

THE COMMUNIST

ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

Vol. II., No 6

JUNE 1, 1920

PRICE 5 CENTS

Problems of The Third International

(RAMSEY MACDONALD ON THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL)

By N. LENIN

Number 5423 of the French Social-patriotic paper, "L'Humanité", of April 14, 1919, contains an editorial article from the pen of the well-known leader of the British so-called "Independent Labor Party" (but which in fact has always been an opportunistic party depending upon the bourgeoisie)—Ramsey MacDonald. This article is so typical of the position of those elements characterized as the "centre" and branded as such by the First Congress of the Communist International in Moscow, that we reproduce it in full, together with the editorial introduction of "L'Humanité."

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

By Ramsey MacDonald

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

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

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

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

* * *

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

means sufficient to warrant a split within the International.

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

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

* * *

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

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

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

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

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

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

Under such conditions whom can we condemn? Some of us did not know that those decisions of the International had no real value and could not be applied as a practical guide.

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

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 7.)

AGENDA FOR THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE COMMUNIST

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY
OF AMERICA

PUBLISHED BY

The Central Executive Committee

VOL. II. JUNE 1, 1920 No. 6

"CONTACT WITH THE MASSES"

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Here is predicated the very question at issue between the "majority" and the "minority." Not "contact with the masses" is the issue, but the kind of contact—that is the issue. The "minority" by deliberately distorting the issue convict themselves of ignorance or willful deceit, or both.

How can there be any question of the desirability of getting contact with the masses? Why, the very organization of the Communist Party, its "illegal" character in the eyes of the law, its underground machinery, is based upon contact with the masses. For the entire membership, with a few isolated examples, are workers, class-conscious workers, engaged in industry, and who carry Communist propaganda in the shops, factories and mines. To whom do its leaflets and proclamations go to, if not the masses? For whose consumption is it intended, if not the masses? Every act of a Communist Party is related up to the every day struggles of the masses."

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

scure the real issue.

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

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

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party should adapt its propaganda to try to win into its ranks masses of the workers politically immature, in the pre-revolutionary, propaganda stage of the organization.

We are opposed to that "contact" which implies that the Communist Party should "unite" with elements who only accept the principles of the Third International but refuse to accept its policies; in other words, those who accept principles in words but reject them in action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

POLITICAL ADVENTURERS AND CHARLATANS

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

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

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

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

A more brazen piece of trickery could not be imagined on the part of so-called "Communists." This is "secret diplomacy" with a vengeance. Damon & Co. have evidently taken a leaf out of the book of Lloyd George in his negotiations with Soviet Russia—an olive branch in one hand and a dagger in the other. Obviously, the letters to the C. E. C. were intended to appease those who sided with the "minority," but were never intended to be carried out.

Even assuming the possibility of a three-cornered convention from the "minority" point of view,—the C. E. C. considers this absolutely impossible and impracticable in view of the split in the Communist Party on principles, and the necessity of clarifying the party position both in the convention and in the membership after the convention,—how could such a "joint convention" be held when the "minority" and the C. L. P. had agreed beforehand NOT TO NEGOTIATE WITH THE "MAJORITY" GROUP OF THE C. E. C.?

The only logical conclusion we can draw from this mess of chicanery, lies and double-dealing is that Damon & Co. want to sell out the Communist Party to the C. L. P., effect "unity" eventually with the "Left elements led by Eugene V. Debs" of the social-patriotic S. P. and blossom out into a united Centrist Party of America camouflaged under the name of Communism.

That this seems to have been the intentions of the Centrist leaders of the "minority" and the C. L. P. (having first attempted to win the membership of the C. P. over by fraud and deception) is further evidenced by an unguarded

INTERNAL AND FOREIGN POLICIES OF ENGLAND.*

By KARL RADEK

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 8.)

* Italics are ours.—Compare this point of view with the similar point of view on the "capitalist peace" with Soviet Russia, expressed by the Amsterdam Bureau of the Third International in several of its statements reprinted in The Communist, by Comrade Frajna in his report to the Party (Communist, No. 4) and by Comrade S. Rutgers in his letter to Comrade Martens reprinted in this issue. Ed.

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

It would be interesting to know what these telegrams contained for one thing, and when and on whose authority they were sent out for another.—Of one thing, however, we are quite certain—that the entire move was a concerted plan to win Debs, and with him the "left elements" of the S. P. to bolt and join the "united party" of the "minority" of the C. P. and the C. L. P. Only when this move failed for the time being, did the C. L. P. reluctantly plead with their membership "whose love for Debs overshadows their loyalty to Communist principles" to please leave the party, or else they might be expelled. But we notice that "The Toiler," official organ of the C. L. P. of Ohio (the home of the "Centrist swamp"), on May 14, is still in the C. L. P., though defying the pitiful squeal of their Central Executive body. Of course, we might suggest that the C. E. C. of the C. L. P. should resign, because of its evident divergence in views with their membership (a course they themselves suggest when such a condition arises in a party), but that would be "rubbing salt into the wound," and so we refrain.

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

A Significant Letter

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * *

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

The Letter of Comrade Rutgers.

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

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

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

"Pressure From the Workers."

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

recognition had to be the pressure from the workers.

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

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

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

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

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

(Signature of Comrade Rutgers follows.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(Continued on page 8.)

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

"Has It Been Worth While?"

"Harold Lord Varney" of The Communist Party
(THE POLITICAL OBITUARY OF Y. F.—"COMMUNIST")

By A—W.

(Continuation.)

To begin with the second part of our article,—we owe an apology to Y. F. In the last issue of the "Communist" we called him a "former editor," which since has proven not to be so. He still continues not only as "theoretician," but also as editor.

Having recently resigned (just before the split) from the editorship of the official organ of the Party, he re-joined with the "minority" in an editorial capacity the moment they split away from the C. E. C. Anyone who takes upon himself the unpleasant task of looking through No. 5 of the slanderous sheet published by the "minority" group,—which they have the audacity to call "The Communist,"—official organ of the Communist Party of America, (1) but which, by no means, can and should be confounded with the real "Communist," the authoritative, Official Organ of the C. P. of A., published by its Central Executive Committee,—will be immediately convinced that its (fake "Communist's") actual editor (to distinguish between him and the "Acting Editor") is our "Harold Lord Varney"—Y. F. himself.*

With the exception of a "statement" by D. Damon and a report by L. Fraina, practically the whole issue is written by Y. F. One article is openly signed by him, another, an unsigned leading editorial article entitled "Communist Party Criticism" is nothing but a mild rephrasing (editorials, you know, and especially unsigned ones,—must of necessity be "mild") of the "criticism" contained in the article "Has It Been Worth While?" of which this presentation is an analysis. As to the rest of the articles,—well, we leave it to the reader to decide who wrote them. Of one thing we are certain however,—nobody will be over-anxious to claim their authorship...

Let us now return to the article in question.

Nothing can better illustrate and more conclusively prove our assertion of Y. F.'s tendency toward opportunism, his opportunistic, purely revisionist attitude toward Communism than his own utterances and pronouncements in reference to the Communist movement in this country in general, and to the Communist Party of America in particular. The general trend of all his utterances and pronouncements is so well familiar to us from the works of Edward Bernstein—the father of revisionism,—and other European revisionists dissatisfaction with and scoffing against, the Party's, and Party leaders' "dogmatism," and what they called "orthodox religiousness." (It is well to remember that the distinction between "orthodox Marxism" and "revisionist Marxism" or "revisionism" dates back to the publication of Edward Bernstein's famous book "Evolutionary Socialism"). In this regard, very characteristic of our author, and very significant, being a typical revisionist statement, is the following citation from the above-named editorial article ("Communist Party Criticism") in the 5th,—but counting from the split, the 2nd—issue of the fake "Communist":

"In the United States there has been largely an acceptance of Socialist science as a system of dogma and absolute faith, rather than as a method of analysis." (Italics ours.)

The very "tests of the worthwhileness of a party," which apparently are the main, if not the sole, object of his article and the chief idea of his "criticism," are but another—a "home-made" name for what in Europe has been called "revisionism..."

But we do not even need to go as far as Europe to illustrate the opportunistic and revisionist character of our author's utterances and statements. For every statement of his we can quote a parallel, substantially similar in sense and meaning, and often almost exactly worded, statement of some more or less known American social-opportunists, or "revisionists." Our author's spiritual and philosophical affinity to those social-opportunists, and that he thinks and speaks practically in the same terms as they do,—will be conclusively proven to the reader.

Summing up—the main points in our author's "indictment" against the Communist Party are: 1.—The Party is "orthodox" and "religious." To this accusation he comes back over and over again throughout the whole of his article:

"We have suffered a great deal to the detriment of the Communist movement in this country by the imposition of a religious attitude of fatal inevitability upon the whole process. A few indefinite slogans have served like hallucinations at revivalist meetings. Hell has gaped before us in all its fearfulness, even more terrifying than the portrayals by Billy Sunday, the hell of being the minutest fraction under one hundred percent. Bolshevik..."

"The Communists, lo and behold, were the hearers of a new revelation! And ever since the Summer of 1919 we have had an official Communism in the United States which proceeds by incantations, counting of beads, annuities to the East, jubilees of phrases and slogans, pieties unending to Bolshevism—to a Bolshevism consisting of a mysterious compound of words and ritual which could only be known to its high priests!"

* Thus, on its very surface (not to speak of its contents), the fake "Communist" published by the "minority" group,—or, rather, what is nearer the truth,—by former Executive Secretary Damon,—carries two lies. Lie No. 1—an announcement that it is the "Official Organ of the C. P. of A." Whatever one may say with regard to Damon's pretension to still style himself "Executive Secretary of the C. P. of A." or even with regard to his appropriation (or expropriation?) of party funds,—calling the pitiful and slanderous sheet published by him "Official Organ of the C. P. of A." is the most shameful, unheard of and brazen lie... Lie No. 2—Damon's signing as "Acting Editor" of the fake "Communist," while its real or actual Acting Editor (beginning with No. 5) is Y. F. Perhaps Comrade Kasbeck, who considered it necessary everywhere and on every occasion to officially and publicly announce that he has "nothing to do and nothing in common" with Langley and Y. F., and that he, right from the moment of the split refused to come out in company with them,—perhaps Comrade Kasbeck will be better able than anyone else to shed some light on the reasons of concealment from the readers (and we dare to presume, even from the membership of the "minority group") the name of the real editor of the fake "Communist." Has it not been "worth while" to conceal the real editor, because, otherwise,—had Damon made public that his editor is Y. F.—he would have risked losing not only his membership, but even the last and only "asset" of his—small as it is—"official family"—Comrade Kasbeck?

"The Communist Labor Party came into being alongside the Communist Party as the confused protest of the Left Wing against its absorption into this religiosity of word-Bolshevism..."

Do we need to reply to, and refute all this mad, nonsensical prattle of a man, who, apparently "lost his faith," and now,—as is the case with all renegades,—vehemently attacks his former "religion"? Do we need to elaborate upon, and prove that what he,—in his intellectual, petty-bourgeois stupidity and inability to understand the working class psychology, judging perhaps by his own psychology while in the Communist Party,—takes for "religiosity" and "religious attitude," is nothing else than the class devotion of class-conscious workingmen and workingwomen to their cause,—to, what for them is not simply a "mental and spiritual self-satisfaction," but the cause of their emancipation from the yoke of capitalism? Of course not!

We shall limit ourselves to just one more quotation:

"...The Socialist Party does not take the theological position as to the unpardonable sin. It is precisely because the Communists insist upon a well-nigh religious orthodoxy as to the mode of revolution; it is because they insisted and still insist, that revolution must proceed as it did in Russia, that we have severed relations with them..." ("What Call Readers Think,"—N. Y. Call, May 8th, 1920.)

The author of the above quotation is no one else than David P. Berenberg—notorious "Right-Winger," former editor of that equally notorious "Socialist," late organ of the New York "Right-Wingers" during their bitter fight against the "Left Wing" in the spring of last year. The reader can see that our "Communist"—Y. F., is in good, respectable company! We are almost certain that in such company he will not feel as lonesome as he does among Communists...

2.—Now as to the above-quoted accusation in "dogmatism."

Here also should be listed his accusations against the Party for its disposition to use the "vaguest sort of phrases" ("jubilees of phrases"), "undefined slogans" and "ready-made principles." This accusation is repeatedly indulged in by all the "leading minds" of the "minority group." Here again our author finds himself in good company: "The revolutionary phrases and stereotyped dogmas of the past are also insufficient, for the new world cannot be ushered in by brain splitting abstractions." (Henry Fruchter in an article: "Shall We Work or Go on Talking?" in the N. Y. Call of May 25th.)

"The question then was whether the Socialists of America would remain true to the fundamental principles and methods... rejecting the suicidal compromises of the extreme right as well as the sterile revolutionary phrases of the extreme left..." And again: "It is vital and indispensable... that our party be preserved... not as a party of mere patch work reforms, or yet as a party of sham revolutionary phrases..." (From the speech of Morris Hillquit at the S. P. Convention.—N. Y. Call, May 9th, 1920.)

"The war is over and we should discard phrases and talk sense... We cannot reach the worker with Marxian phrases..." (Morris Hillquit in opposition to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.—N. Y. Call, May 12th, 1920.)

"We cannot afford to be emotional dogmatists." (Oneal in opposition to Dictatorship of the Proletariat.)

"We should use as few revolutionary phrases as possible. Let us discard the Marxian verbiage that has become so hackneyed by continuous repetition in the last thirty years..." (From an article: "Let Us Drop the 'Revolutionary' Jargon," by Victor L. Berger.—N. Y. Call, May 9th, 1920.)

So much for "dogmatism" and "phraseology." In his zealous attack upon "hair-splitting doctrinaires" and "feverish talk-conspirators" our "Communist" finds himself in company with Morris Hillquit, James Oneal and Victor Berger!... Really, is it not a touching "unity"?

3.—The next accusation is that in its "religious fervor" the Communist Party became "an institution for the holding of ritualistic incantations to the Russian Revolution." (!)

This "untimely" revolution, you see,—and for that matter,—not only Russia, but also the German and Hungarian revolutions, has spoiled all the plans and expectations for a "sound," "healthy," "analytical" and "forward-looking" development of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the United States:

"The adventure element,—with the revolution in process in Russia, in Germany, in Hungary,—was so alluring that none stopped for questioning or analysis."

The results of these "alluring adventures" were simply "disastrous":

"A ready-made Bolshevism was super-imposed in this country upon a Left Wing movement of many years standing." (!)

You see,—that terrible Bolshevism again! Since its ascendancy in Russia, it leaves no one in peace and quiet,—all—"Socialists" as well as capitalists—are compelled to raise their voices against it.

The capitalist press complains that "Bolshevism imposed their will upon the sprawling country" (from an editorial in N. Y. World, May 31, 1920, on "Debs as a Bolshevik"), meaning "poor, suffering Russia"; while our "Communists" of Y. F.'s type, not being so "altruistic," confined themselves to "their own country," complaining that "Bolshevism was super-imposed in this country..."

Compare both complaints. Is there not a touching similarity in thought and even in language?

Truly has it been said that—"great minds" run in the same channel!"

"Ritualistic incantations to the Russian Revolution..."—"The adventure element,—with revolutions in process in Russia, in Germany, in Hungary..."—such statements demand little more than cursory attention from us, because these accusations, clearer perhaps than anything else, expose the real, common-place, petty-bourgeois, non-revolutionary,—counter-revolutionary, we should say,—position of their author.

All great revolutions,—The Great French Revolution of 1789, the European revolutions of 1848, the Paris Commune Revolution of 1871,—always were and remain the greatest inspirations and lessons for all suppressed and suffering humanity... Marx called revolutions—"the great locomotives of history..." Lenin insistently and repeatedly emphasizes the necessity and importance of not only the minutest study, but even the "imitation"—as our "learned statesman," Y. F., would call it,—

of the Paris Commune; he himself and the Soviet Government "imitated" it to a very great extent,—especially during the first period, when making first steps in their work, before the Soviet system had been firmly put on "rails" and began to "move by itself..."

But our "learned statesman" sees nothing in all these revolutions but "adventure elements," and attempts to study and learn from them he scoffingly and venomously calls "ritualistic incantations!"

Our "political scientist" (this refers to Y. F.—please do not confuse "political scientist" with "international politicians," which, by no means, are the same thing,—our "political scientist," we are sure, will feel himself unjustly accused. "I am no less Bolshevik than anybody else,"—will he vehemently protest,—"to call me 'anti-revolutionary' is simply ridiculous; I was always, from my very birth, have been and still am for a revolution,—as a matter of fact for all kinds of revolutions (even for a "revolution" within the Communist Party, we hasten to add). What I am against is the 'super-imposition of ready-made Bolshevism' in this country, which is, by no means similar to being opposed to Bolshevism in general..."

If not in the words, he will most certainly use the same language, in effect... Which, of course, suggests a question: what is the difference between a good, "fit-for America Bolshevism" of Y. F.'s liking,—and a bad, poor species of Bolshevism,—"ready-made Bolshevism"?

The difference in question is plainly indicated by the very adjective: "ready-made," meaning Bolshevism "made in Russia," and "imported" into this country in a prepared "ready" form... Y. F. does not want such a "ready-made" Bolshevism,—made by others in a different country, "in a world of circumstances only dimly akin to those of 1919 in the United States." He has nothing against the name "Bolshevism" (especially because this name has acquired great popularity, promising to bring with it certain adherence and following), but he does not want Bolshevist theory, principles and tactics, built and formulated "in Moscow" to be "super-imposed in this country." He,—a "political scientist" himself,—wants to "discover," or if necessary, to "invent," to build and formulate them over again himself; he wants his own, "home-made" theories, his own "American brand of Communism," preserving only, because of its usefulness and practicability, a "foreign name..."

He is, in this respect not unlike Hillquit, Oneal and other "stars" of the S. P., who "are willing" to affiliate with the Third International, but do not want the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and other theories "coined in Moscow" to be "super-imposed on them..." He is even not unlike Victor Berger, who, in the above-quoted article "Let Us Drop the 'Revolutionary' Jargon," expresses the same "thoughts,"—strangely enough!—stated almost in identical language. Says Victor Berger:

"In order to accomplish anything at all we must cease to gaze upon Russia exclusively. We cannot transplant Russia to America..."

"For the new developments in Socialism—for models to pattern after—we must not look to Russia..."

"We cannot imitate Lenin..."

Yes, our "learned statesman" truly belongs to those "Centrists" of whom Lenin speaks in his article—"Problems of the Third International," the publication of which begins in this issue of the "Communist," when he says:

"The most dangerous—coming from the Berne International—*—is the Lip-service recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Italics ours.)

These men are apt to recognize anything and sign anything only in order to remain at the head of the working class movement. Kautsky already says that he is not opposed to the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. French social-patriots and "Centrists" also sign under the resolution for Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

"They do not deserve any confidence." (Italics ours.)

"They recognize the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in words, in order secretly to read into it the 'will of the majority,' 'general suffrage'..."

We should guard ourselves against these new tricks, against these new hickies of reformism, more than anything else..." (Italics ours.)

8.

The political identity of Y. F. and of all those who stood and stand with him now,—is now clear to us.

He is a typical "Left Winger," which term he himself uses and prefers to the term "Centrist" for a definition of his political position.

The creation and existence of a "Left Wing" was a good and positive sign at the death-bed of the Second International; it still is such in a country where a Communist Party has not yet been organized, presaging its formation in the near future.

The "Left Wing," in other words, belongs to and represents the transitory period from the Socialist to the Communist International.

But when and where a Communist Party has already been organized, or, speaking generally,—in the epoch when the Communist International has been organized and begun functioning,—the left wing most certainly represents a backward stage of development, composed of the indecisive, hesitating, wavering, backward elements, who left the rotten corpse of the Second International, but still—their professions to the contrary notwithstanding—cannot join the Third International full-heartedly, without open or mental "reservations"...

Quoting Lenin (see his "Greetings to Communists Abroad" in the "International Supplement" to this issue of the "Communist"):

"The Left Wing combines the unimaginative, cowardly old prejudices of the small, paltry, petty-bourgeois regarding parliamentary democracy, with the Communist recognition of the proletarian revolution, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Soviet-power."

Exactly this "unimaginative, cowardly and petty-bourgeois" Left Wing, our "learned author" Y. F. represents. His sympathies are all on the side of the Left Wing. Toward Bolshevism or Communism, with its "all-prevailing sense of realism," he feels nothing but "old prejudices" and repulsion.

He repeatedly and expressly indicates this throughout the whole of his article. Bolshevism is to him: "a mysterious compound of words and phrases and ritual which could only be known to its high priests..."—"The Communists, lo and behold"—sarcastically and ridiculingly remarks he,—were the bearers of a new revelation..." He feels really hurt and indignant at the "discovery" that the "Communists were not the Left Wingers of the Socialist Party, but spurned this Left Wing along with the rest of the Socialist Party!"

On the other hand, he, with an obvious and warm sympathy speaks of the "protest of the Left Wing against its absorption into this religiosity of word-

* Meaning, of course, all those who in spirit belong to the Berne "International," with its traditional rule of letting each country retain its own autonomy and right to determine its own policies,—which has since been proven so fatal...