

# THE COMMUNIST

ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

VOL II, No. 7

JULY 1, 1920.

PRICE 5 CENTS

## The Counter-Revolution in Germany

By LOUIS FRAINA,  
International Secretary, Communist Party of America

Berlin, March 28.

The Ebert-Noske-Bauer Government shorn of Noske and Bauer, is again in power. The streets are still a mass of barbed-wire entanglements erected by the counter-revolutionary troops against the Government troops, armed with rifles, sheath-bayonets and hand-grenades, patrol the streets prepared to shoot down the workers (scores have already been shot)—the identical troops that did not fire a shot in defense of the city against the counter-revolutionary invasion of Luttwitz-Kapp. The old apathy is again dominant in the streets of Berlin—that cold, hopeless apathy which immediately impresses the observer in Germany. In the "high life" districts, in Unter den Linden and Friedrichstrasse, the swirl of frightful gaiety again rushes on; while in the proletarian districts there is sullen resentment, tempered by partial anticipations of a new struggle.

Five days ago it appeared as if this new struggle might start immediately. The proletariat of Berlin was still on strike, in spite of the Ebert Government and the trades union bureaucracy having issued orders to end the strike. In city after city the workers used the opportunity of the crisis to usurp power, developing the General Strike beyond the limits imposed upon it as a strike in defense of the Government. In Westphalia and the Rhineland, in the Ruhr mining districts, the working class, while not yet wholly clear on means and purposes, was in complete control, seizing government power and organizing an active Red Army of 30,000 men, with 50,000 in reserve. But, for reasons which will develop later, these hopes against the Red Army, which has been compelled to accept an armistice: disaster and massacre will come in the Ruhr.

These are the inescapable facts of the situation: the Ebert Government is in power, but the military coup d'état has partially conquered since it has compelled the Government to compromise and move more to the Right; the Government is withdrawing its concessions, or rather its promises of concessions to the masses; the interests behind the military coup are securing concessions as against the proletariat which rallied to the Government's defense; the Government is compelled to rely more than ever on military forces; while the Cabinet is being reconstructed according to the policy of the Right and not according to the demands of the Left. The proposal of the Independent Socialist Party for a "Socialist Government" (Cabinet coalition of Independents and Social Democrats) has been contemptuously rejected—a rejection accompanied by a new Terror; the Socialist-bourgeois Government, having to choose between the proletariat and the reaction, again chooses reaction.

The revolutionary crisis produced by the military coup, developing conditions for the final struggle for power, is being converted into a Cabinet-parliamentary crisis, with the Independent Socialist Party manipulating the situation to secure Cabinet concessions and parliamentary power; the Independents having, all through the crisis, acted not with an eye to the revolutionary seizure of power, but with an eye to (1) the reconstruction of the Cabinet on a "Socialist" basis, and (2) the coming elections in which they anticipate becoming the majority party; while the Communist Party of Germany (as represented by the Reichs-Zentrale) is assisting the conversion of the revolutionary crisis into a parliamentary crisis by not measuring up to the requirements of the situation and by rendering criminally opportunist encouragement to the Independents in their proposal for a "Socialist" Government.

And the masses? The masses are stirring uneasily, baffled and betrayed; and they may yet, under the pressure of events, initiate a new struggle, compelling the hesitants and the moderates to accept revolutionary action.

### I.—THE COLLAPSE OF DEMOCRACY

The Ebert-Bauer-Noske Government was directly responsible for the military coup d'état. The coup was made by troops recently returned from the Baltic provinces, where the Government allowed a concentration of the most reactionary troops of the old German army for use against the Revolution and against Soviet Russia—troops which, with the connivance of the Socialist Government, surreptitiously assisted Col. Avaloff-Bermond in his counter-revolutionary campaign against Petrograd. The coup had been discussed for months and open preparations made; but the Government did nothing. On March 11 General von Luttwitz met President Ebert in Conference and issued an ultimatum, but von Luttwitz was not placed under arrest; while Noske, actively or compliantly, allowed the reactionary troops to prepare their coup. Late in the evening of March 12 Noske issued a statement that the fears of the Left concerning a military coup were unfounded—six or seven hours later 10,000 troops invaded Berlin to the strains of martial music and the plaudits of a crowd; the Government troops firing not a single shot in defense of the city, while the Government itself fled in an automobile.

There was no power of resistance in the Government—no resistance in democracy and the parliamentary regime. Aggressive and relentless against the proletarian revolution, the Government was weaker than a woman's tears against the counter-revolution. Democracy and the Government had been compelled to rely upon the most reactionary forces, upon the military of the old regime. Democracy and the Government did not act uncompromisingly against the military, since antagonizing or weakening the military meant weakening the basis of their own power; hence the Government slyly allowed the preparations for a coup to proceed. A revolutionary Government would have answered the threat of von Luttwitz to march upon Berlin by mobilizing the armed proletariat and by general arrests of reactionaries, by mass-Terror against the bourgeois-Junker re-

action; but the Socialist-bourgeois Government had disarmed the proletariat, while aggressive measures against the reaction would have meant an open break with the Right, and the collapse of the Government under pressure of Right and Left. At a meeting of the National Assembly on March 14, Socialist Chancellor Bauer said: "After mature deliberation the Government decided not to enter into a bloody struggle with the Kapp upstarts, and therefore determined to leave Berlin, thereby avoiding violence." (Against the Communists there never was any thought of "avoiding violence"! But that is miserable equivocation. The Government had at its disposal in Berlin alone 30,000 troops and 50,000 armed civilians, and about 300,000 in all Germany; yet the Government evaded a struggle with 10,000 counter-revolutionary troops. Why? Because the Government knew that its troops, reliable in crushing a Communist uprising, were completely unreliable as a means of defense against a reactionary uprising. Moreover, an open military struggle would compel

tained the ascendancy of democracy. The petty bourgeois democracy, accordingly, adopted a policy of "watchful waiting" and "neutrality," which under the circumstances assisted the counter-revolution—democracy did not defend itself against the Left, with whom there could be neither compromise nor merger. It might be unpleasant for the military reaction to conquer, but a satisfactory agreement could be arranged.

This, then, was the consequence of the Socialism of the Social-Democratic Party—that, in affirming democracy as the means to Socialism it developed means for the ascendancy of Junker-Capitalism, thereby directly promoting the coming of military counter-revolution.

And after 18 months of murdering the proletariat and Socialism, the Government and the Social-Democratic Party were compelled—to call upon the proletariat and Socialism to act against its own creation, the military counter-revolution.

### 2.—DEVELOPEMENTS OF THE CRISIS

In choosing the alternative of a General Strike the Government and the Social-Democratic Party were fully aware of the fact that the strike might develop beyond the limits imposed upon it as a strike in defense of democracy and the Government. But the Government was equally aware that it might depend upon the military in the event of the General Strike assuming revolutionary proportions; and, moreover, the Government, simultaneously with the call for a General Strike—issued in name of Ebert, Bauer, Noske, Muller and David (Noske afterwards denied subscribing to the call)—prepared measures to prevent the General Strike becoming revolutionary. In the Ruhr district, for example, revolutionary and under a state of martial law, the strike was consciously limited, and it did not become a General Strike until March 17, when the struggle was no longer against the military coup but against the Socialist-bourgeois Government.

In accepting the alternative of a General Strike the Government, moreover, simply "legalized" an accomplished fact, since the masses acted independently of the Government.

On Saturday March 13 the General Strike was proclaimed in Berlin by the trades unions, the Social-Democratic Party and the Independent Socialist Party. All three proclamations agreed in fundamentals—strike against the coup, in defense of democracy; the Independents juggled with revolutionary phrases in characteristic style, but proposed no definite revolutionary measures; while the trades unions spoke of the "legal" Government being menaced by the coup, of the danger of reaction being restored in state and shops, of the Republic being in danger. There was no clear call to revolutionary action, not even from the Communist Party which, on Saturday, declared against the General Strike on the assumption that the military coup and the Government were identical.

The response of the proletariat to the General Strike was immediate and complete; in Berlin, the struggle immediately and completely assumed the character of a proletarian struggle against the military-bourgeois reaction.

The situation in Berlin was most characteristic of the General situation in Germany. The collapse of the Government was complete; there was not a trace of its authority or its resistance... Herr Kapp occupied the Chancellery; while General von Luttwitz installed himself in the Ministry of War from whence Comrade Noske had issued orders of death against the Communist proletariat. This Government district, now a fortress of barbed wire entanglements, machine guns and artillery, opens on the Tier-Garden where, fifteen months ago, Karl Liebknecht urged the proletariat to Revolution; while three streets beyond is the turgid canal into which the assassins of the Socialist Government cast the mutilated body of Rosa Luxemburg... The National Army either retired to its barracks or fraternized with the counter-revolutionary troops. The Noske Guards, insolently active in all the streets of Berlin the day before, now scurried to cover, and did not appear again until the struggle against the revolutionary masses started. The Einwohnerwehr (literally, Guards of the Inhabitants, civilian White Guards) issued a declaration of neutrality (neutrality under the circumstances meaning assistance to the counter-revolution) while emphasizing its readiness to march against "plunderers," that is to say, against the proletariat; and it did march to action when the General Strike began to threaten "law and order" and the struggle developed against the Government.

As against these open and masked forces of counter-revolution, the proletariat on General Strike was alone. It was clearly, emphatically, the working class against all. The paralysis of industry, of most public activity, was complete; it was as if a giant mass of ice pressed down upon the city. The Kapp-Luttwitz Government was isolated; its troops occupied the streets, but the proletariat closed the factories, halted railway and street car traffic, and kept the city unlighted at night. The Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship issued innumerable proclamations about right and the constitution, bread and liberty—but the iron answer of the proletariat mocked it all; the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship styled itself the "Government of labor,"—but there was no labor; the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship issued threats against the profiteers,—but this did not worry the profiteers, while the General Strike did; the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship issued a decree providing death for strikers and strike directors,—but the General Strike implacably persisted. All Government authority, "legal" and "illegal" was now a myth in comparison with the reality and the might of the General Strike.

The struggle of the proletariat in Berlin was, objectively, a revolutionary struggle. But, un-

## AGENDA FOR THE SECOND CONVENTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

### I. Reports:

- C. E. C. and National Secretary.
- International Relations Committee.
- Editorial Committee.
- Defense Committee.

### II. Current Fundamental Problems.

- Present world situation.
- Present situation in the United States.
- Soviet Russia.
- Communist International and Party International Relations.
- Our attitude towards Parliamentarism.
- Mass Action.
- Industrial Unionism and Syndicalism.
- Our Attitude towards Economic, Educational and other Legal Workers' Organizations.
- Workers' Councils Before, During and After the Revolution.

### III. Revision of the Program and Manifesto.

### IV. Organization Problems.

- Communist Party Centralization and Discipline.
- Underground Organization and its forms.
- Communist Party units and C. P. Shop Committees.
- Functions of Language Federations in the Communist movement of America.
- Propaganda, Agitation and Other Forms of Communist Education.
  - General Propaganda and Agitation.
  - Classes for Propagandists and Other Communist Study Classes.
- Party Press and Literature.
  - Policy.
  - Literary.
  - Technical.
- Communist Unity vs. "Centrist Unity."
- Defense and Relief Work.

### V. Revision of Constitution.

### VI. Resolutions.

### VII. Election of Party Officials.

the Government to arm the proletariat, thereby developing the forces of proletarian revolution. The Government, accordingly, chose to retreat and compromise; never for a moment did the Socialist Government of Ebert, Noske and Bauer forget the menace of a proletarian revolution: concessions to the Right rather than permit the revolutionary proletariat to conquer!

Democracy and the parliamentary regime, acclaimed as the final symbols of the Revolution and the means to Socialism, broke in pieces. Democracy? It was, in the persons of the Government, fleeing to Dresden in an automobile; and there, issuing proclamations about law and order, right and the constitution—at a moment when the issue was power against power and might against might. The Parliament, the National Assembly? It was dispersed as chaff before the wind by the bayonets of the Luttwitz troops; the Reichstag, where the Assembly met, now as imposingly empty and impotent as democracy itself, was guarded by three soldiers, while children played upon its steps an appropriate memorial to Karl Kautzky...

The National Assembly dispersed, issued its defiance to the military coup, spoke of democracy and right, of law and the constitution, decided to convene in Stuttgart—and exercised scarcely any influence upon the march of events. The National Assembly, which approvingly observed the butchery of the workers on January 13, now, on March 13, was incapable or mustering either the moral or physical energy to resist counter-revolution.

The representatives of petty bourgeois democracy fulminated threats against the military coup, but the democracy itself was apathetic. Even where hostile, democracy had no means of its own for action against the counter-revolution. Moreover, for this democracy to act decisively against the counter-revolutionary troops meant precipitating a struggle within the military forces of the nation, to disrupt the power which main-

(Continued on page 7.)

# THE COMMUNIST

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF  
THE COMMUNIST PARTY  
OF AMERICA

PUBLISHED BY  
The Central Executive Committee

VOL. II. JULY 1, 1920. No. 7

## "S O S"

Comrades! There are tens of thousands of "people" in America who are appealed to as "Comrades" by the betrayers of Socialism—the vile officialdom of the S. P. These cowardly counter-revolutionists need but to cry aloud for help, when they are in need, and the response is made in a ready chorus. Having forsaken the struggle, they are permitted by the forces of Law and order (who are not slow to recognize their aides!) to carry on—in the open. Remaining a "legal" party, they meet in halls and in the streets; they print their "legal" papers, give their "benefits" with great popular success, correspond with their "comrades" without fear of post-office interference, and in every way are free to appeal for aid without governmental restrictions. They are safe, and it is possible for them to be so only because they have turned their backs upon every revolutionary principle and forsaken the class-struggle. The "stinking carcass" of the S. P. that we forsook for the living body of Communism can call for help when it is in need, and get it—get it promptly—in the thousands, yes, in the tens of thousands, of dollars.

The Communist Party, Comrades, has no such opportunity. Every channel is practically closed to us. The ordinary ways are shut, with a sign up: "NO THOROUGHFARE." Underground machinery, in the early stages of organization (facing, let us not forget, the rapidly ripening period of world conflict), is a slow and clumsy mechanism for meeting a financial crisis. Aside from our underground Party paper, the means for making an impassioned appeal to the membership are unimaginably meager. The task becomes incredibly difficult to bring home to the heart and mind of every member the realization of a crisis. We can only send an S O S over the wireless of our common revolutionary class-consciousness.

The time has come, Comrades, for such an appeal to be sent out—broadcast for such "wireless" stations to pick up. Your Party wants you to pick up much that is not ordinarily heard—that cannot be set down. Your Communist understanding will help you to grasp the situation and the need. Respond as generously and as promptly as the need is great and immediate.

This must of necessity be no long-winded appeal. If we could hold mass meetings, you would be fired by the eloquence of your speakers. You would dig down into your jeans and throw your silver and your greenbacks into the contribution basket. There would be enough of you in the audience at one meeting to raise the money for the week's issue of the paper—or pay an old printers' bill so that the printer will continue printing our paper on faith (how few there are to print ours under present conditions you hardly realize!) or meet the cost of technical work essential to the conduct of your Party.

But there are no meetings now. Our mail is watched, our activities, even the most innocent or most guarded, noted with suspicion of its character. Our press necessarily concentrated can carry no long detailed explanations of situations, and daily appeals for funds. We must leave much to your understanding, Comrades. All we can say is: **GIVE AND GIVE QUICKLY! AND GIVE TO THE LIMIT OF YOUR POWER!** The need is great—greater than we can tell. We suggest that you do a few "Saturday-ings" for the Party. Follow the example of the Communists of Russia who are "Saturday-ing" for the up-building of the Soviet work in Russia, by doing likewise for the up-building of the Communist work in America. For the month of July give your Saturday morning's wage, and send it promptly through the regular Party channels, that the work of your Party may be pressed forward unhampered.

You know in what financial crisis the criminal action of our former National Secretary left the C. P. Your Executive Committee is making herculean efforts to produce bricks without straw. How long we shall be able to continue to perform this miracle we don't know. If we could go to you in packed meetings, we would sound the note of warning in plain terms. This being impossible, your C. E. C. sends out an S O S.

Comrades, we urge you, don't delay. There is danger in delay. Prompt and generous action alone will avert it. **ACT AT ONCE!**

### IN THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Vienna correspondent of the "Daily Herald" writes:  
At the conference of the Third International, held in Moscow on May 2nd, Bukharin, Radek and Zinoviev were named as the Committee to decide the question of admittance to the Communist International.

## The Panic Is Coming

With the defeat last winter of the great Longshoremen's, coal and steel strikes, a lull, like the calm before a storm, has come in the class struggle in this country. True, certain industries have struck intermittently—particularly in the garment and textile trades—and the "outlaw" rail strike continues in more or less intensity to cripple the rail carriers—but in general the situation is superficially less tense than it was last winter. The capitalist class breathes easier as far as the domestic situation is concerned, and is beginning to hope for a peaceful readjustment of the labor problems and a relatively peaceful reconstruction period in the future. Its main concern right now is with the international situation, which they fear may drag them into the whirlpool of new wars for which they are not prepared.

In this hope the capitalist class are doomed to deep disappointment and that before the year is over.

The black clouds of class war hang ominously over the horizon, awaiting only a psychologically favorable moment to break with the intensity of a deluge. The three great strikes of last year are bound to break out again, despite all the "Wilson Commissions" and the treachery of the labor leaders. The Cost of Living, which is pressing so hard upon all classes of labor, is increasing, according to the United States Labor statistics almost at the rate of three percent a month. Many factories are working part time or shutting down altogether. This is true of nearly all industries, aggravating the already intolerable conditions of the vast majority of the workers.

The export trade is decreasing every month, because of the inability of the foreign nations to pay cash, or because their credit is exhausted.

The banks are calling in their loans to manufacturers, and are holding on tight to their money, or investing it in U. S. guaranteed foreign securities at an exorbitant rate of interest. So much so, that the dumping of the Liberty Bonds on the stock market because of their relatively small interest rates has reached the stage of a national scandal, in the capitalist world.

The wholesale price-cutting of large stores is another evidence of the instability and precariousness of industrial and commercial conditions. **A financial panic, followed by an acute industrial panic is due in this country and will break ere long.**

In addition to the above—a new wave of strikes is impending which may hasten the industrial chaos and put an end to the capitalist delusions of a "peaceful reconstruction period."

The anthracite coal miners, who have been negotiating these weary months without coming to a satisfactory arrangement, are champing at the bit. How much longer the leaders can hold them in check remains to be seen. Likewise, the railroad brotherhoods, whose leaders have performed yeoman service for the capitalist class in checking and "outlawing" the strikes of the most dissatisfied and underpaid workers, are beginning to gather their forces for a tussle with the owners. There is a strong likelihood that the steel, coal and railworkers may come to some working agreement in the near future, to bring pressure to bear upon the government to force wage-increases from the owners. This will naturally fall, as the capitalists will absolutely turn down any demand for more than ten or fifteen percent wage increase.

A financial and industrial panic, complicated by a series of the most gigantic strikes in the history of strikes in this country—plus the new post-war psychology of the workers in general possesses potentialities and possibilities of tremendous significance from the Communist viewpoint. By this we do not mean that the social revolution is here—far from it. This situation will however hasten the capitalist disorganization of industry, demoralize the social and economic structure to an extent that will make recovery impossible. It will even hasten the necessary objective conditions for a "revolutionary situation." That is all.

For the time—as far as the working class is concerned—it will get a taste of the full weight of the capitalist state upon their heads. Court injunctions, impounding of union funds, martial law, backed by the armed forces of the state, on a scale that will compel them to open their eyes and force them to adopt new methods of struggle—a new objective—a political objective—the overthrow of the capitalist state, the conquest of the state power and the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

That is all we can hope for from the working class in the coming era of panics and strikes: 1) a growing class-consciousness which will lead to the ousting of their old leaders in the industrial world—and the adoption of more aggressive methods of waging their battles with the employing class. 2) A new orientation towards the problems of the state as taught by the bitter experience of their own struggle.

That is all, but it is a great deal from our point of view. It will make possible for the time the general spread of Communist propaganda among the masses who until now have been stoically unresponsive. It will develop (with the aid of Communist agitation in the shops and industries) a new type of leader in the trade and industrial unions, who, though they may not come into power will have a strong, influential, class-conscious minority behind them. It will lead to the making of the Communist movement a real "mass-movement" in that it will be possible for us to have, not a large membership, though the membership will naturally grow—but the possibility of getting the ear of the worker and building Communist nucleus in the shops and industries who will have the tacit or open sympathy of the workers in the shops; something out of the question at the present time.

With these new avenues open to the Communist Party, and with the class struggle gaining impetus and speed in the direction of an open conflict with the capitalist state (due to the development of powerful antagonistic social and economic forces inherent in capitalist society and not to any conscious effort of the working class, who are being driven unconsciously forward by these forces) we can look forward, while indefatigably carrying on our work, to another epoch in the class struggle, another milestone passed on the road to the proletarian revolution—to the overthrow of the capitalist state and the establishment in this country of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

## A New Attack Upon The Communist Party

New York City, June 10, 1920.

Dear Comrades:

A few days ago the N. Y. Call carried a full-page headline: "FRAINA IMPLICATED AS U. S. AGENT."—"COMMUNIST LEADER IS CHARGED WITH INDORSING HIS PAY CHECKS FROM DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE."

I hasten to inform you that **THESE CHARGES ARE FALSE.** The Call quotes extensively from a

statement issued by S. Nuorteva of the Russian Soviet Bureau, but it also states that Nuorteva scrupulously refrains from making any direct charges against Fraina.

In fact, however, he most unscrupulously raises old charges that have been investigated and found untrue.

Peterson's story was given a thorough hearing by the Bureau and C. E. C. members of the Communist Party, and on the basis of that hearing the Executive Council passed the following resolution:

Chicago, Ill., Dec. 17, 1919.

"The members of the Executive Council of the C. P. of A. have carefully examined the stenographic report of the hearing of the charges against Louis Fraina, Intern'l Sec. of the Party, which report is attested by six New York members of the C. E. C., and declare that the charges have no basis in fact.

"As to the specific dates mentioned by the informer the members of the Council can state from personal knowledge that Com. Fraina was in the City of Chicago until late at night on Sept. 7, and that on Nov. 14 and 15 he was in the City of Chicago on Party business.

The Council is unanimous that not the slightest taint of suspicion attaches itself to Com. Fraina as the result of this charge, and declares its faith in him as loyal and trusted comrade unshaken. All the circumstances in the case point to a plot against the Communist Party.

"The Council is in full agreement with Com. Fraina's continuance of his work as Intern'l Sec., and requests officially, as the representative of the C. P. of A., that he be received as its official representative."

The January meeting of the C. E. C. took the same stand, and issued a statement, which was published in The Call, against continued rumors and innuendos especially circulated in and by the Socialist Party and its press.

The best answer would have been to publish the stenographic report of the hearing, but we could not do that because the hearing brought out facts and relations very damaging to the Soviet Bureau; because it would have been like giving material to the D. of J. with which to attack the Soviet Bureau.

However, since the D. of J. apparently has, in some unexplained way obtained information about the hearing; and since Nuorteva has seen fit to come out with his statement—omitting and misstating important facts and circumstances, thus attacking the integrity of the Party, we are free now to publish the proceedings in full, and we are going to do that just as soon as possible, thereby to disprove and destroy all charges, all rumors and suspicions.

Nuorteva is a clever and a very unscrupulous man; he writes a statement against Palmer and the D. of J.; he does not make any direct charges, but repeats the accusations of a spy, and relates and co-relates various "facts" which appear to support these accusations; "incidentally" he delivers a wicked blow to a representative of the Communist Party and through him to the Party itself. The Call taking up the cudgel cheerfully and quite "innocently" directing it also against the C. E. C.

In the order quoted by The Call the charges are as follows:

1) Peterson (a spy of the D. of J., and a "friend" of Nuorteva) "had seen Fraina in the New York office of the D. of J. under circumstances indicating that he must be one of the agents of the department."

2) "Certain information regarding communication with Moscow conveyed to Fraina which could not have been in the possession of anyone else outside of our office became known to agents of the D. of J."

3) Peterson reported "that he had seen in the files of the N. Y. office of Palmer's department a returned pay check indorsed by L. Fraina."

4) Peterson "asserting in the face of Fraina that he was the man whom he had learned to know as an agent of the D. of J."

5) "While other members of Fraina's group were being arrested at that time nothing happened to Fraina himself."

6) "Fraina left (for Europe) in company with one Nosovitzky, a Russian doctor in the employ of a British steamship line and obviously a police agent."

7) "The letter (from Rodgers to Martens) could only have gotten into Mr. Palmer's hands through Mr. Fraina or Dr. Nosovitzky."

8) "Palmer is in possession of all reports from that conference (Amsterdam Conf.), which was supposed to be a secret one, and where 'no one from America was present except Fraina and Nosovitzky.'"

The main charges, Nos. 1, 3, 4, are all based upon the words of a **SPY PROVEN ABSOLUTELY UNRELIABLE, CONTRADICTORY AND FALSE.**

He was positive he had seen Fraina at the D. of J. in New York on the 7th of September, when Fraina was still in Chicago.

The second time he had seen him there between Oct. 1 and Oct. 15—he would not place the date at all.

The third time he was positive he had seen him there on Nov. 3, before noon,—then he changed to Nov. 15, then changed back again to Nov. 3, but that he had seen a report made by Fraina on Nov. 15. On Nov. 15 Fraina was again in Chicago, and Nov. 3 he had not left from home before noon.

Peterson's description of Fraina's clothes sandy-black hair, etc., was all wrong. It could not be better since he admitted himself that he had not seen Fraina before those alleged meetings in the D. of J. All he had was a rather vague description by one of his chiefs.

When Peterson was brought in at the hearing where Fraina was present and was asked—"Do you think that there is in this room anyone whom you can identify as Fraina?" he answered—"No, I would not say so." Later he pointed Fraina out, saying that he recognized him by the voice. But where did he learn to recognize Fraina's voice, when he had seen him only three times, and every time on his way out?

The checks indorsed by "Fraina" and the reports of "Fraina" nobody has seen "except" Peterson, and his imitation of the signature was no imitation of the real signature of Fraina. Peterson's story of trying to get the "documents" to show them to Nuorteva, and that he was arrested and the papers taken from him before he could show them to anybody, sounds absolutely "fishy,"—not only in general, but in several important details as told by him.

The fact is that "after the testimony had been all taken, Com. Fraina asked everyone present to state whether he thought that the matter had been sufficiently cleared up so that he could leave for Moscow; all those present, with the exception of the chairman and Com. Weinstein, answered "yes." The chairman answered "no." Com. Weinstein reserved his opinion. Among those who said "yes" there was one member of the Bureau.

For Nos. 2 and 7 Nuorteva has nothing more than bare conjecture. It leaves out of the consideration, for example, the possibility that there may still be some spy in the Bureau—not a "friend" of Nuorteva.

Charge No. 5 is really ridiculous on the face of it.

(Continued on page 8.)

# "At Last" The Centrists Unite!

("A CONVENTION OF REVOLUTIONISTS")

## ("A CONVENTION OF REVOLUTIONISTS") (1)

"At last" a copy of the Convention number of the United Centrist Party of America has reached us. Aside from the Program and Constitution of the new party ("minority" and C. L. P.), which we shall review in the next issue, the other two articles require attention. In order to analyze the program and constitution of a party it is necessary to know who drew it, how it was framed and under what circumstances. Therefore an analysis of the United Centrist Convention is both interesting and necessary as throwing light on the program and constitution of the new party.

There are two articles on the convention, dealing with it from two different angles. One, evidently written by Damon, the editor, bears the slogan "AT LAST"; the other bears the euphonious title of "A CONVENTION OF REVOLUTIONISTS," signed Y. F. the associate editor. Indeed it was unnecessary to sign his name, for it bears all the earmarks of the notorious author of "Has It Been Worth While?"

### "AT LAST"

Damon's article, as the title implies, is a sickening-sweet, sentimental sigh of relief that "unity" has "at last" been achieved. He shuts his eyes to everything but the accomplished fact of the "merger" of the two groups. And well he may. For no Communist can read the story of that convention without realizing that the only "unity" achieved has been one of name only. The groupings within the convention remain the same—neither side having given up an iota, either in principle or "control," of the new organization. A Central Executive Committee composed of ten members, five "minority" and five C. L. P. and ten alternates, five "minority" and five C. L. P.—"minority" alternate to take the place of "minority" C. E. C. vacancy and C. L. P. alternate to take the place of C. L. P. vacancy—gives a glowing illustration of the kind of "unity" achieved.

But Damon gives a sigh and sighs "at last." His mission in the Communist movement, he feels has been accomplished. "Unity," of a sort, has been achieved, praise the Lord and Damon! The torture of his seven months' sojourn with the Communist Party, especially with the "super-bolsheviks" and "great theorists" of the C. E. C.—his artificially prepared "split"—his stealing of party funds and property—his renunciation of Communist principles and tactics (as published in first two statements of the "minority" subsequent to the split)—everything "has been worth while" now that "unity" has been accomplished! Poor fellow! The mountain labored and brought forth a mouse.

The "minority" and C. L. P. leaders are politicians of a very low order; with the cunning of their type—having noticed how Hilquit and Berger had stamped the S. P. convention by mere device of unveiling a life-size portrait of Debs at the right time,—they conceived of a similar scheme to whip up an artificial enthusiasm and stamped the delegates for "unity." What Debs was to the S. P. convention, "unity" was to the United Centrist convention. But let Damon describe this delicious scene himself: "When after meeting as separate groups for a day the delegates from the two organizations were united, there quickly appeared upon the breasts of most of the delegates the words 'AT LAST' in great black letters. A circular bearing that caption had been distributed among the delegates and the words had been torn from it to give expression to their sentiment."

Damon then goes to prove how many meanings these words "AT LAST" have, until one begins to feel that this "new slogan" has as many meanings, as "mass action" has to Damon in the course of his meteoric career in the Communist movement.

"The United Communist Party makes no pretense of legality. It has attempted to express the fundamental Communist principles in a way to make them pass the censorship of its bitter enemy," says our heroic "liquidator." Behind this apparently innocent remark,—aside from the very obvious attempt to make a virtue of necessity,—lies the clue to the manner in which they framed their program. On one side a number of delegates, conscious of the Centrist tendencies of their leaders and highly distrustful to them,—prodged by the merciless criticism of the "majority,"—were determined to make the program Communist to the best of their ability; on the other side, the leaders, who receded inch by inch from their own well-known positions under the threats of bolts and splits—and who only accepted the situation because, not to have accepted it would have meant political oblivion for them. Damon's guilty conscience speaks in that last-quoted paragraph.

### LIGHTNING-CHANGE ARTIST DAMON

That the program was framed by the leaders with the view of averting a split in their own ranks, and to ward off criticism by the "majority"—and not with a clear, sound knowledge of Communism, is forcefully illustrated in the following quotation from Damon's article—which proves that their chief theoretician—Editor-in-Chief of their national organs—and presumably the leading light in the Convention, is not clear on Communism himself.

"The program of the party declares that the final struggle between the workers and the capitalists, between the exploited and the exploiter, will take the form of civil war, and that it is the function of the United Communist Party systematically to familiarize the working class with the necessity of armed insurrection as the only means through which the capitalist government and the capitalist system can be overthrown." (Italics ours, Ed.)

In the first place compare the foregoing with Damon's own statement speaking for the "minority" just prior to the "unity convention."

"In carrying on the work of agitation and education on the question of armed insurrection the social and industrial conditions must be considered. To talk to the workers about arming themselves and armed insurrection at a time when the masses are still without any revolutionary consciousness is to make a farce of and discredit Communism and shows a fundamental lack of understanding of Communist principles."

"While the 'minority' will work for a clear expression on this point in the party program and in the literature explaining Communist principles, it will consider the circumstances in each given case and the general development of the revolutionary consciousness of the masses in deciding whether the propaganda for armed insurrection shall be spread among them."

How comes this sudden change in Damon & Co.? Is it possible for them to have changed overnight on so fundamental a question? If so, whom are we to believe? Damon of the "minority," or Damon of the United Centrist Party?

This was one of the important issues between the "majority" and the "minority" in the recent controversy within the Communist Party, and one of the causes behind the "split." We were accused of doing "agent-provocateur" work, of being "closet philosophers," "Big Bluff of Bolshevism," etc., just because we stated our position uncompromisingly on the question and nature of "force" in relation to the proletarian revolution and its propaganda

to the masses systematically and persistently, as one of the cardinal points of the Communist program. Yet these same opponents of ours—Centrists in character and tendency—have now apparently completely reversed themselves on this question. What does it mean? It means that when Centrists begin to use revolutionary phrases they are most dangerous. As Lenine says: "These men are apt to recognize anything and sign anything only in order to remain at the head of the working class movement. Kautzky 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."

Damon & Co. will betray the rank and file of the U. C. P. when the time comes just as they betrayed the rank and file of the Communist Party at the crucial moment of the organization. As a matter of fact, they have already betrayed that membership which followed them out of the Communist Party in the belief that these leaders would fight for the position enunciated in the statements issued by the "minority." Damon & Co. it has been amply proved, have no position of their own—they are ready to accept any position that will place the power of the organization in their hands.

While on this question we may mention that the fact that Damon, Isaacs & Co. and the old Centrist leaders of the C. L. P. are still in control of the new party is sufficient proof of the Centrist character of that organization. A real Communist party would never again TRUST men of such well-known opportunist tendencies, much less entrust the organization into their hands. These leaders are of the type of the MacDonalds, Longuets, Kautzkys, revolutionary in words and opportunist in deeds—leaders who possess the ideology of the Second International while mouthing the phrases of the Third International. Any party which consciously and deliberately elects them as their leaders is a party which has not yet cut the umbilical cord which still holds them to the ideology of the Second International their "revolutionary" program to the contrary notwithstanding.

Note how Damon (in the last quotation from "AT LAST") already distorts the concept of the final struggle: He says that the final struggle takes place "between the workers and the capitalists, between the exploited and exploiter." How about the capitalist State? Will it be a private war between the workers and the capitalists leaving the capitalist State somewhere on the side—"neutral"? Will the capitalists arm themselves and go out and fight the armed workers, or will they employ the armed forces of the capitalist State—the police, the army, the navy, the bureaucracy, the stool-pigeons, the thugs and gunmen and the whole horde of mercenaries and supporters at their command?

The whole question of force in the revolution is related to and inseparable from the State. Damon does not know or pretends not to know. And in view of his previous accusation of "agent-provocateur" at the C. E. C. of the Communist Party on the question, we are inclined to believe he does know but is opposed to it.

In that same quotation is another glaring illustration of his lack of understanding of Communist principles; he speaks of the capitalist system also being overthrown by armed insurrection. The capitalist system is not overthrown by armed insurrection,—only the capitalist State can be thus overthrown. The capitalist system is abolished in and through the process of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the suppression of the bourgeoisie as a class, the nationalizing of the banks and industries and building up of the workers' own economic administration of production. This process is long and arduous, including all that is known as the transitory period from capitalism to Communism.

Similar mistakes, discrepancies and omissions abound in the program of the U. C. P., and in which Damon undoubtedly, had a great hand in formulating. In general, it is an unbalanced, uncorrelated structure exposing in itself a lack of clarity and understanding of Communist principles. The United Centrists still do not fully understand Communist principles and tactics. They still play with revolutionary phrases—as Damon does in his article—still give "lip-service" to the revolution in words but in practice recede from it...

### "NOW SO BLIND..."

There is little more of interest in Damon's article except a few braggart phrases which mean nothing at all and have been placed there obviously for effect. For instance: "While there still remains outside of the united party a faction made up of part of the language groups, the logic of the situation will compel them to join the united party or bring about the disintegration of their organizations."

As if the Communist Party of America no longer exists just because Damon & Co. ignominiously split away! Damon has always proved himself a good business man—he computes Communism in terms of dollars and cents or membership—depending upon the occasion. When he was about to split away from the C. P., he bragged about the wonderful organizing capacity and what a good Communist Fisher was, because he collected more than five thousand dollars for the National Office. After the split, when he had stolen the party funds in his possession, the five thousand dollars collected by Fisher suddenly turned out to be nothing more than loans which had to be repaid to the Chicago District Committee. Similarly when he threatened to split in the C. E. C. he stated with magnificent gestures that it was morally certain that the overwhelming majority of the party membership would stand with him as against the C. E. C. (he had no way of proving it at the time, but we have since proved to him where the membership stood, to his very evident discomfiture). But now, that he has united with the C. L. P., and bargained for 32 delegates against the 25 of the C. L. P. he must need keep up the bluff, that he carried the major part of the membership of the C. P. with him into the united centrists. That it is a lie doesn't matter to Damon so long as he thinks it will help him crush the Communist Party—The "Big Bluff of Bolshevism"—which he so thoroughly hates and detests because it is usually right and has proved him wrong on all questions.

### "THE CONVENTION OF REVOLUTIONISTS"

We now come to the more interesting of the two articles. Damon writes of the centrist convention like he who has "at last" found the land of the heart's desire—the Centrist swamp. Y. F. makes no such pretenses. He has no illusions about the still-burn monstrosity he helped to create, but, like one who is compelled to acknowledge its authorship much against his will. Not being a Communist he dislikes it for the reason that it even pretends to be a Communist organization. His heart still yearns for the "Left Wing conquest of the Communist Party"—for a retransformation of the Communist Party into the Left Wing of a year ago—with its delightfully hazy, utterly non-Communist conceptions and atmosphere.

But, poor chap, he is in the grip of forces and currents too powerful to cope with and must needs go along. But he serves notice in his article—in the lines as well as between the lines—that Y. F. of "HAS IT BEEN WORTH WHILE?" fame is still the same old Y. F. In its frank attack upon the U. C. P. one is almost tempted to believe that an enemy of the U. C. P. had written it instead of one of its sacred founders. The old proverb, "preserve me from my friends, I will take care of my enemies" is aptly illustrated in the case of Y. F.

Indeed, Y. F. is an incorrigible Left Winger! Note the title of his article—"THE CONVENTION OF REVOLUTIONISTS." What kind of revolutionists? There are bourgeois revolutionists, anarchist who call themselves revolutionists, yellow Socialists who style themselves revolutionists and Centrists who think they are revolutionists. Y. F., in using this indefinite, entirely non-Communist term "revolutionists," permits the reader his own choice. And the reader, if he is a Communist, after going through his article, concludes that if it was a convention of "revolutionists"—it was a convention of Centrist "revolutionists."

### Y. F. GIVES SOME INSIDE STUFF

His introduction, giving a survey of the Communist movement in this country during the last year is a gem in itself. One wonders is he in earnest—is he sarcastic—or, is he just "playful," a condition from which he states the "unity convention" suffered during its seven days when it was not engaged in "uniting" through the process of "splitting" every day, and every session.

Then a grandiloquent gesture—"Sometime recently, somewhere between the Atlantic and Pacific, between the Gulf and the Great Lakes, two groups of elected delegates assembled as the Unity Conference..." He then proceeds to dip into the convention. Its a cold plunge and reader shivers as he flops into the frigid atmosphere of the "unity convention." Let us follow him.

"In spite of the fact that these delegates came together on a call for a 'Unity Conference,' in spite of the realization of the fearful blow it would be to the Communist movement in this country if unity were not at once achieved, it was not until noon of the seventh day that this issue was decided conclusively."

What? In spite of the placards "AT LAST" on the breasts of the delegates? Funny kind of "unity convention" this. What was the reason? Listen to Y. F.:

"Neither side was fully conscious of the undercurrent of sentiment on the other side. Factional controversies (he probably means the issue of principles—but Y. F. never talks of principles in controversies, controversies are always factional; this is a typical bourgeois intellectual viewpoint. Ed.) of nearly a year's standing surcharged the atmosphere with suspicion—suspicion not only across the lines but within each camp. (No wonder, with such recognized and well-known Centrist leaders as Damon Isaacs & Co. in their midst. Ed.) None of the delegates were willing to surrender their reservations (he means their suspicions of the leaders. Ed.) until after a long series of debates, some of little intrinsic importance, many on basic questions of Communist understanding—questions which had never before been really faced in the United States." (Italics ours, Ed.)

Really, that last remark is a crusher. They have evidently discovered or invented a new, American brand of Communism—"copyrighted, patent applied for—infringements will be punished to the full extent of the law."

### CAUCUSES

All the sessions of the delegates, both as separate bodies and as a "unity convention" developed into caucus action, despite the early decision of the "unity convention" to abolish caucuses and in spite of the "minority's" abhorrence of "caucuses" and "packed conventions," about which they raised such a loud wall against the "majority" in the Communist Party. How Damon, Isaacs, Fisher and Kasbeck used to thunder against "caucuses"! It was "treason" for the "majority" to "caucus" in a Communist Party—Kasbeck even went so far as to call it "counter-revolutionary." How about "caucuses," members of the United Centrist Party of America?

### FIRST SESSION.

As soon as the first joint session opened, a bolt of nine or ten delegates from the "minority" seemed imminent because the leaders wanted to proceed to the election of committees and these "irreconcilables" wanted to take up the program first. These nine or ten were evidently the "left elements" of the "minority" who had learnt from the criticism of the "majority" and were suspicious of the leaders of both sides. They wanted to see how the convention would act on the question of "mass action," etc., before they gave their consent to remain with the convention. They were defeated on the motion, but in order to avert a split with motion was reconsidered and the program was next taken up. By the way this business of re-introducing defeated motions was the constant "order of business" at the "unity convention" from the first day to the last in order to keep the various antagonistic factions from splitting away.

In the following paragraph Y. F. is at his best. His humor is infectious and his sarcasm keen as a blade.—we wonder if the members of the United Centrist Party also see the joke.

"The opening debates were sparring matches, with a strong undercurrent of nervousness. Three score persons, engaged in a criminal conspiracy, spent two hours to decide whether capitalism breaks down in that it fails to 'produce' the needs of life, or whether the collapse is due to the failure to 'provide.' After considerable uncertainty (italics ours, Ed.) the argument prevailed that capitalism, in spite of all its equipment, stultifies production; the wheels of industry turn only at the call of profit, regardless of all capabilities for production; crisis or no crisis, capitalism has never functioned to 'provide' the needs of the masses..."

"In the playfulness of the debate was expressed relaxation and the forestalling of another premature clash. This was the safe way of 'getting acquainted'—the suppressed form of the struggle for unity."

After you have stopped laughing at this sally, you realize what Y. F. meant, when he said that this convention discussed "questions which had never before been really faced in United States." Indeed, we make bold to say that this question was never before discussed in any convention in the Communist movement, not even by the Communist International!

There is just one little discordant note there however. Y. F. you must remember is a lawyer, with a bourgeois intellectual mind, so he naturally cannot free himself from bourgeois phraseology. His reference to a so-called Communist convention as a "criminal conspiracy" is not merely sarcasm. Y. F. still secretly holds to his old belief in "legality"—his formal acceptance of the U. C. P. apparently "illegal" position to the contrary notwithstanding. To have any organization functioning underground is a criminal conspiracy."

So ended the first day's session with "unity" six days off. Now let us read about the second day. It was as peaceful as a party convention" of Kilkenny cats.

### THE MAKING OF THE PROGRAM

"Restrained resentment and suspicion broke loose into a furious storm during the next session. At the first statement in the program (a typically

Continued on page 7.)

# Problems Of The Third International

## (Ramsey MacDonald On The Third International)

### By N. LENIN

(Continued)

Ramsey MacDonald with the amusing naivete of a parlor Socialist who merely juggles with words entirely lacking an understanding of their import, not even conscious that preaching a thing requires its being carried out in deeds, says: The Berne Conference made a "concession to the public opinion of non-Socialist elements."

Exactly. We consider the whole Berne "INTERNATIONAL" yellow and treacherous because all its policies are a "concession" to the bourgeoisie.

Ramsey MacDonald knows perfectly well that we have built the Third International and unconditionally severed with the Second, because we were convinced of its hopelessness, its incorrigibility, its playing the role of a lackey of imperialism, carrier of bourgeois influence, bourgeois lie, and bourgeois corruption into the working class movement. If Ramsey MacDonald, desiring to discuss the 3rd International avoids the real issues and just walks around and around the question, uses empty phrases and doesn't say what is necessary to be said, it is his fault and his crime. For the proletariat needs the truth, and there is nothing more damaging for its cause than a polished, respectable, mediocre lie.

The question of imperialism and its connection with opportunism in the working class movement, with the betrayal of the working class cause by their leaders has been raised.

Marx and Engels during forty years from 1852 up to 1892 were constantly pointing out, that the working class of England, due to economic peculiarities of that country (colonies, monopoly on the world's market, etc.), has been acquiring bourgeois character (or—has been becoming bourgeois in character). Marx won to himself in the seventies of last century hatred of contemptible heroes of Berne International tendencies of that time, of opportunistic and reformists, for the reason, that he branded many of the leaders of English trade-unions as men sold out to the bourgeoisie or paid for services to its class rendered from within of labor movement.

During the Anglo-Boer war, the Anglo-Saxon press already put the question of imperialism quite clearly as a new (and the last) stage of Capitalism. If my memory does not fail me, no one else but Ramsey MacDonald resigned from the "Fabian Society,"—this prototype of the Berne International, this cultivator of seed-plots, and example of opportunism characterized by Engels with generous force brilliancy and truthfulness in his correspondence with Zorge: "Fabian Imperialism"—such was then the current expression in the English Socialist literature. If Ramsey MacDonald forgot about this, so much the worse for him.

"Fabian Imperialism" and "Social Imperialism"—this is the same thing: Socialism in words and Imperialism in deeds, the TRANSFORMATION OF OPPORTUNISM INTO IMPERIALISM. This phenomenon became now during the war 1914—1918 and afterwards, the WORLD EVENT. Inability to understand this is the greatest blindness of the Berne yellow "International" and its greatest crime. Opportunism or reformism must have inevitably grown into SOCIALIST IMPERIALISM placed in power a group of the richest, advanced nations, robbing the whole world and thereby allowed the bourgeoisie of these countries to bribe with its monopolistic surplus profit (Imperialism is monopolistic capitalism) THE HIGHER STRATA OF THE WORKING CLASS of these countries.

Those who fail to see the economic inevitability of this fact are absolute ignoramus or hypocrites, who deceive the workers by repeating the old commonplaces about capitalism and thereby hide the bitter truth of the desertion of a large faction in the Socialist movement on the side of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

From this fact, however, two conclusions resolve themselves.

Conclusion number one: The Berne International is in fact, by its actual historical and political role, regardless of the good intentions and innocent wishes of some or another of its members, AN ORGANIZATION OF AGENTS OF INTERNATIONAL IMPERIALISM, working WITHIN the working class movement, spreading in it bourgeois influence, bourgeois ideas, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruption.

In the countries with democratic-parliamentary culture of long standing, the bourgeoisie has learned how to act perfectly not only by means of force but also through deceit, bribery, flattery, in the most approved methods. The "luncheons" of English "labor leaders" (i. e., lackeys of the bourgeoisie in the field of fooling the workers) did not become famous for nothing, and even in Engel's time he had already spoken of them. In the same category can be placed the war-time reception of the social-traitor Merrheim by Mr. Clemenceau, the cordial reception of leaders of the Berne "International" by the ministers of the Entente, and so forth and so on. "You shall teach them, and we will buy them,"—said one clever English capitalist woman to Mr. Social-patriot Hyndman, who described in his reminiscences, how this lady, more farsighted than all the leaders of the Berne "International" put together,—had estimated the "efforts" of socialist-intellectuals in teaching Socialist leaders from the working class.

During the war, when Vanderveldes, Brantings and this whole band of traitors were arranging "international" conferences,—the French bourgeois papers were scoffing at them very cleverly: "these Vanderveldes are suffering from some kind of tic (spasm or convulsion). People thus afflicted cannot say two sentences without suffering a strange convulsion of the facial muscles—in like manner the Vanderveldes cannot come out politically without words like a parrot: internationalism, Socialism, workers' international solidarity, revolution of the proletariat, etc. Let them repeat any sacramental phrases they wish, provided only they help us to lead the workers by the nose, and shall serve us capitalists incarrying on the imperialist war and in enslaving the workers."

The French and English bourgeois can sometimes be very clever and know perfectly how to estimate the lackey role of the Berne "International."

Martov has written somewhere: you, "Bolsheviks," are denouncing the Berne International, but your own friend Lorient, participates in it.

This is the argument of a crook, because everyone knows that Lorient fights for the Third International openly, honestly and heroically. When in 1902 Zubatov\* was arranging a meeting for the workers in Moscow, in order to fool them with "police-socialism," a workingman, Babushkin, attended those meetings in order to fight Zubatov's influence (the "Zubatovschina") and to get the workers out of its "clutches." Babushkin whom I knew from 1894, when he was in my workers' propaganda circle in Petrograd,—one of

the best and most devoted of workmen — "Iskrists," leaders of the revolutionary proletariat. "Iskrists,"\*\* leaders of the revolutionary proletariat, and who was shot by Rennenkampf in Siberia in 1906,—was just as little a "Zubatov adherent" as Lorient is "Berne's adherent."

Conclusion number two: The Third, the Communist International has been organized just for the purpose of not allowing the "Socialists" to get away with such lip-service recognition of the revolution, examples of which Ramsay MacDonald gives in his article. The lip-service recognition of the revolution, in reality covering up the thoroughly opportunistic, reformist, nationalistic and petty bourgeois policies, was the direct progeny of the Second International, against which we are waging war to the death.

When they say: The Second International died, suffering shameful bankruptcy,—it must be understood properly. It means the bankruptcy and death of opportunism, reformism and petty-bourgeois Socialism. Because the Second International has its historical value, has accomplished some good work which a conscious worker cannot deny, namely: formation of mass co-operatives, trade, and political organizations of workers utilization or bourgeois parliamentarism as well as all institutions of bourgeois democracy in general, etc.

In order to really defeat opportunism, which brought the Second International to a shameful death, in order to help the approaching revolution, which even Ramsay MacDonald is compelled to recognize, it is necessary: First,—to conduct all the propaganda and agitation from the point of view of the revolution, in contra-distinction to reformism, systematically explaining to the masses this contra-distinction—both theoretically and practically,—at every step of the parliamentary, union and other kind of work. Not by any means to reject (excepting special cases of course), utilization of parliamentarism and all the other "liberties" of bourgeois democracy, not to reject reforms, but to consider them only as a by-product of the revolutionary, proletarian class struggle. Not a single party of the Berne "International" satisfies this requirement. Not a single one shows even an understanding of how the propaganda and agitation must be conducted by explaining the difference between reform and revolution, how necessary it is to prepare both the party and the masses for the revolution.

Second,—it is necessary to combine legal (open) and illegal (underground) work. The Bolsheviks had taught this especially and insistently during the war of 1914-1918, while the heroes of contemptible opportunism scoffed at that, self-cincedly praising "lawfulness," "democracy," "freedom" of the Western European countries, republics, etc. Now, only plain swindlers, bent upon deceiving the workers, can deny that the Bolsheviks were proven right. There is no country in the world, the most advanced and most "free" of the bourgeois republics, where the rule of the bourgeois terror does not reign, where freedom for agitation for the Socialist revolution, of propaganda and organization in this direction has not been forbidden. A PARTY, WHICH BY THIS TIME DOES NOT RECOGNIZE THAT, UNDER THE REIGN OF THE BOURGEOISIE, AND DOES NOT CARRY ON SYSTEMATIC, ALL-EMBRACING UNDERGROUND WORK, IN SPITE OF THE LAWS OF THE BOURGEOISIE AND BOURGEOIS PARLIAMENTS, IS A PARTY OF TRAITORS AND SCOUNDRELS,—A PARTY, WHICH BY ITS LIP-SERVICE RECOGNITION OF THE REVOLUTION IS FOOLING THE MASSES.\* THE PLACE FOR SUCH PARTIES IS THE YELLOW BERNE "INTERNATIONAL." IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL THEY CANNOT BE. (Italics ours.)

Third,—a persistent and merciless war must be waged for the absolute expulsion from the working class movement of those opportunist leaders, who showed themselves before the war, and especially during the war, in the field of politics as well and especially in the "trade-unions" and co-operatives. The theory of "neutrality" is a hypocritical and contemptible subterfuge which helped the bourgeoisie to gain a hold upon the masses in 1914-1918. Parties which in words stand for the revolution, while in deeds do not carry on persistent work for the influence of the revolutionary—and only for the revolutionary party, in all and every mass working class organizations—are parties of traitors.

Fourth,—it is impossible to reconcile their condemnation of imperialism in words, while in deeds do not wage revolutionary war for the liberation of colonies (and dependent nations) from their imperialist bourgeoisie:—this is sheer hypocrisy. This is the policy of agents of the bourgeoisie in the working class movement. Such a party, English, French, Dutch Belgian, etc., which in words is hostile toward imperialism, while in deeds do not wage the revolutionary struggle within the colonies for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, which does not help systematically the revolutionary work in the colonies which has already begun everywhere, which does not import into the colonies arms and literature for the use of the revolutionary parties there,—is a party of scoundrels and traitors.

Fifth,—the greatest hypocrisy is a typical phenomenon of the parties of the Berne "International": in words to recognize the revolution, and to pose before the workers with flowery phrases about their recognition of the revolution, while in deeds to display the reformist attitude toward such beginning of the growth of the revolutionary manifestations, which are the mass action of the masses, breaking bourgeois laws, stepping beyond the boundary of all legality, such as for instance, mass strikes, street demonstrations, soldiers' protests meetings among the troops, distribution of leaflets in military caserns and camps, etc.

Any hero of the Berne "International," asked whether his party is carrying on such systematic work, will reply either with evasive phrases, screening an absence of such work: lack of organization and machinery for it and inability of his party to carry it on, or, with a declamation against "fire-eating anarchists," etc. But just this constitutes the treason of the Berne "International" to the working class,—its actual desertion into the camp of the bourgeoisie.

All the scoundrel-leaders of the Berne "International" have on their lips declarations of their "sympathy" toward revolution in general, and

\*\* "Iskrists," or, "Iskrovtsy"—followers of the magazine "Iskra," started by Lenin and Plechanov in Switzerland in 1903 and which was instrumental in bringing together all revolutionary-Marxian forces within the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party and led to their victory over the so-called "economists" at the 2nd Party Convention in 1904.

\* Gentlemen of the Socialist Party of America, the Socialist Labor Party (and all other advocates of "legality," as, for instance, Y. F. and his friends), please accept the compliment. Editor.

toward the Russian revolution in particular. But only hypocrites and fools cannot understand, that the exceedingly rapid successes of the Revolution in Russia are the result of the work of many years of the revolutionary party in the above-indicated direction, of the building up systematically for years of an underground (illegal) apparatus for the leadership of demonstrations and strikes, for the work among the troops, of the study and creation of underground literature, summing up the results of their experiences and educating the whole party to the idea of the necessity of revolution, training and preparing leaders of the masses for such occasions, etc. etc.

The deepest and the most fundamental differences which summarizes all of the above, and explain the inevitability of an irreconcilable theoretical and practical political struggle of the revolutionary proletariat with the Berne "International," are the questions of the conversion of imperialist war into civil war—and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

The infection of the Berne "International" with bourgeois ideology is best exposed in having failed to understand (or not wishing to understand, or simulating ignorance) the imperialist nature of the war of 1914-1918, it did not realize the inevitability of its conversion into a civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie of all the advanced countries.

When the Bolsheviks as early as November of 1914 pointed out this inevitability, the Philistines of all countries retorted with stupid ridicule, and among these Philistines were all the leaders of the Berne "International." At present the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war has become a fact in a number of countries, not only in Russia, but also in France, in Hungary, in Germany, even in neutral Switzerland, while the imminence of civil war is being noticeably felt in all the advanced countries without exception.

Now, to pass over this question in silence (as does Ramsey MacDonald) or to dispose of the question of inevitable civil war by using honeyed phrases (after the manner of Messrs. Kautsky & Co.) is equivalent to direct treason to the working class, is equivalent to actually going over to the side of the bourgeoisie. For the real political leaders of the bourgeoisie have long ago understood the inevitability of civil war are thoroughly and systematically carrying out their preparations for strengthening their position in anticipation of just such an event.

Employing all the forces at their command exhausting gigantic energy, mind and determination, not shrinking before the most bestial crime, condemning whole countries to hunger, disease and starvation,—the bourgeoisie of all the world is preparing to suppress the proletariat in the impending civil war. But the heroes of the Berne "International," like fools, or hypocritical preachers, or worn-out, reformist string. There is no sight more abhorrent or more repulsive. The Kautskys and MacDonalds continue scaring the capitalists with the revolution, frighten the bourgeoisie with civil war, in order to wring some concessions from them, in order to win their consent for a policy of reforms. To this end only resolve themselves all the writing, the entire philisophy and politics of the Berne "International."

This pitiful and contemptible method of these lackeys we already had occasion to observe in Russia in 1905 on the part of the liberals (Cadets), in 1917-19 on the part of the Mensheviks and masses in the realization of the inevitability and necessity to conquer the bourgeoisie in civil war, to shape all our policies in strict conformity with this aim, to formulate, clarify and solve all questions from this point of view,—the cringing, slavish minds of the Berne "International" do not even conceive. And therefore, our only purpose must be once for all to shove all the incorrigible reformists, i. e., nine-tenths of the leaders of the Berne "International" into the filthy garbage pile of the servants of the bourgeoisie. (Italics ours.) The bourgeoisie needs such underlings who still enjoy the confidence of some portion of the working class who will paint the bourgeoisie in beautiful colors, prate about the possibility of the path of reform, blind the workers with their trashy stories, divert the masses from the revolution by portraying the charming possibilities of the reformist path.

All the writings of Kautsky as well as our Menshevik and Social-revolutionists present substantially this sort of portrayal, the whimpering of the cowardly philistine who is afraid of revolution.

We have no possibility to repeat here in detail what fundamental economic causes make this revolutionary, and only revolutionary path inevitable and render any different solution of the problems placed by history on the order of the day impossible—except through civil war. It must be written and volumes will be written on this question. Messrs. Kautsky and other leaders of the Berne "International" do not understand this yet—but we need only add that understand this less distant from the truth than prejudice.

For the ignorant but sincere workingmen and supporters of the working masses understand more easily now, after the war, the inevitability of the revolution, of civil war and the dictatorship of the proletariat than such gentlemen as Kautskys, MacDonalds, Vanderveldes, Brantings, Turatis and others, glutted with the most learned reformist misconceptions.

One of the most potent illustrations of the generally-observed phenomenon of the awakening of revolutionary consciousness in the masses are the novels of Henry Barbusse—"Under Fire" and the "Dreamers." The former has already been translated into all languages with a circulation of 230 000 copies in France alone. The conversion of an ignorant and average man of the masses, completely held down by the weight of false ideas and prejudices into a revolutionist, by his reaction to the war, is portrayed in an unusually forceful, talented and truthful manner.

The masses of the proletarians and the semi-proletarians stand with us and are joining us, by leaps and bounds. The Berne "International" is a staff without an army, doomed to crumble like a house of cards the moment it will be thoroughly exposed to the masses.

The Name Karl Liebknecht was made use of during the war by the Entente countries and the bourgeois press for the sole purpose of deceiving the masses,—to make the bandits and robbers of the French and English imperialism appear as sympathetic to this hero, to this "only honest German," as they used to say.

Now the heroes of the Berne "International" are sitting in the same organization with the Scheidemanns who are planning the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, with the Scheidemanns who played the role of hangmen of the workers, who rendered hangman's services to the bourgeoisie. Ostensibly, lip-service attempts to "condemn" the Scheidemanns (as if "condemnation" can help to change the situation) actually, remaining in the same organization with these murderers.

The late Harry Quelch was expelled by the German Government from Stuttgart in 1907, because he denounced a meeting of European diplomats as "a gathering of thieves." The leaders of the Berne "International" are not only a gather-

(Continued on page 5.)

\* Zubatov was the chief of the Czar's "okhranka," or, secret service police in Moscow. Editor.

# MASS ACTION AND REVOLUTION

(CHAPTER FROM "SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND COMMUNISM")

By K. HORNER

(Translated from German)

**Editorial Note.** The article printed below represents only one chapter of a pamphlet dealing with the question of mass action in its entirety, as well as other tactical problems confronting Communist parties and the revolutionary proletariat in general in various countries. Therefore, this article is necessarily incomplete, touching upon certain aspects of the problem only superficially, in a very general way, without entering very deeply into details,—not touching upon certain questions at all. Moreover, this pamphlet from which this article is reprinted, having been published in Germany, in response to a certain particular situation on certain questions, created in the course of the revolutionary working class movement in that particular country, has by necessity, been narrowed in its scope and in its application (and even in its political illustrations) to the specific needs and requirements of that country.

Consequently, this article, in order to justify its title, needs a great deal of elaboration and additional explanation.

However, leaving this and a more elaborate treatment of the problem in question, to future articles on Mass Action and allied problems which it is our intention to publish in *The Communist*, we shall limit this editorial note to a few remarks absolutely essential and indispensable, in our opinion.

1) It should be noted that the article reprinted below, does not tackle the question of Mass Action in its entirety, does not analyze the different forms of Mass Action, such as for instance, mass demonstrations, general strike, armed insurrection, etc., and the conditions of their application. The article takes only one aspect of mass action, namely, its directness, or direct character,—as against the indirect character of parliamentary or any other action where the masses do not act directly, but through the medium of some intermediary agencies, such as parliamentary and "diplomatic" representatives, and "leaders." Thus, the scope of this article may be formulated as: **direct vs. indirect action.**

2) Even this, more limited problem is not treated exhaustively, being mainly confined to parallels taken from the history of the German working class movement, between the attitude of the old Social-Democratic "leaders" and the present Communist attitude.

There are two kinds of leaders—the former (represented by Scheidemanns, Kautskys, MacDonalds, Snowdens, Longuets, etc.) act, as if to supplant the masses without any attempt or even an idea to call upon the masses for action to rely upon their organized support, without taking the masses into their confidence whatsoever, and quite often, if not always, against the interests of the masses. These are "leaders" who want their army—the masses—to perform only one "action," namely, to elect them into office, and then to disappear. They do not want their army to fight, they expect to accomplish everything through their wisdom and "diplomatic" manipulations.

The latter—the true leaders, are those who act together with the masses; who prepare them for mass action, and when the time comes—they lead the masses in their assaults upon the enemy. These leaders are represented by Lenin, Trotsky, etc.

We often hear cries raised against "leaders"—leaders are this and that—we must get rid of leaders—they cannot be trusted, etc. etc. In this connection we should remember the old proverb that we should not throw out the child together with the dirty water. In throwing away from the working class movement, such "leaders" as Scheidemann, Noske and Kautsky, we should not also throw out such leaders as Lenin and Trotsky, whose role and importance in the revolutionary proletarian movement cannot be overestimated.

The antagonism between Communism and Social Democracy had already become evident before the war, although not under this name. At that time it related to tactics. Under the name of "Left Radicals" ("Linksradiikale") an opposition manifested itself in the ranks of the Social Democracy (out of which originated the older adherents of the present-day Communists), who, in spite of the opposition of the radicals and revisionists proved the necessity of mass action. In this fight, the radical spokesmen, such as Kautsky, were forced to reveal the anti-revolutionary character of their views and tactics.

The parliamentary and trade-union struggle under the rule of the young and vigorous capitalism had slightly ameliorated the conditions of the working class, and, at the same time, had erected a bulwark against the ever-lasting tendency of capitalism to impoverish them. But in the last decade, this bulwark, despite the powerful organization, broke down. Imperialism strengthened the power of capitalism and of militarism, weakened the power of parliament, forced trade-unions to take a defensive position, and prepared the world war. It became clear that the old weapons of waging the class struggle had become obsolete. The masses felt this instinctively. In all countries they were actually seen to be engaged in activities, often against the will of their leaders,—now in tremendous trade-union conflicts, now in transportation strikes that paralyzed industrial life, or else, in demonstrations of a political nature very often the eruption of the proletarian revolt and the show of its power so shakes the self-assurance of the bourgeoisie that it granted concessions. Oftimes, too, these outbreaks were throttled by massacres. The Social Democratic leaders seek to use these movements for the furtherance of their own political aims. They acknowledge the usefulness of political strikes for definite purposes to be tolerated only on the condition that they be waged within prescribed limits—to be initiated and terminated at the command of the leaders. And, above all, in tactical questions to be subordinated to the injunction of the leaders. In this prescribed manner strikes have been waged at times. But of no avail. The policy of compromise introduced by the leaders usually paralyzes the powerful force of the instinctive outbreaks, for it is supposed to be subordinate to this policy of compromise. Moreover, the menace of danger which inspires the reigning bourgeoisie—the feeling of uncertainty as to the proportions such mass actions can take on and grow into a revolutionary movement—was absent from both of the "disciplined" mass actions whose harmlessness had been proclaimed in advance.

The revolutionary Marxists, the present Communists, saw even then the narrowness of the prevailing views of the ranks of the Social Democrats. They knew that throughout all history the masses, even the classes, were the driving and active power in all revolutions; that revolutions never came about through the reasoned and wise counsels and procedure of the acknowledged leaders. When conditions became unendurable, the masses, for any cause whatsoever, broke loose, wiped out the old powers and called into power a new class or stratum capable of erecting a state or society to suit their needs. Only during

the last half century or comparatively peaceful development could the illusion be created that leaders were the only beings who could, through their superior wisdom, direct the destinies of peoples. The members of Parliament, officials of the Central Executive Committees believe that their deeds, speeches, transactions and resolutions determine the course of events. The masses standing behind them are or occasionally make their appearance when they are called for the purpose of lending emphasis to the words of their spokesmen, only again promptly disappearing from the political horizon. The mass is to play a passive role merely, it has to elect leaders, who then act as the effective force of revolution.

If this viewpoint has any real value in regard to former revolutions in history, it is even thus of less value when the great difference between bourgeois and proletarian revolutions is taken into consideration. In bourgeois revolutions the mass of workers and the petty bourgeoisie took an active part but once (as in Paris in February 1848) or only then, when as in the great French Revolution, for the purpose of overthrowing an old empire or a new untenable power like the Girondists. When they had performed their task, then the representatives of the bourgeoisie would have appeared as new individuals, as a new government, in order to reconstruct and renew the State institutions, the Constitution, the laws. The proletarian mass power was needed to overthrow the old order but not to build up the new one, because the new system of society was the organization of a new class.

According to this model the radical Social Democrats also conceived the proletarian revolution, which they—contrary to the reformers—considered necessary. In their opinion, a tremendous uprising of the people was to remove the old absolutist military domination, put the Social Democrats into power, and the Social Democrats will do the rest, and through the enactment of new laws would create the Socialist order. Thus did they conceive the proletarian revolution. But this revolution is an entirely different thing. The proletarian revolution is the liberation of the masses from all class domination and exploitation.

That means that they themselves take the reins of destiny into their own creation. But of the old race of narrow-minded slaves who only think of themselves and cannot see further than their workshop, new beings must evolve—defiant, ready for the conflict of independent spirit, filled with the strength of solidarity, no longer confused by the treacherous bourgeois teachings, and capable of independently adjusting themselves to conditions. This change cannot come about through want, bitter disappointment, occasional victories and repeated defeats, gradually gain the power, the firm unity, and the ripe understanding for freedom and power. This long process of struggle is the proletarian revolution.

The duration of this process will differ according to countries and conditions, and will depend mainly upon the power of the resistance put forth by the dominant class. The reason that the process was terminated with comparative speed in Russia was due to the fact that the bourgeoisie there was weak, and that its combination with the landed aristocracy drove the peasants on the side of the working class. The great institution of power of the bourgeoisie is the State-Power—that all-potent, intricately branched organization of domination with all the means for exerting power at its command—legislation, the schools, the police, the courts, the army and the bureaucracy that has all the directing power of all the channels of public life in its hands.

Revolution is the combat of the proletariat against this machinery of power of the ruling class, and it can only attain their liberation by confronting this hostile organization by a more formidable and powerful organization. The State power and the bourgeoisie seek to keep the workers powerless, divided and intimidated in order to crush the slightest strivings toward unity by force and deception and divide their forces in all directions. In opposition to this power the working class applies mass action, which paralyzes the state machinery and causes it to crumble. As long as the state remains intact, the proletariat cannot be victorious, for over and over again will it see the State rise against it. The conflict then—if the world is not to go down in utter ruin through capitalism—must end so, that finally, the repeated mighty actions of the proletariat crushes the bureaucratic state machinery and it breaks down powerless.

\* Karl Kautsky took exception to this interpretation of the proletarian revolution even before the war. He maintained that the proletariat should not be guided by the tactics which would lead them to destroy the State power, because it would have to use his state machinery for proletariat in order to enact the laws in its own purposes. All the ministers of the present State were also needed under the rule of the interests of the workers. The aim of the proletariat must be to seize and not to destroy the State. The question was raised in this connection as to how the state machinery of the victorious proletariat would be created—whether it would be a continuation of the bourgeois state, as Kautsky maintained, or a newly-constructed machinery. But the Social-Democratic theories as they were formulated and propagated by Kautsky for thirty years, had always spoken of the economics of capitalism out of which Socialism would "necessarily" originate. They never dealt with the "how," and for that reason the question of the State and the revolution could not be answered. It was only later explained. The difference between the Communist and Social-Democratic interpretations had, however, become quite evident.

For the Social Democrats, the sole act—the uprising of the people, which overthrows the old power and places the Social Democrats in government positions at the head of the State—constitutes proletarian revolution. The overthrow of the Hohenzollerns in Germany on November 7, 1918, was for them a real proletarian revolution, which, due to the peculiar circumstances that the old regime had been disorganized by warfare, made the victory attainable without difficulty. For the Communists this revolt could only be the beginning of the proletarian revolution, which, through the abolition of the old oppression opened the way for the working class, so that they could, through the creation of their own class organization, undermine the old forces. In reality, the workers, under the leadership of the Social Democrats allowed and even aided, the building up of the old State power upon a firmer basis, after a moment of paralysis. They are still facing a period of hard struggle. For Kautsky and his friends Germany is a true Social-Democratic republic—Noske and his Imperial Guard (Reichswehr) are simply defects of beauty—a republic in which the working class aid in governing even if they do not rule. Most certain-

ly, they could not expect Socialism thus far. Kautsky had emphasized again and again that Social Revolution—according to the Marxist conception—will not come all of a sudden, but is a long historical process. Capitalism was not ripe for an industrial revolution. In other words, this would mean, that although the proletarian revolution took place, the proletariat should allow itself to be exploited, and then by degrees a suitably large industry would be nationalized. Or, in plainer language—in place of the old ministers at the head of the government, there are Social Democrats, but capitalism with its exploitation remains. That is the real meaning of the Social-Democratic conception: after a single proletarian revolutionary uprising there must follow in the footsteps of the Social Revolution a longer process of socialization. Communism takes the opposite view-point, maintaining that the proletarian revolution—the conquest of the state power and industry—is a long process of mass action, during which time the proletariat becomes mature and attains wisdom to govern itself, and the old state machinery is destroyed. At the turning point of this struggle, when the power is in the hands of the workers, there will be short work made of exploitation, the abolition of all claims to unearned revenue will be proclaimed, and on this new and just foundation will be constructed a new machinery—industrial machinery—an organized, systematic mechanism of production.

## PROBLEMS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

(Continued from page 4.)

ing of thieves—they are a gathering of dastardly murderers.

They cannot evade the tribunal of the revolutionary workers.

6.

Ramsay MacDonald gets away from the question of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat with a few words, as from the subject for a discussion about freedom and democracy.

No. It is high time to act. Discussions are too late.

The most dangerous—coming from the Berne "International"—is the lip-service recognition of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Italics ours, Ed.) These men are apt to recognize anything, to sign anything, 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 the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

They do not deserve any confidence whatsoever. Not lip-service recognition is necessary, but the actual rupture with the policies of reformism, with the prejudices of bourgeois freedom, bourgeois democracy, the actual carrying on of the policies of the revolutionary class struggle.

They attempt to recognize the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in words, in order secretly to read into it the "will of the majority," "general suffrage" (Kautsky precisely is doing this thing) bourgeois parliamentarism, the refusal for the complete destruction of the bourgeois state machinery. We should guard ourselves against these new tricks, against these new lackeys of reformism more than anything else.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat would be impossible if the majority of the population did not consist of proletarians and semi-proletarians. Kautsky & Co. attempt to falsify this truth by presenting the necessity of the "Vote of the Majority," in order to accept the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. (Italics ours, Ed.)

Comical pedants. They did not understand that generally not through the ballot, but through civil war are all the serious problems of politics decided at that time, when the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has been placed on the order of the day by history.

They did not understand that the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is the power of one class taking into its hands the whole apparatus, the whole machinery of the new state, conquering the bourgeoisie and neutralizing the whole petty-bourgeoisie, peasantry, philistines and intelligentsia. \*\*

The Kautskys and MacDonalds give lip-service recognition to the class-struggle, in order, in reality to forget about it in the next decisive moment in the history of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat: in the moment, when the proletariat, having captured the state power, and supported by the semi-proletariat, and with the assistance of this power, the class struggle bring it eventually to the abolition of classes.

Like true philistines, the leaders of the Berne "International" are repeating the bourgeois-democratic phrases about liberty, equality and democracy, not noticing, that they are repeating the obsolete merchant ideas of "free and equal," and failing to understand that the proletariat needs the state not for "freedom," but for the suppression of his enemy, the exploiter and the capitalist. (Italics ours, Ed.)

The liberty and the equality of the merchant died, as died capitalism. Neither the Kautskys nor MacDonalds will be able to resurrect it.

The proletarian needs the abolition of classes—this is the real meaning of proletarian democracy, proletarian freedom (freedom from the capitalist and from the capitalist system) proletarian equality (not the equality of classes—a commonplace into which the Kautskys and MacDonalds fall, but the equality of workers, who are overthrowing capital and the capitalists).

So long as classes exist, the freedom and equality of classes is a bourgeois deception. The proletariat takes the power becomes the ruling class, destroys bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, suppresses the bourgeoisie, suppresses all attempts of the other classes to return back to capitalism, gives real freedom and equality to the toiling masses (which can be realized only with the abolition of private ownership of the means of production) gives them not simply "rights," but the real use of what has been taken away from the bourgeoisie.

The one who does not understand this meaning of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat (or—what amounts to the same thing—of Soviet Power, or Proletarian Democracy),—accepts this word in vain.

I cannot develop here in more detail these ideas, expounded by me in the "State and Revolution" and in the brochure "Proletarian Democracy and the Renegade Kautsky." I may conclude by dedicating these notes to the delegates to the Luzerne Congress of August 10, 1919, of the Berne "International."

July 14, 1919.

\* We call especial attention of our comrades to a remarkably deep thought contained in this paragraph. How many in our own ranks—of the former "Left Wingers" together with "Kautsky & Co. assumed the "same false position!"... The whole position of the so-called "michiganites" and their followers, for instance, is based on this misconception. Editor.

\*\* A Russian word, signifying "intellectuals" and professional people as a separate social group.

# Greetings To Communists Abroad

By N. LENIN.

(Continued from last issue.)

The followers of Scheidemann and of Kautzky are still talking of "democracy" in general; they still cling to the ideas of 1848. They pay lip-service to Marxism, but their deeds are those of Louis Blanc. They talk of "majority" rule in the belief that equality at the ballot-box represents equality as between exploiter and exploited, the worker and the capitalist, the poor and the rich, the hungry and the well fed.

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkis behave as if they were honest, noble, peace-loving capitalists had never made use of the forces of wealth, money, capital, bureaucracy, military dictatorship but had always in truth applied the majority rule in the decision of public affairs.

The Scheidemanns and Kautzkis (partly from hypocrisy, and partly from extreme dullness engendered by decades of reformist activity) are bolstering up bourgeois democracy, bourgeois parliamentarism, and the bourgeois republic, and are endeavoring to make the workers believe that the capitalists are conducting State business according to the will of the majority, and not according to the will of the capitalists, not by means of deceit and oppression of the poor by the rich.

The Scheidemanns and the Kautzkis are willing to recognize the proletarian revolution provided that an election conducted by the bourgeois State with bourgeois election machinery, a majority of the electorate declared itself for the revolution. It is difficult to realize the magnitude of small-bourgeois obtuseness and of small-bourgeois trickery in capitalists, in the bourgeoisie in general, and in the bourgeois State machinery.

In reality it was the bourgeoisie which was guilty of hypocrisy when it invested the hollow parliamentary equality with the high-sounding name of "democracy," while it oppressed, exploited, and by no end of clever devices tricked the workers and the poorest peasants. The imperialistic wars (which the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis were shamelessly bolstering up) has revealed this fact to millions of people. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the only means of protection for the workers from the yoke of capitalism, from the military dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and from imperialistic wars. It is the only step which will lead to equality and true democracy, not a democracy on paper and consisting of political phrases, but a live democracy, bringing economic freedom with it. The Scheidemanns and Kautzkis, having failed to grasp these facts, have proved themselves of bourgeois ideas.

The Kautzki or "Independent" party is dying and will inevitably be finally destroyed by the dissensions between the revolutionary majority of its members and the counter-revolutionary "leaders."

The Communist Party will grow in strength and experience, living down the dissensions which are similar in character to those which confronted the Bolsheviks.

As far as I can judge, the dissensions among the German Communists are centered around the question of "making use of legal possibilities" (to use the Bolshevik terminology of 1900-13). To put it plainly, the question is—should bourgeois parliaments, reactionary trade-unions, "the council's law" (Räte Gesetz), mutilated by the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis, be made use of, or should they be boycotted? We, Russian Bolsheviks, had to go through the same kind of dissensions in 1906 and in 1910-12, and we can plainly see that many young German Communists are simply suffering from lack of revolutionary experience. Had they lived through a couple of bourgeois revolutions (1905 and 1917, they would not be such ardent advocates of the boycott and they would not, at times, fall into the errors of Syndicalism.

Those are growing pains which will pass with the growth of the movement which is developing splendidly. These obvious mistakes must be fought against quite openly, and the greatest care must be taken not to magnify the dissensions, for it must be clear to everyone that in the near future the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and for the Soviets will do away with most of these dissensions.

From the point of view of Marxist theories, as well as from that of the experience of three revolutions (1905, February 1917, and October 1917), I most decidedly consider it a great mistake to refuse participation in bourgeois Parliaments, reactionary trade-unions (Legien's, Gompers, etc.), and in the most reactionary workers' "soviet," disfigured and mutilated by the Scheidemanns, etc. At times, under certain conditions, in certain countries the boycott is the correct attitude, as for instance was the boycott of the Czarist Duma by the Bolsheviks in 1904. But these same Bolsheviks took part in a far more reactionary, nay downright counter-revolutionary Duma in 1907. The Bolsheviks participated in the elections to the bourgeois Constituent Assembly in 1917, and in 1918 they dispersed it to the profound horror of the small-bourgeois democrats, the Kautzkis and other "Socialist" renegades. We took part in the most reactionary, purely Menshevik trade-unions which, in the matter of counter-revolutionism, are on a par with Legien's infamous and most reactionary trade-unions in Germany. Even now, two years after the conquest of State power, we are still struggling with the remnants of the Menshevik (that is to say, the Scheidemann, Kautzki, Gompers) trade-unions, which goes to prove that this is a long and tedious process, and that in certain localities and in certain unions the influence of small-bourgeois ideas is still very great.

To begin with, we were in a minority in the Soviets, the Trade-Unions, and the Co-operatives. It is only by prolonged hard work and struggle, before, as well as after the conquest of political power that we obtained a majority in all the Labor organizations, and later on in the non-Labor, and still later in the organizations of the small peasants.

Only fools or knaves can imagine that the proletariat must, in the first place, obtain a majority in a ballot conducted by the bourgeois and their hired slaves, and that only then it can strive for power. Such reasoning is the height of stupidity or hypocrisy; it is the substitution of the ballot box under the old regime, the old order, for the class struggle and the revolution.

The proletariat carries on its class struggle without waiting for the ballot before the strike, although the sympathy of the majority of the workers, and consequently of the population, is required to ensure the complete success of a strike. The proletariat carries its class struggle, overthrowing the bourgeoisie, without waiting for a preliminary ballot, conducted by that same bourgeoisie, but it knows all the time that for the successful overthrow of the bourgeoisie it is essential to have the sympathy of the majority of the workers, and consequently of the majority of the population.

The Parliamentary cretins and modern Louis Blancs insist on a ballot, and a ballot conducted by the bourgeoisie in order to ascertain the amount of that sympathy for Socialism that exists amongst the workers. But those are the views of pedants or clever tricksters.

The history of real revolutions shows that the sympathy of the majority cannot very often be proved by any kind of ballot and certainly not by a ballot organized by the exploiters, notwithstanding the existence of Parliamentary "equality" as between exploiters and the exploited.

The sympathy of the majority of the workers very frequently finds expression not through the ballot box, but by the growth of one of the parties, or by the increased number of that party's members in the Soviets, or by the success of some strike which for some reason or other had assumed great importance, or by success in the civil war, etc., etc.

The history of our revolution has, for instance, shown that the approval of proletarian dictatorship on the part of the majority of the workers in the extensive territories of Siberia and the Urals did not manifest itself by the vote, but by a year's experience of the rule over these territories of the Czarist general Koltchak. We must bear in mind that Koltchak's rule also began with a coalition of the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis (translated into Russian the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries, the partisans of the Constituent Assembly), just as to-day in Germany Messrs. Haase and Scheidemann, with their coalition, are paving the way for Von der Goltz and Ludendorff. Here I should like to say, in parenthesis, that the Haase-Scheidemann coalition has come to an end inside the Government but the political coalition of these betrayers of Socialism remains. Proofs of this are Kautzki's books, Stampfer's articles in the "Vorwaerts," and articles by their followers on their "unity" and so on.

The proletarian revolution cannot be achieved unless the workers give their sympathy and support to its vanguard. But this sympathy and support cannot be gained all at once, nor will they be determined through the ballot box, but they will be obtained by a long, difficult and hard class struggle. The class struggle of the proletariat for the support of the majority of the workers does not end with the conquest of political power. After this conquest, the same struggle continues, but assumes a different character. In the Russian Revolution all the circumstances were exceptionally favorable to the proletariat in its struggle for dictatorship. The proletarian revolution took place at a time when the entire nation was armed, and when the entire peasantry desired the downfall of the landowners, and was incensed at the Kautzki policy of the traitor-Socialists, the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries.

But even in Russia, where the circumstances were so favorable, where there was an immediate unity of the entire proletariat and the entire army and peasantry, even there it took the proletariat months and years to gain the support of the majority of the workers in its struggle for dictatorship. After two years this struggle is almost at an end, but even now the proletariat cannot say that the contest has been absolutely settled in its favor. It has taken us two years to gain the entire sympathy and support of the vast majority of the workers and working peasants in Great Russia, including the Urals and Siberia; but we have not yet achieved that result with the majority of the working peasants (as distinct from the exploiting peasants) in the Ukraine. We may be crushed, and yet we shall not be crushed by the military power of the Entente. In the interior of Russia we enjoy now such a solid support from the majority of the workers that there never has been, in the entire history of the world, a more democratic State.

Anyone who chooses to make a close study of this extremely complicated and long history of the proletarian fight for power, so rich in its manifold forms, sudden changes and transitions from one form of struggle to another,—will recognize the error of those who wish to "prohibit" all participation in bourgeois Parliaments, in the reactionary trade-unions, in Czarist or "Scheidemann" workers' committees, or in workshop Soviets, etc., etc. This error is the outcome of the revolutionary inexperience of the most sincere, convinced, heroic revolutionaries of the working class. That is why Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were a thousand times right when in January, 1919, they recognized and pointed out this mistake, but preferred to still remain with the erring proletarian revolutionaries (erring in a matter of secondary importance) than to side with the betrayers of Socialism, the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis who did not err on the question of participation in the bourgeois Parliament, but had ceased to be Socialists and had become small-bourgeois democrats.

But a mistake is a mistake. It must be criticized, and one must endeavor to rectify it. The struggle with the betrayers of Socialism must be relentless, but it must not be a struggle for, or against participation in bourgeois Parliaments, reactionary trade-unions, etc. This would constitute an enormous error, and it would be a still greater error to recede from Marxian ideas and from the practical line, a strong, centralized political party, to the ideas and tactics of Syndicalism. The chief endeavor of the party should be to participate in bourgeois Parliaments, in the reactionary trade-unions, in the "workshop committees," crippled and castrated à la Scheidemann, in fact to participate in every organization, in order to be in continuous touch with the workers and to exercise the influence of the Communist Party on the working masses. At all costs legal work must be combined with illegal, in order to bring about systematically the strict control of the illegal party and its working class organization over the legal activities. This is not easy, but there are not and cannot be "easy tasks" and "comfortable" means of struggle for the proletariat.

This difficult task must somehow be fulfilled. The recognition or non-recognition of the armed rising is not the only difference (and not even the chief difference) between us and the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis. The chief and fundamental difference is—their inconsistent, opportunist, nay even treacherous policy in every field of action, bourgeois Parliament, trade-unions, co-operative societies and journalism.

We must fight on every field of action, without any exceptions whatsoever, against the social-traitors, against reformism and opportunism. Only with these masses the vanguard of the proletariat, the Marxian centralized political party will lead the people without fail to the victorious dictatorship of the proletariat, to proletarian democracy in lieu of bourgeois democracy, to the Soviet republic to the Socialist world order.

The Third International has won a series of brilliant victories in the course of a few months. It grows with a remarkable rapidity. Its frequent errors and growing pains have no terrors for us. By constant and open criticism of these errors we shall bring the working masses of all the cultural countries, who have imbibed Marxism, to the point where they will sever all connection with the Scheidemanns and Kautzkis of all nations; those who have betrayed Socialism are to be found in all countries.

The victory of Communism is inevitable.

# Who Is Santeri Nuorteva?

June 16th, 1920.

I would advise you not to take too seriously the accusations raised by Mr. Nuorteva against Comrade Fraina. At least we, in Massachusetts, cannot do so knowing Mr. Nuorteva and his activity in the Socialist Party in Massachusetts. You might just as well believe Nuorteva's Menshevik friends in Russia, when they call Lenin a German spy and agent of the Kaiser.

This is not the first occasion where Nuorteva has co-operated with the police-powers of the capitalist state. He is one of a group of Finnish yellows, who, after expelling the revolutionary elements from the Finnish Federation of the Socialist Party in 1913, DENOUNCED THEM TO THE POLICE AND COURTS AS ANARCHISTS, SYNDICALISTS, etc., in order to steal their property.

In his Socialist Party activities Nuorteva has always been the worst kind of social-patriot and traitor to the working class. To prove that, I will cite a few characteristic examples: Dealing with Mass. State Socialist Party Fitchburg Convention in 1915, where yours truly happened to be a delegate, and where Mr. Nuorteva with his bloc of yellow Finns and Menshevik Letts showed his skill in "political dentistry" (pulling the "teeth" out of Bolshevik motions and resolutions). Nuorteva acted as the only spokesman of that bloc, because practically all of his delegates did not understand or could not speak in English, but only raised their hands in voting as soon as Nuorteva raised his.

Our first resolution, to congratulate Comrade Liebknecht for his stand taken against the war, Socialists and "burgfrieden," was defeated by Mr. Nuorteva and his bloc, on the ground that the workers SHOULD defend their "fatherland," and that "everybody's doing it now."

When we pointed out the attitude of the Russian Bolshevik party (then Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party), Nuorteva dismissed them as a set of irresponsible soreheads.

At the same convention we presented a resolution on "Dick's Military Law," pending in the U. S. Senate at that time, and proposing forced military training. Our resolution advised our young comrades and sympathizers to refuse to become cannon-fodder. Mr. Nuorteva gave us the following advice: THIS IS NOT RUSSIA BUT AMERICA. This is a free country and we must all obey the law once it is passed. "Law and Order" won and our resolution was defeated.

At the same time U. S. agents of the capitalist class were ready to invade Mexico for the glory of Standard Oil Company. We presented a resolution, calling on the working class to refuse to serve, if conscripted, but in case they are forced to fight, they should fight against their only enemy—the capitalist class of this country.

"Treason" and "traitors" were the only arguments of Mr. Nuorteva against us. I pointed out to Nuorteva, that he cannot avoid being a traitor. He should only decide, whether to become a traitor to the working class of U. S. and Mexico, or commit treason against Standard Oil. Nuorteva decided for Standard Oil, and then and there again showed that he is a traitor to the working class by defeating our resolution.

On the same day (Sunday), a well-known minister of the Gospel in Boston preached a sermon on the subject: "WAR IS HELL, CHRISTIANS SHOULD NOT GO THERE," and called upon his congregation to refuse to serve in any army.

But, you may argue, Nuorteva is a Bolshevik now. If so, just read his "Open Letter to American Liberals," and you will see that he is just a plain, everyday middle-class liberal and nothing more. As to his connections with the Soviet Bureau—birds of a feather flock together. You'll find there also Mr. Hilquit, the great Red Army slayer; Mr. ———, ex-inspector of ammunition under the regime of bloody Nicolas; Mr. Freidin, Mr. Weinstein and other worthy Mensheviks who always fought against Bolshevism in Russia and in this country, and are doing it now.

The real reason for accusing Fraina, as I understand it, was to keep our party out of touch with Soviet Russia and the Third International. How long they will succeed in this remains to be seen.

Meanwhile we should continue our work of agitation and education, and not pay too much attention to the barking of "dog-hounds" of the American capitalist class, as represented by Mr. Nuorteva.

Hoping you will agree with this, I remain  
Fraternally yours,

John Morgan.

## LENIN AND LONGUET

Lenin publishes an article in the "Kommunistische Internationale" with regard to a letter written to him by Longuet. In this article Lenin points out that under the influence of the considerable movement towards the Left on the part of the working masses, certain leading Socialists would seem to be ready to save their positions by a formal acceptance of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, being even ready to join the Third International, but, says Lenin, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat is a serious matter and can only be brought about by those who accept it in fact, as well as on paper. It is impossible to accept the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and yet at the same time to work side by side with Thomas Sombart and Bracke (their English namesakes will readily be supplied by our readers). The Dictatorship of the Proletariat implies the continual exposing of the character of the war just ended and the daily emphasis of the possibility of war breaking out again as soon as the people show a tendency to organize the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. One must also show up the traitorous behavior of the Social-Democracy during the war and avoid every union with them. Further, it is essential to carry on a propaganda amongst the masses for the total abolition of capitalism instead of carrying on a struggle merely to better the daily conditions of the workers.

Longuet and his friends, says Lenin, do not understand this, and he compares them to the Hungarian Social Democracy, who, accepting the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in words, yet sought to keep Bela Kun's Government back when the latter attempted to put the dictatorship into actual practice. As a result of this, thousands of Hungarian Communists have been martyred.

(London "Call.")

## THE LAST WORDS OF A COMMUNIST

The "Mitmenschen" prints the last words of Eugene Levine (the German Communist executed by the "Socialist" Government of Hoffman in Munich) at his trial. It is well for all workers to remember them:

"If your verdict corresponds to the intentions of the public prosecutor, then I beg you to be present when it is being carried out. I have known a long time now that we Communists are but 'the dead on leave.' It depends on you, gentlemen, whether my ticket of leave shall be once again renewed, or whether I, must go and join Karl Liebknecht, but my ideas will live on, and sooner or later, judges will sit in this court before whom will be indicted those who have dared to do anything against the Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

## "At Last" The Centrists Unite!

(Continued from page 3.)

Centrist one no doubt from the pens of Damon & Co. Ed.) concerning the overthrow of the capitalist system (note the same mistake that Damon made in his article about the overthrow of the capitalist system. Isn't it more than a coincidence? Ed.) It was insisted that the word "forcible" be added. Likewise, at the first mention of "conquest of political power" it was demanded that there be added "by the use of armed force." One amendment was piled upon another—a veritable "force" panic. (Italics ours. Ed.)

"In vain was it argued that this part of the program continued only preliminary definitions, statements of the goal to be achieved; that the Program, under appropriate sub-divisions, gave full attention to the methods of action; that the item of armed force does not stand by itself but is the inevitable culminating aspect of mass action; that this tactic must be presented in its developmental character—armed uprising as the unavoidable sequence of the advancing class conflict. (Italics ours. Ed.)

"The C. L. P. delegates, for the most part, were ready for a test of strength against the C. P. 'irreconcilables.' They were conscious that this minority would have to accept defeat, since the point to be voted was only on what page something should be stated in the program. Others sensed too much danger of misunderstanding behind such a vote, too much anger where agreement could easily be reached, Caxton (in which we recognize our old friend Y. F.) moved to recommit this part of the Program, then to adjourn. There were some protests, but the union prevailed. Meanwhile the tension relaxed by the brilliant satirical speech of Sherwood, whose Yankee wit was the perfect antidote for passionate argument (reminds us of Oscar Ameringer at the S. P. convention who in every tense situation, was used by the leader to put the delegates in good humor again, making them forget what was 'itching' them. Ed.) on an artificially stimulated issue."

How is that for a peaceful "unity session"? Do you get the significance of the whole proceeding in this session? Y. F. characterizes those who justly distrusted him and his Centrist colleagues as "iron oracles." Notice Y. F.'s contemptuous reference to the "item of armed force"—such a paltry detail. Note how he speaks of "armed uprising as the unavoidable sequence of the advancing class conflict." Here is a Centrist conception which looks upon the "armed conflict" as something to be avoided, if possible but if not, then to get rid of it as of some terrible nightmare. They dread and fear it, coming at last to the revolution, tardily and unwillingly, uncertain in their movements, with the pacifist moral aspect in their attitude toward it and desiring to get rid of it as soon as possible. To the Centrists "armed insurrection" is a "necessary evil"—not something the Communist Party must prepare itself and class-conscious workers for as the highest stage of the class struggle.

But our opportunists of the type of Damon, Y. F. & Co., pay lip-service to the proletarian revolution, mouthe the phrase of "mass action" (which they termed "mass actions" before. Isn't natural for advocates of "mass actions" to unite with the advocates of "action of the masses?" Ed.) and "armed uprising," but in their hearts they are opposed to it—their Centrist activity is for the purpose of delaying this highest stage of the class struggle—and either openly or surreptitiously will retard the working class preparation for this culmination.

As for the "unity session" which was thrown into a "veritable force panic," one thing stands out clear. Many of the delegates, sincerely desiring to meet the issue squarely, having learnt from the "majority" criticism of the "minority" position, were determined that their discredited leaders would not fool them on this issue. Therefore the "force panic." It is a natural outcome where the opportunist leaders are determined to put one over on a convention where some of the delegates at least, know their game. Of course, the net result, as far as the program is concerned, is as Y. F. states. He knows why he criticizes them; he is opposed to the whole thing—and by ridicule he sweeps the whole program inferentially into the refuse.

The writing of "force" into every part of the program does not make it a Communist program—this is something our United Centrists will have to learn. Another lesson they will have to learn is that even a good program in itself does not make the organization really Communist in character—although the clearness and soundness of the Program does give a clue to the clarity and consciousness of the party which frames it. Even a Communist Program with a bunch of opportunist leaders such as Damon, Y. F. & Co.—to lead the organization, expound the principles and tactics, publish its propaganda to the masses would stamp that organization as Centrist—having been thoroughly exposed as opportunists and Centrists in the split.

But as a matter of fact, the program of the United Centrist Party is a poor, mechanically stultified document—"made to suit every antagonistic faction in the convention"—in some parts a poor paraphrasing of fundamentals put together helter-skelter without any idea of correlation of ideas or sequence—in some places yague—in some places taken directly from the C. P.—and the last two columns a reprint from the manifesto of the Third International, where their own efforts evidently had proved fruitless. It might do as a primer for beginners in Communist study classes, after the proper revisions had been made and it had been touched up in general. But as a Program it is a good dissertation!

### PARLIAMENTARISM

On the question of parliamentarism another discussion ensued which showed how far apart the assembled "unity" delegates were on all fundamental questions. They only seemed to agree on the question "unity," all other questions were a "free-for-all-match"—each side giving in a little in order to effect "unity." A sound, uncompromising Communist program was furthest from their minds.

### INDUSTRIAL UNIONISM

The third day came the longest and most stubborn debate of the whole convention on the question of Industrial Unionism and I. W. W. On this question there were also three groups—one group who stood for outright endorsement of the I. W. W. (in spite of the recent convention decisions of the I. W. W.), another group who were ready to give it a limited endorsement, and a third group who believed neither in a direct endorsement of the

I. W. W. nor in an outright condemnation of the A. F. of L.

Finally, the (former) Chicago District Committee's resolution on this question was adopted which gave an outright endorsement of the I. W. W. But again, in order to maintain harmony and "unity" the convention reconsidered the matter and amended it to please all three factions. The result is that their position on I. W. W. is neither fish, flesh, fowl nor good red herring. It has no merit however, which the "unity convention" is satisfied with—and that is, it prevented another "split" at the convention.

**PARTY NAME ALMOST LEADS TO A SPLIT**  
Then came the question of a party name—and again frail, overtaxed "unity" was nearly smashed into pieces. After thirty votes had been cast for "Communist Party" on a roll call vote (our former "minority" tried their best to bring confusion into the Communist Party by adopting our name)—which meant that the name was adopted—the C. L. P. raised a loud holler, and what Y. F. calls "the moral power of effective minority criticism" and what we call the deadly fear of a deadlock and a split, won the day. The question, like all the others was reconsidered and a new motion re-introduced to placate all elements. "United" was added and the dove of peace again hovered benignly over the "unity convention."

Thus far, on the question of reconsidering passed motions the "battling average" of the "unity convention" was 1,000 per cent.

As a balm to the wounded feelings and the suspicions of the C. L. P. they were permitted to retain their emblem.

### CONSTITUTION-MAKING

Then came the discussion of the constitution. Two questions occupied them—one centralization, the other, federations. The question of underground organization was not apparently discussed for nowhere is there a mention of it in the Constitution. On the question of centralization two main groups stood out. One group apparently headed by Damon & Co. (who now talks of giving the C. E. C. full power to elect and control the party officials—some hypocrisy!) and the other group composed of the C. L. P. whose conception of Communist organizations had not advanced from the bourgeois democratic ideology of the S. P. Note their arguments: "Lack of confidence in officials was the central theme of the contrary argument. (If they mean their own opportunist leaders we don't blame them—but then why didn't they remain in the S. P., since there is little to choose between the opportunist leaders of the Right and the Centre—in fact, it is easier to fight the Right leaders because they are out in open, but the Centrist leaders who lean toward the Left, as Lenin said are the most dangerous. Ed.) The party affairs, it was urged, must be brought nearer to the control of the rank and file. The central committee had been the breeding place of factional controversies. It was not asking too much to give the district committees a veto in the choice of the organizers upon whom their work depended." (Italics ours. Ed.)

Nothing can show the Centrist character of the "unity convention" better than the italicized quoted statement, about "the central committees being the breeding places of factional controversies." As a matter of fact, the whole paragraph is the C. L. P. echo of Left Wingers who "left" the S. P., not because of a fundamental difference in principles and tactics, but because they were opposed to the S. P. machine, to the steam-roller methods of the Right-Wing, to the crooks and scoundrels among the officialdom.

But perhaps lest you think that the other side really believed in revolutionary centralization, we hasten to dispel such an idea. Their policy is half and half. On paper the C. E. C. is the highest body between conventions, collects all the dues, publishes all the papers, etc., etc. but actually, each district holds its own conventions to legislate for itself and elect its District Committee. The C. E. C. organization machine extends only as far as the District Organizers, then it stops and meets the machine built up in the various sections, sub-districts and districts. In other words, there are two machines in their party. A C. E. C. machine and a "democratic" machine, slow, cumbersome and unwieldy. The friction between these two machines must lead to paralysis of work, disagreements, appeals, counter-appeals, etc. In case of serious friction in the organization, each District Committee can do as it pleases even to the extent of bolting the organization. Having abolished language federations, the C. E. C. has no effective counter-check against the possible machinations of any organized group within the party.

But even this half-and-half measure of centralization was won only after the most stubborn fight. At first the proposition was defeated. Of course, it was reconsidered and re-introduced. It took three roll-calls for it finally to pass.

### LANGUAGE FEDERATIONS DISPOSED OF

We now come to the question of language federations. Y. F.'s report is interesting in this connection so we quote: "On the federation question the Joint Committee had come to no agreement. In curious contrast to the history of last Summer, it was the C. L. P. committee members who were loath to take a rigorous stand against federations. At the convention the C. L. P. delegates took no group stand on this question. Two plans were presented, one for the C. P. delegates by Damon (remember Damon's insistence that he was not opposed to federations—that he did not want to abolish them but only to change their method of paying dues?) the other by Dubner and Raphaeloff for the federation members of the C. L. P. The debate was largely between the federation delegates on both sides. The principal controversy was as to the existence of national executive committees for the language groups, this proposal being decisively voted down."

Anyone who reads the United Centrist constitution about language federations will quickly realize that the object behind the abolition of the federations was not to make for greater centralization, as they claim, but for the purpose of effectively closing the channel of organized expression and control of the vast majority of the "foreign comrades" who cannot speak or understand English, over the actions of the opportunist leaders of the United Centrist Party of America. This undoubtedly is the purpose. But, the opportunist leaders composed of Damon & Co. have evidently ridden to a fall. Note that the C. L. P., which had experience with the federation question for nearly a year, had changed its policy, or, rather was willing to change its policy. They know by bitter experience, that the "foreign comrades" who cannot speak or understand English, must have a centralized body of their own, which can function for them, else, they drift away, lose interest in the party, or veer away from Communism gradually and are swallowed up in other movements.

It will not be very long before Damon & Co. find this out for themselves and then they will, we can safely predict (knowing the character of these men) that their C. E. C. will change the convention decision or make it a dead letter, and permit language federations to exist in their party.

Just as their program is "a scrap of paper" so is their constitution a "scrap of paper." Nor are they afraid of conventions. They can defy conventions and when it gets too hot, split away

(Continued on page 8.)

## Counter-Revolution in Germany

(Continued from page 1.)

fortunately, only in an objective sense. The proletariat was unarmed, while its representatives manifested neither revolutionary initiative nor political capacity. The fundamental task was to issue the call and develop measures for the armament of the proletariat; no such call was issued or measures adopted during the first four days of the General Strike—the decisive period, during which the basis had to be laid for all subsequent action.

But elsewhere the revolutionary struggle flared up. Where the workers were armed they initiated a struggle for power, and usurped power; in other places they disarmed the troops as a preliminary to the struggle for power. In city after city Soviet Republics were proclaimed; while in the Ruhr a giant revolutionary struggle loomed threateningly. Among these workers the military coup was a call to action, the opportunity to conquer power. It was the elemental action of the masses breaking loose, in spite of the dangers, in spite of the Party moderates and compromisers. Those vital developments indicated that both the Reaction and the Revolution had completely underestimated the German proletariat; the Reaction—its capacity to resist a military dictatorship; the Revolution—its will to engage in the struggle for power.

The menace of Bolshevism, which the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship in its first proclamation had projected as a bogey, was now a real menace. To continue the struggle between the Government and the coup meant to prepare the conditions for the revolutionary conquest of power by the proletariat. What was necessary now was agreement and compromise, unity against the Revolution. The danger was very real. Hindenburg appealed to Kapp-Luttwitz to withdraw from Berlin, and to the Government for compromise and agreement. Now the strategy of the Socialist-bourgeois Government was apparent—in avoiding the decisive military struggle against the coup, the opportunity was provided for agreement and unity against the Revolution. The opportunity was seized at the earliest moment.

It is a fact, in spite of denials, that the Government was negotiating with the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship. On Wednesday these negotiations resulted in an agreement. On Monday the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship had announced negotiations, and stated its conditions: "Elections to be held two months hence for the Reichstag and the Prussian Landtag; a new President to be elected, the former President to be requested to continue office until the elections." This declaration was denied by the Government and the National Assembly; but the agreement was concluded two days later, practically on the Kapp-Luttwitz conditions. On Wednesday the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship declared that, having accomplished its mission, the old Government agreeing (1) that elections should be held within two months and (2) election of the President to be direct vote of the people, it would withdraw. This was not accomplishing the program of the coup, but it was a partial victory; and, moreover, the Kapp-Luttwitz troops withdrew from Berlin with all the honors of war, to the strains of the martial music and assisted in their evacuation by the Government troops; carrying with them, moreover, an enormous mass of captured munitions. A proclamation characterized the agreement in this fashion: "After long negotiations between the representatives of the Government parties and representatives of both Right parties (which had recognized the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship), especially between representatives Trimborn, Sudekum, Gotthel, Stressman and Hergt, the following compromise has been reached: The representatives of the majority parties will advocate elections to the National Assembly to take place not later than June; that the President be elected by the people; that the National Government will undergo a change in the near future; the carrying on of the business of Government in Berlin to be taken over by vice-Chancellor Schiffer." At 12:15 Thursday morning, Schiffer issued a proclamation in the name of the Government, designating General Seckt as commander of the troops and calling for restoration of economic and political activity. (A joint proclamation by Schiffer and Hirsch (Social-Democrat) in the name of the National and Prussian Governments declared it was false to accuse the National Army and the Security (Noske troops) of offering no resistance to the coup, and has this delicious bit: "It is not commonly known that on the night of Friday-Saturday (March 12-13) the troops stood at their posts ready to defend the Government; but, because of the difficult conditions of night fighting, they were, before the advance of the rebels, re-called to barracks!")

Simultaneously with the conclusion of the compromise, the Government and the bourgeois parties issued the slogan: "Back to work." The paralysis of the economic activity united with the menace of Bolshevism to compel a compromise. But the proletariat of Berlin rejected the call to end the strike, the trades unions and the Social-Democratic Party being compelled to order the strike to proceed against the compromise.

The General Strike was now, in its impulse and in the mood of the masses, a strike against the Government. But, in the conscious direction imparted to it by the trades union bureaucracy and S. D. P., the strike was against the compromise of the Government—purposely or stupidly evading the problem, in that the compromise was not in a formal agreement but in the prevailing situation itself; the Government might repudiate the formal agreement but would inevitably be compelled to compromise, as actually did happen.

The compromise agreed upon by the Government and the military coup, the masses persisting in the General Strike, now in fact a strike against the Government,—these developments emphasized the inherent character of the crisis, as developing the conditions and providing the opportunity for the definite Communist struggle for power.

It was clear to all that the continuation of the General Strike was latent with the threat of proletarian revolution. On Thursday and Friday the citizens of Berlin acted as in mortal terror; the words Spartacus, Arbeiter, Unabhaengigen, were on all tongues and the basis of discussion in all crowds. At night, stores and hotels were barred and people ordered off the streets; terror was rampant in Berlin. The Government troops now occupied the entrenchments erected by the Kapp-Luttwitz troops and new entrenchments were erected. Riots were frequent, the Government troops using rifles and machine guns at the least pretext; in three days more persons were shot by the Government troops than in the five days of the Kapp-Luttwitz dictatorship. In the proletariat a new energy manifested itself, a developing consciousness of larger means and purposes. But the General Strike did not move to Revolution; nor was it the masses who were not ready, but the representatives of the masses...

Never were the limitations of the General Strike in itself more apparent than in Berlin. The strike was complete; for eight days not a factory nor a car was in motion. But in spite of all this, the strike broke and dispersed after unsatisfactory promises of concessions by the Government...

# PARTY MATTER

## CASH STATEMENT FOR MAY, 1920.

| CASH RECEIVED:                  |                |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Dues: Distr. II                 | 125.00         |
| Let. Fed.                       | 225.60         |
| Lith.                           | 152.80         |
| Russ.                           | 388.60         |
| Ukr.                            | 288.00         |
| Spec. Org. Stamps: Distr. II    | 10.00          |
| " III                           | 217.00         |
| " IVab                          | 15.00          |
| Defense Stamps: Distr. II       | 39.25          |
| " III                           | 110.20         |
| " IVab                          | 20.00          |
| Russ. Fed.                      | 42.75          |
| Defense Contrib.: Distr. II     | 25.00          |
| " IVc                           | 150.00         |
| " V                             | 28.00          |
| Org. Fund Contrib.: Distr. I    | 55.00          |
| " II                            | 239.45         |
| " III                           | 122.50         |
| " V                             | 2.90           |
| Leaflets: Distr. III            | 9.63           |
| Mchry. Fund Contrib.: Dist. III | 9.63           |
| Distr. Acct. Entries: I         | 97.20          |
| " II                            | 4.00           |
| " III                           | 98.62          |
| IVab                            | 59.66          |
| IVc                             | 120.00         |
| V                               | 188.10         |
| Total Received in May           | 3097.16        |
| Balance from April              | 1230.44        |
|                                 | <b>4327.60</b> |

| CASH PAID:                    |                |
|-------------------------------|----------------|
| Office Exp.: Sundry           | 11.77          |
| Supplies                      | 24.15          |
| Postage                       | 6.00           |
| Salaries                      | 320.00         |
| Organiz. Exp.: Prtg. Statemt. | 100.00         |
| Traveling                     | 23.02          |
| Distr. Trav. Exp.: I          | 12.40          |
| " II                          | 19.98          |
| " III                         | 63.98          |
| IVab                          | 11.66          |
| " V                           | 113.95         |
| Distr. Salaries: I            | 175.00         |
| " II                          | 535.00         |
| " III                         | 360.00         |
| IVab                          | 270.00         |
| " V                           | 235.00         |
| Communist: Edit. Sal.         | 202.50         |
| Printing                      | 368.60         |
| Delivery                      | 19.00          |
| C. E. C. Mrg. Exp.            | 181.18         |
| Office Mchry: Neostyle        | 65.00          |
| Scale                         | 4.00           |
| Deposit on Comm. Forms        | 100.00         |
| Distr. Acct. Entries: I       | 37.00          |
| " II                          | 90.00          |
| " III                         | 27.05          |
| IVab                          | 100.00         |
| IVc                           | 80.00          |
| V                             | 167.90         |
| Total Paid in May             | 3828.17        |
| Balance to June               | 499.43         |
|                               | <b>4327.60</b> |

\* Inc. some back salaries and sub-distr. salaries.

## JEWISH FEDERATION

The Jewish Federation Convention held recently split at the last moment, four delegates going to the "minority" and thirteen delegates remaining with the Communist Party. Raphael and Cornel also went with the "minority" after all their manoeuvring to win the convention over to the "minority," and finally for "neutrality" had failed diamally. Raphael has certainly turned out to be a worthy companion to Damon, Isaacs, Langley & Co. since his defection from the ranks of the "majority."

The Jewish Federation elected a C. E. C., and the process of re-organization is taking place rapidly. More than half of the membership is with them and the others are slowly turning back. The Brooklyn, the largest branch in Chicago, a branch in Brooklyn, the largest branch in Chicago, a branch in Philadelphia, are with the "majority" already.

## POLISH FEDERATION

The C. E. C. of the Polish Federation has expelled Tyline, its former Secretary, who went with the "minority," and is in the process of getting back the property of the Federation in his hands. Many of the Polish branches are with the C. E. C. of the Party, and, after their next convention, the whole Federation with very few exceptions will probably be back in the Party.

District No. 1. The leaflets will be printed and distributed. Our comrades suggest that the leaflets should be printed on one side only, to they can be posted on walls, poles, etc. Also text should not be very long.

I hear, that "our" joint convention has decided to demand "unity" with the "Big Bluff of Bolshevism" (B. B. B.) gang, as if they had not enough of bluff already. I don't think we should fall for it. Perhaps, they have realized that they themselves haven't enough of "bluff."

Something should be done in the Fraina case. Mr. Nuorteva is getting too bold. I think we should expose that gentleman a little, because he is not much known outside of Massachusetts.

District No. 1 delegates claimed they represented 400 members in the "unity" convention. Our Americanized Lettish branch is still undecided and might go with them. Their members say that the "unity" program and constitution is very very r-r-revolutionary. Our own comrades say—"nix" on hat unity stuff. Our District and Sub-District Committees will decide whether we should keep a paid sub-district organizer or not.

Yours for B. B. B.,

District Organizer, No. 1.

District No. 2. The four sub-districts in this district are now fairly well-organized. New York City, approximately 900 members, New Jersey, 669 members, Connecticut, 287 members, and Upper New York State, about 300 members. Queens section, after having bolted the "minority" has returned to the C. E. C. Leaflets on Transport Workers, and New Offensive Against Soviet Russia, printed and in the hands of sub-districts. The "minority" in this district are silent on the results of their "unity" convention, evidently they are not bragging about the results, and for good reason too, as a glance at their new organ will show.

Work is proceeding well and things are normal in general.

District No. 3. Last week I was in Wilkes Barre sub-district. Things there are alright and our work is proceeding very well. The Polish Comrades repudiated their former actions, voted that they agree with us on principles and this week they will decide whether they will participate in our convention.

Garish came to his Jewish comrades to make a report of the "unity" convention; he started to read the program and constitution but his members didn't want to listen to a "new program" as they say they are not a new party. And the meeting broke up. There is complete disorganization, and they are disgusted with the actions of the "minority." It is too late to get now, but do not worry, they will come to us.

Baltimore Sub-District is O. K. Lithuanians representing 238 members, held a S. D. Convention and unanimously decided to stand with the "majority." Contributed \$50.00 with greetings to the Party.

District No. 4 (Pittsburgh and Cleveland). Erie, small but active membership—Polish, Lith., Jewish, Lettish and Russian branches—committee meets regularly—functions excellently. German branch neutral, contributes to our Party and distributes our literature. Total membership about 80.

Buffalo—Russian, Ukrainian, German, Polish and English branches. Committee meets regularly—finances absorbed by local defense—membership sound and solidly with us. English (35) and German (15) are most active and loyal.

Wheeling, W. Va. district consists of small towns along Ohio River. Membership small and inactive.

Pittsburgh—Lithuanian, Ukrainian and Russian branches only—has large and active membership in 30 towns—mostly new and not broken in to party work, but loyal and active—finances good. Will become very powerful district as members are young and enthusiastic.

Akron committee against us through Centrist activities of former local secretary—consists of German Polish, Lithuanian, So. Slavic, Ukrainian-Russian branch entirely lost—district will have to be re-organized after convention. No finances as Secretary has told members that funds will be stolen.

Cleveland, committee recently organized and meets most regularly, membership large and inactive—finances go entirely through Federations sources. Russian branch (124 members) just pay dues. Lithuanian branch (300) members very inactive. etts best branch and active.

Youngstown, Warren, Toledo, no connections, one Ukrainian, Russian and Lithuanian branches respectively with us and will be represented in dist. con. by delegate. This report supplements last report as to membership, does not supercede.

## RESOLUTION OF BRANCH No. 1 (PHILADELPHIA) OF THE LITHUANIAN FEDERATION

We, group of delegates of Branch 1, Lithuanian Communist Federation, at a meeting held May 7, 1920, having considered reports of both sides of the C. E. C. Communist Party, arrived at the following conclusion, and adopted a resolution to that effect:

1. Whereas, splitting the Party, especially at the present moment, while the Party is being torn to pieces by the most violent rage of reaction, and while it is in process of reorganizing itself from the open existence to an underground basis, —is treason to proletarian interests and a violation of the Party discipline;

2. Whereas the "minority" headed by Damon, appeared in the role of the Party disrupters and left the Central Executive Committee;

3. And, whereas, the fundamental reason for the "minority's" withdrawal from the C. E. C. is a disagreement in the matter of principles and tactics, and not technical questions,—

Therefore, Branch No. 1 of the Lithuanian Communist Federation has come to a decision, that:

1. We resolutely protest against the minority withdrawal from the C. E. C. Communist Party, and against splitting the Party;

2. We demand that the "minority" turn the Party funds over to the majority of the C. E. C.;

3. We whole-heartedly support the majority on the question of principles, which is in harmony with the proposition of the Third Communist International and the program of the American Communist Party;

4. Together with the majority we stand for: a) The Soviet System, b) Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and a revolutionary interpretation of Mass Action.

We endorse the position taken by the Exec. Committee of the Lith. Fed. on this question; i. e. we condemn the minority with Damon as their head, for their treacherous work of splitting the Party.

Group Delegates of Branch No. 1,  
Lithuanian Commun. Fed., Phila., Pa.

## A New Attack Upon The Communist Party.

(Continued from page 2.)

By far not all "other members of Fraina's group" have been arrested, and if this is to be a sufficient basis for charges of connection with the D. of J., then most of our active members are "suspicious" individuals. Perhaps this is the implication that Nuorteva wished to be drawn from his statement.

As to Fraina's leaving in company with Nosovitzky (No. 6), the arrangements for this were made entirely independently of both, and not at all between themselves, as Nuorteva implies.

In regard to No. 7, there has been a "trial" of Dr. Nosovitzky, the stenographic report of which shows that there were other possibilities of that letter coming into the hands of the D. of J.

As to No. 8, the Amsterdam Bureau has published in their Bulletin the whole proceedings of the Conference, and Palmer could get all his information from there without any difficulty.

All the new charges are mere guesses, which would not stand investigation. To come out with them without any authoritative investigation,—to come out with the story of an agent-provocateur that HAS BEEN PROVEN FALSE,—these are acts which must reflect most seriously upon the maker himself, and not cast any shadows either on the persons or the Party attacked.

Yours for Communism,  
D. Bunte, Act. Sec.—C. P. of A.

## "At Last" The Centrists Unite.

(Continued from page 7.)

before the next convention, organize their own convention and thus rehabilitate themselves as "leaders" (save the mark!). They have done it before and they can do it again.

### THE ELECTION FARCE

Now we come to the piece-de-resistance of the "unity convention"—the elections. We shall quote: "Late in the afternoon of the fourth day of the joint sessions (joint sessions? and we thought all the time it was a "unity convention"—isn't it mean of Y. F. to so cruelly shatter our illusions—and perhaps the illusions of the U. C. P.? Ed.) it was decided to proceed with elections of party officials. There had been many hours of caucusing on each side as to elections. Regardless of the sentiment of the convention expressed by a majority vote against further caucuses (what is a majority vote in a convention to Damon & Co. and the C. L. P. Menshevik leaders! Ed.) neither side was willing to risk a surrender of its group strength. (Strange situations for people who have been shouting "unity" for over a year and are about (?) to accomplish it "at last." Ed.)

Note how even both groups in the "unity convention" distrusted each other after the adoption of an apparently satisfactory program to all concerned. No better proof of the insincerity and hypocrisy that animated the whole convention and its proceedings can be given than the suspicion, distrust, jockeying, bargaining, trading, dickering that went on during the election of officials.

The mask of "unity" was thrown off "at last." Both groups stood, ready to battle for the control of the new organization. "Control" or "split" became the new slogan of both sides. But we are anticipating. Let Y. F. tell you all about it. He was there and witnessed it: "Then came ten nominations for the nine places on the C. E. C. Damon, Scott, Reinhart, Dellon, Zemlin (C. P.); Meyer, Klein, Flynn Brown, Dawson (C. L. P.). These were the caucus nominations. Obviously the C. L. P. caucus had determined to avail itself of the dissensions in the C. P. ranks and to attempt to elect a majority of the committee. (Won't somebody be shouting "packed" convention soon? Ed.)

"At the night session was announced the result of the balloting: Damon, Scott, Klein, Flynn, 29; Brown, 33; Dawson, 32; Meyer 30; Reinhart, 26; Dellon, Zemlin tied at 24. (Damon & Co. evidently got a bad licking and they knew it too. Watch them swing into action when the question of "control" is involved. There he fights like tiger. But on principles, that's another story. Ed.)

"Damon, Scott and Reinhart quickly offered resignations. A bitter discussion was precipitated. Both sides had played for "control" and the result had been a boomerang; for how it was urged, could the C. P. delegates report back to their members that they had been outwitted in strategy in a way to give the minority control of the united party? Even though the fault was that of the C. P. delegates themselves, how could that remedy the outside situation? (Here Y. F. unwittingly gives a sidelight on the situation which would make pleasant reading about a Democratic or Republican Convention but coming from a so-called Communist Convention represents the very lowest order of political consciousness. Do you see what worried the "minority" C. P. delegates—not the formulation of a Communist Program and Constitution—the laying of the basis for their activities for the coming year—or even the superficial achievement of "unity" which they did manage to accomplish for the time—but what their members will think if the C. L. P. gets control of the party! Ed.)

After some bitter retorts from the C. L. P. a recess was held for half an hour.

"Then began the tug of war which went into the middle of the night, only to be resumed the next morning—the two groups, apparently completely welded, now standing sharply apart as C. P. and C. L. P. The convention vanished; in its place were two caucuses, with committees for interchange of offers and counter-proposals.

"The strained item in the C. P. camp had been an attack upon Caxton, based on the "majority" C. P. criticism. (So, our work was bearing fruit "at last." Ed.). In the C. P. caucus, after long discussion, he had been nominated for the C. E. C., 18 to 9. (Was Reinhart, who used to denounce Y. F. when he appeared at meetings one of the 9?) Later Caxton withdrew his name. Now it was insisted that his name be re-introduced, making Zemlin first alternate. The C. L. P. offered to substitute Caxton for Brown as International Secretary." (The International Secretaryship, the highest office in the party is something to be traded and bargained for not on the basis of the man most fit for it but on a purely bourgeois basis of political trading. Ed.)

"The last morning found the situation deadlocked. To open the convention again meant to give the C. P. the advantage of the renewed caucus pressure in favor of solidarity for C. P. control, all questions of personality aside. The issue of control having been precipitated by the turn of the election, the C. P. delegates were in no mood to give up their demand for a majority of the C. E. C.

"The C. P. delegates made only demand, to reopen the convention, it was for the other side to make the next move.

"How is one to visualize one group of delegates in heated argument, while the other group is engaged in the singing of revolutionary songs, mostly Russian,—how is one to imagine all this without something in the way of special dimensions? The singing group marches halfway toward the arguing group—a challenge to unity, the song of the International—and reluctantly back to its own meeting place.

"There is a committee conference. Before the report comes back the lines are formed for a new march, this time to go all the way. Agreement is reported: a C. E. C. of ten members, the five C. L. P. to stand elected, five C. P. members now to be chosen. The march proceeds; it is the only report to the anxious C. L. P. delegates,—the two groups merge into one another, all singing the International. There is the grasping of hands, the embrace of comradeship; nothing is said—there is too much feeling for speech... Unity is achieved.

"At last" as Damon would say the torture and suspense is over "unity is achieved!"—The Centrists have united into the United Centrist Party of America!

Need anything more be added to the foregoing? Surely, every reader has formed a vivid picture in his mind of the "unity convention" which gave birth to U. C. P.! Born in compromise and betrayal, fathered by Centrists of the type of Damon, Y. F. & Co., and mothered by the C. L. P.—with one who claims to be a representative from the III International in the role of godfather (the latter is himself responsible for a great deal of the disorganization that has been going on recently in the Communist Party, through his unwarranted meddling). This new United Centrist Party is doomed to an ignoble career in the Communist movement in this country.