

5351

**The Menace**  
*of*  
**OPPORTUNISM**

*by*  
**MAX BEDACHT**



**15 CENTS**

**DAILY WORKER PUBLISHING CO.**  
*"The Source of All Communist Literature"*  
**1113 W. WASHINGTON BLVD. CHICAGO, ILL.**



290



## FOREWORD.

The building and perfecting of a revolutionary party of the proletariat is a process. The most important of this process is that of the Bolshevization of the party. The Workers (Communist) Party of America is now in the first stages of this process.

Bolshevization is the process of adaption of the party, its form of organization, its activities and the ideological and theoretical understanding of its membership to its task, that of organizing and leading the workers for and in the proletarian revolution.

This aim can be achieved only if the party frees its ranks from all elements that are not responsive to the duties of a revolutionist. Elements opposed to the revolutionary class struggle must be eliminated.

This task is more complicated than it appears. It seems that in a voluntary association of revolutionists no one should be found who does not subscribe to revolutionary principles. But this is not so. Conscious or unconscious anti- and counter-revolutionary elements find their way into a revolutionary party and try to sway it from its duty. They attempt to accomplish this task by means of false theories, by spreading of enervating pessimism, by trying to turn the party from an organization of revolutionary action into one of revolutionary phrase. They are busily engaged in replacing the guiding principle of the revolutionary party—Marxism, Leninism,—by opportunism.

A vicious American variety of opportunism presents itself to our party in the form of Loreism.

What is Loreism?

"It is an invention of the enemies of Ludwig Lore within the Workers Party," answer the Loreites.

A two months discussion in the "New York Volkszeitung" has revealed Loreism in its fullest glory. No longer restrained by a desire to hide their true identity because detected and unmasked by the party, the Loreites have given voice to their true desires, ideas and principles. In their own discussion they answered the question "What is Loreism?" And the

answer was: "Loreism is opposition to the theories of Communism; Loreism is antagonism to the tactics of the Communist International and its American section, the Workers (Communist) Party of America."

Hatred against the Communist International was the outstanding feature of most contributors to this discussion. The spirit of counter-revolution prevailed in them.

And the inspirer, the guardian angel of the paradise of American opportunists in the "Federation of International Workers" is Ludwig Lore, the editor of the "New York Volkszeitung."

"Only Communists can participate in this discussion," declared Lore. Communists indeed! Communists of his caliber—Communists to Lore's liking! By permitting the articles of his friends to appear, by failing to take issue even with the most treacherous expression in them, by being a member and the leader of the organization of these traitors to Communism, by expressing the same views as these Lore-ites, Lore identifies himself with every word written in this discussion, and is responsible for every word.

This pamphlet aims to take issue with Loreism, with opportunism. We must combat it. We must cleanse our party and the whole proletarian movement in America of this menace of potential counter-revolution. We must steel ourselves and our party against the anti-proletarian influences of this opportunism and these opportunists, and in that way improve our revolutionary understanding and the revolutionary value of our party for the proletariat.

Max Bedacht.

CHICAGO, January 2, 1926.

# The MENACE of OPPORTUNISM

*A Contribution to the Bolshevization of the  
Workers (Communist) Party.*

by MAX BEDACHT



## 1. The Background of the Problem.

"It is our task to continually remodel those elements who (in the days of revolutionary turmoil, M. B.), come to us . . . but who do not possess persistency enough to fight not only on revolutionary holidays but also on counter-revolutionary weekdays." Lenin: "Liquidation of the Liquidators," 1909.

The news of the victory of the Russian workers over their bourgeoisie in November, 1917, enthused the proletariat of the world. It regained its revolutionary self-confidence. The pessimism of the masses with regard to their own future, which often took the unnatural form of optimism for the future welfare of their immediate enemy, the bourgeoisie, gradually gave way to new independent proletarian class life. Even the politically most backward workers began to raise their heads higher. And this new life, this new hope, this new enthusiasm, manifested itself in a general way in a revolutionary advance of the proletarian masses.

This change of the state of mind of the proletarian masses also changed the attitude of many of the leaders of the workers. In Germany, for instance, the Scheidemanns, Eberts, and Noskes turned over night from lackeys of the Kaiser into "leaders" of the revolution against the Kaiser. One day they bowed to "his Majesty, the Emperor"; but the next day they bowed without hesitation to "His Majesty, the Revolutionary Proletariat." One day they bowed to the Kaiser, using their influence over the masses to prevent the revolution, the next day they bowed to the revolution in order to maintain their influence over the masses so that they might betray it.

In those days the menace of opportunism showed its real face, that of the most formidable enemy of the proletariat, causing its temporary defeat. A working class whose leading strata or party was educated in the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism would not have fallen victim to this treachery. With such a party at the head of the workers, the first betrayal of leaders, as that of Scheidemann in 1914, would have been difficult; the second betrayal in 1918 would have been impossible.

The growth of revolutionary confidence of the proletarian



masses as a result of the Russian revolution not only changed the tactics of the social chauvinists but also those of the social pacifists. In a self-deceptive enthusiasm the latter passed off their pacifism for internationalism, and their sickly sentimentalism of "brotherly love" as international class solidarity. The revolutionary holiday transformed these peaceful lambs into imitations of roaring lions. A successful continuance of the universal revolution would either have transformed these elements into genuine and faithful servants of the revolution or it would have thrown them to the surface as counter-revolutionary refuse.

The course of the proletarian revolution, however, is not a straight line upward to success. While it marches onward and upward to victory with irresistible accuracy it meets many obstacles and temporary setbacks. Temporarily the revolutionary holiday makes room for the counter-revolutionary weekday. Revolution takes on the face of counter-revolution, not as an indication of defeat for the proletariat, but as a demonstration of the difficulties which the revolution encounters in its road. On these counter-revolutionary weekdays the work of the revolutionist is not inspired by the enthusiasm which is generated by success within reach. In these days the enthusiasm must be supplied by theoretical understanding and conviction. The work on the barricades which, in spite of its dangers, appeals to the romantic soul, makes room in these days for the tedious detail work of the everyday struggle. The success of this work has no spectacular features and can be understood and judged only by its relation to the general position and advance of the working class in the class struggle.

Those are the trying hours of the convert of revolutionary days. He sees victory slipping away from the revolution. He takes the attitude of waiting for better opportunities instead of exploiting existing opportunities for the struggle and for its organization. He introduces his old and worm-eaten phrases of brotherly love and universal peace to replace the principles of unrelenting class struggle. His belief in the revolutionary power of the working class vanishes and all energies left to him he spends in trying to foist his own pessimism upon the party and upon the working class as a whole. To avoid any responsibility he denies the role of leadership of a revolutionary party and transfers the revolutionary initia-



tive from the party to the masses; instead of marching ahead he proposed to limp behind the masses. And all these changes he ascribes to his realism, which "recognizes the absence of a revolutionary situation."

A Communist Party can overcome this tendency in its ranks only by increased activities and by an energetic campaign of cleansing its ranks from any leading elements who represent and propagate these tendencies.

The Workers (Communist) Party of America is face to face with such a tendency in the form of Loreism. Loreism is revolutionary pessimism. To meet the situation, this pessimism advances its own tactic, opportunism, the tactic of inaction. The Communists must meet this tendency; they must fight it. They must eradicate it from their Party and kill its influence in the working class.

Loreism attempts to make itself and the world believe that it alone withstood the wave of revolutionary romanticism which originated with the November revolution in Russia. In reality it was its only victim and now when the wave has receded it becomes the torch bearer of revolutionary disappointment. It is revising its "revolutionary" orientation of the period of illusions and returns to its old and unadulterated opportunism. Terrified by its own dream of yesterday of a revolutionary success, it now attempts with all its power to prevent revolutionary success for the morrow.

It is the period of counter-revolutionary weekdays in which this opportunism raises its head most consistently and in which it is most dangerous. It is in these days when the Bolshevik qualities of the Communists are tested. And it is in these days when all those who fail in this test must be removed not only from the position of leadership but also from the ranks of the Party.

## II. The Essence of the Problem.

"One of the most indispensable conditions for the preparation of the proletariat for its victory is a difficult, persevering, inexorable struggle against opportunism, reformism, social-chauvinism and such other bourgeois influences and tendencies which a proletariat in capitalist surroundings can not escape. Without such a struggle, without a complete victory over opportunism (and anarchism) within the labor movement, there can be no hope for a proletarian dictatorship. Bolshevism could not have defeated the bourgeoisie in 1917-1919 if it had not learned before, 1903-1917, to defeat and pitilessly



drive out of the party of the proletarian vanguard, the Mensheviks, that is the opportunists, reformists and social-chauvinists." Lenin: "Elections to the Constituent Assembly and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," 1919.

Opportunism is a serious menace; it is a slow but deadly poison—deadly to revolutionary understanding, to revolutionary self-confidence and energy. With disastrous effects this poison had penetrated the Second International of the revolutionary workers, causing its utter collapse at the first serious crisis. Under the ruins of this structure were buried the hopes and the lives of millions of toilers.

Few revolutionists were unaffected by this poison; still fewer understood and uncovered its deadly character and attempted to eliminate it from the body of the organizations of the revolutionary proletariat.

These few, the greatest of whom was Lenin, became the leaders of a new, a truly revolutionary International, which keeps the weapon of the revolutionary class struggle free from the devastating breed of the bacillus of opportunism. In this new International the hope expressed by Frederick Engels at the death of the First International finds its fulfillment; it is "a Communist International, built on the solid foundations of the revolutionary principles of Karl Marx,"—fortified by the invulnerable principles of Leninism.

Opportunism is the fundamental tendency of a social group that has nothing to hope for in the future. This group is the petty bourgeoisie. The petty bourgeois fears and hates big capital because the pressure of its monopolies pushes him out of his position in society. But he loves capitalism. He fears and hates the workers, because he sees in their struggle for a better existence a fundamental struggle against capitalism itself. With his longing eyes fixed on the position of a big bourgeois, on a heaven of richness and independence, he is in reality quickly moving toward the hell of a proletarian existence. Seeing in his sober moments this real future before him, he searches for his ideals in the past. But the past has no future. Thus the petty bourgeois finds himself hanging on to some substanceless abstractions like "justice," "liberty," "peace" and "brotherhood."

Chasing these phantoms the petty bourgeois alternately tries to recruit the proletariat against big capital—or big capital against the proletariat. But because it is without a constructive program of its own, the petty bourgeoisie is unable



to lead. It can only be useful in the further development of society as an instrument either of the big bourgeoisie or of the proletariat. With its eyes fixed on the past the petty bourgeoisie cannot but be reactionary. The latent rebellious energies of that group, however, can be freed and utilized for the struggle for social progress. The revolutionary proletariat can and must exploit the fear and hatred of the petty bourgeois against big capital. This task can be accomplished with least difficulties in periods of economic depression when big capital reaps its harvest in baisse and drives large portions of the petty bourgeoisie into bankruptcy. But even in such periods this aim can be accomplished only if the revolutionary proletariat establishes its leadership over the petty bourgeoisie.

Wherever and whenever the proletariat tolerates the political leadership of the petty bourgeoisie over its class, then and there the petty bourgeoisie inevitably and invariably proves to be the instrument of big capital. As such it operates either thru a political party of its own, preaching "justice" while it persecutes the workers, uttering phrases of "peace" while it wars for big capital—or it operates directly as a leader of the proletariat, forcing even upon the revolutionary organizations of the workers the practice of an opportunist antithesis to every one of the revolutionary principles of such organizations.

To counteract these poisonous petty bourgeois influences the revolutionary party of the proletariat, the Communist Party, must carry on unrelenting struggle against opportunism within its ranks. The antidote to opportunism is Leninism.

### III. Activity Against Passivity.

"Do not minimize the tasks of the advance guard of the revolution. Do not forget your duty to support this vanguard by your own organized activity. Less commonplaces about the development of the self-activities of the workers—these workers engage in eminently more revolutionary self-activities than you ever can comprehend—but see to it that the workers are not corrupted by your own 'chvostism.'" \* Lenin: "Two Tactics," February, 1905.

A Communist Party is either a party of action or it is

---

\* Khvostism—From the Russian Khvost (tail). Khvostism means trotting after the movement as its tail instead of marching ahead of it as its head.



neither communist nor a party. Certain fundamentals must always be kept in mind:

1. The proletarian revolution and its victory is not an event that the proletariat merely has to wait for with the confidence of a fatalist. It must be brought about. It must be consciously organized. Marxism teaches an understanding of the immanent laws of social development in general and of capitalist development in particular and thus shows the conditions under which the proletarian revolution must and will take place. Leninism teaches the mechanics of the revolution thru a proletarian dictatorship and thus becomes an indispensable guide to the workers in the period of imperialist capitalism, in the period of the proletarian revolution.

2. The proletarian revolution is not one separate and distinct act which is initiated by the workers on the day when they reach full revolutionary consciousness. It is rather an uninterrupted series of struggles and actions, created and intensified by a growing class-consciousness, and in turn creating and intensifying the class-consciousness of the proletarian masses. These struggles thus gradually reach a climax which turns, in the period of a revolutionary crisis, into a struggle for power.

3. Revolutionary consciousness, initiative and self-confidence of the proletariat, are therefore not the creators, but the result of the struggles of the workers. The important teacher of the working masses for the revolutionary struggles is their own experience gained in action. **The army of the revolutionary proletariat is recruited not only FOR but also BY its battles.** While this army sets itself greater and greater tasks its ranks grow and its consciousness increases. While its ranks grows and its consciousness increases it sets itself greater and greater tasks.

4. The revolutionary party, the Communists, represent the highest potentiality of revolutionary consciousness, initiative, self-confidence and understanding of the working class. It is therefore the indispensable factor in all struggles, the initiator, the organizer, the leader and the teacher who bases his lessons not merely on gray theory but on the lessons derived from the struggles. Within the ranks of this group of most advanced workers all the activities of the workers must reach their greatest intensity. If the Communist Party is and does neither of these things it is not a revolutionary party. If it is and does all of these things it must be a party of action.



The opportunists deny all these functions of a revolutionary organization. Lore declares: "According to the situation and in view of the disorganized state of the labor movement in our country it is much more correct to build an organization which confines itself purely to the propaganda of the ideas of revolutionary socialism." Not organization of the revolution, not active participation in the class struggle, but propaganda of ideas, is the aim thus expressed.

Here we find opportunism excelling itself. There is chaos and disorganization in the labor movement. What is there to do? The revolutionary worker answers: The only thing to do is to go to work and bring order into the chaos. To accomplish this, action is required and the initiatory action must be furnished by the vanguard of the proletariat, by the Communists; action to overcome the lethargy of the masses; action to set an example for these masses; action to set the masses into motion; action to gain the confidence of the masses.

The opportunist proposes to solve the situation with propaganda. Propaganda of what? Propaganda in itself means nothing. Propaganda must have an object. "Our propaganda will teach by interpreting present day history for the workers," answers the opportunist. But the Communist answers in the words of Marx: "Our task is not to make new interpretations but to make new history." As far back as 1882 Engels wrote to J. P. Becker: "The New International, of course, can no longer be a propaganda society, but it must be an organization of and for action."

We have here not merely an unimportant difference of opinion. Here we find resurrected within the ranks of the Communists the very poison which paralyzed the energies of the Second International, which was responsible for the utter lack of preparation of the proletariat in the memorable days of August, 1914, and which led to the inevitable debacle of that movement. After years of experience of the utter failure and falseness of this maxim, Loreism is trying to teach it as the expression of highest revolutionary wisdom.

The idea of socialism will not overthrow capitalism. Proletarian action will do it if this action is based on the principles of revolutionary socialism, on Communism.

"All we need," says a Loreite in the "New York Volkszeitung" of September 17, "is to teach a small number of workers, about a million, how to be clear in their aim, and



then we will, perhaps, be able to lead the 130 millions of Americans to the revolution." And the methods with which he proposes to teach this small little million the principles of the class struggle is—Loreism. More nonsense has never been put into so few words. More ignorance has never been displayed in so few words. More lack of revolutionary knowledge and confidence have never been disclosed in so few words. And these are the people that sit in judgment upon the Workers (Communist) Party in this discussion. And these are the people whom Lore organizes into his preparatory school for the revolution. Poor revolution!

What says Lore to this? He very gravely declares that this article is presenting "objective arguments which elevate this discussion to the level of a political debate."

All we need is a million Loreites, "a small number indeed," remarks the writer, and we will be able to lead the millions of unorganized in their struggles. This is merely the way of an idiot who says: "I do not want a revolution."

The Loreites speak of lack of realism and of revolutionary romanticism of the Communists. Here we have utopianism pure and simple. For this Loreite whom we have quoted above, the proletarian revolution does not develop out of the class antagonisms within capitalism, but it is the creation of one million leaders who are well trained in Loreism. Before the task of educating this million is completed, all thoughts of revolution are mere illusions.

This counter-revolutionary argument is not only answered by the theory of Marxism, but it is decisively answered by history itself. "Before the 22nd of January, 1905, the revolutionary party of Russia was made up of a mere handful of people—the reformists sneeringly referred to it as a sect.

"In a few months things changed completely. The hundreds of revolutionary socialists increased to thousands. Thousands turned into leaders of the two to three million proletarians. The proletarian struggle produced deep ferment and caused, partially, the revolutionary movement of the mass of fifty to one hundred million peasants; the peasant movement, in turn, produced sympathies in the army and resulted in military rebellions, in armed struggles of sections of the army against other sections. Thus the vast country with its 130 millions of inhabitants found itself in the throes of revolution. Thus the sleeping Russia turned into the Russia of the revolutionary proletariat and of the revolution-



ary people." These are the words in which Lenin describes the transformation in 1905 of peaceful into revolutionary Russia. Thus do the elementary forces of the class struggle exert themselves. Thus does history disregard all the plans and the desires of the opportunist and accuse him, by the experiences of the revolutionary proletariat, of being an enemy of the working class. Whether this enmity be born of idiocy or design, its danger is none the less indisputable and serious.

"All we can do at present," says another Loreite in the "Volkszeitung" of September 9th, "is to seriously study and teach socialism." After all we must first become social-democrats before we can become Communists. "Lenin was a social-democrat, Marx was one, and so was Engels."

Here, in the heat of the controversy, Loreism discloses its heartfelt wishes. "What distinguishes us from the social-democrat of today is not the socialist theory," says the Loreite, "but merely the practice." But Lenin "the former social-democrat" has spent the best part of his life and his energies in fighting, first of all, the theories of the social-democrats. And Engels, the other "social-democrat" cited by the opportunists, fought vigorously more than fifty years ago against the very name "social-democrat." He pointed out that there is an insoluble contradiction in this name. A socialist could not at the same time be a democrat.

But such little contradictions mean nothing in the life of a Loreite. This crew is in itself an insoluble contradiction of the revolutionary movement. But the movement cannot stand such contradictions. They must be eliminated from it by a major operation.

The Communist is active; the opportunist talks. The Communist organizes action; the opportunist fears action. The Communist organizes revolution; the opportunist talks about it. The Communist uses his party to set the masses in motion; the opportunist dreads motion (except of his tongue) and excuses his own motionlessness by that of the proletariat. The Communist attempts to develop a revolutionary movement of the masses; the opportunist explains his own lack of revolutionary spirit by the absence of such a spirit in the masses. The Communist will lead in the revolution; the opportunist will try to prevent, and finally betray it.



#### IV. "Independent" Communists.

"The Bolsheviks have always emphatically declared that they do not desire to form a new and special tendency of socialism, but that they merely desire to apply the fundamental principles of the whole, international, orthodox Marxian Socialism to the new conditions . . . and that they will prove that they know how to do their duty even in the most difficult, slow and tedious everyday work." Lenin: "Liquidation of the Liquidators," 1919.

The Communists do not represent a special school of revolutionists. They do not express merely a tendency of socialism. The Communists are the revolutionary socialists. Their fundamental principle is Marxism. Their loyalty is to the working class. Their enmity is to capitalism. Their function is to organize and lead the revolutionary class struggle.

There is no organized group of proletarian revolutionists outside of the Communists. There can be none. Whoever wants to take issue with this assertion cannot take issue with the Communist Party but must take it with Communism.

Lore has not yet learned that. And when history proves it to him then he turns from the lesson and hides behind an analogy.

Hoeglund in Sweden has fought the Communist International. He was thrown out. He established himself as an "independent" Communist. But in spite of his protestations of independence and loyalty to Communism he gravitated quickly and irresistibly toward the Social-Democratic Party of Sweden. Finally the inevitable happened. Hoeglund united with the Social-Democrats. Lore was an understudy of Hoeglund. Hoeglund's fate foreshadowed his own. So he became busy exploiting. He did not take issue with Hoeglund's principles nor with his grievances with the Communist International. He took the "justice" of Hoeglund's cause for granted. But he "explained." On September 25th, 1925, Lore declares in the "Volkszeitung":

"The independent Communists (? M. B.) in Sweden have now united with the Swedish Social-Democracy. Although it is deplorable that these Swedish Communists (my emphasis, M. B.) have gone back to the Social-Democrats, yet we can understand it. In Sweden there exists a strong Social-Democratic movement, a mass movement. The Communist movement, too, although far weaker than the socialists, is a sort of a mass movement. An independent Commu-

nist movement seemingly could not maintain itself there. And such will be the case everywhere where the working class is well organized and where it has at its disposal mass organizations and mass movements. In this respect the United States differs from the European countries. Because here there exists neither a Socialist nor a Communist mass movement. Here it is therefore possible to be **truly and honestly independent** (? M. B.) without being crushed by either the one or the other of the millstones—because there are no millstones.”

Here we have Loreism in “Reinkultur.” \* Loreism, truly and honestly independent—**independent of what?**

We understand Lore’s independence perfectly when we see that he finds it in order, and can understand why the “independent” Communists in Sweden go back—not to the Communists, but—to the socialists. While Lore sees no significance in that, we are obliged to find significance in Lore’s attitude. “Hoeglund had to give up his ‘independence’ on account of the size of the Socialist and Communist movements in Sweden,” says Lore. If you grant that argument, then Lore easily ducks from under the necessity of explaining why Hoeglund went back to the socialists. He simply could not resist the size. If the Communist Party were larger there is no question that Hoeglund would have gone back to that party. It is simply and purely a matter of gravitation. And we all know that the larger body has the greater attraction. If Hoeglund’s independents were the larger of the three groups then it would have had the greater attraction—but not for the Communists.

But let us be serious. Any of our Pioneers could inform Lore that independence in politics is expressed in a program. Where such an independence of program is missing there is something radically wrong with the independence. If the program of our Loreite “Independents” has any definite affinity for the program of any of the larger political bodies moving around it like millstones, then the millstone in question is bound to haunt and finally to get the “Independents.” If Lore does not believe our Pioneers we advise him to ask his opportunist friends and brothers, Longuet in France, Kautsky and Levi in Germany, Adler and Bauer in Austria, Grimm in Switzerland, Turati in Italy, etc. The “independence” of

\* Reinkultur—A pure and unadulterated specimen.



these opportunists from the social patriots of their and all other countries proved so badly founded that today the man whose shot made an end to the life of Count Stürghk, Fritz Adler, and the man who is responsible for the murder of tens of thousands of German workers, Gustav Noske, are arm-in-arm, together in the same, the socialist, International.

Let us investigate the basis of Hoeglund-Lore's "independence." In the relation between the working class and the capitalist class there are possible two fundamental approaches. One is that of relentless struggle for a final and decisive victory of the proletariat. The other is that of compromise, class collaboration, and class peace. There is no room in between. To be independent of any of these positions is tantamount to being dependent upon the other. Not to be for war means to be for peace. Not to be for peace means to be for war. Any position in between is merely a temporary one for people who are on the way over from one position to the other. Such people make themselves independent of the position they held heretofore to be free for the acceptance of and dependency on the other position.

The road that the Loreite opportunists are traveling this day leads to the official recognition of their betrayal of Communist principles, leads to membership in the same International with Noske. Levi has traveled this road; so have Frossard and Hoeglund. Even the Loreites themselves see where the road leads to. They attempt to furnish in advance a glorification of their knavery. On September 22nd, 1925, we read in the "Volkszeitung": "The ablest comrades and best heads in the different countries have either been expelled from their organizations or have left it on account of the reign of terror of incompetent leaders." Thus we find Levi, Frossard, Hoeglund, raised from the position of traitors of Communism and elevated to that of martyrs of the terrorist and incompetent Communist leadership. The Loreites are thus excused in advance for joining these "martyrs" in the catacombs of the resurrected Second International. To make it clear as to where they place the blame, the Loreites continue: "The present leaders of the Communist International have proven to this day capable only of holding on to the rule over and the control of the Comintern, a position which they have usurped. In the government of Russia they have proven themselves incompetent since the death of Lenin." After one reads that, one will be convinced that these "inde-

pendents" will land in the camp of the social reformists. And they have to travel only a short, a very short distance indeed, —these "independents." Therefore, when the "independence" of the Loreite opportunists from Communism will be finally crowned by their unity with Berger and Hillquit, the Communists will be neither surprised nor chagrined. It will be merely the consummation of the inevitable.

"But," says Lore, "my grievance is not with Communism; it is with the Communist Party." Let us see. Is Lore's grievance with individuals in the Party? If so, he lacks the first fundamental quality of a Communist. He has not yet learned to subordinate his own feelings to the dictates of the Party.

Or is his grievance with the form of organization of the Party? The form of organization of a Communist Party is part of the principles of Communism. The form of organization must be adapted to the tasks of the Party. We are out of the stage of discussing the question of whether to make this adaption; and we are almost thru with the discussion of the question of how to do it. If Lore wants to resurrect all the arguments made on this point by the Mensheviks against Lenin, then his place is with the Mensheviks. And again—his independence vanishes. Or is Lore's grievance with the principles of the Party? The principles of the Party are the principles of Communism. Lore's grievance in this case is merely a grievance with Communism, is a manifestation of his non-Communist concepts.

The Loreite opportunists make much of their duty to defend the interests of the "Volkszeitung's Family" against the dark designs of the Party. This "Volkszeitung's Family" is not Communist, we are informed. It is merely educated to the principles of the class struggle.

Accepting this explanation of the Loreites we ask the question: "What are the principles of the class struggle?" They are Marxism, Leninism, Communism. There are no principles of a class struggle outside of the principles of Marxism, of Communism. To be for the class struggle and to fight consciously in it, is to be a Communist. To oppose Communism is to deny the principles of the class struggle. The deep regard the Loreite opportunists show toward the "Volkszeitung's Family" is a manifestation of a worse "Khvostism" than Lenin ever fought against. Here we have a "revolutionary" paper where the readers shape the principles of the



editor, instead of the revolutionary editor exerting all his influence and ability to shape the principles of his readers. Instead of marching ahead of his "Volkszeitung Family" and leading it, he hangs on to its tail, allows himself to be led by it. That is a sample of the Loreist concept of leadership.

The result is easy to foresee. On the day when the battalions of revolutionary labor challenge the power of capitalism to final combat, then the education of the editor of the "Volkszeitung" will be completed to that point, that he will betray the proletariat and earn the applause of the "Volkszeitung's Family."

## V. Freedom of Criticism.

"'Dogmatism,' 'doctrinarism,' 'growing rigidity of the party as an inevitable punishment for the arbitrary elimination of all thinking'—those are the enemies against whom the crusaders for 'freedom of criticism' are arming. We are glad that this question is put on the order of the day and desire to add only one more question:

"Who are the judges?"

"The much praised freedom of criticism does not mean the replacing of one theory by another; it means freedom from any uniform and well-thought-out theory; it means eclecticism and lack of principle." Lenin: "What to do?", 1902.

Opportunism is the very antithesis of Leninism. Leninism grew in a relentless struggle against opportunism. Opportunism has led to the defeat, Leninism to the victory of the working class. The principles of Leninism must prevail against the lack of principle of opportunism.

Today we know not only the tendencies of opportunism but we also know its methods. We know that wherever some abstract and meaningless principle is raised there is an opportunist not far away.

All of the Loreites sign an indictment against the Workers (Communist) Party of America accusing it of dogmatism and complaining against its refusal to allow freedom of criticism within its ranks.

What does this mean concretely? The desire to criticize must spring from some dissatisfaction with the principles, aims and tactics of the Party. If these are to be subjected to a critical examination it is the **Party itself and only the Party that can sit in judgement.** And in passing judgement against its critics the Party merely exercises its indisputable duty to determine for itself its aims, its principles, and its tactics. If the question is to be decided as to what constitutes

good Communist theory or tactics, it is the Communist International and the Communist Party that must make the decision. And if the individual opportunist and Loreite wishes to match his judgement against that of the Party or the International he may do so—but not as a Communist, not as a member and adherent of these organizations, not as a defender of Communism, but as one who differs with and therefore stands outside of them.

Some of the opportunists declared in the discussion under consideration that as socialists “we” have fought against catholicism for decades and “we” cannot permit now that a dogmatism not unlike that of the catholic church be introduced in the Communist Party.

What is the question? Nowhere in their article do they take issue with the principles of Communism. They do not say what particular dogma they are fighting against. They are merely opposed to dogmatism in general and on principle.

The catholic church is and has been one of the strongest and most consistent counter-revolutionary forces in society. It is an object of combat for the revolutionist. We revolutionists fight its theories and its activities. In these struggles we find this organization a formidable opponent. The reason for this is its ideological unity and its organizational centralization. If we revolutionists had not already learned these lessons in our experience we could learn the value of ideological unity and organizational centralization from the catholic church.

The Communist Party can maintain its ideological unity only by insisting that all its members be revolutionists. The first prerequisite of membership in a Communist Party is that the candidate be a Communist. His Communist qualities in turn are attested to by his principles and activities. And if these principles and activities are not in conformity with the principles and activities of the Party, if they show a serious deviation from the principles of Communism then the Party says: “You are not a Communist and therefore: Get out!” If that be heresy hunting, make the best of it! We say it is merely the exercise of the revolutionary sense of the workers.

The demand of “freedom of criticism” merely indicates a desire to be freed from the duty of accepting the Communist principles and of participating in the Communist activities of the Party. Such “freedom” would be suicidal for the Party. And since the Party considers it its duty to be instru-



mental in the destruction of capitalism instead of practicing self-destruction it preserves its Communist integrity and fights its opportunist "critics."

Under the leadership of Lenin the Communists have steered clear of the swamp of opportunism. But the opportunists do not give up hope. They persist in propagating a return into the quagmire of opportunism. And when they are told that they cannot carry on this propaganda within our Party they complain of intolerance. We Communists answer their complaints in the words of Lenin: "O yes, gentlemen, you are 'free' to beckon to us, you are 'free' to go wherever you want to go, even into the swamp. We even believe that your fit place is in the swamp. We are ready to help you get into it. But keep your hands off us; do not hold on to us; do not soil the great word 'freedom'; for we, too, are 'free', free to go where we please, free not only to fight against the swamp but also against those that want to return to it."

## VI. Communists and Petty Bourgeoisie.

"The question of what to do to convey political knowledge to the workers cannot always be answered as simply as the practitioners do. Mostly the answer is: 'Go among the workers.' To convey political knowledge to the workers, the socialists (Communists) must go among ALL CLASSES of the population, must send troops of their army into all directions." Lenin: "What to do?", 1902.

"Finally there are in every capitalist country always wide bourgeois strata that forever vacillate between capital and labor. To insure victory the proletariat must first of all choose the right moment for its decisive attack on the bourgeoisie, considering among other things disunity between the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, or the impossibility of maintaining their alliance, etc." Lenin: "Elections to the Constituent Assembly and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," 1919.

"Communism is the science and knowledge of the conditions under which the proletariat can emancipate itself," declares Engels. We know that this emancipation can be accomplished only by the proletariat itself. The proletariat cannot free itself without at the same time freeing all other exploited and oppressed classes. This result will be achieved because the proletarian power will be used to remove the economic basis from under the feet of all classes. While other revolutionary classes replaced in their revolution merely the rule of one class by another, the proletarian revolution will make an end to all class rule by making an end to all classes.

While thus the revolutionary workers serve in their strug-

gle the interests of all the exploited and oppressed classes, nevertheless the groups and classes between the proletariat and the capitalists do not recognize this. As a whole they will never recognize it until the proletariat, in the period of its dictatorship, will demonstrate this in its attitude toward these classes. Meanwhile these groups and classes try to serve their own group and class interests. But while the revolutionary proletariat solves in the struggle for its emancipation the problems of these intermediary classes, also these latter classes in turn cannot solve the problem of the proletariat in trying to solve their own. It is clear, therefore, that these classes and groups between the proletariat and the capitalist class cannot be the driving force of the social revolution. This task is reserved for the proletariat. The latter must establish and maintain its undisputed hegemony in the revolutionary movement.

The very existence of groups and classes between the proletariat and capitalist class proves that the forces of capitalism are by no means homogeneous. Varying interests divide them. These divisions, at times, become so sharp that they cause bitter struggles in the camp of capitalism.

The attitude of a revolutionist toward these different groups of the capitalist class and toward their divisions and struggles determines his quality as a leader of the proletariat. In this attitude there are revealed:

First, his theoretical understanding of the problems of the proletarian revolution.

Secondly, the degree of determination he displays in organizing the struggle against capitalism and the capitalist class.

The opportunist fails in both. His theory is confined to the vulgarization of some Marxian phrases. His practice exhausts itself in the constant repetition of these phrases. He calls that "educating the workers" or "preparing the proletariat for the revolution." Because the opportunist phrase sounds more radical than the proposed immediate action of the revolutionist some well meaning workers are misled. But the unpretentious action of the revolutionist digs the ground from under capitalism, while the radical phrase of the opportunist confines itself to making noise. The opportunist covers his objection to revolutionary action with the radical phrase. All opportunists acclaimed enthusiastically the radical language of the anti-war resolutions of the Second International



at the congress in Stuttgart (1907), and at the special congress in Basel (1912). But all of them, with the same unanimity, opposed at Stuttgart and at Basel even the slightest actual step to organize and prepare action against the coming war.

The problem of the revolutionist is that of the organization of the revolution. To solve this problem the revolutionist must:

1. Organize himself with all other revolutionists into a revolutionary party, comprising all those who understand and know the conditions under which the proletariat can emancipate itself.

2. So construct his party and act thru it that he can establish his party's influence and leadership over the proletarian masses and can thus help to convey to the latter the experiences of their struggles in the form of the highest possible degree of class consciousness and revolutionary self-confidence.

3. Be active in and draw the working class into all political struggles of capitalism and against capitalism, exploiting differences among the enemy, winning allies for the workers.

4. When the workers are ready, when their consciousness is prepared, when groups and classes between proletariat and capitalist class have either been won as allies for the workers or have been at least neutralized so that they will not fight against the workers, in other words, when the objective and subjective factors make this possible, then lead the forces of the revolution into decisive battle with capitalism.

It is the historic achievement of Leninism that it provides a guide for the revolutionary working class on this road to the establishment of dictatorship of the proletariat. The opportunist does not want to travel that road. He dreads revolution. And for his justification he digs up out of the dead past the Lassallean phrase of the one reactionary block outside of the proletariat. He accepts the bourgeois revolutionist Lassalle against Marx. He defends Lassalle against Lenin. That he can do that unblushingly even years after the workers of the world have witnessed the experiences of the Russian revolution shows in what little regard the opportunist holds the intelligence of the revolutionary proletariat.

## VII. Communists and Farmers.

"Only if we succeed in moving the peasant masses to a coalition with the proletariat, will the proletarian revolution obtain a chorus without which its revolutionary solo is doomed to become its swansong in all agricultural countries." Karl Marx.

"If the parties of the Second International had only indifference or even aversion for the peasant (farmer) question the reason is not solely to be found in the special conditions of the West, but above all in the fact that these parties did not believe in the dictatorship of the proletariat, feared the revolution and never dreamt of leading the proletariat to the conquest of power. Now if one does not want to lead the proletarians into battle, it is obviously futile to look for allies for the proletariat. The Second International considered its ironical attitude toward the peasant (farmer) as a sign of true Marxism. In reality this attitude—for indifference to such an important question on the eve of the proletarian revolution is an indirect betrayal of the dictatorship of the proletariat—is a definite betrayal of Marxism." Stalin: "Theory and Practice of Leninism."

Our American opportunists run true to the color of their friends of brothers of the Second International. In the name of Marx they betray Marxism. In the name of a pseudo-radical phrase they betray the revolution.

The Communist is a Marxian. For him changes in the economic base of social groups are not merely welcome subjects for philosophical speculation, but they are first and foremost indications of the weakness or the strength of the enemy. They point the way in which a direct advance of the forces of the revolutionary proletariat is possible; they show where, thru careful exploitation of the defections in the ranks of the enemy, portions of that enemy can be neutralized. They indicate where classes and groups hitherto in the ranks of the enemy can be won over as allies of the proletariat.

The opportunist does not react to such changes. First because of a lack of theory. He does not understand and cannot evaluate such changes. And secondly because he is not a revolutionist. He believes only in talking about the revolution. But he condemns every measure to organize it.

In the last decade the United States witnessed repeatedly deep-going crises in the field of American agriculture. The pauperizing of the American farmer proceeds with unerring precision. The assimilation of American agricultural capital by finance capital is an uninterrupted process.

Only a few years ago this phenomenon led to the formation of the non-partisan league movement. The leaders of this movement were political charlatans and turned traitor



to the farmers. But the masses supporting the league were farmers revolting against the capitalist system.

The critical agricultural prosperity of the war interrupted this revolt. But in 1922-23 it was renewed with greater intensity. The recurrence of these crises is an integral part of capitalism in the period of imperialism. Imperialism shifts the economic base of capitalism from competition to monopoly. The farmer loses his economic independence which he had retained by virtue of his control over his means of production. He becomes a victim of monopoly. A veritable economic revolution takes place. This revolution turns millions of farmers into proletarians. Other farm owners are turned into renters, tenant farmers; and again others become the virtual slaves of mortgage holders.

This economic revolution also produces a political one. The agricultural problem becomes an ever recurring issue in the political life of the country. But the capitalist parties are the parties of imperialist monopoly. The best they can do for the farmer is to give expressions of sympathy. The farmer is thus driven to self-protection. He wakes up politically. He revolts against the rule of the capitalist parties, against the rule of capitalism.

Here we are confronted with a revolution. A deep-going change takes place which vitally affects the proletariat and especially its movement for emancipation. Here is an occasion where the army of the revolutionary proletariat must execute a maneuver. Instead of confronting the political forces of the farmers face to face as is inevitable in the period in which the farmers are an integral part of the political army of capitalism, the revolutionary proletariat now sides with the farmers against capital. Temporary tho this condition may be, but as long as it exists the tactics of the proletarian revolutionist are predetermined. Protecting and even strengthening the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement, the working class must establish an alliance with the farmers in the struggle against capitalism.

The counter-revolutionary opportunist opposes this maneuver. He does not want to strengthen the forces of revolution. That would be a danger to capitalism. He sneers at those who point to the revolutionary significance and the revolutionary character of the farmers' movement. And after one wave of a serious agricultural crisis has passed and capitalism has succeeded temporarily in quieting the agricultural

masses, then these gentlemen "Marxians," the opportunists, self-complacently parade their idiotic, "I told you so." These gentry try to cover up their own revolutionary impotence by whining about the inherent reactionary qualities of the farmers.

"It is just as easy for a Communist to travel to Mars as it is for him to approach a farmer," say the Loreites. The farmers are a "proud and ignorant" lot. They forced even the Communist Party of Russia into a "total deviation from Communism" thru the N. E. P. To tackle the farmer question is but an attempt to "go with the head thru the wall." All these quotations are from one single article in the "Volkszeitung" of September 8th, 1925.

There is no dispute about the role of the agricultural proletariat as an integral part of the proletariat as a whole. The question at issue is the attitude of the Communists toward the non-proletarian working farmer. The attitude of this economic group toward the revolutionary movement of the proletariat is a question of victory or defeat of the workers. Irrespective of the prevailing ideology among the poor farmers their economic status is bound to make them sooner or later the enemy of capitalism.

Left to itself this enmity will crystallize into an inherently reactionary movement because the farmer belongs to a class of the past and not to one of the future. His aim is to bring back the "good old days" and not to achieve new and better days. He sees in the onward development of capitalism still more oppression of himself; the revolutionary worker on the other hand sees in the onward development of capitalism the ripening of the conditions of his freedom.

The Communist is not blind to these differences. But he is not merely a theoretician; he is an active director of history. He sees that capitalism becomes more and more of a problem to the farmer. If he, the Communist, can induce the farmer to combine his attempt to solve this problem with that of the proletariat under the leadership of the latter, then the anti-capitalist forces will be strengthened tremendously and victory will be made easier and more certain.

"But the farmer is 'reactionary'; he is 'proud' and 'ignorant,'" say the opportunists. What does that mean? Do the opportunists claim that the laws of society are not operative on the farmer? Do they mean to say that the farmers' attitude in the class war is finally determined by his "pride"?



That is sheer nonsense. His "pride" is a result of his seeming economic independence. With the gradual disappearance of this independence his "pride" also disappears. The farmers' economic, political, or social position are not, in the last analysis, determined by their ideals. On the contrary; their ideals are determined by their economic, political, and social position.

The total value of all capital invested in agriculture in the United States decreased by 25.3% since 1920. This is not due to extensive withdrawal of capital from agriculture but represents an actual loss in value.

In 1920 the total value of capital invested in agriculture in the United States amounted to \$79,607,000,000. Of this \$13,400,000,000 or 16.9 per cent of the total was invested by mortgage holders. In 1924 the total value of the investment had decreased to \$59,409,000,000 while mortgage holders increased their share of this value to \$14,000,000,000 or 23.5 per cent of the total. Thus, while the total value of investments decreased by 25.3 per cent, the total amount of indebtedness increased by 4.4 per cent. And, on top of that, the average rate of interest on the indebtedness of the farmers changed from 6.7 per cent to 6.8 per cent, an increase of 1.5 per cent.

Within four years the net income of the farmer available for the upkeep of his family decreased from \$932.00 to \$520.00, a loss of 44 per cent. This average is arrived at without separating big and small farms. It is clear, therefore, that the actual net income of the poor farmer is far below \$520.00 per year.

Official census figures show that in the year 1922 alone, 1,120,000 people shifted from the farm to the city. The Department of Agriculture reported for January, 1924, that 23 per cent of all the farmers of fifteen wheat and corn growing states went bankrupt. "The American farmers whose debts before the war amounted to twenty billions, have paid the largest portion of these debts and are now living in luxury and plenty"; this is the expert information that is given to the Loreites in the issue of the "Volkszeitung" of September 16th, 1925. And Lore himself gives weight to such statements by claiming that the writer is "considering things from higher aspects." Let us investigate these "higher aspects." Let us consider the "realism" upon which Loreism builds its tactics.

According to the Department of Agriculture in Washing-

ton, a witness surely not biased in favor of revolution, the average debts per farm in the United States amounted to \$1,715.00 in 1910, and to \$3,356.00 in 1920. This is equal to an increase of 93.2 per cent. That is the way the farmers have paid their debts. The indebtedness of the farmers increased from an average of \$9.00 per acre in 1910 to \$17.50 per acre in 1920, an increase of 75.2 per cent. This proves beyond any doubt that the value of the increased acreage of the farms is by far not meeting the increasing indebtedness.

Bankruptcy among the farmers is constantly increasing. Even during the banner years of farm prosperity in 1918, 1919 and 1920 the bankruptcies of the farmers amounted to 7 per cent, 6.3 per cent and 6.4 per cent respectively of the total amount of bankruptcies registered. These percentages increased to 9 per cent in 1921, to 14.4 per cent in 1922, and to 17.4 per cent in 1923. Luxury and plenty, indeed!

The percentage of tenant farming and share cropping is constantly increasing. In 1880 this class of farmers amounted to 25.6 per cent of the total. Since then the percentage has increased uninterruptedly to 38.1 per cent in 1920.

Within two years, from 1920 to 1922, the percentage of totally abandoned farms increased from 4.7 per cent to 7.3 per cent. Such is the "plenty" the farmers enjoy. And as to their "pride"—that "pride" goes the way of the farmers' economic independence—it goes to the dogs. Having seen the "luxury and plenty" which the Loreite permits the farmers to enjoy let us hear how capitalist experts view these conditions.

"The drastic economies which have become necessary on the farms have greatly reduced farm standards of living. They have compelled over-work by the farmers, unaccustomed farm work by the farm mothers; increased work by the children, kept out of school—in too many cases the older children taken out for good. . . . The farmer has no challenge to heroism, the farmer's wife has no glory in her sacrifice and disappointment and long days of toil. The result has been a social and political unrest which has not contributed to national welfare. **The undeserved fate and the powerlessness to pull himself out of his difficulties has lessened hope and developed unrest . . .**" Thus speaks the United States Department of Agriculture in its yearbook of 1923, the last one available.

Capitalism itself realizes the seriousness of the problem.



It cannot even suggest a remedy. It sees the unrest, caused by the misery which imperialist monopoly creates for a whole class of formerly economically independent people. But the Loreite opportunist stands by, and with the intelligence and stubbornness of the man who for the first time saw a camel, he exclaims: "There ain't no sich animal."

The opportunist claims that it is foreordained that the farmer is a reactionary, and if you claim otherwise, the Loreite stamps you either as an idiot or as a traitor. But the treacherous idiocy must be looked for according the petty bourgeois formula of the opportunist.

The poor farmer is not a capitalist. He differs from the proletarian merely in that he owns the means of production. But he does not differ in his relation to capital. Both, the proletarian and the poor farmer, are exploited by capital. The one is the victim of industrial capital, while the other is under the heel of agricultural or banking capital. And in the period of industrial monopoly we find that it is the quickly accumulating gains from industrial capital that celebrate their resurrection in the form of agricultural and banking capital.

The Communist, knowing the dynamic forces of social development, makes himself a conscious part of these forces and aids and directs this development toward a revolutionary solution. The opportunist, not understanding these forces, makes himself a part of the counter-acting powers, thus aiding capitalism and counter-revolution.

### VIII. Shop Nuclei.

"Every shop must be our fortress! . . . The shop nucleus must consist of . . . revolutionists who take their powers and their orders for their revolutionary work from their leading committee. All members of the shop nucleus must consider themselves as agents of the leading committee. It is the duty of these agents to subordinate themselves to all decisions of this committee and to live up to all laws and regulations of the 'army' they have joined; and they have no right to leave this army except by permission of the higher units." Lenin: "Letter to a Comrade," 1902.

The task of the Communists, the revolutionists, is not merely that of propagating, but that of organizing the revolution. The Loreite disputes this.

The idea that the revolution must be consciously organized is proclaimed a romantic illusion by the opportunist. His claim to realism we see is thus purchased at the price of Marxism.

In spite of all the lamentations of the opportunist the class struggle is a reality. The revolution is merely a phase of the class struggle, the last phase, the climax. This last phase cannot be reached without a conscious participation and maneuvering in the every-day class struggle. This conscious participation is organized and led by the Communists and the science that determines the moves of the Communists and their party is Leninism. In these maneuvers and in the conscious participation in the class struggle a number of things must be accomplished:

1. The leadership of the Communists over the working class in the class struggle must be established.

2. Larger and ever larger masses of workers must be drawn into the struggle.

3. In connecting and unifying the many disconnected struggles of the workers the army of the working class must be strengthened and its consciousness developed.

4. Thru careful maneuvering the enemy must be divided and allies must be won for the workers.

5. The divisions and weaknesses of the enemy must be exploited in the movement of the forces of the proletariat.

6. Clear revolutionary direction must be given to all movements of the workers so that the intensity of the struggle reaches the climax of a revolutionary struggle for power.

Let us be absolutely clear. The organization of the revolution and the education of the proletariat for it are not tasks separate and apart from the revolution itself. The present day manifestations of the class struggle are an integral part of the revolution. The success of the Communists in the organization of the revolution depends upon their ability to gain influence in and to shape the events of the present day class struggle. The extension of the influence of the Communists among the workers gradually eliminates from leadership the opportunist and reformist apostles of class harmony; it supplies the working class with proletarian consciousness, and the class struggle with revolutionary purpose. Whether the Communists will succeed in achieving their task depends upon their ability to make themselves a part of the working class itself, the most conscious, the most active part—not only in name but in fact. The Communists are the vanguard of the proletariat. They supply it with class consciousness, with revolutionary understanding, with revolutionary energy and initiative. The opportunist conceives of the rev-



olutionist not as a source of revolutionary ferment among the workers but as the pedantic schoolmaster of the workers. Fear of action is the opportunist's dominant characteristic. The reorganization of the Workers (Communist) Party on the basis of shop nuclei he opposes because it will make the Party and its members active. This horrifies the Loreite. In the "Volkszeitung" of September 8th, 1925, a Loreite laments: "The first shop nucleus man who is not deadly silent in his union and who attempts to carry on real revolutionary propaganda will be expelled, will no longer find a job, or will be imprisoned." "Therefore," he says, "shop nuclei—a beautiful idea—good for Russia, perhaps for Germany, altho even there only a hot-house plant, but absolutely impossible in America."

Mark the argument: Any worker who would show his revolutionary principles, who would open his mouth in the union, who would carry on revolutionary propaganda among his fellow workers in the shop, would be expelled, black-listed or incarcerated. Therefore no shop nuclei! But the conclusion does not end there because it is not the nucleus that brings calamity upon the revolutionary worker, but his mouth. Therefore—the Loreite leaves only one conclusion as to his advice—keep your mouth shut in the union so you may not be expelled; refrain carefully from propaganda among your fellow-workers in the shop so you may keep your job; be an all around good citizen, so you may avoid imprisonment. That is the Loreite "revolutionist." He hangs his revolutionary "principles" on a hook in his closet to take them out temporarily once or so a month for display in some back room at a meeting of the "Federation of International Workers." And this miserable phrase monger of a Loreite dares to desecrate the name of revolutionist by claiming it for himself.

What are these shop nuclei that Lore did not dare oppose while in the party and that he now tries to ridicule since he is out?

The Communists are not the army that fights the battles for the working class. This is impossible. The emancipation of the working class can only be achieved by that class itself. The Communists are merely the vanguard of the proletariat. The army is the proletariat itself. But the vanguard, the leading section of the working class, the Communist Party, must have its "agents," its roots, in all parts of the working class.

If it has not and is detached from it, it is a mere sect.

The army of the working class, tho it is numerically strong, lacks consciousness of its strength. To sweep capitalism from the earth the working class must move with revolutionary speed. At present it is hardly moving at all. And whatever movements this army executes lack a unity of plan and purpose. In other words: the colossus of the working class is practically motionless. It is lacking a head and brains to think for it. Without its directing center no matter how high the intelligence of the individual workers may be, the collective intelligence of the working class—or any other—amounts to exactly nothing. With one unifying purpose absent one intellect negates the other in the mass. It is the revolutionary political party of the proletariat, the Communist Party, that must supply that unity of purpose, that must supply the collective intelligence of the class, an intelligence that is based on the rock foundation of Marxism, Leninism, Communism.

But this head, the Communist Party, has no value whatever for the body of the colossus of the working class, unless it is connected with it thru a system of nerves. These nerves must be supplied by the party units which must penetrate the whole body of the working class.

The working class presents itself to the Communists organized in many different groups. There are, first of all, those groups of workers organized by capitalism itself into productive units in the shops and factories. These organizations comprise practically the whole working class. They include both sexes, all ages, all races. These productive units of the working class in the shops, mills, mines and factories are the basic units of the working class. Into these basic units of the working class the Communists must build the basic unit of their party, the shop nucleus. It is in the shop where the worker is exploited and where his resistance to exploitation takes its first form. It is in the shop where the problem of the worker first arises and where consciousness first develops in the worker, that his problems and those of his fellow-workers alongside of him in the shop are identical. And here, at the source of the proletarian struggle, the Communist Party must have its organized agency. If the Communists are the vanguard of the workers they must be that right there in the shop and for the workers in the shop. The influence which a Communist Party can wield over the working

class as a whole depends to a large degree upon the influence the Communist workers can yield over their fellow-workers in the shop.

The centralization and discipline of the Communist Party supplies the unity of action and of purpose to all of these nuclei. The will of the Party, the Party's policies and campaigns revibrate thru the nerve system of its units, the shop nuclei, and thus must find an echo in the working class itself. And back from the workers in the shop revibrate their feelings, their problems, their troubles, back thru the nuclei and thus must find an echo in the Party and its activities.

The system of nerves built into the body of the working class by the Communists is not complete in the nuclei. Besides the basic and involuntary units of workers in the shops and factories the workers form many voluntary units which comprise only parts of the working class. In these organizations, economic, social, cultural, educational, benevolent, etc., the Communists also build their nuclei. But here the organization of the Communists appears not as a sub-organization of the Party, but as a fraction of all the Communists. These fractions enable the Communists to act as a unit in all of such organizations in the presentation of Communist principles and policies.

The building up of nuclei and fractions is a necessary prerequisite for the success of the Communist Party in the organization of the proletarian revolution. Being means to this end these party formations cannot escape the hatred of the inherently counter-revolutionary Loreite opportunists.

## IX. Revolutionary Illusions and Realities.

"Marxism distinguishes itself from all other socialist theories by its wonderful combination of absolute scientific soberness in the analysis of the objective situation and the objective trend of development, and a decisive recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, the revolutionary creative power, the revolutionary initiative of the masses and naturally also of different individuals, groups, organizations and parties which succeed in uncovering and exploiting connecting interests with other classes." Lenin: "Notes of a Socialist Writer," 1907.

The opportunist fails to see the inner connections and dialectic relations of all manifestations of the life of society. He flounders helplessly between capital and labor. Vacillation is his outstanding characteristic. But when he is re-



proached for his hesitation and fear he conjures up an analysis that makes an angel out of him—but that belies the situation.

Like the murderer to the place of his crime so does the opportunist return inevitably to the starting point of his excursion into the realm of the proletarian revolutionary movement, namely, opposition to, fear and hatred of the proletarian revolution. This constant backward move of the opportunist is not executed openly along straight road to reaction. Oh, no! As befits opportunism its apostles choose different and devious ways. To uncover these ways, to tear the cloak of revolutionary phrases from the shoulder of the opportunist and to show him to the proletarian masses in his counter-revolutionary nakedness, is the duty of the revolutionist.

Revolutionary traditions are the most cherished treasury of the proletariat. These traditions inspire and teach the workers. The bourgeoisie, therefore, does everything to kill these traditions. That is only natural. But what shall we say of persons who pose as revolutionists and are busily engaged in killing such traditions?

The recent Lore discussion in the New York "Volkszeitung" has produced a whole flower garden full of opportunist weeds of this character.

In March, 1924, on the occasion of the anniversary of the formation of the Communist International, Lore wrote his leading article about the adaptability of the Communist International to changed conditions. Had he stopped there Lore would merely have paid a compliment to the revolutionary quality of the Comintern. But he went on to say that "the Communist International utterly disregards its own orientation, it murders today the theses it adopted only yesterday. . . ." Here Lore's compliment takes on a more than dubious character. Is the Communist International so bare of analytical abilities that it had to feel its way forward like a blind man? Was it so stupid that in its analyses it came to one conclusion while the situation forced upon it another?

A benevolent interpretation might explain that Lore did not infer mistakes but merely wanted to show that a constantly changing situation must be met with a constantly changing tactic, and that the Communist International adapts itself to this necessity.

But Lore did not enumerate in this article only tactical

changes, but also reversals of fundamental policies—such as in the question of parliamentarism or in trade union work. The late Lore discussion in the "Volkszeitung" uncovered some more of this Loreite carcass, real and unadulterated opportunism. The Communist International started out with an entirely wrong orientation according to the Loreites. It suffered under the illusion that there existed a revolutionary situation.

"Drunken with the victory of the newly established Soviet Government they considered it certain that the Russian revolution would be followed by the revolution for the freedom of all Europe. . . ." But nothing became of these hopes! It was all a mistake. It was a day dream produced by an overdose of revolutionary spirit. Our opportunists, the Loreites, would never render themselves guilty of such an overindulgence in revolutionary spirit. They are sober, careful, realistic. So sober are they indeed, so careful and realistic, that they feel perfectly justified in indignantly raising their brows at the "mistake" of Lenin. With the spirit of the narrow-minded, ignorant and reactionary schoolmaster they pass judgment on the revolutionary spirit of Lenin.

But all this judgment is mere pose. This pose is born of a deep satisfaction with the ability of capitalism to have maintained itself up to now against the attacks of the proletarian revolution. In this suppressed enthusiasm for the temporary defeat of the proletarian revolution the Loreites forget for a moment their claim to realism. Of the most realistic leader of the proletariat, Lenin, they make an enthusiast, swayed by sentiment and blind to realities. "Drunken with victory" Lenin rushed into the formation of the Communist International,—that is the Loreites' picture of Lenin. We answer: "Drunken with a suppressed hatred against the revolution the Loreites distort history and try to besmirch the memory of the proletariat's greatest leader, Lenin." On March 23rd, 1919, only a few days after the formation of the Communist International, Lenin spoke before Congress of the Russian Communist Party, saying: "The bourgeoisie, taking it as a world institution, is still stronger than we are." And a little further on in his speech he repeated: "If we regarded the material means on a world-wide scale we must admit that the bourgeoisie is materially still stronger than we are."

The dead Lenin stands up against the calumnies of the Loreites, just as the living principles of Leninism stand up against the anti-revolutionary poison of opportunism.

Lenin was all wrong, they say. But, unbelievable as it may seem, although all the opportunists, counter-revolutionists, and capitalists of the world urged him to, he never admitted this mistake. Just think of it. "Although the German revolution was defeated yet Moscow still clung to the conviction that only a little push was needed in Italy to get a revolution, made to order, ready and victorious." This is not a quotation from one of the numerous phantastic reports of the agents of the American Defense Society and directed against the Communist International and against Soviet Russia. No; this is clipped from the "New York Volkszeitung" of September 17th, 1925.

Moscow's revolutionary optimism was incurable. That is the judgment of the Loreites. After Noske, Scheideman and Ebert had proven with the blood of tens of thousands of murdered German proletarians that there was no revolutionary situation, Moscow still insisted that there was one, and that, therefore, Italy had to "make" a revolution. Before we consult the Loreites further on this matter let us see what happened in Italy. The Socialist Party of Italy had a strong left wing which demanded affiliation with the Communist International. The right wing held a separate conference and decided not to submit to such a decision and to split. Under these conditions the Communist International instructed the left wing to carry on a relentless struggle against the right wing and to take the party away from them. Serati, one of the leaders of the left wing, refused to do so, but instead compromised with the right wing. The Communists then split. Serati later saw his error and corrected it.

But another thing had happened. The metal-workers of Italy, in order to enforce a wage demand made on the bosses, took possession of the factories. That any conscious attempt to turn this action into a political struggle would have very probably resulted in a victory for the Italian workers is now clear. Gioliti, the Italian prime minister of those days, admitted later in the chamber of deputies, that he did not immediately proceed against these workers in the factories because he did not have reliable military forces and because his move in that direction would have forced the workers into the political battlefield where they were strongest



at this moment. Instead of that Gioliti relied upon Italian variety of opportunists, upon D'Aragona and Turati, to hold the workers back from a political battle and thus starve and negotiate them out of the factories. This is history. What say our American D'Aragnas about this history? "Out of the Italian revolution developed the Fascist revolution. . . . Mussolini copies Lenin . . . blood flowed in streams . . . the Communist movement in Italy is now illegal." Turati may be a traitor, D'Aragona a scoundrel and Modigliani a betrayer of the workers; but why talk about such little things? "The decisive point in Italy is not the treachery of the opportunist scoundrels of the Socialist Party of Italy," say the Loreites. Oh, no! The decisive point, according to them, is the fact that the Communist International insisted on a clear division in the revolutionary movement of the Italian proletariat between the opportunist traitors and the Communists. The American Turatis in the Lore camp will never forgive this act of the Communist International. They see in it the forerunner of the separation of the American Communist movement from them. And this separation they do not welcome, because it will be harder for them to betray and handicap the revolutionary movement outside than it would be as were they part of it.

Let us read further in the Loreist history. "In Germany the Communists attempted to 'make' a revolution. . . . The prisons are yet chock full of sentenced comrades" as a result. Here speaks Loreism! Here speaks opportunism! Here speaks hatred of the proletarian revolution! Here speaks counter-revolution!

Hail Noske! The Loreites have decreed that you are not a traitor, that you are not the murderer of revolutionary workers, that you are not the treacherous agent of German capital. You are merely the instrument thru which history proved to the world in general and to the Loreites in particular, that Germany was not yet ripe for the proletarian revolution.

Thus speak Social Democrats and opportunists. Thus speak Loreites.

The imperialist war had broken the chain of international capitalism at its weakest link—Russia. Absolutism died there of its own inner rottenness. The capitalist class of Russia took over political rule from absolutism as its natural inheritance. But the right to this inheritance was disputed. The capitalist

revolution had been born too late in Russia. The working class was already strong and class conscious. What it lacked in numerical strength was made up by a perfect ideological ripeness for revolution. This ripeness had been carefully developed and cultivated by the Bolsheviks in fifteen years of unrelenting struggle against opportunism. The proletariat challenged the usurped prerogative of the capitalist class to rule. The capitalist class was defeated. The first great battle of the revolution was won. The proletarian revolution was ushered in.

This event shook the capitalist world to its foundations. It brought back to the workers of the world their revolutionary confidence which was shaken by the betrayal of the Second International. It was this event in Russia that ended the world war. It was this revolution that set the forces into motion which made emigrants out of the Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg. It was this upheaval that set the masses of Germany, of Austria, of Hungary, of Italy into motion against their rulers and exploiters.

For weeks workers' councils were the undisputed rulers in Germany. The bankruptcy of capitalism was attested to by Soviet Republics in Hungary and Bavaria. For many days the Italian proletariat could remain unchallenged in possession of the factories. In this atmosphere the Communist International was born. The weak connections which the loyal revolutionary workers had saved out of the shameful debacle of the Second International, and which were strengthened during the war by the left of Zimmerwald and Kienthal, were crystallized in Moscow in 1919 into the Communist International. The Communist International was the child of revolutionary determination as well as of a revolutionary situation.

"But where is the victory?", ask the Loreites. "History," answers Marx, "could be made easily indeed if a battle need only be accepted under conditions of a predetermined victory."

For several years the world was aflame with revolution. International capitalism made frantic efforts to save itself. It was saved, for a time. But it was saved not by its own inherent strength. It was saved by the inherent weakness of the working class. And this weakness, in turn, was caused by the bacillus of opportunism.

What does it mean when Loreism, the American variety

of opportunism, now claims and declares that the Communist International, in its beginning, had a wrong, an unreal orientation? What is the object of lying away some glorious chapters of proletarian struggle? Why kill in the world proletariat the memory of the traditions of these struggles? What purpose do these Loreist gentry serve when they declare unblushingly that there was no revolutionary situation?

The defeat of the German, the Austrian, the Hungarian, the Italian proletariats in the struggles of 1918-1921 was the fruit of the treachery of international Menshevism, of opportunism. When the scepter of political rule sank from the enervated hands of capitalism to be taken up by the proletariat, then the opportunist leaders of the workers, the Mensheviks and Social-Democrats, took it up—in the name of the workers—and used it in the interests of the capitalists.

"There was no revolutionary situation," say our opportunists, say our Loreites. So says Berger. They all have good reasons to agree on that point. They aim to stamp our martyrs, our Liebknechts, our Luxemburghs, our Levenies, our Szamuels, as fools. They try to picture them dying in chase of a phantom, so that the crimes of their brother opportunists may be hidden. They must soil the memory of our martyrs so that the deeds of their murderers may be forgotten.

Thus Loreism decrees that the Communist International was wrong in believing that there was a revolutionary situation. Otto Bauer comes into his own with this latest edition of American opportunism. "The relation of forces favors the capitalists; therefore the proletarian revolution is premature," says Bauer. The Loreites subscribe to Bauer's analysis; they reject the analysis of the Communist International. They are brothers of Bauer and not followers of the Communist International.

Liebknecht staked his life on his "belief" in the timeliness of the proletarian revolution. Noske staked the life of his mercenaries in his "belief" in its untimeliness. Noske won. "Therefore," so say the Loreites, "Noske was right in his belief; Liebknecht was wrong. The Social-Democrats were right; the Communist International was wrong; the murderers were right; their victims were wrong."

Workers! Do you see the road these opportunists travel? Do you realize whither it leads?



## X. American Illusions and Realities.

"These pedants and sceptics should learn from the theoretician and leader of the proletariat how to believe in revolution; they should learn how to induce the workers to solve their revolutionary tasks to the last; they should learn how to preserve will-power and confidence enough to withstand faint-hearted despair even in the face of temporary failure of the revolution.

"These pedants of Marxism are of the opinion that all this is ethical chatter, romanticism and absence of realism. No, gentlemen! This is the combination of revolutionary theory with revolutionary practice. It is the combination without which Marxism turns into Brentanoism, Struveism and Sombartism.\* The Marxian doctrine has combined the theory and the practice of the class struggle into one indivisible whole. And they are not Marxians, who, instead of soberly stating the objective situation, misuse the theory to justify existing conditions, and who even go so far as to adapt themselves quickly to every ebb of the revolutionary wave, who, in the quickest way possible throw away their 'revolutionary illusions' and begin to gather up 'realistic fragments.'" Lenin: "Introduction to Marx' letters to Kugelmann."

The Communists have confidence in the revolutionary powers of the proletariat. The opportunists have confidence in the counter-revolutionary powers of the bourgeoisie. They call confidence in the revolutionary powers of the proletariat, illusions and revolutionary romanticism, while their own confidence in the counter-revolutionary powers of the bourgeois they label realism.

The confidence of the Communist in the revolutionary powers and qualities of the proletariat is based on his knowledge of the laws of capitalist development. He sees not only what appears to be but he can analyze what is. Outward strength does not hide from him inner weakness.

The opportunist sees the growing powers of monopoly, the ever more brutal use of the state power by these monopolies and he concludes: "Capitalism was never further from revolution than it is today."

The Communist sees the increasing socialization of labor thru the growth of centralized production; he sees the antagonisms growing within the society as a result of the growing monopolies; he sees in the ever more brutal use of the state power by monopolistic capital the outward manifesta-

---

\* Struvism, etc.—Peter Struve: a socialist renegade, leader of the reactionary Russian bourgeoisie. Ludwig Brentano and Werner Sombart: German bourgeois Socialist professors.

tion of the growing resistance to it; he sees in this application of ever growing powers the manifestation of an ever growing weakness of the system, he sees that capitalism tries to strengthen its hold on society with bayonets because it wants to counteract its constantly weakening economic domination; he sees how capitalism arms the proletariat, its enemy, for the defense of its last trench; he sees the imperialist antagonisms grow, with the result that war gains a state of permanency in present day capitalistic society; he sees these things and comes to the conclusion that the age of imperialism, though the stage of highest powers of capitalism, is the age of dying capitalism, and that capitalism was never nearer revolution than it is today.

Our Loreite opportunist laughs at the idea that a revolutionary party should have hope of success even in the United States. He is opposed to revolution. His promise is: No revolution. And from this premise he reasons backwards to causes. Capitalism is too strong for a revolution. That is his excuse here. Capitalism is too weak; that was his excuse in Germany; that was the Mensheviks' excuse in Russia. There they said that the prerequisite of revolution is the development of the productive forces of society. If, as in Russia, these forces are not yet developed, or if, as in Germany after the war, the productive machinery is disorganized, "we" cannot make a revolution. A revolution, so they reasoned, would kill the very machine, capitalism, which we need to accomplish an absolutely necessary task, that of constructing or reconstructing the productive forces.

The American reformist, on the other hand, declares: "Capitalism is too strong here. The productive forces in the United States are developed to the highest pitch. That puts too great power in the capitalist class; too great for the workers to tackle."

There is no contradiction in these seemingly different conclusions. The different conclusions are merely accidental to different countries. The decisive thing is the premise. And that premise is, here as there:—**No revolution.**

It is true; American capitalism was the victor in the war. But its victory has not negated the forces that are working within it for its downfall. On the contrary. These forces have been augmented. The growing strength of American capitalism intensifies its contradiction to the needs of society. The speed with which capitalism races upward increases in

the same ratio the distance which separates the capitalist class from all the other classes in society.

The growing strength of capitalism goes hand in hand with, and is impossible without, a constant shift in the social groupings in society. This change is invisible to the eye of the opportunist. He repeats phrases. He speaks of the working class and does not mean the working class but merely means a portion of the workers, the aristocracy of labor, the skilled workers. The millions of unskilled workers in the basic industries, poorly paid and exploited to the utmost, are a negligible quantity for the opportunist. He cannot perceive the never-slackening levelling process which gradually eliminates not only the differences between the well paid, skilled and the poorly paid unskilled worker, but also decisively affects the difference between the working class on the one hand and the lower strata of the petty bourgeoisie on the other. This process is increasing in speed.

During the last twenty years the tendency of an unparalleled enrichment of the capitalist class and the gradual and comparative impoverization of all other classes in society has been progressing and gaining momentum.

In 1904 there were a total number of 216,180 manufacturing establishments in the United States. They employed a total of 5,468,383 wage earners. The total value of their products amounted to \$14,793,902,563,000. Of all these manufacturing establishments there were 1900 that produced each one million or more dollars worth of products per year. That is 0.9 per cent of the total number of manufacturing plants. These 0.9 per cent employed 25.6 per cent of all the workers and manufactured 38.9 per cent of all the products.

Since then the process of centralization has proceeded without interruption. The following figures speak volumes:

Year	Number of manufacturing establishments	Number of workers employed	Total value of products
1904	216,180	5,468,383	\$14,793,902,563
1909	268,491	6,615,046	20,672,051,870
1914	275,791	7,036,337	24,246,434,724
1919	290,105	9,096,372	62,418,078,773
1921	250,266	6,987,494	43,790,208,908
1923	196,305	8,778,950	60,555,998,200



Establishments with an output of one million dollars or over compare in point of numbers, number of workers employed, and total value of output, as follows:

Year	No. of establishments	Perc. of total	No. of wage earners	Perc. of total	Total value of products	Perc. of total
1904	1,900	0.9	1,400,000	25.6	\$5,628,456,171	38.9
1909	3,060	1.1	2,015,629	30.0	9,053,580,393	43.8
1914	3,819	1.4	2,476,006	35.2	11,794,060,929	48.6
1919	10,414	3.6	5,172,712	56.9	42,301,103,617	67.8
1921	7,333	2.9	3,379,562	48.4	25,837,475,868	59.0
1923	10,326	5.2	5,014,303	57.1	40,162,154,202	66.4

Since the many subsidiary organizations owned and controlled by the big trusts, the steel trust, the oil trust, the packing trust, etc., figure as independent establishments in the government statistics, it is clear that the real numbers and real percentages are considerably below the ones given. But even the figures given suffice to prove the point. An insignificant number, barely one-twentieth of all manufacturing establishments, employ three-fifths of all the workers and manufacture exactly two-thirds of all the products. The tremendous stimulation of the process of centralization by the needs of the war was followed by a temporary downward movement, which in turn was succeeded by a decided and persistent turn upward again.

Every shift in these figures means new recruits for the working class from the petty bourgeoisie and the farmers; it means a decisive attack against the illusion of the petty bourgeois that his class is merely an anti-chamber to the heaven of the big bourgeoisie; it means a consolidation of the proletariat as a class; it means the growth of all the forces that make for the downfall of capitalism.

And in the face of this, the opportunist claims: "Nothing has changed: no revolution is in sight; people who see a change are revolutionary romanticists; we are the only genuine realists." Twenty-three years ago Lenin characterized these realists; "Weak and vacillating in theoretical questions, with a narrow view, justifying his political flabbiness with the spontaneity of the masses, a man who looks more like a trade union secretary than like a leader of masses, incapable of working out a comprehensive and bold plan which can command respect even from the enemy, inexperienced, clumsy,—I beg of you—that is not a revolutionist, but a wretched blunderer."

## XI. Colonial Illusions and Realities.

"We must not only build independent revolutionary groups and parties in all countries; we must not only propagate the formation of peasants' councils and try to adapt the Soviet organizations to the pre-capitalist conditions; but the Communist International must also declare and establish theoretically that it is possible for backward countries with the help of the proletariat of the advanced countries to establish a soviet organization and for the soviets, by stages, to reach Communism, avoiding the capitalist system." Lenin: Speech on Colonial Question, Second World Congress of Communist International, 1920.

"The revolution in the colonies will not be a Communist revolution in the beginning; if, however, the Communist advance guard immediately puts itself at the head, then the revolutionary masses will be brought on the right road on which they will gradually gather revolutionary experiences to reach the established goal." Supplementary Theses to Colonial Question, adopted by Second World Congress of Communist International, 1920.

Imperialism is the stage of decaying capitalism. This is a well established Leninist principle. The opportunist denies this—if not in theory then surely in practice. The imperialist power of American capitalism is more convincing to him than Leninism. And when Leninism, in a last effort to convince, points out that the very strength of capitalism in the epoch of imperialism turns into its weakness, the opportunist answers with a deprecating remark about the "revolutionary illusions" of the Leninist.

The opportunist refuses to see that the imperialist expansions are a result of the growing insufficiency of the homeland as a market, as a source of raw material, as an opportunity for the investment of constantly accumulating new capital. This need of expansion creates an acute and permanent conflict with all other imperialist and expanding governments. War becomes an ever present reality. It forces capitalism to arm its workers at home to suppress and keep in check the proletarian and peasant masses of the colonies. It necessitates the arming of these colonial proletarians and peasants for the imperialist wars of the home government. It creates the insoluble contradiction of an ever increasing socialization of production on the one hand, and an ever decreasing circle of individual capitalists exercising control over it, on the other.

The epoch of imperialism makes every section of the world an inseparable part of every other section. As a result,

any event in one part of the world has its serious repercussions in the other. Thus the vulnerability of capitalism is increased tremendously.

The opportunist fails to see this side of imperialism. He retains the attitude of the Second International on the question of the struggles of colonial and semi-colonial peoples. He does not see that these struggles form part of the general struggle for emancipation of the proletariat. The basis for the stand of the opportunist is his fear of and opposition to all revolutionary struggles.

But, like in all of his reformism, the opportunist attempts to hide his non-revolutionary and anti-revolutionary stand on this question with a radical phrase. To demonstrate a shining example of this tactic, let Lore speak.

On June 8, 1925, he wrote in the "Volkszeitung"; speaking about the Chinese situation:

"Here we have to deal with a struggle not yet against capitalism nor yet a battle for a Communist Society, but with a national movement which hopes to re-conquer China for the Chinese by driving out the foreign big capitalist imperialism.

"Naturally, this is a Utopia—especially so since China is unarmed and there is little possibility for it to exert itself against the militaristically well armed imperialism of Europe, the United States and Japan.

"But even if the possibility to drive out foreign imperialism did exist, what would be the gain? The place of the American, British and Japanese capitalists would be taken by the Chinese capitalists, whose suppression of their own countrymen would be no less brutal, whose robbery of their wage slaves at the tenderest years of childhood, of their health and happiness would be no less merciless than that of their Japanese, American, British, French or German class colleagues heretofore.

"For the Chinese proletariat, also, there is no other road to freedom than that of the proletarian revolution. BUT, OF COURSE, CHINA IS NOT THAT FAR YET BY A LONG WAY." (Emphasis mine—M. B.).

There are two typical Loreisms contained in this. One is a tactical and the other a theoretical monstrosity.

The tactical Loreism is obvious: opposition to struggle. "You cannot win," says Lore to the Chinese revolutionists, "because your opponent has better weapons. But even if you win, it will be all the same to you because in place of the foreign capitalist you will be exploited by your native capitalist. So why fight?" Why fight?—that is the conclusion



of all considerations of the Loreite opportunist. His theory is merely incidental. The theory serves the purpose of proving in all cases that the answer to the question "Why fight?" must be: No.

Now to the theory of this gem of Loreism.

"To support the struggle for the overthrow of foreign rule in the colonies does not mean to subscribe to the national aspirations of the native bourgeoisie but it rather means to point the way to the proletariat of the colonies to its emancipation," so say the theses of the Communist International on this question. Is the Communist International correct—or Lore?

The expansion of capital to colonies as a result of having outgrown the boundary lines of the homeland shows the importance of the colonies to the national economy of the homeland. A rebellion in the colony seriously disturbs, and a victory of the rebels completely upsets, capitalist economy in the homeland. Capitalist economy needs the colonies. Their loss initiates the collapse of this economy and the end of the system. A serious nationalist revolutionary struggle of a colonial or semi-colonial country is the beginning of the proletarian revolutionary struggle in the home country.

But aside from this international aspect of a colonial rebellion Loreism is also completely wrong in its consideration of the internal aspects. We meet here with a typical case of Menshevism. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia was condemned by the Mensheviks because of its "untimeliness." The Mensheviks, too, said: "For the Russian proletariat there is no other road to freedom than that of the proletarian revolution. But, of course, Russia is not that far yet by a long way." They declared that Russia must go thru a period of capitalist rule, and that, therefore, the task of the proletariat is not to defeat but to defend the capitalists.

Lore's Menshevism comes to this conclusion: China cannot escape capitalist rule. Therefore what is the use of fighting against it? From this Loreite position there is only a very short step to the position of the Social-chauvinists. The latter start from the same premise: "The colonies can not escape capitalism." From this premise they proceed: "Since the imperialist homeland forces capitalism into the colonies they carry on 'socialist work,' preparing the colonies for revolution. Colonial uprisings, therefore, are essentially

reactionary. The colonization policy of the imperialist government must be supported. All that we 'Socialists' can fight against are 'bad methods' of colonization." That is the colonial policy of the Social-chauvinists. It differs little from that of the opportunists. Its theory is exactly the same. Its practice differs only so long as it remains theory.

The Communist, in clear contradiction to the Loreite opportunist, knows that the productive forces of any backward country can be developed also under proletarian rule. He knows that the existence of proletarian rule in Russia is a most important factor in the prospects for a success of a colonial rebellion. He knows that the duty of the Communists is not to speculate about the success of a colonial or semi-colonial revolt, but to support it by mobilizing the workers at home against the same forces against whom the colonial or semi-colonial rebels are fighting.

Loreist opportunism always looks for the best reasons why not to fight. Communism always looks for the best methods how to fight.

---

## CONCLUSION.

"Reformist tendencies have nothing in common with Communism. . . . The difference between Socialists and Communists is just this—that the former refuse to do what we (the Communists) do under all conditions, namely, to carry on revolutionizing activities." Lenin: Speech, Second World Congress of Communist International on Twenty-one Points, 1920.

The Loreite opportunist has no theory. In place of the unifying science of Marxism he sets up eclecticism. He does not base his position on his theory, but he theorizes about his position.

The Loreite opportunists pride themselves on their originality as thinkers and revolutionists. In their two months of discussion of Communism, of the Workers (Communist) Party and of the Communist International, they pointed again and again to their new and different ideas. They ridicule the dependency of the Communists on "oracles from Moscow."

The Communist, on the other hand, is not concerned with the originality but with the correctness of his stand. He cherishes in the Communist International the collective experience and wisdom of the revolutionary movement of the world. And in the originality of the ideas of the Loreite

opportunist the Communist sees the absence of Marxian-Leninist theory. The variety of 'bright ideas' of the opportunist Loreite is the outgrowth of the absence of one idea, a unifying theory.

The duty of the Communist to carry on revolutionizing activities determines his stand toward opportunism. Within the ranks of a Communist Party the theory of inactivity, as personified by the opportunist, becomes a serious menace. It paralyzes the party. It poisons the theoretical understanding of the party members. It acts as a counter-revolutionary influence within the advance guard of the army of the proletarian revolution.

To combat this menace is one of the revolutionizing activities the Communists are always ready to carry on and one that must be carried on with double energy on counter-revolutionary week-days.

In true Bolshevik fashion the Communists set out to cleanse the ranks of their Party and the science of their theory of all opportunist poison, and thus execute the command of their greatest leader, Lenin, who said:

"To make clear to the masses the inevitability and necessity of a separation from opportunism, to educate these masses to revolution by a pitiless struggle against opportunism . . . that is the correct Marxian aim of the International proletarian movement."



*New Numbers*

*of*

# The Little Red Library

*Will be issued in as rapid succession  
as suitable material will allow.*

## TITLES NOW READY:

No. 1.—TRADE UNIONS IN  
AMERICA, by Wm. Z.  
Foster, J. P. Cannon  
and E. R. Browder.

No. 2.—CLASS STRUGGLE  
vs. CLASS COLLAB-  
ORATION, by Earl R.  
Browder.

No. 3.—PRINCIPLES OF  
COMMUNISM, by  
Frederick Engels.  
Translation by Max  
Bedacht.

No. 4.—WORKER CORRE-  
SPONDENCE, by  
Wm. F. Dunne.

No. 5.—POEMS FOR WORK-  
ERS, Edited by Man-  
uel Gomez.

IN

## PREPARATION:

THE DAMNED AGITAT-  
OR and Other Stories, by  
Michael Gold.

THE WORLD RULE OF  
WALL STREET, by  
Manuel Gomez.

**For  
\$1.00**

Twelve copies will be sent of any single  
number—choice of numbers—or follow-  
ing numbers as soon as off the press.

# Labor

ity in the Project

## IE WORKER

the progress of  
ass their vision  
every struggle  
is accurately re-  
porter that serves  
night labor.

in Labor moves  
closely in every  
development.

is of importance  
together with sup-  
porting labor's  
can be found at  
AILY WORKER

*write!*

Y WORKER

shington Blvd.  
aco, ILL.