kautzky, and the majority of the leaders of the "independent social-democratic party" of Germany, which is independent of the revolutionary proletariat, but dependent on petty bourgeois prejudices.

The scarcer 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 about France is—that Paris alone has already two Communist papers: "The International," edited by Raymond Pericat, and "Le Nom Défendu," edited by Georges Anquetille. Several proletarian organizations have joined the Third International. Evidently the working masses are on the side of Communism and the Soviet Power.

As to the German Communists, we have learnt that a number of towns possess Communist newspapers, most of which bear the title "The 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 flunky 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 stand made 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 Kautzky, the Renners and Friedrich Adlers, have shown themselves as 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 all proved to be in reality nothing but small-bourgeois democrats, knights of bourgeois-republican and bourgeois-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 masses. Disunion 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; these are only growing pains.

Let the Scheidemanns and Kautzky's express malicious joy in the "Vorwärts" and the "Freiheit" at dissensions among the Communists. These heroes of a decomposing small bourgeoisie are reduced to covering up their own rottenness by sneers at the Communists. Only the deliberately blind can refuse to recognize the real truth about the situation in Germany, which is the shameful betrayal of the proletarian revolution by the Scheidemanns and Kautzky, 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 followers of 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 Kautzky, 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, petty, bourgeoisie regarding parliamentary democracy, with the Communist 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 world revolutionaries and the small bourgeoisie, which, like its proto-type of 1848, worships bourgeois democracy, oblivious of the latter's bourgeois character. These two cannot work together. Haase and Kautzky, Friedrich Adler and Otto Bauer, may twist and turn, they may fill reams of paper and deliver no end of speeches, but the fact remains that, in reality, they are incapable of understanding the dictatorship of proletariat and the Soviet Power, and that they are nothing but small-bourgeois democrats. "Socialists" à la Louis Blanc and Ledru Rollain. 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, are seemingly a united party, but in reality a large proportion of the members disagree with the leaders on everything which is essential. These members 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 Hiferding in Germany, and Friedrich Adler in Austria, are proving themselves past masters in this art.

However, in the thick of the revolutionary struggle, people who try 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 cannot see the fundamental difference. Those are the dissensions among the representatives of a mass movement of a remarkably quick growth. These 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 terrors: they are growing pains and not senile decay. Bolshevism has also experienced dissensions of this kind and splits in 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' Dreadnought.")

(To be continued.)

Greetings to American Communists

FROM THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

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 thought 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 bying the minority, by coercing and victimizing the vanguard of the masses.

It is the glorious task of the American Communism 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 things 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 its organization. There is comparable enthusiasm in our country.

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 its organization. There is comparable enthusiasm in our country.

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 its organization. There is comparable enthusiasm in our country.

Political Parties in Great Britain

REPORT TO THE AMSTERDAM SUB-BUREAU 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 it is being carried on.

The class war was forgotten by the working class except by a few 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 (called Unionists). Fabians, I. L. P., B. S. P., Co-Operative Societies.

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

The demand of economic readjustments, is driving the big interests and the petty and free trade interests to 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 largest of Socialist parties, was largely a pacifist in sentiment.

Their leaders are strenuously endeavouring to lead it in the direction of the Labor Party, while the increasing intensity of the class conflict and the lessons of the revolution in Europe are driving the rank and file towards the Third International.

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 1906 elections having marked its definite advent into British politics. It is a party of 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 working class.

It is a party which has led to much confusion in estimating its capacity to express proletarian interests.

As its primary aim was to gather together all the elements which could lay claim to be focussing the workers interests in order to express them in united form, its organization was necessarily and its platform wholly indefinite.

In actual experience it is dominated by the heavier forces within it, the trade unions. Most of the important trade unions are affiliated, and put forward candidates in elections under the Labor Party auspices.

It has thus in spite of what may be termed the more radical elements within it, become the political reflex of trade unionism.

The program is essentially a reformist program, aiming at 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, whilst the capitalists look to its deeds to save them from their disaster.

The party's original looseness, nominally retained actually steadily disappears and leaves the Socialist elements to function as protesting voices.

It has not become united with machinery equal to the traditional party machinery of Liberalism and as it is enforced by the middle class elements of the old Liberal Party the voice of revolt within it but serves to strengthen and broaden the hands of reactionaries who lead the movement.

The party's original looseness, nominally retained actually steadily disappears and leaves the Socialist elements to function as protesting voices.

It has not become united with machinery equal to the traditional party machinery of Liberalism and as it is enforced by the middle class elements of the old Liberal Party the voice of revolt within it but serves to strengthen and broaden the hands of reactionaries who lead the movement.

In that certain Liberalism was lost by the centralizing and oligarchical demands of 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 Labor Party was compelled to move away from the coalition.

It is necessary to have dictatorship of the proletariat, the dominance of one class, the power of its organization and discipline, its centralized power, based upon the conquest of culture, of science, of the technique of capitalism, of the proletarian "nearness" to the psychology of every worker, its authority over the disintegrated, less developed, less-versed in politics, toilers in the village or in small industry—it requires all this in order that the proletariat should be able to lead the peasantry and all the petty-bourgeois elements in general.

It is necessary to have dictatorship of the proletariat, the dominance of one class, the power of its organization and discipline, its centralized power, based upon the conquest of culture, of science, of the technique of capitalism, of the proletarian "nearness" to the psychology of every worker, its authority over the disintegrated, less developed, less-versed in politics, toilers in the village or in small industry—it requires all this in order that the proletariat should be able to lead the peasantry and all the petty-bourgeois elements in general.

The B. S. P., much less an organization, the lineal descendant of the S. D. F., has also undergone a variety of changes even though it clings to the Labor Party.

Its next important change occurred subsequent to the Russian revolution. Up to this time it had carried with it the traditions of parliamentarism. Its opposition to the latter being not so much because it possessed an alternative theory of organization as opposition to the idea of building organizations external to the trade unions.

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

Formed in 1902 it has steadily and persistently focussed the class struggle, revolutionary parliamentarism and industrial unionism, following on the lines of De Leon of America. It has never been large in membership but its influence has been felt in every Socialist party in the country.

The Workers Socialist Federation is of recent growth out of the Women's Suffrage movement. It is now definitely anti-parliamentarian, proclaims the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviets as the only means of achieving the triumph of the working class.

The South Wales Socialist Society is a small party akin to the W. S. P. 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. A number of anarchist groups exist, many active propaganda work in sympathy with the Russian Revolution although their numbers are not large.

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

In February of 1919 the 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 W. S. F. and S. W. S. S. have their own party. The L. L. P.—"The Labor Leader," the B. S. P.—"The Call," the S. L. P.—"The Socialist," the Workers Socialist Federation—"The Workers Standard," the S. P. of Gr. Br.—"The Socialist Vanguard," the Guild Socialists—"The Guildsman."

Without the support of the party will vote in favor. The B. S. P. agree to fuse with the S. L. P. The B. S. P. apparently will now have to choose between affiliation and affiliation to the L. P.

The intensification of the conflict and the extended propaganda following the Russian Revolution had its effect on the L. L. P. in spite of its official declaration at the Scottish Conference of January 1920, declared in favor of the Third International.

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 up by tens of years of comparatively "peaceful" capitalism and of bourgeois parliamentarism that they cannot conceive of 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 believe, entirely or in part the bourgeoisie 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, deeming it "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, from bourgeois dictatorship to proletarian dictatorship. They confused one or another of the peculiarities of the Russian Soviet power, of Russian history and its development with Soviet power, with the Communist program.

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 more complete than in Russia, namely, the voluntary resignation of the bourgeois government, the momentary restoration of the unity of the working class, the unity of Socialism in the Communist program.

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, to remove all possibility of the exploitation of man by man.

It requires a pretty long transition period between capitalism and Socialism—and for that reason the re-organization of production is a difficult task, for that reason the conquest of culture and mental changes in all branches of life, for that reason the tremendous force of habit to petty-bourgeois democracy, the habit of bourgeois rule, 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, and he refers the dictatorship of the proletariat to the workers to the peasants, to the petty-bourgeois elements who resist consciously and from a numerous mass of workers too much stuffed with petty-bourgeois habits and traditions (including the peasants) who, very often, resist unconsciously.

It is necessary to have dictatorship of the proletariat, the dominance of one class, the power of its organization and discipline, its centralized power, based upon the conquest of culture, of science, of the technique of capitalism, of the proletarian "nearness" to the psychology of every worker, its authority over the disintegrated, less developed, less-versed in politics, toilers in the village or in small industry—it requires all this in order that the proletariat should be able to lead the peasantry and all the petty-bourgeois elements in general.

It is necessary to have dictatorship of the proletariat, the dominance of one class, the power of its organization and discipline, its centralized power, based upon the conquest of culture, of science, of the technique of capitalism, of the proletarian "nearness" to the psychology of every worker, its authority over the disintegrated, less developed, less-versed in politics, toilers in the village or in small industry—it requires all this in order that the proletariat should be able to lead the peasantry and all the petty-bourgeois elements in general.

It is necessary to have dictatorship of the proletariat, the dominance of one class, the power of its organization and discipline, its centralized power, based upon the conquest of culture, of science, of the technique of capitalism, of the proletarian "nearness" to the psychology of every worker, its authority over the disintegrated, less developed, less-versed in politics, toilers in the village or in small industry—it requires all this in order that the proletariat should be able to lead the peasantry and all the petty-bourgeois elements in general.

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

Bolshevism," raised by the Communist Labor Party and by "disseminating voices" within the Communist Party. His only error is that these protests were "confused,"—so far as the Communist Labor Party was concerned, and that they were "disseminated" within the Communist Party...

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 Zinoviev, the chairman of the Communist International, in one of his official communications, calls the Russian Communist Federation "promulgators of the Communist movement in the United States."

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 Federations: "The net result of the Federation leadership has been an absolute pushing backward of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States," he indignantly exclaims.

O, of course, since the Communist Party has already been organized in this country,—it is already not the desire at this date to quarrel with the fact that the Communist Party, he tries to reassure us. He is so marginal a mouse, that he does not even mention—"At this date"—that the Convention, at which the Communist Party would have been backed...

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. By the way, Comrade Reader, does this not have a familiar ring to you—this charge of "a small clique of vain politicians"? Isnt this the very same charge which is now being "spread" by the reptile press in "dominating and suppressing the good, kind and generous but simple Russian people"?

his accusation that "an aggressive membership" could be or has been dominant in the "small clique of politicians," certainly sounds just as absurd as the most ridiculous and lying accusations invented against the Bolsheviks by the capitalist press.

While virulently attacking the Federations for their "fighting" in order to transform it into the Communist Party,—our virtuous Left-Winger confesses, however, his aim as well as his adherents' into Communist convention and electioneering, in the Communist Party was "a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party"—in other words,—re-transformation of the Communist Party back into the Left Wing:

"Once in Communist Convention (in other words,—once such a "catastrophe" had happened), there appeared an escape from the dilemma—a Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party!"

The Federations, and especially the more experienced Russian Federations understood very well, and saw through the tricky plans of the "perpetual Left-Wingers"; they realized the danger of a "Left Wing conquest (or absorption) of the Communist Party, and acted accordingly. . . . But Y. F. and his followers, in their stupidity and did not know that they and their plans were discovered and warded against,—and this is precisely why he so "sarcastically" accuses (in his naively but unsuspecting 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 and understand 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 any other date. The only difference of fact the Federations shifted the date from the former to the latter,—but it was important, and it made a great difference as to how to start the Party. It is 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—in the numerically but poor in "Communist quality."

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

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) during the subsequent seven months of the Party's existence, our "Lord Varney" and his followers were not discouraged; they found their consolation in the sentence: "defeats are 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.

"A 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 "theoretician" of the "minority" group,—his administrative Sancho Panza—Damon—decided 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!"

His recent "coup d'etat" 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 "new wisdom" 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

(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 COMING CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY. APPEAL TO THE MEMBERSHIP, ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY.

The Central Executive Committee recognizes the necessity for a party convention in order to settle finally the differences that have been seething within the party at a long time and 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, A 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 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 PARTY CONVENTION MUST AND WILL BE CALLED.

year—no organized Communist Party, but only an "unimaginative," diffused Left Wing divided into two groups,—majority and minority...

At the end of the first paragraph of his article,—of which this is an analysis,—Y. F. promises a "continuation." We do not know, whether or not he will fulfill this promise. But even if he should, we doubt whether he will say anything new, whether it will be anything particularly interesting. As we stated before, his "political identity" is now definitely clear to us. Whatever "new" and "interesting" he could have said, is already contained in the first part of his article. His further "written exercises" can only have an "archaeological" or "psychological" interest. They may contain interesting material for a treatise on the "Psychology of a Political Has-Been," but no more than that.

He revealed himself politically, as a "Communist Has-Been." Together with Harold Lord Varney Walling, Spargo and others, he has the dubious honor to belong to a "class" of political "has-beens."

It may be argued that to identify him with Walling and Spargo is a "little too strong." To which we reply, that we do not imply that his apostasy is of the same degree as that of Walling or Spargo. We do not intend to imply, may be better expressed in a "mathematical formula": The relation of Y. F. to the Communist Party is identical to the relation of Walling and Spargo to the Socialist Party, or of Lord Varney to the I. W. W.

All of them belong to the same political species, all of them should be carefully shelved and listed in a museum of "political has-beens." Regrettable, however, is that no many comrades—many of them good and sincere Communists, perhaps,—still do not understand this "has-been" character of Y. F. and of the "minority group" whom he represents.

Some of these earnest comrades, are still due to misunderstanding, misinformation, or misinterpretation, on the side of the "minority," serving the latter as a sort of "gunfunder" in its fight against the Communist Party. But even among the comrades who are on the side of the "majority," rather than of the Communist Party,—some Communists though they be—we hear from time to time (but more and more seldom though, it is true) voices in favor of "requesting Damon and the other members of the C. E. C. to return immediately to their respective posts" and continue to work under the control and supervision of the C. E. C.

The comrades voicing these "requests" and "demands," in their honest and sincere conviction, to the Communist Party do not realize that neither Damon nor Y. F. and other leading figures of the "minority" group do belong any longer to the Communist Party, and for that matter—to the Communist movement in general,—that to "invite" them back into the Communist ranks sounds just as naive and sentimental,—if not to say ridiculous,—as for instance, to "invite" Hill-cup or Oneal into the Communist ranks!

We want to see the "minority" group where—a real, definite, revolutionary Communist Party, without any "Centrist" taint about it. It was for such a Communist Party that we split away from the Socialist Party, that we (for overwhelming majority of us) broke from the National Left Wing Conference and separated ourselves from the Centrist "Communist Labor" elements. Are we now going to destroy the results of this long and painful process of building the Communist Party? Are we now going to "invite" back to our ranks those "Centrists," who—just because of their "Centrism"—have themselves voluntarily left us? No, comrades! It is high time to understand, that—whatever might be said of the split in the C. E. C. its reasons and its necessity or practicability at that particular moment, two months before the convention,—now, since the split has already occurred, we have no reasons to regret its occurrence.

Prematurely, perhaps, having occurred earlier than it would have otherwise, this split liberated us from the "Centrist" elements who handicapped our Communist work, and, if anything,—we must rejoice about it.

It is high time to understand that the return of all these "Centrist" elements into the Communist Party (granting, for the sake of argument, that such an absolutely impossible thing could have occurred) would be a disaster for the Communist movement backward in this country by at least one year. . . . considerations and the desire to bring them to the attention of the comrades pointed us to write this article. Though devoted to "one individual" only,—as it might appear on the surface,—this "one individual" being the leading "theoretician" of the "minority" group,—it was important to prove conclusively to the comrades his and his followers "Centrist" character.

Not speaking even of the utter incoherence of inviting "back to his post" former Executive Secretary Damon, a man who so shamelessly betrayed his trust and the confidence placed in him!

must be well-prepared and carefully arranged. The time, the place, the method of electing the delegates are essential prerequisites 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, when the time comes for the election of delegates, they will not elect them blindly, BUT INTELLIGENTLY AND RESPONSIBLY. ONLY THOSE MEMBERS WHO ACTUALLY REPRESENT THEIR OPINION ON THE ISSUES IN THE CONVENTION.

All this requires time for preparation,—preparation for the process of elections in the various stages and the technical arrangements connected with these and the convention itself, both by the membership and the Central Executive Committee. It can be too soon, without the proper time for preparation and study stated above, for the convention will inevitably fail to accomplish its purpose.

Moreover, this convention should be called only by the Central Executive Committee of the party, convention can speak with authority in the name of the Communist Party and its membership as a whole. This is the only meaning of revolutionary discipline and discipline upon which a real strong Communist Party can be based. 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 fixed in the call issued by the former Executive Secretary implies no real desire to have any convention at first.

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 the membership, with the Central Executive Committee. He is only the executor of the decisions of that body, or where a division exists of the majority of the 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 chance 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. Most assuredly they know it, but still they purposely fixed such an impossible date as a sort of "trap" in 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 a "shorter" date. The very fact that in their letter to the C. E. C. requesting a joint action on the question of a party convention, the "minority" express a 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, to appoint to the C. E. C., to appoint paid District Organizers in every District, even where District Organizers appointed by the C. E. C. are still functioning, in order to build up rival "organizing" units 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 "minority" will anger the "minority" and in no uncertain terms. They will not be led into the trap set for them. They will refuse to go into a "convention" called by the "minority" and "minority" and 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, TAKE SIDES and elect their delegates accordingly in order to settle the issues at the convention called by the Central Executive Committee. At present, the "next order of business" before the membership is to discuss these 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 the discussion, before the sub-district and district conventions are held (not after them). For it is exactly these preliminary 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 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.

THIS CALL WILL BE SIGNIFY THAT YOU STAND BEHIND THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY BY REPEATING THE WORDS ESTABLISHED BY THE FORMER EXECUTIVE SECRETARY.

SIGNIFY THIS CONCRETELY, BY ALIGNING YOURSELVES WITH THE DISTRICT ORGANIZATIONS UNDER THE CONTROL AND DIRECTION OF THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTION.

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

IS THE EXHAUSTIVE DISCUSS THE ISSUES. WE MUST UNDERSTAND THEM SO THAT YOU WILL BE ABLE TO ELECT THE DELEGATES WHO REPRESENT YOUR POINT OF VIEW. ONLY

(Continued on page 8.)

*Not being a "theoretician" and shamelessly 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 "theoretical" and "organizational" ideas found its expression in the following profound sentences in his "Statement to the Majority members of the C. E. C. (Ex. Council). "The Chicago District Organizers . . . in the most capable man in such a position . . . he has turned over to the National organization . . . more funds than all the other districts combined . . . The affidavits of the I. W. W. are used "Vote-buyers" Damon may well be called a "vote-buyer." And he certainly knows how to catch money. He "appropriated" more than seven thousand dollars of party money and "got away with it."

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 "majority" 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 conservator 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.

As for their statement that they 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. disregarding the differences between the two organizations—and disregarding the elemental consideration in Communist unity—ACCEPTANCE AND PRACTICE OF COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES. They never looked beyond the mere technical advantages of gaining more organizers, writers and speakers and ignored all else.

On the question of International Delegates and Relations with the Third International we have proved conclusively that their conception of international relations is on a par with that of

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 nowise 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'etat 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 setting the real fundamental issues between the "majority" 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 "Humanité" of April 15th, has replied to Chicherin's last note, assuring the Soviet Government of its sincere friendship towards 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 "Imperial" 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 Elias)—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 "Humanité" of April 15th, the White General Wrangel 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 15th, that the general strike had just begun, and attributed its origin to the following causes. The workers, in agreement with the Unions and the Party, have organized factory councils (commission interni) everywhere; the employers have consequently begun a struggle against the new organizations with the object of divesting them 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 labor 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's 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 forsook 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, parliamentary 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 know the truth of the Socialist Revolution in Russia. Not to understand that the bourgeois parliamentary 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 if 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

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 C. L. P. together with the C. I. 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 author. When all the facts are in, we have no doubts as to how we 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 has not yet finished—the path of its activities still new and unexplored—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 camp 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—for those who claim 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. Only 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 against the other members of the C. L. P.—an overwhelming majority of ten. 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 majority has means 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 Labor Party.

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 Central Executive Committee to remove District Organizers whom he had appointed; he is dissatisfied with the sending of delegates to Europe (to meetings of the Third International), although such delegates were elected at the September Convention; 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 trust 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, besides the Central Executive body there 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 moralizations 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 be those elements, who by their sympathy already stand with the C. L. P. In the triumvirate of the "minority" there is, for example, a member who took part in the so-called Anarcho-Menshevik Russian Congress (Jan. and Feb. 1916), and who was so characterized even by Gregory Weinstein—at that time, editor of the *Novy Mir*.

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

Let us not forget the conclusions arrived at by the International Conference in Holland, namely, that "opportunists (to which belong all Contrists without exception—St. R.) are the most dangerous enemies of the proletarian revolution whom in their tendency they lean toward the Left."

Therefore, it is well that they go. It would be a bad thing for the movement only inasmuch as by various hooks and crooks—the *Conférence* and other ways with their so-called Communist elements—that would be a real loss.

This argument about Contrists is not an invention but an actual fact. One of the members of the C. L. P., a close friend and partner of the Secretary, had resigned some time ago for the reason that he could not get used to 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 express satisfaction at the split and really invite the "minority" into their ranks. They write in their May issue, among other things, as follows: "Unity between this (the splinter-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 Debs, will go back to the old Socialist Party, which, you know, has also decided to join the Third International; and, has applied for a charter. In the extreme left there will remain the Communist Party—the only necessary representative of Bolshevikism in the revolutionary working class movement of America.

St. R.

NEWS FROM EUROPE

P. R. A. N. C. P.

To the Strains of the "International."
Recently-mobilized recruits of the 1920 class write to "La Vie Ouvrière," of April 16th, as follows:—From Metz: "The departure from the Gare the 15th took place amidst the strains of the 'International.'" From Toul: "I have seen in a Nancy paper that the 1920 class was joining up with enthusiasm. This is a little too strong. From Paris to Nancy we sang the 'International.' All the time our captain was saying that all the Parisians were Bolsheviks. On Thursday, while we were going through Nancy, our officers wanted to make us sing 'Madelon.' We all said we didn't know it." Another writes: "We left singing, certainly, but not the 'Marseillaise.' On our arrival and at departure, in all the stations—Chateau-Thierry, Châlons, Bar-le-Duc, Commercy, the 'International' was chanted, broken every now and then by cries of 'down with the Army!'"

S. W. I. & E. R. I. A. N. D.

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 Communist International—"Le Populaire," April 17th, 1920.

