

“Resolved :

**That the
terms of the**

**Third
International**

**are
inacceptable
to the**

**Revolutionary
Socialists**

**of the
world.”**



Affirmative

JAMES ONEAL

Member National Executive Committee,
Socialist Party, and expressing the view-
point adopted by majority vote of the
Socialist Party of the United States.

US.

Negative

ROBERT MINOR

Who experienced two years personal con-
tact with persons and events in Russia
and Germany, and who expressed the
viewpoint of the Communists in America.

TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

**THE ACADEMY PRESS
112 FOURTH AVENUE, N. Y. C.**

“Resolved:

***that the terms of the Third
International are unacceptable
to the Revolutionary Social-
ists of the world.”***

being the report of a debate, held
in Star Casino, New York City
Sunday, January Sixteenth, 1921

Affirmative

JAMES ONEAL

Member National Executive Committee,
Socialist Party, and expressing the view-
point adopted by majority vote of the
Socialist Party of the United States.

US.

Negative

ROBERT MINOR

Who experienced two years personal con-
tact with persons and events in Russia
and Germany, and who expressed the
viewpoint of the Communists in America.

.....

Temporary Chairman

GEORGE H. GOEBEL

Permanent Chairman

BENJAMIN GLASSBERG

.....

THE ACADEMY PRESS
112 FOURTH AVENUE, N. C. Y.



INTRODUCTION

THE terms of affiliation set forth by the Third International have caused widespread discussion in the Socialist movement of the world. The First International was organized in St. Martin's Hall, London, in 1864. Down to 1869 the Marxian Socialists had controlled it, but with the advent of the Paris Commune in 1870 the Bakunin Anarchists made rapid headway in the organization and threatened to control the whole international movement. Owing to this struggle within the International and the ascendancy of Bakunin and his followers, Marx succeeded in having the headquarters transferred to New York in 1872. Here it dragged out a precarious existence, in which further struggles with the supporters of Bakunin weakened the remnants of the organization. It was formally dissolved in 1876.

In 1889 the Second International which had its origin in a conference in Paris, was followed by a series of conferences down to the outbreak of the world war. The Second International increased in strength until delegates of all the more advanced nations attended, as well as many from the more "backward" countries.

It however began to disintegrate from the day that the German party voted the war credits to the German Government, which action was followed by similar action by the Socialist parties of a number of other countries. Efforts to revive it have only revealed its declining prestige until now it is certain that it has no future.

The Third International was organized in Moscow in March, 1919, the initiative being taken by the Bolshevik party of Russia. The terms of affiliation laid down by it have been communicated to the French party, the German Independents, and other parties in various documents, the famous 21 points having been printed in *The Call*, September 23, 1920 (see page 27). It is the terms embodied in these 21 points as contrasted with the recognition of the Class Struggle and Political Action which served as test for affiliation or membership in the Second International (and under which the Internationals were representative of the Socialist parties and groups of all nations) that are the subject of dispute.

(The debate was reported by Joseph Zinman,
of The Convention Reporting Company.)

Mr. ONEAL *for the opening:* —

Mr. Oneal: Comrade Chairman, Comrade Minor and Friends and Comrades: First I want to say that I am unreservedly in support of the revolutionary government established by the workers and peasants of Russia, and that I believe that those who call themselves Socialists and who don't give that support, who in any way approve of the intervention on the part of the international imperialists, automatically takes himself out of the Socialist classification, and no one has spoken more frequently than I have in behalf of the Russian workers and peasants to work out their own problems and to establish their own regime without interference on the part of anyone throughout the world, and it is my judgment that when the history of the last three black years is written by the free historians of the future it will record the intrigues and subsidized interventions on the part of the imperialist diplomats as one of the blackest periods in all the world's history. I want to say, however, that support of a social revolution in Russia, or in the Argentine, or in China or Japan, or anywhere else in the world, does not necessarily carry with it the support of a particular international organization, of which the Russian workers and Communists are merely only one section. I want to make that distinction clear.

Furthermore, I want to say that I don't believe that any international organization of the working class, calling itself Socialist, claiming to represent the best of Marxian thought, I don't believe that such an organization can direct the policies and the methods of the workers in all countries of the world, regardless of the particular historical conditions that prevail in each and every one of these countries. Furthermore, the attempt to do this is in direct conflict with the dialectical method of reasoning of which so many of our Socialists are utterly ignorant, and so many of our Communists especially. There is not one Socialist or Communist in a hundred that I have met who has attempted to familiarize himself with these dialectics as they have been set forth in the two volumes of Joseph Dietzgen, who was praised by Marx himself as 'our philosopher,' the philosopher of the Socialist movement of the world.

By dialectics I mean this—the dialectical method of viewing the world and its evolution. The development of human institutions and thought is by no means a uniform thing. Each and every nation on the face of the earth undergoes a particular historical development unlike that of other nations, even though they may be neighbors, and while a revolutionary transformation is possible in a particular country at a particular

time, it does not necessarily follow that it is available in another nation, even though in the other nation the institutions may be largely similar. Dietzgen, in his "Positive Outcome of Philosophy," puts it this way:

"If there were such a thing as an absolutely right law, dogma, or action, it would have to serve the welfare of ALL mankind under ALL conditions and at ALL times."

This, the very thing that the Third International is insisting upon in the various terms that it is making to the various parties of the world. Continuing, Dietzgen says:

"But human nature is as different as men, circumstances, and time. What is good for me is bad for another, and the thing which may be beneficial as a rule, may be injurious as an exception. What promotes some interests in one period may interfere with them in another. A law which would presume to be absolutely right would have to be right for every one at all times. No absolute morality, no duty, no categorical imperative, no idea of *the* good, can teach man what is good, bad, right, or wrong."

Engels further on, in a small passage in his "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," says, "Dialectics comprehends things and their representations, ideas, in their essential connection, concatenation, motion, origin and ending."

"Utopian Mode of Thought."

I ask you to reconcile this particular view with the view that social transformation must take place in all the nations of the world in a certain particular rigid dogmatic form. Reconcile it if you possibly can.

Engels also goes on to emphasize it in the same book. He says that "the Utopian's mode of thought has for a long time governed Socialist ideas of the nineteenth century, and still governs some of them. Until very recently all French and English Socialists did homage to it. The earlier German Communism, including that of Weitling, was of the same school. To all these Socialism is the expression of absolute truth, reason and justice, and has only to be discovered to conquer all the world by virtue of its own power. And, as absolute truth is independent of time, space and of the historical development of man, it is a mere accident when and where it was discovered"—speaking in a satirical vein.

Now then, this is the position that I take—that it is an absolute impossibility for you to do this thing as the Comrades standing for the Third International attempt to do—impossible for the reason that the historical conditions, including the intellectual development of the working class is different in Argentina, in Uruguay, in China, in India, in Japan and in the United States and the various nations of the world. Social revolution, when it comes in the various nations of the world, is going to take its own particular form adapted to the historical conditions prevailing in that

country and not in accord with any ukase that may be laid down by a central committee in Moscow or in Berlin, in Paris or in New York.

Failure of Second International.

Again, viewing the breakdown of the Second International—and I want to say to you that I am happy that the Second International, because of its frightful failure in 1914, is dead. It is fortunate for the working class of the world that it is dead. But when you come to explain the failure of the Second International, as some of our Communist friends do, because some member of the party in France, in the United States, in Germany, in Austria or some other country, or a few of them in each country, failed to lead the masses, because they were false to the International itself—when you attempt to explain its failure upon that ground immediately you place yourselves upon a Utopian basis by assuming that individuals are primarily responsible for the conduct of great masses of mankind.

In connection with this Marx, in writing of the revolutions and counter-revolutions on the continent of Europe in 1848, said this:

“When you inquire into the causes of the counter-revolutionary successes, there you are met on every hand with the ready reply that it was Mr. This or Citizen That who “betrayed” the people. Which reply may be true or not, according to circumstances, but under no circumstances does it explain anything—not even show how it came to pass that the ‘people’ allowed themselves to be thus betrayed. And what a poor chance stands a political party whose entire stock in trade consists in a knowledge of the solitary fact that Citizen So-and-So is not to be trusted.”

This from Marx, mind you, regarding those who began to indulge in recriminations, following the period of 1848, that So-and-So is responsible for the failure in Germany, for the uprising in Paris and in Brussels and in Vienna and so on.

The Third International.

Now then, to come to the terms of the Third International itself. I might say that they have been expressed in various forms, in the famous 21 points, in the message to the I. L. P. of Great Britain, to the party in France, to the Independents in Germany, and in a way to the reply to the application of the Socialist party of the United States. But there is a typical passage in the answer to the I. L. P. of Great Britain. In answer they say:

“There is no other form of Socialism. There is only Communism. Whatever else goes under the name of Socialism is either wilful-deception by the lackeys of the bourgeoisie or self-delusion by persons who hesitate to choose between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.” (Great applause.)

In other words, my, friends, a particular type of Socialism as it has come to be expressed after the war laid down by a particular section of the movement and in striking contrast with what Socialists have stood for in the past is now offered as the only genuine revolutionary blown-in-the-bottle movement of the working class of the world, and all others are spurious.

Now it is all right for a movement to make that claim for itself, but it is necessary for a movement to do more than make a claim. It is essential for that movement to tell us where it got its particular ideas, whether those ideas have been in conflict with the movement organized by Marx and Engels before they can ask us to accept their word for it. I shall not attempt to take up all the 21 points, because it is impossible. I shall select a few of the most important. First, "Secret and public organization in every country." Second, "Armed insurrection." Third, "Orders to be taken by all affiliated parties from a central committee located in Moscow." There are certain fundamentals. I want to ask you: Have these things been advocated at any time before in the International Socialist movement of the world, and if so, what has been the attitude, especially of Marx and Engels and the older Liebknecht? Fortunately for history these three fundamental ideas that are now being imposed, or that these Comrades are seeking to impose upon the Socialists of the world, have been urged in the past. By whom? By Michael Bakunin in the First International. (Applause.) Please, please, don't take my time. His fundamental idea was the establishment of what he called the International Brothers. The International Brothers were to consist of a central committee, secretly organized, with all power in its hands to direct the affiliated movements of the world, and with the affiliated sections obligated to accept orders from the central committee whenever that committee issued them. Immediately beneath this central committee, this International central committee, was the organization of the National Brothers, the national organizations of the various countries. Beneath them were the local sections and groups in the various countries that were to organize a public organization and a secret organization.

Bakunin's Organization.

Bakunin's propaganda through this spectacular type of organization was devoted to urging armed insurrection. Marx and Engels fought Bakunin tooth and nail in the First International upon those propositions. Bakunin carried the largest number of working men in the organization with him at that time, by his constant reference to Marx and Engels as bourgeois intellectuals, just as those Comrades who are accepting the Bakunin ideas today are saying to everybody who disagrees with them that they are petty bourgeois idealists. The analogy is identical. (Applause.) The analogy is identical in every point between the two organizations, and I say to you this afternoon, Comrades, that as between the

romantic, Utopian, phrase-mongering Michael Bakunin and the dialectician, Marx, who refused to allow himself to be swayed by phrases, by emotions, I stand with Marx, and against Bakunin. (Applause.) And this program does not come, or a large part of it does not come, from Marx, but it comes from Bakunin, and mark you this, my friends, I have little to say against the Comrades in Russia for offering this program, because one who keeps in mind the dialectical view of things I can understand perfectly well. In Russia the Comrades never in all their lives had a chance to organize the working class openly, economically, politically, culturally, or in any other way. They had through the economic conditions—the political bureaucracy of Russia—made it absolutely essential for them to organize upon this particular basis. And, mark you, Engels said that. So did Marx. So did the other Socialists. They said that wherever the workers could not organize and demonstrate openly it was their duty to organize secretly and go in for conspiracy and armed insurrection against a bureaucracy that made it impossible for any other tactics to be carried on. And yet, because he said that, does that mean that Marx stood for conspiracy and secret organization and physical uprisings? Not at all.

Writing of the trial of the Cologne Communists in 1852—and I would urge some of you Communist Comrades to read that chapter, as it reads like a chapter in the United States with Palmer as the central figure, sending his spies into your organization, throwing suspicion in your ranks, forging evidence, forging documents, forging minutes—all that with a view of cultivating your little local groups, getting the evidence on you, giving you long terms of imprisonment and deportation—and in his article on the trial of the Cologne Communists in 1852, Marx said:

“He is a coward that under certain circumstances would not conspire, just as he is a fool who, under other circumstances, would do so.”

Present Day Communist View.

And what is your position on this? Your position is that we are fools if we don't do it under any and all circumstances, and I say you are not in accord with Marxian revolutionary Socialism. We hear a great deal about revolutionary tactics. Many of the Communist Comrades have the idea that revolution is in some way or other necessarily connected with riots or uprisings, and without them you have no revolution. Why, as a matter of fact, there is no such thing as revolutionary tactics. An armed uprising can be used for reactionary purposes. It can be used in behalf of a military clique, in behalf of a junker coalition or any other reactionary group. Said the elder Liebknecht at the Zurich Congress, in 1893:

“There is no such thing as revolutionary or reactionary tactics.

Only the aim is revolutionary. Tactics vary from one epoch to another, from one country to another. If Germany was today in the

situation of Russia, the German Socialists would employ no other tactics than those of the Russian terrorists."

Here is material reality speaking through the lips of William Liebknecht in 1893.

A Reflection from Russia.

Now, what is the character of the so-called Communist movement in the United States? It is solely and almost exclusively a movement that lives by reflection from Russia. It is startling when you come to consider the evidence before the split in the Socialist party. A "Left" Russian local in Massachusetts offered a referendum to the party providing that we should change the name of the locals of the United States and call them Soviets. Why they failed to also offer the suggestion that we call the membership Red Guards I don't know. When the "Left Wing" first offered its program to the Socialist party, it copied its program almost exclusively from the Russian program, and they included in it a clause providing that small investors should not be harmed if we got in control in the United States—small investors and small stockholders. Why, if we Socialists put that in our program, immediately you would come back with your customary phrase, "Petty bourgeois." You were taking care of the petty bourgeois interests of the United States. But you are simply reflecting and reacting solely to the Russian revolution. Russia has soviets, why we must have them, too, in their reflection. Not only that, you believed that we were on the eve of the revolution in the United States. The Left Wing program out of which your existing movement has evolved—in 1918 said: "The temper of the workers and soldiers, after the sacrifices they have made in the war, is such that they will not endure the reactionary labor conditions so openly advocated by the master class." They continued by saying, "There are many signs of the awakening of labor. Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action"—two years ago. Where is the revolutionary action? (Laughter.) Why did you say this? You got it out of a program of the Comrades in Russia. You didn't think to analyze the situation in the United States that you were dealing with. "Verge on revolutionary action"—why, don't you know that the organized masses, with the exception of a few tiny factions here and there throughout the United States, are the most reactionary in the world? (Applause.)

A VOICE: Thanks to the Socialist party.

Socialists Called Bourgeois.

MR. ONEAL: Again, my friends, We attempted—we attempted to call your attention to these things. Oh, no! We were bourgeois. We were little petty bourgeois intellectuals. (Applause.) So we told you that the United States came out of the war one of the most reactionary imperialist bureaucracies anywhere in the world, and that this was the

last place to expect a huge mass movement that would finally result in the development of the seizure of power by the workers or the establishment of any such thing as Soviets. I have an answer two and a half columns that I wrote to a Comrade in answer to a question on June 10, 1919. Again, the Russian Comrades at home are not so much responsible for this. Mark you, they have been afflicted with famine. They have been afflicted with counter-revolutionary intrigue. They have been blockaded. They have been starved. They have been invaded by the subsidized bandits of the imperialist powers of the world. For two or three years they have been in agony and suffering and they appealed across frontiers and they asked the workers of the various countries to rise and overthrow the imperialists and to relieve the Russian masses of their agonies and to inaugurate a universal revolution. I can understand that.

But you who live in the United States and you who live in England and some of the other countries, you who refuse to analyze the economic conditions that prevail in the society around you, you refuse to estimate the psychology of the class that you would appeal to—you immediately adopted this thing and thought that it could be done, and because the masses do not move in response to revolutionary appeals, then you turn around and say to others who warned you in advance that it could not be done—you tell them that they are petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionists and Kolchaks and Scheidemanns and Noskes and all the other phrases.

Substitute Phrases for Argument.

In other words, you substitute phrases for argument, you substitute invectives for analysis, experiment and investigation, the very reverse of the dialectical method of viewing things. But these Russian Comrades, mark you, together with those who associated with them in the two congresses at Moscow, have insisted that what they have in Russia, Soviets, including the very methods by which they acquired power, all of these things must be done exactly in the same way in all other countries of the world. Now, note this. When James M. Beck and other 100 per cent Americans talk about Americanizing Europe, we always refer to them as chauvinists. They want to impose the institutions of the shoddy democracy of the United States upon all the other countries of the world. But when our Russian Comrades, because of the unusual situation there, attempt to do the same thing, we don't call it chauvinism. But you Comrades call it internationalism, a revolutionary Socialism or Communism, as the case may be.

Would Spurn Marx and Engels.

Again, on the matter of individual responsibility for the collapse of the Second International—Longuet was responsible in France, Scheidemann

or Noske, or some of the other reactionaries in Germany were responsible, or that Hillquit was responsible for it in the United States. This seems to me a very childish way to look at these huge movements. But let me call your attention to the fact that with all the tremendous knowledge that Marx and Engels, both of them, possessed, and we all do homage to their wonderful philosophical minds, do you know that even these Comrades made their mistakes regarding wars in the past, and if you had had your movement at that time you would have read both Marx and Engels out of the international movement on the ground that they were petty bourgeois and counter-revolutionists? Said Marx in 1870 in the second of two addresses he read for the International Workingmen's Association regarding the Franco-Prussian war—he said:

“On the part of Germany the war is a war of defense. But who has put Germany into a position that makes this defense necessary? Who made it possible for Louis Bonaparte to make war upon Germany? Prussia! It was Bismarck who conspired with that same Louis Bonaparte in order to crush down popular opposition at home and to annex Germany to the Hohenzollern dynasty.”

Engels, writing as late as September 29, 1892, in full possession of his intellectual powers—one year, I believe, before he died—Engels said:

“This much seems certain to me: If we are beaten (that is the Germans) chauvinism and revenge wars in Europe will for years find an open door. If we win, our party comes into power. The victory of Germany hence will be the victory of the revolution. We must not only wish it if war comes, but we must help it on with all means.”

—the very thing that Scheidemann and Ebert actually did in the world war.

Now I say to you this, if both Marx and Engels can misjudge a situation, even when they are living in the actual midst of it, and take a position like that, supporting two wars that apparently were imperialistic, let me ask you, isn't it reasonable to assume that hundreds or millions of working men, with not one fraction of the same information or knowledge, are just as likely to be swept off their feet? Most assuredly.

Would Expel Hillquit.

However, there is no consistency on the part of the executive committee of the Third International on this matter of affiliation; that is, regarding specific individuals. For example, Hillquit must be expelled. (Great applause.) Please don't take up my time. (Laughter.) They say that Hillquit must be expelled, that somebody must be expelled over in France, and so on. Are they competent to ascertain what the position of various men has been during the war? If you are to have an international executive committee that is to determine things for you in the

various countries they must be supermen to know exactly what has transpired and what position those men have taken. Lenin, one of the best informed men in the international movement, in a recent letter that I clipped from the Russian Press Review, an organ that is issued by the Communists in Russia—Lenin, in that article which we reprinted in The Call two weeks ago—made reference to John Spargo as a member of the Socialist party today, though he had been out of the party for three years. (Laughter.) Cachin of France is recognized as a thoroughgoing revolutionary and a representative of the movement in France, and Cachin lined up with the French Government during the war and he did the very same things that John Spargo did, made visits abroad for the French Government. Cachin went to the Italian movement and tried to induce the Italian Comrades to approve the entrance of the Italians into the war. But Cachin is all right, despite the fact that he was a social patriot and lined up with the imperialist government of France during the period of the war. Why? Because Cachin is willing to take orders from the executive committee in Moscow.

Mistakes of John Reed.

The late John Reed, noble, fine, brilliant fellow in many ways, a man I thought a great deal of—John Reed, traveling in Mexico just a few years ago, presented Villa of Mexico as the genuine revolutionist down there—Villa, who, it was afterward learned, was in the pay of the Standard Oil Company. John Reed in 1916 wrote a letter indicating that he was going to support Wilson for re-election in the United States—and he is accepted and has been accepted in Moscow as one of the representatives of the movement in the United States to issue orders to us. We in the United States who stood solid for our own candidates in 1916 when the masses were being swept in behalf of Wilson—the late John Reed supported, or at least we have reason to believe from that letter that he did support Wilson. He is accepted in Moscow, but Morris Hillquit, who never approved of the war, who never supported it in the slightest degree, he must be expelled in these United States.

VOICE: Right! (Applause.)

Stoklitzky, another one—Stoklitzky remained quiet till about the close of the war. Then he crawled out of his hole some place and appeared at the head of the Russian Federation in Chicago, and then began to tell us in the Socialist party, we who had our headquarters raided, we who were clubbed and mobbed by the patriots in Boston, who had the same experience in Indianapolis, New York, in Chicago—Stoklitzky, who crawled out of a hole just about the close of the war, got at the head of the Russian Federation, and then told us that we were counter-revolutionists (great applause), and that we did not know anything about the international Socialist movement, and Stoklitzky is now in Moscow—

scouted out of the country the moment that the Palmer storm broke about you Comrades' heads—he scouted out to Moscow the moment it actually began, and he is there now as a representative of the working class movement of these United States—(applause and cries of “Hush!”)—absolutely no consistency in the application of the terms up to the present time.

But my main contention here this afternoon is that it makes no difference how great intellectual powers you may gather together in an international executive committee—however great may be their fund of information it is an impossibility for those supermen to guide, to direct the movement all over the world and tell us precisely just how the working class is to emancipate itself from the thrall of capitalism. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrades, the time has now arrived for us to listen to Comrade Minor. I now introduce him to you. (Tremendous applause.)

Robert Minor Presents His Side.

MR. MINOR: Comrades, I don't mind your losing a little time by applauding. However, let us get down to business. We are going to attempt to please the advocates of the other side by speaking dialectically. (Laughter and applause.) Let me remind you that the whole science of Socialism is distinguished from that which went before by the fact that it is scientific. When I say scientific I mean that it has at every stage of its development abstained from any guesswork. It is not built on hunches. It derives its scientific principle, its laws of sociology—it derives them from actual hard experience. When our adversary—or mine, I should say—made an admonition to the Communists of the world that they must not get things just out of their heads, he was talking against himself. Everywhere it is to historical experience that the laws of scientific Socialism must go for its principles, but when it derives principles, I mean what I say, it derives principles. It derives laws. Otherwise it is not a science.

Prior to 1847, when there was little that could be called scientific Socialism, the Marxian science had not been able to develop anything like so much as we know of it now. The early Socialists, led by Marx and by his partner in science, Frederick Engels, developed certain principles that were fundamental and applicable universally. (Applause.) And among those principles were these most importantly: the economic determination of history, an iron scientific law that applies to Argentine and China and Japan. (Great applause.) And another thing was the law, the sociological law, as firm in its truth as any law of biology, the law of the class struggle. Now, further than those few fundamentals,

Marx and Engels did not undertake to go without the facts, without experience to prove the correctness of what they propounded to the world.

The Revolutions of 1848.

The revolutions of 1848 served to confirm the law of the class struggle, served to round it out, to develop it beyond the shadow of a doubt, as a correct scientific law. However, the class struggle was conceived by Marx and Engels at that early time in not so refined a manner as they later conceived it. It was not until a great revolutionary experience came along that they undertook to tell the world as scientists what manifestation of the class struggle could be looked for under the circumstances of a great proletarian revolt. The great revolutionary experience which came to substantiate the manifestation of the class struggle further than it had hitherto been developed was the Paris Commune in 1871. Marx and Engels studied the Paris Commune just as I wish my friend Oneal would study the Russian revolution. (Great applause.) And as he studied that Paris Commune he derived honesty from the facts, as a physiologist, a biologist, or any other scientists would derive laws from facts—he derived a further principle of the manifestation of the class struggle.

From studying the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels learned, not that they wanted or did not want, but that history would produce, whether men liked it or not, that triumph of the working class which we have learned to call the dictatorship of the proletariat. (Tremendous applause.) The dictatorship of the proletariat is not drawn from the brain of a theologian nor from anyone's likes. It is drawn from the hard bed-rock of history, and whether our friend Oneal wants it or does not want it, he shall see it. (Applause.) Whether I want it or don't want it, history, science says I shall see it.

The First International.

In 1864 the First International was formed. The First International lasted a while and it went to pieces. It went to pieces after the Paris Commune a few years, and it went to pieces for a different reason than Oneal has told you. It went to pieces because Michael Bakunin, because Michael Bakunin and his followers wanted to build inside of the revolutionary organization another revolutionary organization fighting in opposition to it. Secret, it is true. Secret—yes—but every revolutionist that lived in those days had to live secretly to a large extent, and all the original conceptions of revolution were based upon the very knowledge, fundamental knowledge that they would have to operate secretly if they were going to make a revolution.

In 1889 the Second International was formed. The Second International attempted to carry out the scientific principles discovered by Marx and

Engels, but the Second International was affected by a very important phenomenon. And when I tell you what that is, I want you to know that it is an important point of my lecture. Just this one point I must put to you, and if you understand and accept it, then I shall have accomplished my purpose. I attempt to tell you what was the matter with the Second International. Marx and Engels were exiles. They were exiles because they taught revolution, revolutionary revolution. (Laughter.) Because they taught the overthrow of the capitalist state and its destruction. Marx and Engels, living abroad, did not completely dominate the German Socialist movement. There were others.

LaSalle and Marx.

There was a brilliant young man by the name of Ferdinand LaSalle, who, in a countess' boudoir, wrote great revolutionary tracts which caused Marx from London to write his agonized protest. From LaSalle, Bebel, the elder Liebknecht and Kautsky, there grew up a conception of Marxian science, so-called, which was a pseudo-science. As originally conceived this new pseudo-science that grew up in Germany attempted to be a legal revolutionary science. (Laughter.) It attempted to obey the law which says that revolutions shall not be made. (Laughter.) And LaSalle and his followers developed in this fashion. It was illegal to say that the bourgeois state should be destroyed. Therefore, they would not say it. (Laughter.) They would take advantage of a little phraseology.

It had been advanced by Marx and Engels that the state is the rule of one class by another, and that it has no other function than the repression of one class under the iron heel of another, that its function was to play the part of lessening the tension of the class struggle and dominating by force of arms for the ruling, the propertied class, as it was at that time and is now in all places but Russia; that the state, always the armed organized force for the rule of one class by another, would last just so long as there was a class struggle, that it would be overthrown—the state in the hands of the bourgeoisie would be overthrown—and that the working class would substitute its own organized armed power, which would likewise be a state; that the workers' state would function in such manner in socializing industry, in expropriating property, the means of production and exchange, would act in such a manner as to wipe out class distinction; that there would be no further class distinction, and there being no further class distinction there would be no further need for a state. There being no more class antagonism the state would "ablosen"—would wither away. The LaSalles, the political compromisers who followed LaSalle and used his comparatively innocent perversions to bring about more tragic perversions, they took advantage of that situation, with the real revolutionists exiled, to build up this pseudo

philosophy which held for a cardinal principle that it was not necessary to overthrow the bourgeois state because the bourgeois state would wither away. (Laughter.)

Marxian Concept of Revolution.

The Marxian science was always, while in the hands of Marx and Engels, an anti-state philosophy and the only scientific anti-state philosophy on earth. The Marxian concept of revolution was born of the mouths of cannon and never was a pacifist philosophy. The Marxian science was different from Bakunin's science in vital fashions and the Marxian science has no more relation to the philosophy of the American Socialist party as expounded by Hillquit and Oneal than it has to do with Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. (Hearty laughter and great applause.)

The German Socialist party prospered, prospered beautifully, so to speak. It built up its millions of so-called Socialists in Germany, and they all believed, just as their party and their Second International and all that is associated with them, and all the defenders of Scheidemann believed, that by leaving the bourgeois state, Constitution and fundamental institutions intact—I mean political institutions—that they would be able to go ahead, receive a majority vote, develop bourgeois democracy into Socialism. They took that naive conception that the bourgeois class, armed to the teeth and ready to murder, as you and I know it is, always was, and always will be, when so many votes were cast would give up. (Laughter.) They had the conception that Socialism would be the mere outcome of bourgeois democracy developed much further. You know what it is. Just let it lie and get a little rottener and then it will be Socialism. (Laughter and applause.) They conceived the state to be what Louis Waldman said, "a people's government"—(laughter)—"not quite capitalistic"—"not quite." (Laughter.) They believed in Germany, and their belief filtered out through the world—to America, to France, to England, and, yes, even to Russia. They believed that by its position the state was the protector of both classes of people, that the state was essentially an intermediary between the classes. Its business was to protect the worker, among other things.

Russian Revolt in 1905.

In 1905 there came a revolution in Russia. Marx was dead and Engels was dead, and through the opportunist pseudo-philosophy of the Second International their science was well-nigh dead in the world. But there stood in the Russian Social Democratic party one great, giant man who carried with him the tradition of scientific integrity handed down by Marx, and that man was Vladimir Ulianov—Lenin. Lenin went to the 1905 revolution as Marx went to the Commune of Paris: he went as a scientist, not as a man with a hunch. (Laughter.) He

went there not to tell the 1905 revolution that it ought to be so-and-so, but to examine that revolution under the microscope, so to speak, and to learn from that revolution how revolutions conduct themselves, how human beings under those given circumstances are going to act, not how they should act—how they will act. From the 1905 and 1906 revolution the greatest living scientist, Nicholai Lenin, learned another step in the Marxian science. He learned what form the dictatorship of the proletariat would take, and that form would be the “Sovietskaya Vlast.” I forgot and slipped into the Russian term—I mean the Soviet form of dictatorship of the proletariat.

When Lenin had completed a close study, as a cold-blooded, clear thinking scientist, of the facts of the Russian revolution of 1905 and 1906, he gave to the world the most important scientific principle that has been discovered since 1871, and he discovered it not for one country, not as a freakish happening. He most carefully discarded those peculiar manifestations coming from Russia—typically, peculiarly Russian circumstance—and he found the fundamental principle which can be proven to apply to the human—the human man in revolution.

Differences Between Countries.

When our friend Oneal speaks of differences between countries, I wish that he had been enabled to get hold of the 21 points in the original form published in Moscow: “Publishing Office of the Communist International—Moscow, 1920.” And he would have seen that the third point of the 21 points says, among other things, “In every country where in consequence to martial law or to other exceptional laws the Communists are unable to carry their work lawfully, a combination of lawful and illegal work is absolutely necessary.” If people would simply search the documents of current history instead of their heads, by which I mean their memories of Second International philosophy, they would see that the science of which Lenin is the chief exponent takes account more carefully than does Louis Waldman of the local situations. (Laughter and Applause.)

When after 1906 this law was established, Lenin went to the Bolshevik section of the Socialist party of Russia, and he advanced this discovery of a law, and he said, “I advocate its incorporation, its advocacy, in the program of our party,” and in 1907 it was incorporated as a basic principle of Marxian science in the accepted thesis of the Bolshevik section of the Russian Socialist party, that the dictatorship of the proletariat would manifest itself in the form of the Soviet power.

And after that, after, in 1907, 13 years ago, that great party that now rules Russia had officially proclaimed that, we find the leader of the American Socialist party, Morris Hillquit, publicly stating an absolutely

false thing, that the Bolsheviks did not think of the Soviet power until they found they could not get elected in the Constituent Assembly. (Laughter and applause.)

Greatest Event in History.

In 1917 came the greatest event in the history of mankind since civilization's dawn, the Russian revolution.

The bourgeoisie, seeing the Russian Czar fall, undertook to hold power, and they could not hold power because the working class was aroused. The class struggle made impossible that the bourgeoisie could hold directly, and they looked about, and the bourgeoisie discovered—discovered a great scientific law of bourgeois philosophy (laughter), and that is this—that when you want to rule workingmen in slavery nowadays you cannot rule directly—you must get a yellow Socialist. (Hearty laughter and tremendous applause.) They called for a Socialist, Alexander Kerenski (laughter). I know him personally, and he is a nice young man. (Laughter.) He is as honest as you or I, or as Comrade Oneal, and Alexander Kerenski believes, like Comrade Oneal, in democracy. But he believes that the state rules for all men alike. Alexander Kerenski tried to hold the helm of the ship of state, and when he tried to rule for all alike he learned a law of sociology for the bourgeoisie and for the workers alike, and that is this: that he could not rule for two classes; that the very ruling meant ruling for one and keeping the other down. (Applause.)

Problems That Kerenski Faced.

And Alexander Kerenski, when he began to rule, found Russia tied up with strikes, and then he had to face the problem that Comrade Oneal will have to face when he is called to Congress some day, and that problem is this: "Will you uphold the bourgeois state or will you not?" And Kerenski took the position that as a democrat he must uphold democracy. He went ahead, and holding up democracy meant what? Shooting the strikers! Yes, an idealist, Kerenski, did not want to hurt a human being—shooting strikers to uphold democracy! And Kerenski learned that there was but one choice. It was the choice between the dictatorship of the proletariat or the absolute iron dictatorship of the wealthy class. He ruled for the wealthy class and the workers were weaned away by—not the glib tongue of a Lenin or a Trotzky from the Bronx (laughter)—they were weaned away by the bullets of Kerenski's troops. They learned in bitter experience that the working class has either to submit and lie on its face, or it has to make its insatiable rival class get down upon its face upon the ground. The working class followed the scientist, Lenin, and it followed him to the greatest victory the human race has

ever won. Through this triumph the world was transformed. I was fortunate enough to see close at hand the phenomenon. It took me long to understand it. I made mistakes. I think at last I get its essentials.

Went from Russia to Germany.

I went from Russia to Germany, and there I saw the same thing, with a different outcome. I saw the philosophy of Kerenski—of Kerenski, of Oneal (Laughter and applause), of Hillquit, of Hillquit, of Waldman (Laughter. I saw the bourgeois class call for a Socialist to come and hold the helm that they could not hold. A German wealthy bourgeois told me that the German revolution would have been a success for the proletariat if they had not had a Socialist to take the helm. (Great applause.) After my friend and your friend—Comrade Karl Liebknecht, had been struck down—after his skull was cracked by the orders of Comrade Noske (Cries of “Shame!”)—after 10,000 German men and women workers had been killed upon the sidewalks of Berlin, the working class of Germany has learned that nothing on earth can defeat the revolution and the workers except Socialists that are not Socialists. (Great Applause.) And the French workers learned it too, and the British are beginning to learn. The Italians learn, and when they learn they turn away—away, away, away, from Scheidemann, from Kerenskiism and from the honest but sincerely mistaken Onealism (laughter and applause), and they advance in a world-wide single battlefield, they advance to the tune of the Internationale, and they call their formation the “Third International.” (Applause.) And when the Scheidemanns see it, when the Kerenskis see it, and the Cachins, and all the rest, including Oneal and Hillquit and Waldman, when they see it—the workers will follow nothing any more except the Third International—they go ahead—they go ahead—they say, “Let us go in too. Let us join the Third International.”

Voice of the Workers' Revolution.

And then the majestic voice of the workers' revolution is raised and it says, “No!” It says, “Workers of the world you can not accept a non-Socialist, a Scheidemann, a man who defends Scheidemann from this platform—you cannot accept them into your International, because that alone is the thing which can strew the streets of this and all other cities of the world with the mangled forms of workers, killed, slaughtered, as Noske slaughtered in the interest of ‘democracy.’”

They believe in it—they believe in social pacifism, and believing in social pacifism means to prevent the working class revolutions, in the name of “no violence,” to enforce, to uphold the bourgeois state. (Deafening and prolonged applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Oneal will now open the rebuttal with 15 minutes. (Applause.)

Emotionalism and Understanding.

MR. ONEAL: Mr. Chairman, Comrade Minor, Comrades: If emotional enthusiasm is calculated to create a world revolution and to support the 21 demands of the Third International, Comrade Minor is a tremendous success. (Laughter and applause.) Please don't take my time. Comrade Minor has not answered a number of vital questions that I brought out in my previous address (Applause): First, Has the Third International, particularly in the three fundamentals I mentioned, adopted Bakunin or Marx? We have no answer to that question. I have no answer on Marx's position regarding conspiracy, that it is proper under certain circumstances to indulge in it, and under other circumstances one is a fool to do it. Comrade Minor simply assumes that the terms of the Third International, are adapted for any and all conditions and all times. He has not answered my proposition that you Comrades in the United States live in a reflected world. You have not known what you believed until you got the latest news from Moscow.

I challenge Comrade Minor to point out a single contribution that has been made by the so-called Left Wing and the Communists to the Third International. The Revolutionary Age, for example, edited by Louis Fraina, in one of its latest numbers was talking about the democratic rights of free speech. And then the news came through from Moscow that that is a petty bourgeois idea. Out with it! Fraina began to talk about petty bourgeois ideas with respect to free speech. You live in a reflected world. You have thought nothing out. You have not analyzed the situation in the United States. You don't know the American proletariat. (Applause.) You don't know its psychology. (Applause.) You don't know its psychology. You don't know its history, and some other history you don't know. Comrade Minor tells us that Marx went to the Paris Commune to study it. That is very bad history. Marx remained in London, never was in Paris during the Commune, and he studied it from London and wrote of the Commune from London. (Laughter.)

Unanswered About John Reed.

I am not answered regarding the admission and the acceptance of the late John Reed as a philosopher and as a representative of the United States and John's supporting the imperial scholar in the White House in 1916. I am not answered why the social patriot Cachin and tool of the French bourgeoisie during the war, running errands for the bourgeoisie in Italy—why he is accepted, and Morris Hillquit, who refused to indorse the war, is rejected as a social patriot in the United States. I present the questions and insist upon an answer and an explanation of these contradictions.

It is true that Marx and Engels both pointed to the Paris Commune as the dictatorship of the proletariat, but what was the Paris Commune?

Was it the seizure of power by a factio nor a clique and using the power against everybody else, including the working class? Not at all.

The Paris Commune held an election upon the basis of universal suffrage, even including the bourgeoisie. Sixty-five communards were chosen against 21 of the opposition, of which 15 were reactionaries, and it was supported strongly by the masses, and among the revolutionaries were men of various opinions. It did not occur to any one group that it had an absolute truth, that it alone was capable of ruling. This was the dictatorship Marx and Engels had in mind.

Stands for Dictatorship of All Workers.

I stand for the dictatorship of the working class in the sense in which they did, not the seizure of power by a clique or a faction, that assumes that it has all information, all knowledge, that it cannot err, but in the sense of every group of the working class interested and supporting the transformation.

I favor all power to the working class, not all power to a handful of dictators, which is something entirely different—all power to the working class, not all power to a clique that assumes to have super-human knowledge, that it is infallible, that it cannot possibly err. Comrade Minor started by saying that he was going to deal in a dialectical manner with these propositions, and by way of verifying or keeping that promise, rather tells us that Socialism has principles that are of universal application, one of them economic determinism—I don't deny it—the second, the class struggle—I don't deny it. I might add to it the production of surplus value. I don't deny it. I would add a fourth—no bourgeoisie coalitions, where the workers get control of any country on the face of the earth.

Certain Universal Principles.

There are certain universal principles that must be established by an international if you are to have unity and if it is to capably represent the international movement. What I do object to, and what Comrade Minor has not answered, is the proposition that an executive committee located in some world capital can lay down the course that a revolution must take in every country of the world, and insist that the revolution must take exactly the same course in every country of the world. I deny that, and I say it is an impossibility for Minor or anybody else to reconcile that view with the dialectical view of the world and its history. I think Comrade Minor, however, was mistaken in describing to me any defense of Scheidemann. I have never, either in The Call or on the platform, anywhere, supported the social betrayers of the working class in Germany or elsewhere, and I want to emphasize that.

Comrade Minor tells us that the state is armed to the teeth. He is correct—(laughter)—and especially the strong, powerful bourgeois

states of the world—not a weak, rotten, corrupt regime like you had in Russia, where the great masses of the army were already moving within a year after the war, moving toward revolt and rebellion, but in England, especially in the United States—yes, the modern capitalistic state is armed to the teeth, and you come here, and you, Comrades, in your enthusiasm and in your sincerity, you advise the working class to get out into the streets and bare their breasts to all the mighty military and police powers that the ruling classes of the United States are able to mobilize inside of 24 hours against the working class. (Applause.) I say to you that it is suicidal, absolutely suicidal.

No Illusions About Bourgeois Democracy.

Democracy—I have no illusions regarding bourgeois democracy. I have written something about it in some of my historical books. Democracy in the United States—I know its limitations, I know its drawbacks. I know how hard it is for the working class to contend with it, but I do say this, Comrades—that either you will choose to work under the forms of freedom, limited though they be, that have come about through historical evolution, either you will do that or else you will take the other route, and relying—because the Russian rotten regime fell to the ground at the first puff from the proletariat—relying upon that fact that it is going to fall here, you are bent upon a road that leads to suicide, and that leads to capitalist reaction and several generations of tragic struggle on the part of the working class.

Co-operate With Rulers Unconsciously.

If the yellow Socialists like Scheidemann and their crowd, if any of them (and many of them have) betrayed their power and permitted their practices and their point of view to be used in the interests of the capitalist class, the ruling class; you follow purposes, you follow aims, you follow a program, you follow tactics that justify the ruling class in establishing the iron heel where it does not prevail as yet. To that extent you co-operate with the reactionary ruling class of the world, although you do it unconsciously. (Applause.) Nor do I believe that the bourgeois state is a popular state. I understand it as an organ of class rule in the sense in which Marx has always discussed the evolution of the state. But nevertheless also I understand that you cannot automatically make history bend to your will. You, unless you adapt yourself to history, history will bend you to its will. Don't forget that. (Applause.)

Minor Closes for Negative.

THE CHAIRMAN: Comrade Minor will now close for the negative with 20 minutes. (Applause.)

MR. MINOR: Comrade Oneal said that I did not answer three questions of his. I did, but as Comrade Oneal either did not hear me or did

not understand, I will repeat the answers. "Has the Third International in these three particulars followed Bakunin or Marx?" My answer is Marx, and I made it very plain. The second, "Marx's position on conspiracy in regard to whether it was to be under all conditions and times or only under particular circumstances." In answer to that, I went so far as to read him out of the official document of the Moscow International just exactly what they said about it. I hope he will take it and read it. I won't take up your time with it further.

Now in the third point he says, "You live in a reflected world. The news from Moscow determines for you what you believe, and there is no single contribution of the Left Wing or the Communist movement to the Third International"—from the United States I believe he means.

Fraina and Free Speech.

Now, he gave an illustration about how Fraina advocated the rights of free speech until he learned from Moscow that that was a petty bourgeois thing to ask. Let me set you right. If a man is a moralist of a theological type, he will do things that he thinks are idealistic. But if he is a modern materialistic revolutionary he will do the things not that are metaphysically moral, but the things that work, and he will take a position for free speech when it is the bourgeois dictatorship that is on top, and he will take a position against free speech for the bourgeoisie, when it is the workers that are on top. (Great applause.) You see, that is a little dialectics. (Hearty laughter.) It is a proven fact, one of the most important of these revolutionary times that that class which holds the press and schools and controls the meeting halls with the right to police and to censor, that class will always control as one unit the majority opinion. That is why we cannot say or print what we please under bourgeois dictatorship.

Socialist Party Called Childish Drivel.

That is why the Socialist party with its childish drivel about getting a majority vote is just stringing along the poor working class, that very small remnant of the working class that has not yet left the Socialist party. (Applause.) They string you along. They tell you you will get a majority some day, when they, if they would think dialectically, (Laughter), would know that with the New York Times selling perhaps one thousand papers to one yellow Socialist daily, with the New York World doing the same, the Herald—in other words, the Socialist press almost amounting to nothing, that the vast majority will always have a bourgeois point of view. When you take the press you take the opinions of men in your hands. That is why Lenin said that he would not advise the workers to wait until they could get the majority to get out from under the stupid culture of the bourgeoisie. That is why he said to the

workers, "Go and take the press and edit it by and for the workers, and then you will have a true working class expression and never before." (Applause.)

Bourgeoisie and Free Press.

Freedom of the press—petty bourgeois drivel! There never was a ruling class that allowed freedom of press for its destroyer, and there never will be. And all that Comrade Oneal can say for the sacred rights of the bourgeoisie to participate in the Soviet government (Laughter) and to have freedom to continue their damnable lies that are dripping with the blood of mortals, all that he can say will never save the bourgeoisie's rights, nor change that fundamental social law that a ruling class does not give liberty to an opponent class, and to deny such liberty is the function, *the* function of government.

Now Karl Marx did not go to Paris. He is right. He wins the debate. (Hearty laughter and applause.) He only studied the records for about two or three years. That is all. (Laughter.)

Now, Comrade John Reed is called before us in the form of an immortal shade and put on trial here for not voting for that bourgeois Allen Benson (Applause) in 1916. If Comrade John Reed was for Wilson, he was at least a few degrees better than he would have been to be for Scheidemann Benson. ("Hear, hear!" and applause.)

The statement is made by Comrade Oneal that it is his fundamental principle that no committee can sit in one center and run the Socialist movement. Then why in hell did Karl Marx found the First International? What is an International? What? What is it but a single organization, and an organization means control from a democratically-selected center, and when I say democratically I mean within the ranks of the organization, not outside. That is one reason why it is necessary to take out of the working class-revolutionary movement Comrades Hillquit and Oneal because we don't want them participating in that democratic control—democratic selection of a center. And they say—they ridicule the revolution—they say it cannot be done, and they say they will come to us afterward and say, "We told you it could not be done." And my reply is, "Then, my dear friends, get out of the Socialist movement. Why do you call yourselves Socialists?" (Great applause.) If you believe that it cannot be done, then why do you call yourself a revolutionary Socialist? (Laughter.)

Says Socialists Lie to Workers.

There is nobody here on this half of the platform (laughter) who has advised the working class to bare its breast to the bayonets of an armed bourgeoisie. No! The fault lies on the other half of the platform, for I tell you that the whole propaganda of the Socialist party

constitutes, no matter how honest they may be, objectively speaking, "obyektivno," as Lenin would say, which amounts to this, that they are lying to the working class unconsciously. With perfect honesty they are lying to them by telling them that they will make a revolution by going to a ballot box, and making them believe that the triggers of the machine guns will be held and not discharged. They make them believe those things which bring destruction—the triumph of the bourgeois.

The German workers have learned that the German Socialist party was a servant party to the bourgeoisie, to herd the workers for them. The Socialist party of America, through its Waldmanns and Orrs and Hillquits and Oneals, is taking a public stand for the laws of the bourgeois state, for the Constitution, pledged—pledged to make of themselves White Guards to fight for repelling the troops of the Third International, if ever there comes a world class war—solely provided that the bourgeoisie will give them an excuse that it is a war for defense (laughter and applause), which excuse has never been lacking since the days of Bismarck.

Minor Criticises Louis Waldman.

Mr. Hillquit says that the Bolshevik International wants an immediate realization of Soviet Government here. It is a pity he would not read that, just as it is a pity he would not read before he speaks, the outstanding fact that the Soviet form was conceived 13 years ago. Now, Comrades, Mr. Waldman (laughter) in the New York Assembly is asked whether he prefers the government of the State of New York to the Soviet Government of Russia, and he says, "By all means." (Laughter.) Mr. Waldman says, when asked whether this is a capitalist government, "Not quite so." (Hearty laughter and applause.) Hillquit asks him, "Is it a government of capitalists?" or something to that effect, to which he replies that it is a people's government. Did he tell the truth? (Cries of "No!") (Voice: "He lost his job.") Why does he tell you so? Why does he tell you so, if it is not true? He tells you so because—(interrupted by various remarks of the audience)—he tells you so because he wants to get his chance—his chance to take the leadership of the bourgeois state—(A Voice: "Why don't you defend the Third International instead of indulging in personalities?")—I can attend to him, don't bother—which has as its purpose—the sole purpose of defeating the objects of the revolutionary working class. It is because those objects will be defeated if the Waldmans get a chance to say that they are in the Third International; that the Third International must protect the working class against the honest stupidity of Waldman by saying, "You shall not enter." But I have gone pretty far—

MR. WALDMAN: You bettcha! (Laughter.)—in saying that there is a likeness between the position of the American Socialist party—not

all of its rank and file, but of its official leaders who have seen fit to expel a very large part of the membership and lose most of the rest (Laughter)—there is a similarity between that party bureaucracy and the party bureaucracy of Scheidemann.

Refers to Seymour Stedman.

If you think I go too far, look at the record of Seymour Stedman in Detroit, where he went into a civil court while 700 odd Communists were under arrest, threatened with 20-year sentences and deportation; and in that civil court Seymour Stedman, candidate for Vice-President of the United States on the Socialist ticket shortly afterwards—Seymour Stedman said: “Those men are guilty of seeking to overthrow the American Government by force and violence.” (Cries of “Shame, shame!”) And I challenge any man to deny it, as I have challenged before. I say that was a civil court, and you will get lawyers’ excuses. But Noske began that way and ended with gutters flowing in Berlin with the blood of the working class for the sake and at the direction of the bourgeoisie.

Now, Comrades, I must close. I suppose Comrade Oneal will have something to say that has not been touched upon by me in his last five minutes. That is the debaters’ art. However, I think you can probably answer what he may say. You may answer it, but he cannot make you fail to see this, that a Socialist party that does not now join the International of the revolution is not a Socialist party. (Great Applause.) It is a servant party of the bourgeoisie, more dangerous than the Democratic or Republican parties. (Great Applause.) And that Socialist party is opposed lock, stock and barrel to the Third International, and it dare not face you and say so, but it comes with the smirking style of a lawyer, and it says to you—its official writers say to you, “We are for the Fourth International, or for the Third with reservations”—reservations that would mean the death warrant to the working class. (Deafening and prolonged applause.)

Oneal Closes the Debate.

MR. ONEAL: Mr. Chairman and Comrades: By way of novelty and getting back to the proposition before us for debate, I want to again call your attention to the fact that Comrade Minor does not answer whether in the adoption of certain fundamentals of the 21 terms, the Third International has been captured by Bakunin rather than Marx. (Applause.) No answer on the matter as to whether conspiracy and secret organization should be followed in all countries under any and all circumstances and the matter of individual responsibility, the childishness, as Marx states, of ascribing the failure of great mass movements because an individual here and there betrayed the people.

Let me say, Comrades, in conclusion that as a Socialist I have never contended that we are going to triumph through the ballot—never have—and if you have studied the movement you will know that long before the Russian Revolution occurred that in every local and branch organization all over the world Socialists always considered and discussed the question: “Will the ruling classes acquiesce in the mandate of the masses at the polls?” It is generally conceded that in most places they will not.

[Mr. Oneal was very much interrupted in his closing speech by Communist adherents, at one time taking his seat, and finally having to appeal to the Chairman and Mr. Minor for order, the remarks below being such as were made between the interruptions.]

(A VOICE: What will you do?) All right, he wants to know what we will do. I will say this, that if the Communists, as they have been, and as they are now doing, rejecting political action and going—(Cries of “They are not! They are not!”)—and going in for secret conspiratory acts, they will justify their own suppression by the masses of the working class who still have a bourgeois psychology.

On the other hand, if we, knowing full well the limitations of this bourgeois democracy, if we take full advantage of it and we do get a mandate from the masses all over the country (VOICE: “Like London!” and laughter)—just a moment—and then the ruling classes refuse to acquiesce in the decision of the masses, then you have a justification for going to the workers and saying that nothing but violence is left to you. (VOICE: “What happened in Albany?”) (A general disturbance occurred at this point which was finally quieted.)

Communists Driven Under Ground.

It is true that the Communists do not openly reject political action, but in practice they take a position that does not leave political action open to them. You know it as well as I do. If after you have appealed to the masses of the country and you have secured a mandate and the ruling classes have repudiated that mandate, you place the ruling classes in the position of repudiating that limited bourgeois freedom that weighs like an Alp upon the brains of the proletariat, and you can then go before them with a justification for any other action that you want.

But you go about it just the other way and you drive your movement underground. You succeed in fomenting and fostering and stimulating and giving a justification for the ruling class to plant the iron heel upon all working class organizations and put before us generations and generations of harsh, bitter, bloody struggles for the working class to be emancipated. (Applause.)

Famous 21 Points of the Third International

“The second congress of the Communist International adopts the following conditions for membership in the Communist International:

“1. The entire propaganda and agitation must bear a genuinely Communistic character and agree with the program and the decision of the Third International. All the press organs of the party must be managed by responsible Communists, who have proved their devotion to the cause of the proletariat.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be talked about as if it were an ordinary formula learned by heart, but it must be propagated for in such a way as to make its necessity apparent to every plain worker, soldier and peasant through the facts of daily life, which must be systematically watched by our press and fully utilized from day to day.

Party Must Control Press.

“The periodical and non-periodical press and all party publishing concerns must be under the complete control of the party management, regardless of the fact that the party as a whole being at that moment legal or illegal. It is inadmissible for the publishing concerns to abuse their autonomy and to follow a policy which does not entirely correspond to the party’s policy.

“In the columns of the press, at public meetings, in trade unions, in co-operatives, and all other places where the supporters of the Third International are admitted, it is necessary systematically and unmercifully to brand, not only the bourgeoisie, but also its accomplices, the reformers of all types.

“2. Every organization that wishes to affiliate with the Communist International must regularly and systematically remove the reformist and centrist elements from all the more

or less important posts in the labor movement (in party organizations, editorial offices, trade unions, parliamentary groups, co-operatives, and municipal administrations) and replace them with well-trying Communists, without taking offense at the fact that, especially in the beginning, the places of 'experienced' opportunists will be filled by plain workers from the masses.

Spurn Bourgeois Legality.

"3. In nearly every country of Europe and America the class struggle is entering upon the phase of civil war. Under such circumstances the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois legality.

"It is their duty to create everywhere a parallel illegal organization machine which at the decisive moment will be helpful to the party in fulfilling its duty to the revolution.

"In all countries where the Communists, because of a state of siege and because of exceptional laws directed against them, are unable to carry on their whole work legally, it is absolutely necessary to combine legal with illegal activities.

"4. The duty of spreading Communist ideas includes the special obligation to carry on a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the army. Where this agitation is forbidden by laws of exception it is to be carried on illegally. Renunciation of such activities would be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the Third International.

Systematic Agitation Urged.

"5. It is necessary to carry on a systematic and well planned agitation in the country districts. The working class cannot triumph unless its policy will have insured it the support of the country proletariat and at least a part of the poorer farmers, and the neutrality of part of the rest of the village population. The Communistic work in the country is gaining greatly in importance at the present time.

"It must principally be carried on with the help of the revolutionary Communist workers in the city and the country who have connections in the country. Renunciation of this work or its transfer to unreliable, semi-reformist hands is equal to renunciation of the proletarian revolution.

"6. Every party that wishes to belong to the Third International is obligated to unmask not only open social patriotism,

but also the dishonesty and hypocrisy of social pacifism, and systematically bring to the attention of the workers the fact that, without the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, no kind of an international court of arbitration, no kind of an agreement regarding the limitation of armaments, no kind of a 'democratic' renovation of the League of Nations will be able to prevent fresh imperialistic wars.

Must Break With Reformism.

"7. The parties wishing to belong to the Communist International are obligated to proclaim a clean break with the reformism and with the policy of the 'center' and to propagate this break throughout the ranks of the entire party membership. Without this a logical Communist policy is impossible.

"The Communist International demands unconditionally and in the form of an ultimatum the execution of this break within a very brief period. The Communist International cannot reconcile itself to a condition that would allow notorious opportunists, such as are now represented by Turati, Kautsky, Hilferding, Hillquit, Longuet, MacDonald, Modigliani, et al., to have the right to be counted as members of the Third International. That could only lead to the Third International resembling to a high degree the dead Second International.

"8. In the matter of colonies and oppressed nations a particularly clear-cut stand by the parties is necessary in those countries whose bourgeoisie is in possession of colonies and oppresses other nations.

"Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International is obligated to unmask the tricks of 'its' own imperialists in the colonies, to support every movement for freedom in the colonies, not only with words but with deeds, to demand the expulsion of its native imperialists from those colonies, to create in the hearts of the workers of its own country a genuine fraternal feeling for the working population of the colonies and for the oppressed nations and to carry on a systematic agitation among the troops of its own country against all oppression of the colonial peoples.

"9. Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International must systematically and persistently develop a Communistic agitation within the trade unions, the workers' and shop councils, the co-operatives of consumption and other mass organizations of the workers.

“Within these organizations it is necessary to organize Communist nuclei which, through continuous and persistent work, are to win over the trade unions, etc., for the cause of Communism. These nuclei are obligated in their daily work everywhere to expose the treason of social patriots and the instability of the ‘center.’ The Communist nuclei must be completely under the control of the party as a whole.

“10. Every party belonging to the Communist International is obligated to carry on a stubborn struggle against the Amsterdam ‘International’ of the yellow trade unions. It must carry on a most emphatic propaganda among the workers organized in trade unions for a break with the yellow Amsterdam International. With all its means it must support the rising international association of the Red trade unions which affiliate with the Communist International.

Must Watch Parliamentarians.

“11. Parties wishing to belong to the Third International are obligated to subject the personnel of the parliamentary groups to a revision, to cleanse these groups of all unreliable elements, and to make these groups subject to the party executives, not only in form but in fact, by demanding that each Communist member of Parliament subordinate his entire activities to the interests of genuinely revolutionary propaganda and agitation.

“12. The parties belonging to the Communist International must be built upon the principle of democratic centralization. In the present epoch of acute civil war the Communist party will only be in a position to do its duty if it is organized along extremely centralized lines, if it is controlled by iron discipline, and if its party central body, supported by the confidence of the party membership, is fully equipped with power, authority and the most far-reaching faculties.

“13. The Communist parties of those countries where the Communists carry on their work legally must from time to time institute cleansings (now registrations) of the personnel of their party organization in order to systematically rid the party of the petit bourgeois elements creeping into it.

Must Support Soviets.

“14. Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International is obligated to offer unqualified support to every Soviet republic in its struggle against the counter-revolutionary forces.

The Communist parties must carry on a clean-cut propaganda for the hindering of the transportation of munitions of war to the enemies of the Soviet Republic; and furthermore, they must use all means, legal or illegal, to carry propaganda, etc., among the troops sent to throttle the workers' republic.

"15. Parties that have thus far still retained their old Social Democratic programs are now obligated to alter these programs within the shortest time possible and, in accordance with the particular conditions of their countries, work out a new Communist program in the sense of the decisions of the Communist International.

"As a rule the program of every party belonging to the Communist International must be sanctioned by the regular Congress of the Communist International, or by its executive committee.

"In case the program of any party is not sanctioned by the executive committee of the Communist International, the party concerned has the right to appeal to the Congress of the Communist International.

Congress Rules Are Binding.

"16. All decisions of the Congress as of the Communist International, as well as the decisions of its executive committee, are binding upon all the parties belonging to the Communist International. The Communist International, which is working under conditions of the most acute civil war, must be constructed along much more centralized lines than was the case with the Second International.

"In this connection, of course, the Communist International and its executive committee must, in their entire activities, take into consideration the varied conditions under which the individual parties have to fight and labor, and only adopt decisions of general application regarding such questions as can be covered by such decisions.

"17. In connection with this, all parties wishing to belong to the Communist International must change their names. Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International must bear the name: Communist party of such and such a country (section of the Third Communist International). The question of name is not only a formal matter, but is only to a high degree a political question of great importance.

"The Communist International has declared war upon the whole bourgeois world and all yellow Social Democratic parties. It is necessary to make clear to every plain workingman the difference between the Communist parties and the old official 'Social Democratic' and 'Socialist' parties that have betrayed the banner of the working class.

Must Print All Documents.

"18. All the leading press organs of the parties of all countries are obligated to print all important official documents of the executive committee of the Communist International.

"19. All parties that belong to the Communist International, or that have applied for admission to it, are obligated to call, as soon as possible, but at the latest not more than four months after the second congress of the Communist International, a special convention for the purpose of examining all these conditions.

"In this connection the central bodies must see to it that all the local organizations are made acquainted with the decisions of the second congress of the Communist International.

"20. Those parties that thus far wish to enter into the Third International, but have not radically changed their former tactics, must see to it that two-thirds of the members of their central committees and of all their important central bodies are Comrades who unambiguously and publicly declared in favor of their parties' entry into the Third International before the second congress of the Communist International.

"Exceptions may be allowed with the approval of the executive committee of the Third International. The executive committee of the Communist International also has the right to make exceptions in the cases of the representatives of the center tendency named in paragraph 7.

"21. Those party members who, on principle, reject the conditions and these laid down by the Communist International are to be expelled from the party.

"The same thing applies especially to delegates to the special party convention."



T**HIS** book was printed by the New York Call Printing Company, 112 Fourth Avenue, New York City, composed of 102 Socialist organizations, 123 Labor Union bodies, 244 Fraternal organizations and 5000 individuals. The company prints *The New York Call*, the only English daily working class newspaper in the east.

The New York Call Printing Company is equipped to print everything from a postage stamp to magazines or newspapers, and is not conducted for personal profit, all surplus earned being used to strengthen and better a working-class press.

Give us a chance to estimate on your work, no matter how small or large.