

THE COMMUNIST

ALL POWER TO THE WORKERS!

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF AMERICA

VOL. II., NO. 4

MAY 1, 1920

PRICE FIVE CENTS

HAIL TO THE SOVIETS!

May Day Proclamation by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of America

Workers of America:

Eighteen months have passed since the imperialist nations of the world signed the armistice agreement which was to bring to an end the slaughter of millions of workingmen upon the battlefields of Europe.

You were told that this was a war of democracy against autocracy. You were told that out of the bloody struggle would come a better world for you. You were urged to give your labor without stint and to sacrifice your lives without question, so that the cause of "right" and "justice" might triumph.

For a year and a half the representatives of Allied imperialism have been in control of the affairs of the world. Wielding power such as few men have possessed in the history of mankind, Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and their lesser satellites, have reshaped the world in harmony with their ideas of "democracy" and "justice."

What has been the result of their labor, workers of America? What have the imperialist masters of the world achieved for you and for the workers of the world?

Have the glowing promises through which they tricked you into supporting their imperialist war been kept? Have they rebuilt the world upon the new foundation through which they told you the useless slaughter of the flower of the youth of the nations would be ended? Have they changed the conditions under which you gain your livelihood, broken the strangling grip of the exploiters upon your throat and made your lot more bearable?

MAY DAY—Labor's International Holiday—is approaching. On May Day the revolutionary workers of the world will count their gains and losses; they will renew their courage and determination by recounting their victories and pay tribute to those that have fallen as martyrs to their cause.

Dare you, workers of America, face the facts of the promises and performances of your masters, the exploiters, to whom you have in the past given your support?

Eighteen months have gone since your masters won their victory for "democracy" and "justice." Look abroad in the world and witness their achievement!

The war is at an end and but war still goes on. On two continents, on many battlefields, men are fighting. The threat of war and yet more wars hangs over the people of almost every country of Europe and America. Imperialistic ambition and greed—the desire to secure new economic resources for exploitation, which is the characteristic of every capitalist nation—are creating new jealousies and conflicts and continually threaten to again precipitate the people of these countries into the abyss of universal slaughter.

The economic system of Europe is in a state of collapse. The strivings of the "statesmen" at Paris have failed to put this machinery in order. The

efforts of the "statesmen" have proven fruitless in the face of the contradictions of capitalist production which are destroying the system. All over Europe the workers are starving because the machinery of capitalist production cannot be set in motion again.

Financially the entire structure of the capitalist system faces collapse. Money is becoming valueless in many countries of Europe because of the inflation during the war and in the United States prices mount ever higher. The government has issued paper money and others forms of obligation and destroyed the wealth these represent and consequently the value of money has depreciated. The financiers of the world see their danger, but yet they can find no remedy. Capitalism destroys itself.

Workers of America, you have not thus far felt hunger, misery and suffering to the extent of your brothers in Europe. But already your masters are warning you. The black clouds are on the horizon and the men who know the financial and industrial conditions are forecasting that by fall the United States will be in the grip of a panic which will bring industrial depression, unemployment for millions, with the consequent suffering and misery.

This is the reality of the "better world" with the capitalist and their tools deluded you into fighting their battles. In place of a "better world" economic breakdown and wide-spread misery and suffering. In place of "democracy" and "justice" the brutal oppression of the workers as in the steel strike and the miners strike.

There is only one way in which the workers can save themselves from the consequences of the breakdown of the present economic system. Capitalism has played its part in the history of mankind. It is no longer workable. It must be uprooted and destroyed and a new system of industry built in its place. This is the historic task of the working class.

The work of destroying international capitalism has already begun through the splendid achievements of the workers of Russia. Consider Russia and the Communists who control the Soviet Government and contrast it to the capitalist nations and their statesmen!

The Soviet Government was established in Russia after the old regime had brought about the complete collapse of the economic system in that country. In Russia the chaos existed toward which the capitalist system is tending everywhere. While in the capitalist nations things are going from bad to worse, the Communists of Russia are reconstructing the social and industrial system of that country. Attacked by the capitalist imperialists of the world, they organized the Red Army, which has been victorious on every front. While fighting the battle against counter-revolution and hemmed in on all sides by the blockade of the Allies, they have still been able to

achieve wonders in the work of rebuilding and reconstructing the economic life of the nation so as to end exploitation and secure the necessities of life, education and recreation to those who work.

The means through which the workers have outed their exploiters and carried on the work of reconstruction is the Soviet Government, through which is expressed the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The workers found that they could not exercise their power through the government machinery of their exploiters. They found that the state machinery of their exploiters, whether it appeared in the shape of the autocracy of the Czar or in the shape of a so-called democratic parliamentary government such as we have in the United States, was an instrument for their oppression which they must replace by their own institution of government before they could use their power and destroy capitalism.

The Soviets—Workers Councils—are the natural expression of the power of the workers. When the workers of Hungary wrested power from their exploiters they did so through the Soviets. When the workers of Bavaria achieved their victory it was through the Soviets. In Germany the workers found that Moderate Socialism of the Ebert-Scheidemann type and the militarist autocrats are equally their enemy and are fighting against both for the establishment of a Soviet Government.

Workers of America, you must join in the Revolutionary Struggle of the Workers of the World if you would emancipate yourselves from capitalism. The parties of your enemies the capitalists—the Republican and Democratic party—have proven to you that they stand for your oppression and exploitation. Labor parties, Moderate Socialism such as that of the Socialist Party, and the reactionary trade unions are

merely the new tools through which the capitalists maintain their power when they can no longer dupe you by the old methods. *You must break the power of the capitalists.* You cannot compromise with them as do the Labor Parties, the Moderate Socialists and the reactionary Trade Unionists.

You must develop your power through engaging in the present struggles against the capitalists. The general political strike is the means of expressing your power and the beginning of the revolutionary struggle which will finally establish the Soviet Government and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

While in this country we are not ready for the final struggle, the Communist Party of America calls you to show your power on May Day.

There are in the prisons of the United States hundreds of political and industrial prisoners whose only offense is that they fought the battles of the workers. Shall they rot behind steel bars forever? Other thousands are to be imprisoned and deported as the result of the effort of the capitalist government to destroy the revolutionary movement in this country. Are these workers to be removed from the class struggle? *What do you mean?*

Strike for the release of all political and industrial prisoners on May Day. Close the shops and factories. Demonstrate your power.

Demand the freedom of those who are imprisoned for fighting the battles of the working class.

Make the slogan of the day *All Power to the Workers!*

Hail to freedom for all political and industrial prisoners.

HAIL TO THE POLITICAL STRIKE.

HAIL TO THE SOVIETS AND THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT.

AN OPEN LETTER TO EUGENE V. DEBS

Issued by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of America
Dear Comrade Debs:

A year ago you were taken from our midst by the enemies of the working class and thrust into Atlanta Penitentiary—with head unbowed—hurling defiance at the Capitalist Government—the very incarnation of the proletarian revolution in America.

All through the war, while the leaders and officials of the Socialist Party were betraying the class struggle and making a hollow mockery of the St. Louis Resolution, you stood like a rock for International Socialism and against the capitalist-imperialist world war. Later, when the Bolsheviks conquered power in Russia and set up a dictatorship of the workers and peasants, you, Comrade Debs, came out for them in ringing words—while the officials and leaders of the Socialist Party were busy discrediting the idea of proletarian dictatorship as the means of overthrowing capitalism. You also came out openly for the Liebknecht-Luxemburg Spartacan revolt against the Ebert-Scheidemann bourgeois

government, while the official Socialist Party was, and is, defending those traitors and their government as "Socialist."

All your life you had championed the cause of the working class—all your life you had espoused the class struggle and the principles of International Socialism. Not without reason did the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) in issuing the call for the formation of a New International, invite "the left elements of the Socialist Party of America under the leadership of Eugene V. Debs" to send delegates to Moscow.

Your article in the February, 1919, "Class Struggle," and of the organs of the Left Wing, of which you were one of the editors—THE DAY OF THE PEOPLE—was one of the factors aiding this revolt. We shall quote the last part of it in order to refresh your memory: "The reign of capitalism and militarism has made of all the people inflammable material. They are

(Continued on page 7)

Editorial Page of the Communist

May Day 1920

The proclamation issued by the Third International calling for a May Day Demonstration Strike for Peace with Soviet Russia, marks a new epoch in the world-revolutionary movement, and also marks a new policy in proletarian tactics with regard to aiding Soviet Russia.

Before the advent of the Third International, May Day had lost whatever of revolutionary significance and character given to it by its promoters. It was intended to be a day of general strike all over the world—it was intended to be a day when the international proletariat would raise the threat of revolution before the eyes of the Master Class—but, instead of trying to give revolutionary character to this Day of Promise, the defunct Second International consciously turned it into the channels of speech-making and merry-making and away from revolutionary practice. This corrupting policy corroded every principle and theory of the class struggle, until Capitalism, class-conscious to the core, incorporated not only May Day demonstrations into its normal life, but the whole Second International movement as well.

But the rise of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia, the establishment of a Soviet-Republic—the formation of a new Communist International, free from the corrupting influences of the old International, has changed the course of the international revolutionary movement and turned it back into

Today, the Third International, vanguard of the class-conscious proletariat of the world, is calling for a Demonstration Strike for Peace with Soviet Russia—and the working class of the world are thrilled with the message and making ready to respond by the tens of millions to this rallying cry of revolution.

The European proletariat are preparing feverishly for this day. Crushed, starving, degraded by the infinite tragedy of the late world war, they mean to end the rule of Capitalist-Imperialist exploitation and set up workers' republics in place of the bourgeois republics and monarchies that guide and shape the destinies of humanity today. The International Demonstration Strike for Peace with Soviet Russia on May Day will be the first step in this direction.

May Day 1920 will be the beginning of the realization of the hopes and aspirations of the European masses.

But what of the American workers? Are they ready to strike a blow for Peace with Soviet Russia—are they ready to strike a blow for their own emancipation—are they ready to follow in the foot-steps of their European comrades?

Are the American workers satisfied with their conditions and with their government?

Are you satisfied with your "high wages" which cannot even buy enough food for your wives and children?

Are you satisfied with your government's use of injunctions, troops and machine-guns to break your strikes?

Are you satisfied with your government's intervention and blockade of Soviet Russia?

Are you satisfied with your government's attacks, raids, deportations and

jailings of workers who dare to fight openly *IN YOUR FIGHT*—in your struggle with the enemies of your class?

Are you satisfied with the cost of food—the high rents—the cost of clothes? Are you satisfied with your miserable wages—with the miserable increases which your labor fakers have "procured" for you—are you?

Are you satisfied to continue to toil with sweat and blood to fill the pockets of your bosses, your union grafters and your government officials, who use that stolen wealth which you create to crush you and starve you and shoot you when you go out on strike?

Are you satisfied to stand idly by while this gang of international murderers destroys the only working class government in the world—the Soviet Republic of Russia?

You are not. We know you are not. We know you are stirring. We know you are discontented. We know you are striving blindly to change this state of things. But you don't know where or to whom to turn.

Everybody you have trusted has betrayed you.

Wilson has betrayed you.

The Government has betrayed you.

The American Federation of Labor, supposed to be your union, has betrayed you.

The newspapers, the church, the professors, the liberals, the reformers have all betrayed you.

Even the Socialist Party has betrayed you.

Where shall you turn?

If you want to be free, if you want to get rid of this rotten capitalist government; if you want to help your worker-comrades in Russia to maintain their great working class government; rise to the true status of men and women; turn to the Communist party of America, the only party which aims at the destruction of this damnable capitalist government and the establishment of the Communist Society, through the dictatorship of the working class.

Do you want to own and control the industries in which you work?

Do you want a workers' government in America?

Do you want a Soviet Republic of the United States, in which you, the workers, rule?

Show your solidarity, your strength, your determination to act like soldiers of the working class revolution when the time comes—stop work on May Day—quit your shops and factories and mines and stores—pour out on the streets by the millions and show your enemies that you are demonstrating for peace with Soviet Russia.

The Party Crisis

The Communist Party is facing its first internal crisis. On the surface it seems to be nothing more than a "revolt" against the authority of the Central Executive Committee. If that were the real reason, or the only reason, the situation would not be serious. But underneath the surface there is basic disagreement with the very policies and tactics of the Communist Party itself, as laid down at its first convention. The cleavage goes down into the very structure and foundations of the Communist Party.

The statement prepared by the Central Executive Committee and printed elsewhere in this issue, outlines these fundamental differences. We do not intend to deal with them here. What we do want to point out is the larger aspects of this cleavage as it affects the course of the Communist movement, its propaganda and agitation in the United States.

The question resolves itself to this—what kind of propaganda shall the Communist Party of America promulgate to the workers in this country?

When we have answered this question, all others will be answered—the form of organization, its aims and method of achieving those aims.

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

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

"We must not isolate ourselves from the masses." That has been the cry of the Second International in the last decade and especially during the world-war. And in attempting not to "isolate" themselves from the masses they were drawn into the vortex of imperialist ambitions—because they kept too close to the masses and followed them to their own destruction.

That is the struggle between the two wings of the Communist Party of Germany today. The very same. One group retains its representation in the bourgeois Ebert government "betriebsrate" (Workers Councils) on the plea that it does not want to "isolate itself from the masses"; the other, calls for the Communists to withdraw from these bourgeois government institutions and urge the formation of revolutionary Workers Councils free from the curse of government control.

In England today, there are four Communist groups which have been negotiating for unity into one Communist Party for more than a year, but as yet without success. What has prevented the unity of these four groups? The British Socialist Party refuses to withdraw from the Labor Party on the plea that it does not want to "isolate itself from the masses."

So we see that this internal struggle within the Communist Party of America is not peculiar to this country alone. It is evidently a universal phenomenon which appears in all revolutionary movements at a certain stage of their development.

This cry of "contact with the masses" holds in itself the seeds of future compromise, vacillation and betrayal. It is the cry of confusionists and sentimentalists who seem to think that a Communist Party must have "contact with the masses" at all stages of its development. They do not see, that if they attempt to run after the masses, at a time when the masses are not ready for them, they will, in their zeal, reduce Communism to a theory and practice that will meet with the approval of the politically immature masses. They will compromise principles and tactics in order to get "contact with the masses."

Is it necessary to have "contact with the masses" at all times? Let us put the case more concretely. Is it absolutely necessary to have "contact with the masses" in America at the present time, when the economic and political forces are as yet undeveloped to bring with it that degree of class-conscious and revolutionary faith which will compel the masses to accept Communism?

For what will happen if we sacrifice our Communist policies (as the "secessionists" are willing) in order to get this contact?

Of course, our opponents will say that they defy us to show them where they intend to sacrifice Communist policy in order to get this "contact with the masses." Well, we shall show them.

The leaders of the "secessionists" have expressed themselves already, unwittingly perhaps, on this very question.

They have stated in the course of discussions in the Central Executive Committee—as a close reading of their articles and leaflets will substantiate,—that a real vital fundamental difference existed as to their conception of mass action, and as to the manner of propagating it to the workers. They have stated openly, that there are times when it is advisable to keep silent on the USE OF FORCE (armed revolution and civil war) as the means of overthrowing the capitalist state.

There you have the deadly seeds of compromise and opportunism already germinating in the Communist movement. There are times, they say, when it is advisable to propagate the USE OF FORCE and there are times when it is best to keep silent. Undoubtedly, one of the times to keep silent, is when you are trying to get "contact with the masses," before they are ready to accept the full implication of Communist theories and tactics!

And when the Communist Party is swamped with these politically immature masses, they will clog and hamper the revolutionary effectiveness of the Communist Party, holding it back when the time for real action arrives. These masses flocking to the party when it was silent on the necessity of the USE OF FORCE to overthrow the bourgeois state will refuse to accept that tactic when the revolution comes. It will mean that these masses, having not yet cut the Gordian knot which binds them

(Continued on page 8)

STATEMENT TO THE MEMBERSHIP

ISSUED BY THE CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

COMRADES:

The Communist Party is in crisis. A grave danger confronts it from within, unless you stand firm against the disruptive tactics of a small group of "secessionists." The Executive Secretary and two members of the C. E. C. have organized a "revolt" against the Central Executive Committee elected by the Convention.

This dastardly crime has been committed at a time when all arrangements for a convention were about to be consummated. We never were, and are not now, for unity at any price, but in view of fundamental differences that do exist—the only place to settle such differences is at a convention—and not by attempting to create a split just before such convention.

At this critical time, while the party has not yet fully recovered from the blows rained upon it by the government—while we are still consolidating and solidifying our forces for propaganda and agitation—when our enemies from all sides are seeking our destruction—disruptive forces from within have organized a "secession" movement led by the Executive Secretary of the Communist Party.

The Central Executive Committee—handicapped by almost insurmountable difficulties—has been occupied with the task of reuniting the shattered fragments and building up a strong, effective underground organization—only to find that the forces of disruption and disorganization have raised their heads within the party itself.

There is not a particle of justification for this "secession" at the present time with a convention so near. A revolutionary organization, such as the Communist Party, aiming at the destruction of the highly centralized capitalist system must itself have a high degree of centralization and revolutionary discipline. Its Central Executive Committee must be highly centralized. Any attempt to weaken the Central Executive Committee is a blow at the party itself.

Nevertheless, your Central Executive Committee dealt with this "secession" in the most conciliatory spirit. Rather than precipitate a split in the rank, at this time, your Central Executive Committee did all in its power to avert this calamitous situation consistent with Communist principles and policies. But to no avail. The "secessionists" were determined upon forcing the issue. Their policy was rule or ruin.

What was the question upon which the "secessionists" could not wait until a convention and bolted the C. E. C.?

It was simply a question concerning the authority of the Central Executive Committee—which the "secessionists" themselves dare not challenge.

The Executive Council, elected by the C. E. C. to function during the sessions of the C. E. C. as governing and executive head of the Communist Party, had attempted to discipline one of its agents, the Chicago District Organizer, appointed by the C. E. C. for misrepresenting the views and working in opposition to the Central Executive Committee. The Executive Secretary threatened, that if this decision was carried out, he would withdraw from the Council, remain as Executive Secretary and Acting Party Editor and hold all funds, records and property in his possession.

Faced with this anomalous situation, the Council called for a special meeting of the Central Executive Committee to settle the controversy.

At the C. E. C. meeting—just as the discussion had begun—the Executive Secretary, now the spokesman for the "secessionists," handed down an ultimatum, that unless the C. E. C. abrogated its rights and authority until the convention—in other

words—unless the C. E. C. agreed to abolish itself in everything but name—he, together with his followers, would bolt the C. E. C.

To have accepted this ultimatum would have meant desertion of the posts to which the convention had elected us—treason to the rank and file—and a betrayal of Communist principles and policies which we had been elected to safeguard.

However, the C. E. C. did not refuse to negotiate with the "secessionists"—it did not refuse to take all the steps compatible with Communist principles and policies to avert the break at this time as the enclosed negotiations will show. But the "secessionists" were determined to split—leaving the C. E. C. but one course to pursue: To proceed with its Communist task entrusted to it by the First Convention of the Communist Party, ignoring entirely the "secessionists" and disrupters. This course the C. E. C. adopted.

It may be stated here that of the 13 members of the C. E. C. present at this meeting, only two members and the Executive Secretary bolted. (Langley, Kosbeck and Damon.) The others remained and immediately upon the departure of the bolters, the C. E. C. resumed its regular sessions with the following C. E. C. members participating: Raphael, Black, Andrew, Bernstein, Sascha, Alden, Bunte, Brown, Reiss and Meyers.

This body, together with the alternates elected at the last convention, who fill vacancies created by the withdrawal of those who had bolted is the only legal Central Executive Committee which can act and speak with authority in the name of the Communist Party of America, and around which should rally all comrades who have the interest and success of the Communist movement in this country at heart.

The above is, in brief, an outline of the controversy upon which the "secessionists" split away, as it appears on the surface.

But, of course, at the bottom of this question of authority of the C. E. C. lie more deep and fundamental differences on Communist policies and tactics. It is obvious that no group within the Communist Party would split away merely because they disagreed with some of the decisions of the C. E. C., or because of its legitimate attempt to enforce discipline upon one of its recalcitrant representatives. A full understanding of these fundamental differences is necessary for a proper conception of a crisis which the party has been facing for a considerable length of time, and which has come now to a climax.

We shall now proceed to analyse these fundamental differences in principles and tactics dividing the majority and minority on the Central Executive Committee.

The controversy dates back to the inception of the Communist Party at its first convention. It is a well-known fact that the "minority" were dragged into the convention much against their will. The revolutionary determination of the rank and file, which could not be denied, was the motive power that drove them into the convention. At the convention itself, many of the decisions were passed against the votes of those who now find themselves in the "minority." No wonder, now, seven months after the convention, this "minority" complains that the convention was "packed."

Among those decisions were two very important ones, which we shall proceed to elaborate as throwing light on the origin of the controversy.

One was the so-called question of "unity" and the other, the question of language federations.

The question of unity, as it came before the convention, was the admission of delegates who had no direct mandate to the

Communist Convention. Again the bitter opposition of the "minority" it was decided not to admit them as full-fledged delegates, but only as fraternal delegates, with a voice but no vote.

The fight on the federation issue, at the convention, centered around the extent of their autonomy. The majority realizing that the language federations—especially the Russian Federations—were the carriers and—as Zinoviev recently expressed it, "the promulgators of the Communist movement in this country"—insisted upon full autonomy for them. The "minority," who came to the convention opposed to the very idea of the existence of language federations within the party, put forth many attempts to destroy this "foreign domination," as they termed it, by abolishing, and when this failed, by limiting their autonomy.

On both of these questions the "minority" were decisively defeated. But, as it is apparent now, they never forget the bitter taste of this defeat; they nursed their bitterness and opposition in silence within themselves, waiting a more propitious time to break out again on those questions.

All through the legal existence of the party no one of the minority raised their voices on either of these questions. The party, and especially the language federations, was too strong—the sentiment of the membership was manifestly against them—and they realized that to fight on those issues at that time meant sure defeat again.

But when the Iron Heel of the Capitalist Government came down upon the party, right after the raids upon its headquarters and meeting places—when the party units were scattered—when the federations themselves were struggling painfully to reunite again their shattered forces—during the transition period between our legal and underground existence—the "minority" saw their long-sought opportunity and grasped it.

Then, like typical Centrists, they raised again the old cry of "unity"—this time, unity with the C. L. P. They shouted it from the house-tops and began to obstruct and hamper the party work by injecting this cry of unity at every opportunity. The minutes of the C. E. C., beginning with January, will show that the first and "most important" order of business at every meeting was the question of "unity," always brought up by one of the "minority." As a matter of fact, all other party work, real constructive work—of which the "minority" boasts so much, was practically sabotaged by their constant injection of this question.

Unity With the C. L. P.

What has been the position, on this question, of the "minority" of the C. E. C., who are now leading the "secessionists"?

Up to the January raids, all of the "minority" voted with the majority of the C. E. C. at different times on this question. After the raids, the "minority" switched and began to carry on a feverish campaign for immediate amalgamation of the Central Executive Committees of both parties (C. P. and C. L. P.).

What was the position of the "majority" on Unity, which the "minority" knew and did not dare refute? Simply this.

Our—the "majority" position was, that mechanical unity, a mere merging of the two Central Executive Committees did not constitute organic, Communist unity. We contended, that the acceptance of our Manifesto and Program by the Executive Committee of the C. L. P. did not mean that their entire membership accepted it. Another prerequisite for the uniting or amalgamating of the two Executive Committees, something more than a professed acceptance of a program only, is necessary. There must be also, fundamental agreement on

organization problems and tactics as well. And since, neither of these prerequisites existed, the amalgamation of the two Executive Committees could only bring confusion and discord into our ranks. Two such differing elements, sitting on one Executive Committee, could only mean that each group would paralyze the other, making all propaganda and agitation impossible, if not worthless. Far better for each Committee to work separately, unhampered one by the other, thus clearly exposing the position of both on fundamental issues and gradually clarifying those issues in the light of conditions as they developed.

We maintain that organic unity of all real Communist elements within both parties could only be effected at a convention—a joint convention—where the delegates representing the rank and file could come together and thrash out the fundamental questions of principles, tactics and organization, and see, if real Communist unity could be achieved. And we further maintained, that prior to such a convention, the party organs on both sides must carry on a discussion and debate on the issues involved, in order to clarify them to the rank and file and aid them in selecting those delegates who agreed with their position.

Instead of amalgamation of the two Executive Committees, the "majority" insisted on a Joint Convention—while the "minority" wanted only to effect an immediate amalgamation, the convention with its discussion of principles and tactics was to them, only incidental.

So logical was our position of a joint convention, that when the "minority" resolution was decisively defeated by a vote of nine to four, the motion of the "majority" was adopted unanimously.

What becomes of the vicious slanders and vilification to which the "majority" were subjected by the "minority"? In their present attacks on the "majority," they are silent on this question; yet, it is a well-known fact, that a great deal of the animosity generated against the "majority" received its impetus from just this question of unity with the C. L. P.

International Relations.

Another fundamental issue which rose to the surface soon after the convention, and constantly grew up since, becoming a great factor in the present crisis in the party, was the question of International Relations and International Delegates.

The "minority" charges the "majority" that a "month after the convention, certain individuals of this 'majority' group became more concerned with the question of obtaining for themselves the opportunity to make a 'junketing trip' to Europe at the party expense than any interest of the party." Aided and abetted by the "majority" group, of course.

It is obvious, of course, that the above "sarcastic" paragraph refers to the sending of the International Secretary and International Delegates to the Communist Congress in Europe. Participation in the Communist International Congress or Conference is, in the opinion of the "internationalists" of the "minority," nothing but "junketing trips" of "international politicians" . . .

Apparently the "minority" agrees with Morris Hilquit that the 3d International is "scarcely more than an idea or a name." They go even further than that—they wish to keep it in that nebulous state, detached from the living, revolutionary world-proletarian movement. This point of view implies an entirely non-Communist conception of the 3d International contrary to the conception of its founders and of the Communist Party of America. This point of

(Continued on page 6)

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST CONFERENCE

LOUIS C. FRAINA, *International Secretary, Communist Party of America*

The Conference of the Communist International, convened in Holland, February 10-17th, was an event of prime importance in the development of the International. In spite of the enormous difficulties experienced by Communists in moving from one country to another, the Conference met; and in spite of the Dutch police breaking up the meetings before our work was completed, the Conference transacted enough of its business to make it of fundamental value—particularly in the development of a Communist International functioning actively and unitedly on a world basis. And in initiating the formulation and discussion of problems of party tactics and immediate action decisive for victory in the final struggle.

Organizations represented in the Conference were as follows: Communist Party of Russia, represented by mandate; Communist Party (Opposition) of Germany; Communist Party of America; Communist Party of Holland, England—British Socialist Party, Workers Socialist Federation, and the Shop Stewards and Workers Committees; Communist Party of Switzerland, and the Communist Group of the Socialist movement of Belgium. In all, sixteen delegates were officially present; in addition, with a voice but no vote: a member of the Communist Party of Hungary, formerly in the Soviet Government there; a Chinese comrade; a representative of the Communist movement of the Dutch East Indies; and Comrades Anton Pannekoek and Herman Gorter. After the Conference was dispersed there arrived delegates from the Communist Party of Germany (Central Committee), the Communist Party of Austria, the Communist Party of Rumania, and the Left Wing of the Socialist Party of Spain. F. Loriot, of the Left Wing of the French Socialist Party, sent a letter expressing regrets at not being able to come, and describing the recent French movement, its prospects and its defeats, particularly lamenting the faith in "the unity of the party" which prevents the emergence of a Communist Party. The delegates who did come but could not participate in the Conference discussed problems with the Executive of the International Sub-Bureau created by the Conference.

Decisions of the Conference.

The Conference, in brief, accomplished:

1. The Conference adopted a declaration on Soviet Russia, calling upon the workers of all countries not to allow peace with Russia to come through capitalist necessity, but to compel peace by means of revolutionary pressure upon the government, urging three methods of action, mass demonstrations of protest, demonstration strikes, and coercive strikes—coercive strikes being the decisive move to compel the acquiescence of the government. The declaration repeatedly emphasized the necessity of action, and authorizes the International Sub-Bureau to issue a call for an international general strike as the situation matures. The declaration, moreover, provides against repeating the fiasco of the July 21st strike initiated by the Socialist Party of Italy, by

a) Instructing the Bureau to establish connection with each country to measure the sentiment prevailing, and insuring a period of intense preparative agitation and organization. b) Providing that the General Strike for Russia shall include political and economic demands in accordance with the revolutionary requirements in each country, thereby making the movement for Soviet Russia an integral part of the immediate revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

c) Avoiding the fundamental mistake of the July 21st strike of working through the bureaucracy of the trade-unions, and urg-

ing that preparations for a general strike shall proceed through the branches of the unions, extra-union organizations (such as the Shop Stewards and the Workers' Committees), and the creation of extra-union organizations if necessary.

2. The Conference adopted a thesis on Unionism, which I prepared and introduced in the name of the Communist Party of America and which was adopted unanimously. This thesis constitutes the first authoritative utterance of the International on the Communist conception of unionism (in general, it agrees with a declaration of G. Zinoviev on Unionism): and it indicates, moreover, that the conception of Unionism developed by the Communist Party of America (which has been misrepresented and stupidly attacked equally by the I. W. W. and the Socialist Labor Party) is the identical conception of the Communist International. This is a summary of the thesis:

a) Unions are necessary organizations for the immediate struggle of the workers: in spite of their limitations they can, particularly as industrial unions, become active means of revolutionary struggle and a factor in the Communist reconstruction of society.

b) The Trades-Unions, while means of resisting and often improving the most degrading conditions of capitalism, are incapable of actually and materially improving the general condition of labor.

c) The Trades-Unions developed during the epoch of small industry, and of intense national economic development (1870-1900) this circumstance, combined with the artisan conception of craft skill being a form of property, produces a property and petty-bourgeois ideology and a concept of limiting the struggle within the limits of capitalism and the nation. The Trades-Unions represented, and still largely represent, the skilled workers in the upper layers of the working class, the aristocracy of labor.

d) The dominant trades-unionism accepts capitalism: and, under imperialism, Capitalism seduces the "aristocracy of labor" with a share in the profits of Imperialism, by means of higher wages, labor legislation, and improved conditions generally: the upper layers of the working class using the Trades-Unions to "stabilize" labor in industry and promote Imperialism.

e) Realizing its economic impotence (and impotence produced by non-revolutionary purposes, archaic craft form of unionism unable to cope with the concentrated industry of modern capitalism) the dominant trades-unionism turns to parliamentary action in the form of Laborism: and, as Laborism, trades-unionism in its dominant expression merges definitely in State Capitalism and Imperialism. The tendency is for Laborism and Socialism to unite.

f) Laborism becomes the final bulwark of defense of capitalism against the oncoming proletarian revolution. Accordingly, a merciless struggle against Laborism is necessary: but while expressing itself politically as Parliamentarism and petty-bourgeois democracy, the basis of Laborism is trades-unionism: the struggle against trades-unionism, therefore, is an indispensable phase of the struggle against Laborism.

g) This struggle against trades-unionism must proceed by means of the Communist Party's general agitation to drive the unions to more revolutionary action, the formation of extra-union organizations such as the Shop Stewards, Workers Committees and economic Workers Councils, the organization of direct branches of the Communist Party in the shops, mills and mines, and the construction of industrial unions.

h) The agitation for, and construction of, industrial unions is a factor of the ut-

most importance in developing Communist consciousness and the final revolutionary struggle. But industrial unionism must recognize its limitations: it must develop the concept in practice, in cooperation with the Communist Party of the general political strike. Industrial Unionism cannot under capitalism organize all the workers or an overwhelming majority: the concept of organizing, under capitalism and gradually, workers' control of industry in terms of industrial unions, is an expression, inverted in form, of the concept of parliamentary acquisition of power gradually and peacefully: the "penetration" of capitalism by Socialism.

i) The objective of the class struggle is the conquest of the power of the state. The industrial unions (or the parliaments) are not the means for conquest of power, but mass action, Soviets and Proletarian Dictatorship. The parliamentary and doctrinaire industrial union (syndicalist) conception evades all actual problems of the revolution.

j) After the conquest of power and under the protection of proletarian dictatorship, industrial unionism comes actually to function in the Communist reconstruction of society in terms of control and management of industry by the industrially organized producers.

3. The Conference adopted a thesis on Social-Patriots and Unity, which I prepared and introduced in the name of the Communist Party and adopted after one amendment strengthening the thesis proposals. The thesis stresses the fact that the Social patriots and opportunists are the worst enemies of the proletarian revolution, with whom there can be no Communist unity or cooperation: and moreover, it particularizes and accomplishes five very definite and practical things:

a) Provides that the Communist International reject the admission of any party or group (such as the Longuet "majoritaires" in France or the American Socialist Party) even should these affiliate with the Third International.

b) Reject definitely the proposals of Jean Longuet, Morris Hilquit and the Independent Socialist Party of Germany for the organization of "another international" to include the social-patriots and opportunists of the Second International "and also" the Bolsheviki and the Communists.

c) Emphasizes the incompatibility of a Communist Party tolerating the Socialist Party of Italy for not expelling its social-patriots and opportunists in the party (indirectly condemning the Socialist Party of Italy for not expelling its social-patriots and opportunists, particularly in the parliamentary group).

d) Uncompromisingly repudiates Communist Party cooperation with the social-patriots or opportunist organizations, with bourgeois or social-patriotic parties, with parties affiliated with the Second International or with the agents of capitalism in the labor movement. (This implies that the Communist Party about to be organized in England by unity of B. S. P., the Socialist Labor Party, Workers Socialist Federation and South Wales Socialist Party, must reject affiliation with the Labor Party—the British Socialist Party favors this affiliation, the others are against).

e) Rejects the concept of Communist unity "in general," urging that unity must be based not upon formal acceptance of general principles but agreement upon fundamental action.

The tendency of the thesis on Social-patriots and Unity is to preserve and strengthen the revolutionary integrity of the Communist International to prevent the International from being swamped under the

onrush of undesirable elements from the Second International.

4. The Conference did not act on the problems of parliamentarism, being dispersed by the police. There were before the Conference three proposals on this problem—a thesis introduced by Anton Pannekoek, a series of amendments introduced by myself in the name of the Communist Party of America, and a resolution introduced by Sylvia Pankhurst (Workers' Socialist Federation of England) the tendency of which was to reject Communist use of parliamentarism. The resolution of Sylvia Pankhurst would have received her own vote and perhaps that of the delegate representing the opposition in the Communist Party of Germany. The original thesis and the amendment would, I think, have been adopted substantially if not actually as proposed: they thus formulate the problem:

a) Parliamentarism is not for the conquest of political power—the proletariat must create its own organs of struggle and of state power, the Soviets and Proletarian Dictatorship. The Communist use of parliamentarism is secondary to the mass struggle of the proletariat, being used for the purpose of agitation only and to emphasize the political character of the class struggle.

b) Even in the epoch of imperialism, when parliaments degenerate in functions and become side-shows, the revolutionary use of parliamentarism and participation in elections is important in mobilizing the proletariat for action and the conquest of power.

c) The tendency to opportunism latent in parliamentarism must be resisted by (1) emphasizing its agitational and secondary character, and (2) rigorous party control of parliamentary representatives and their immediate expulsion should they develop an opportunist or a non-Communist tendency.

d) Limiting the number of public offices for which nominations are made, the limitations to be determined by the conditions in each country (as for example, the Communist Party of America excluding nomination for executive offices of the bourgeois state).

e) In periods of intense class struggle, although not yet revolutionary a temporary abstention from parliamentarism may most effectively promote our revolutionary purposes: in that event, a boycott of the election becomes necessary.

f) In a period of actual revolution the complete repudiation of parliamentarism may become necessary.

While the Communist use of parliamentarism in this sense was insisted upon, the Conference did not make mandatory the acceptance of parliamentarism: in the thesis of social-patriots and unity the condition proposed as the basis of which Communist groups should unite was, mass action, Soviets, proletarian dictatorship, and no compromise (including acceptance of the necessity for a Communist Party as the unifying and directive force in the revolutionary struggle).

5. The Conference devoted a large part of its labors to the problem of organization—of making the International actually function on a world basis, of unifying and centralizing the movement. While the Executive Committee still remains the supreme executive authority, the Conference organized still remains the supreme executive authority, the Conference organized supplementary machinery for purposes of immediate contact, expression and unity.

a) The Conference decided to create an international sub-bureau composed of one delegate from each country (where in a country there is more than one organiza-

tion affiliated with the International, the one vote is divided equally). Meetings of the sub-bureau may be held when there are present representatives of five out of the following countries: England, Germany, France, Italy, Holland, the United States.

b) An Executive Committee was elected composed of Henriette Roland-Holst, S. J. Rutgers and D. I. Wynkoop. The executive is located in Holland: it is to act for the sub-bureau and to issue a bulletin in German, English and French.

c) The Sub-Bureau and the Executive Committee are empowered to complete certain phases of the work of the Conference. Their chief task is to link up the world movement with the Central Executive of the International in Moscow: and to facilitate this task the Conference created two subsidiary bureaus—(a) A Central European Bureau, for activity in Germany, Austria, Poland, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria; (b) the American Bureau of the Communist International, to be organized, provisionally by the Communist Party of America: this bureau to call a Pan-American Conference of Communist organizations at which the bureau is to be organized on a permanent basis. It has since transpired that a representative of the International recently organized a Latin-American Bureau, the machinery of which must be utilized and transformed into the larger activity of the American Bureau of the Communist International through the intervention of our party. The American Bureau is to represent the International on the American continent, unite the movement of Latin-America, the United States and Canada and issue proclamations on affairs and issues immediately concerning the proletariat of the Americas.

d) The Executive Committee is to publish in one volume the reports on the movement in various countries: while the sub-bureau after adequate study of the situation in each country, is to issue a comprehensive declaration on prospects, tactics and action. This declaration on prospects, tactics and action will survey the whole international movement, measure the maturity and relation of forces, interpret revolutionary experience and prospects of revolution, and indicate the phases of immediate struggle most calculated to promote the revolution. In its organization measures the Conference partially met the needs of the International for centralized contact and authority: but the measures are only partial, and the problem still requires serious consideration and action. This task of organization is crucial in the progress of the Communist International.

The Conference and Problems of the International.

A vital phase of the thesis adopted at the Conference is that they provide the material for an answer to many of the problems now agitating the International. Among these problems are: (1) Unionism; (2) the Functions of a revolutionary political party; (3) Shall Communists stay in the old opportunist organizations to "capture" the party, or shall they split; (4) the basis of admission to the Communist International.

1. The split in the Communist Party of Germany is fundamentally, the product of antagonistic conceptions of unionism. The Central Committee of the Party favors working in the old trade-union—"boring from within": and rejects absolutely the agitation for and construction of industrial unions. The opposition favors an intense struggle against the trades-unions, considering the breaking of their power indispensable for the proletarian revolution, urging the agitation for and construction of industrial unions: (the opposition, however, rejects the non-political and non-Communist concepts of the I. W. W., conceiving mass action, Soviets and Proletarian Dictatorships as the means for the conquest

of power). On this problem of unionism, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany holds a position of hesitation, evasion and compromise, justifying its "boring from within" policy on the plea that the trades-unions include the bulk of the proletarian masses, and the Communist Party must not "isolate" itself from the masses,—a plea familiar to the students of the Russian, British and American movements as being, repeatedly used by the Menshevik and the compromiser. This compromise tendency expresses itself in another form by the Communist Party (Central Committee) participating in the Betriebsrate (shop-committees) formed by the government and under direct government control, after dissolving the militant Betriebsrate formed during the revolution: and participation in these government organizations is justified on the plea that "we must not isolate ourselves from the masses." The Central Committee, moreover, argues that, Germany being in a state of revolution, it is futile to develop a program of initiating new forms of industrial organizations which would necessarily require a span of years for its fulfillment, thereby hampering instead of promoting on industrial unionism, as on other problems, considers the *moment* in the struggle, and adapts itself to the requirements of the moment: emphasis varies as conditions vary. The agitation for industrial unionism justifies itself even should actual organization never materialize, in the sense that it is imperative to break the faith of the proletariat in the trades-unions and in the machinery of the trades-unions as means for revolutionary action. In the United States, which is not in a state of revolution, more emphasis is necessary on the organization aspects of industrial unionism than in Germany. The defect in the policy on unionism: and that it is, in tendency at least, compromise, is proven by participation in the government betriebs-rate. The struggle against the trades-unions and for industrial unionism (even should new organizations never materialize) is a necessary factor in developing revolutionary consciousness and struggle. The Conference of the Communist International, in its thesis on Unionism makes a definite answer to the problem.

2. Another fundamental problem concerns the function of a revolutionary political party—of the Communist Party. Two tendencies are apparent: (a) that represented by the British Socialist Party (inherited in spirit from the moderate Socialism from the 2nd International) which maintains that the political party must not "dictate" to the economic movement, the unions to initiate mass action and general political strikes, the Communist Party performing simply the functions of agitation; (b) that represented (but as yet only in tendency) by the Opposition in the Communist Party of Germany, which maintains that the unions (revolutionary) and the political party are equal to each other, over-emphasizing the industrial organizations—a conception which in tendency, particularly when accompanied by rejection of the revolutionary use of parliamentarism, proceeds directly to elimination of the political party. Now it is a fundamental Bolshevik (and Communist) conception that the political party is the spear-head of the revolutionary movement, dominant and decisive in the revolutionary struggle for power. The function of the Communist Party is action, not simply agitation; it must necessarily assume the initiative in developing general political strikes, in mobilizing and directing the mass action of the proletariat for the conquest of political power. The thesis on social-patriots and unity adopted at the Conference proposes four fundamentals on the basis of which Communist groups still in the old opportunist organizations should unite and the first is: "mass action as the fundamental means

for the conquest of power—the Communist Party as the unifying and directive factor in this mass action."

3. The Conference decisively rejected the concept of "unity of the party"—that concept which degrades revolutionary initiative and audacity, and which, at this moment, prevents a Communist Party being organ- by the process of inner transformation. The Communist struggle in an old party stultifies itself if it allows "unity of the party" to penetrate its consciousness; nor must it become a movement to "capture" the party, thereby weakening the struggle to capture the revolutionary masses in the party. The machinery of the old party can never become an adequate means to express our Communist aspirations and tactics; the simple fact of a split, of a decisive break from the old and the creation of a new party in itself contributes enormously to the development of revolutionary ideology and practice. The ideology of "capture" of the party is usually identified with that of "unity of the party"—and each is Menshevik in tendency. To persist in the struggle to "capture" the party and avoid a split means to make an end of the means, to compromise our revolutionary purposes; the "capture" of a party, with the retention of the Centre (and perhaps of the Right) is antagonistic to uncompromising revolutionary practice. Our most dangerous enemy is the Centre; the "capture" of a party (or its ideology) means to agree and unite with the Centre, while to split the party means immediate and rigorous separation from the Centre. The Conference in its thesis on Social-patriots and Unity emphasizes the necessity of rigorous separation of the Communists from the social-patriots and opportunists, urging Communist groups still in the old party organizations to split and unite in the Communist Party—the concept of "unity of the party," which some Communists still cherish is as much a phase of a petty bourgeois ideology of Moderate Socialism as are Reformism and Parliamentarism. This unity of the party" concept dominates the Socialist Party of Italy, preventing the expulsion of the social-patriots and opportunists, and prevents even disciplining the parliamentarians who openly flout the party's revolutionary aspirations and practice. This situation in Italy has its immediate and peculiar reasons, perhaps; but still it is a serious defect produced largely by the concept of "unity of the party."

4. One of the most important and immediate problems is the basis of admission to the International. The problem may be put this way: Communist parties or groups in almost every country have affiliated with the Communist International; but, the old International now being broken in pieces, there are Socialist Parties in some of these countries seeking admission to the Communist International—the Left Wing Independents of Germany, the American Socialist Party, the Left Wing of the Independent Party of England, the Socialist Party of Spain, and others who may seek admission, such as the French Socialist Party (Longuet majoritaires), etc. What shall be done with these? The spirit of the discussions and theses of the Conference mean to double-bolt the door of the Communist International to these undesirable Centre and wavering elements. This answer to the problem is emphasized by two declarations issued recently by the Executive Committee of the International in Moscow, one of the Independent Socialist Party of Germany, the other to the Socialist Party of France, in which these organizations are condemned in severe style, and informed that they are mistaken if they imagine they can enter the Communist International without purging themselves of the social-patriots and the social-traitors—imagine the Socialist Party of France being admitted to the Communist International without having purged

STATEMENT OF THE EX- SEC. TO THE MAJORITY GROUP OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Comrades:

At the meeting of the Executive Council on Tuesday I withdrew from further participation in the meeting when the Council made a decision which I considered an effort to bolster up the control of a certain group in the Council at the expense of creating a situation which might result in the disruption of the party.

Before stating the course of action which it is my intention to follow, I wish to review the circumstances which lead up to this decision.

After the recent meeting of the Central Executive Committee opposition to the decisions of the majority group of the committee developed in the Chicago District. This movement, as expressed by the Chicago District Committee, which claims that it is but carrying out the wishes of the membership in that district, was based on the following indictment of the majority group of the Central Executive Committee:

1. That this majority group "packed" the Chicago Convention through securing the election of about twice the number of delegates representing its viewpoint than any membership basis gave authority for and through its caucus controlled the convention and placed its members in control of the party.

2. That since the convention, this majority group, in place of devoting its energies to building up the party has been largely concerned with the work of maintaining its control and has decided every question that has come before the Central Executive Committee from the standpoint of its interests and the maintenance of its control of the party, rather than from the broader standpoint of the building up a strong, unified Communist Party in this country.

3. That within a month after the convention certain individuals of this majority group, who largely controlled its actions, became more concerned with the question of obtaining for themselves the opportunity to make a junketing trip to Europe at the party expense than any interest of the party.

4. That Comrade Andrew, after his designation as one of the delegates who were to go to Europe if a Congress of the Third International was held, began an intrigue to secure party funds to enable him

(Continued on page 8)

itself of the Centre and the Right of Jean Longuet as well as Marcel Cachin—sympathy for the Russian revolution or deciding to join the Communist International are not enough: there must be acceptance of revolutionary principles and practice. Imagine the American Socialist Party being admitted to the Communist International while it repudiates Communist fundamentals—mass action, Soviets and proletarian dictatorship; and while it is still dominated by Morris Hilquit, Victor Berger, Meyer London, Seymour Stedman, by all its infinite variety of opportunists and social-patriots—on this problem the Communist International will act uncompromisingly, ruthlessly; it will meet the problem by rigorous exclusion, by using the dictatorship of its revolutionary aspirations and practice.

The Conference met a moment of intense agitation in the International, serious problems of immediate policy and practice pressing for consideration and answer. The Conference met these problems in a style that places the Conference definitely in the Left Wing of the International—a circumstance of supreme importance in the development of our movement.

(Continued from page 3)

view is nothing but the "regurgitation" of the attitude of the "heroes" of the infamous 2d International.

If there is one outstanding difference between the 2d and the 3d International—aside from the vital difference in principles and tactics—it is, that the 3d—*Communist*—International, must be, and is a living and vital organism, actually functioning in the world-revolutionary movement, guiding and shaping the policies of Communist Parties in all countries.

According to this, the only real Communist point of view, not only must the Communist Party see to it that it has actual physical contact with the 3d International, through the sending of its full quota of delegates to all Communist International Conferences and Congresses—but it is one of the highest duties to the 3d International to make every effort to be actually represented, and actively participating in the work of, those conferences and congresses.

These Conferences and Congresses undoubtedly affect the policies and tactics of Communism in all the countries affiliated with it. They not only provide for exchange of information and experience at their meetings, but on the basis of this, formulate policies and a common course of action for all Communist parties. The Communist parties of all countries must be nothing more or less than branches of one, strong, highly centralized, harmoniously-working proletarian International.

In this International, mere correspondence and "red tape" cannot replace actual physical meetings of delegates. Only the merest tyro, the unsophisticated neophyte in the Communist movement can hold a different point of view.

In conformity with this point of view, the Communist Party of America at its first convention elected an International Secretary and four International Delegates. By this, the Communist Party showed that it wished to take its rightful place in the 3d International IN FACT, and not merely by resolutions on paper. So strong was this attitude, that the convention elected it full quota and not merely a perfunctory one or two. It even elected its full quota of alternates, in case some of the delegates elected would, by unforeseen circumstances, be prevented from attending.

In this connection it should be borne in mind, that the meetings of the 3d International—which the capitalist governments use every means from taking place—cannot be held at stated times. Travel is long and difficult under these circumstances, and information regarding such meeting must, of necessity, be at hand at the earliest possible time, and be secret, in order to facilitate the realization and success of the meetings, and to protect the delegates and the meetings as well.

Nevertheless the "minority" strenuously opposed the sending of the International Secretary immediately to establish connections in Europe and go on to Moscow,—but were overruled by the "majority." At the same meeting of the C. E. C., again in spite of the opposition of the "minority," to send two of the delegates elected by the convention as those who should proceed to Europe as soon as "further proof" (as if the proof at hand was insufficient) was received that a meeting was to be held. The motion to send them abroad immediately was defeated. And it is these trips to Europe, to attend the International Communist gatherings, that the "minority" characterized at that time—and characterizes even now—as "junketing trips" of "international politicians" for their own pleasure, and against the interests of the party.

The International Secretary finally went abroad. But, by various machinations and intrigues the "minority" succeeded in preventing other delegates from following him.

Surely we need not recite here in detail

the highly important work that our International Secretary has accomplished abroad in the interest of the Communist Party of America particularly, and in the interest of the Communist movement in general.

The report of the Holland Conference is eloquent testimony on this score. Suffice it to mention his thesis on *Unionism*, which he introduced by instruction by the C. E. C. and which has contributed greatly towards clarifying that question.

His thesis on *Social-Patriots and Unity of the Party* has also been of tremendous importance, clearing up the attitude of the 3d International towards the Centrist parties which seek to swamp it and thus destroy its revolutionary effectiveness. The adoption of this thesis shuts the door to the Independents of Germany, the French Centrists led by Longuet, the Labor Party of Great Britain, the American Socialist Party, the Socialist Labor Party of America, etc.

Lastly, the instruction to the Communist Party to organize, provisionally, a Pan-American Bureau, is a direct result of the International Secretary's presence there.

Were it not for the foresight of the "majority" even the International Secretary's trip would have been cancelled and the party would have had no representation at that Conference whatever.

But the "minority" even at this time, in spite of the services rendered to the party, by the participation of the International Secretary in the Amsterdam Conference, dares to continue its attacks and slanders on the "majority," and even upon the International Secretary himself as one of the "majority."

Mass Action.

Another vital and fundamental difference that arose between the "majority" and "minority" was on the question of Mass Action.

The "minority" conceives of Mass Action as of some nebulous economic power of the working class, organized industrially and exerting pressure industrially on the capitalist system, in order to topple it over. They believe that the use of FORCE (armed revolution and civil war) may or may not be necessary in order to accomplish the overthrow of the capitalist state, depending upon circumstances. They are opposed to propagating the inevitability and consequently, the necessity, when the time will come, of the USE OF FORCE to conquer the power of the state,—as "pre-mature" at the present time. They claim they are not even certain on that score, and therefore object to propagating this doctrine to the workers. Mass Action to them means only the use of general strikes and mass demonstrations—they contend that Manifesto and Program, adopted at Chicago, nowhere implies anything else beyond this point.

With this conception of Mass Action the "majority" completely disagrees. Our conception of Mass Action, is that expressed by the Manifesto of the 3d International. We maintain, that if the lessons of the history of all revolutions—and particularly, the proletarian revolutions—means something and teaches us anything (lessons which the 2d International completely failed to learn),—we must propagate to the workers the USE OF FORCE as the ONLY MEANS of conquering the power of the state and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. And that, instead of remaining silent on this question, we must constantly STRESS it, in order to show the workers the utter futility of hoping for any "peaceful revolution," accomplished either through the parliaments, as the opportunistic Socialists teach—or, by mere general strikes, as the syndicalists teach.

Those familiar with the discussion in the Russian Social-Democratic literature on the same subject (some years ago), will easily recognize that the "majority" takes

the same position as the Bolsheviki took at that time; while our friends of the "minority" are innocently repeating the arguments of the Mensheviki . . .

Language Federations.

As the climax of the differences between the "majority" and "minority," as expressed in the field of organization problems, the question of language federations recently came to the front again. This time it came in the form of an attempt to change the method of selling dues-stamps to the Federation branches, through the District Organizers, instead of through the Central Executive Committees of the Federations. This was intended to be "the first step in the process of abolishing the federations," as frankly stated by the Executive Secretary of the party, himself the proud author of this motion. It will be well to bear in mind that this is exactly the method of paying dues adopted by the C. L. P., which, as is well known, differs fundamentally with the Communist Party, on the question of federations.

This proposition was defeated both in the Executive Council and in the Central Executive Committee. This defeat intensified the bitterness and opposition already existing towards the "majority" in the ranks of the "minority" . . .

Needless to say, like typical Centrists, the "minority" in their fight against the "majority" evaded the fundamental differences with them, as described above. Instead, they preferred to wage a vicious campaign of personal slander and vilification—a method of attack which is characteristic enough not to need any comment.

Their opposition to the stand of the "majority" on principles was camouflaged by reducing them to technicalities of administration routine. Their opposition to federations, for example, was never expressed as such, but was screened behind the technical detail of changing the method of paying dues . . . Their opposition to sending delegates to the International Communist Congress or Conference was masked behind the objection to the use of party funds for "junketing trips" . . . They were opposed to the C. E. C. because the convention was "packed"—because the National Headquarters were removed from Chicago to New York,—because Wicks had been eliminated from the C. E. C.,—because Langley had been removed from the Council and replaced by Andrew, etc., etc., ad nauseum.

Failing in their attempts to change the decisions of the C. E. C., to which they were opposed, they resorted to personal misrepresentations and nasty insinuations against the "majority" members of the C. E. C. "feverish talk-conspirators"—"politicians who were making a plaything of the party"—"self-seekers," and similar terms were only a few of the epithets hurled at the heads of the "majority." They kept up a ceaseless campaign of vilification and abuse, which for venom and bitterness, outdid the attacks of the C. L. P. itself.

The "minority" having control of the party organ and the organization machinery, spread their slanderous campaign among party units, thus hoping to create a "revolt" and dissension in the party, leading to the elimination of those members of the C. E. C., who stood against them. The "majority" position was never presented, neither in the party organ, nor among the party units.

"Chicago Affair."

The Chicago "insurrection" came as the climax to this campaign of personal attacks, slander and vilification.

The "secession movement" came to the attention of the Executive Council about the 1st of April. The Executive Secretary, at this meeting reported that a serious situation had arisen in Chicago—the Chicago District Committee was going to hold a meeting at which an attempt would be made to repudiate the authority of the C. E. C.

and to call a conference of party officials to elect a new C. E. C.

The reasons for their opposition the C. E. C., was their displeasure with the "majority" of the C. E. C., based upon the charges which have been mentioned in the course of this statement and need not be repeated here.

The Council authorized the Secretary to go to Chicago and gave him full power to deal with the situation, "to come down upon them with both feet," as he himself expressed it.

At the next meeting of the Council the Secretary returned and made a verbal report, to the effect that the "secessionists" had withdrawn their contemplated course of action on the promise of complete immunity to all concerned.

The Council, not satisfied with the report, and the terms of the settlement, passed a motion to send a special representative to Chicago to investigate and clarify the situation, and to remove the Chicago District Organizer, if he found that he could not be entrusted with carrying out the policies of the C. E. C. At this point, the Secretary, acting as the spokesman of the "secessionists," stated, that if this motion was passed and carried into effect he would withdraw from the meeting and decide what course of action to pursue. The motion passed and the Secretary withdrew from the meeting.

At the next meeting of the Council the Secretary returned and read a statement, reciting in detail the charges of the Chicago District Committee, claiming that he agreed with those charges, and ended with the following threat:

"Should it (the Council) persist in the course of action determined upon at the last meeting and this result in the removal of the Chicago District Organizer and refusal of the Chicago District to further recognize the authority of the Executive Council and the Central Executive Committee until the convention, it will be impossible for me to continue to work with the present majority of the Executive Council. I will continue to conduct the work of the office of Executive Secretary and Acting Party Editor and will carry on the work of the party through the District Organizations, including the Chicago District Organization as now constituted, holding all funds and report of my work for submission to and disposal of by the convention."

The Council, immediately after the reading of this statement, called for a special meeting of the Central Executive Committee, inviting all District Organizers and Secretaries of the Federations to attend. Another motion was then passed removing the Executive Secretary as Acting Party Editor, pending the decision of the C. E. C., because he could not represent the views of the C. E. C. in the party organ.

As another "Kornilov revolt," the Chicago "insurrection" besides Kornilov, personified by the Chicago District Organizer, had also its "Kerensky" in the person of the Executive Secretary, who returned to the Council, not as its representative, but rather, as the spokesman of the Chicago District Committee, but like Kerensky upon his return from a parley with Kornilov, he announced his terms of settlement—complete immunity to the Chicago "insurrectionists" and denial of the right of the Council or the C. E. C. to remove their agent who had proven to be a traitor to his trust.

C. E. C. Meeting.

The Central Executive Committee meeting opened with the reading of the minutes of the previous meeting. At this point seven members of the C. E. C. submitted a written protest against the distortion and method of preparation of minutes on the question of UNITY—as the minutes on

this question could not be corrected from memory.

The minutes of the last meeting, full of errors, omissions and evasions, were greatly amended before adoption. The uncorrected minutes, as sent out by the Executive Secretary, contributed largely to the Chicago "insurrection" in disseminating falsehoods, slanders and insinuations against the "majority" of the C. E. C.

The Council then reported on the party crisis and the Executive Secretary made his report.

Just as the discussion began on these two reports—before the C. E. C. had taken any action—the Executive Secretary, acting as the Spokesman of the "minority" presented an ultimatum, under threat of an immediate split, which forced the C. E. C. to adjourn its session as a meeting of the C. E. C., in order to negotiate and reach an agreement if possible.

For two days the negotiations proceeded with the "minority" standing firm on the following demands:

That no changes in District Organizers should be made until the convention, except to fill vacancies; and that the party organ should be edited as follows: half, general matter with no supervision by Executive Council, to be edited by the Acting Editor Damon, one-fourth by the "minority" group and one-fourth by the "majority" of the C. E. C.

Finally, the "majority" willing to reach an agreement on mere technical matters of administration, offered the following minimum basis to the "minority" as the limit of its compromise consistent with Communist principles and policies:

Statement of the C. E. C. of the Communist Party to the "Minority" Group.

Confronted with your determination to split the party if the C. E. C. proceeds with exercising its rights to discipline the Chicago District Committee for attempting secession and to remove the Chicago District Organizer for misrepresenting the views and opposing the policies of the C. E. C., whose representative he is supposed to be, and

In view of your opposition, backed by a threat to split the party immediately before a convention, if the C. E. C. removes the present Acting Party Editor, who is an active partisan of the "minority" and cannot therefore be entrusted with editing the organ of the present C. E. C., and

In order to preserve the unity of the party by all means compatible with Communist principles and policies, we propose the following:

(1) That the C. E. C. sends a special representative to Chicago and other parts of the country if necessary, to investigate conditions and report back to the Executive Council. On the question of appointment and dismissal of District Organizers a majority vote of 5 will be necessary in the Executive Council.

(2) That the party organ be edited by two editors, one editor for the "majority" group and one editor for the "minority," any dispute between the two to be settled by the Executive Council.

The "minority" refused to agree to this basis and the negotiations reached a deadlock.

In an attempt to break this deadlock, Bunte, who was neutral throughout this controversy in the C. E. C., proposed that the meeting of the C. E. C. should again formally resume its session. The Executive Secretary refused to recognize such action and stated that he no longer recognized the authority of the C. E. C. Thereupon, Bunte, as acting secretary, called the meeting of the C. E. C. to order and asked the Executive Secretary to turn over the minutes and papers of the meeting. This was again refused. Then all those who refused to recognize the authority of the C. E. C. were asked to withdraw—and the "minority"

group, consisting the following, withdrew: Damon, Ex. Secy., Langley and Kasbeck—C. E. C., Palmer, Estonian; Reivert, German; Tynly, Polish; Legun; Ukrainian; Stan, South Slavic; Smith, District No. 1; Wood, District 4A; Davey, District 4C, and Fisher, District 5.

The following remained to carry on the party work:

C. E. C. members, Bernstein, Meyers, Reiss, Sascha, Andrew, Raphael, Black, Bunte, Brown and Alden.

Bernstein, also District Organizer No. 2; Reiss, No. 4B; Henry, District No. 3; Field, Russian, Burba, Lithuanian, Baltic, Lettish.

We have proposed beyond the shadow of a doubt, that fundamental differences do exist between the "majority" of the C. E. C. and the "secessionists."

We have enumerated these differences in principles and policies, as they have cropped in the C. E. C. and other party units.

We have proved beyond the shadow acted against the instructions of the Convention.

We have proved that they lack the first principle of organization morale—DISCIPLINE.

We have proved that they have been opposed to the decisions of the convention, particularly, on the question of sending delegates to the Third International.

We have proved that they have acted against the recommendations and spirit of the Third International.

We have proved that their cry of "unity" has been a false cry—the whining of sentimentalists and confusionists since these "unity-shouters" have not hesitated to bring disruption, discord and disunity into the Communist Party itself.

We have proved that they have been opposed to the decisions of the September Convention, particularly on the question of Federations—that they seek the destruction and abolition of the only organized elements who have promulgated Communism in America—THE LANGUAGE FEDERATIONS.

The rank and file must now teach these DISRUPTIONISTS a lesson in Communist discipline and organization that they will not quickly forget.

Show them that you will not tolerate counter-revolution within the party.

The CONVENTION of the Communist Party WILL BE HELD as soon as it can be arranged.

It will be called by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party, the only body having authority to call such convention.

Instructions will be given through your district organizations as to the method of election, time and place.

All official communications, including the call for the Convention will be issued by the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party through its Acting Secretary, Bunte.

If you want the Convention to be a success,—if you want the Convention to clarify the principles and policies of Communism and solidify our forces—rally to the support of the Communist Party.

Unite behind the Central Executive Committee to resist all attempts at destroying the foundations of the Party.

Close your ranks—and crush in its inception, any attempt to smash the Communist Party from within,—just as you prevented the capitalist government from smashing your organization from without.

Comrades—stand behind the Central Executive Committee elected by the Convention.

Help us to carry out the decisions of the Convention.

Long live the Communist Party of America!

Long live the Communist International!

An Open Letter to E. V. Debs

(Continued from page 1)

ripe and ready for the change, the great change, which means the rise and triumph of the workers, the end of exploitation, of war and plunder, and the emancipation of the race. Let it come! Let us all help its coming and pave the way for it by organizing industrially and politically to conquer capitalism and usher in the day of the people. In Russia and Germany our valiant comrades are leading the proletarian revolution, which knows no race, no color, no sex, and no boundary lines. They are setting the heroic example for world-wide emulation. *Let us, like them, scorn and repudiate the cowardly compromisers within our own ranks,* challenge and defy the robber-class power, and fight it out on that line to victory or death! From the crown of my head to the soles of my feet I am Bolshevik, and proud of it. The Day of the People has arrived!

Thus spoke the man whom the capitalist class placed behind prison bars, last year.

Today, after a long tomb-like silence, comes the announcement of your acceptance as presidential candidate on the corrupt Socialist Party ticket!

We address this open letter to you because we desire to place the facts squarely before you. Your life-long devotion in the cause of the working class, your attitude toward Bolshevism and the heroic Communist leaders, Lenin and Trotsky in Russia, and Liebknecht and Luxemburg in Germany—your scorn and repudiation of the betrayers of Socialism and the class struggle, make it imperative that we acquaint you with the type of party and men you, in your ignorance, are aligning yourself with.

During this eventful year, while you have been kept behind prison bars, without chance of inter-communication, the Communist International has extended itself to every part of the world. During this year, revolutionary Socialists of practically all countries have decisively cut themselves off from association with the old parties of the Second International and have formed new Communist parties. In this country the rank and file revolt led to the formation of a Left Wing movement within the Socialist Party, which culminated in September of last year at Chicago in the creation of a Communist Party of America. Together with the Communist Labor Party, these two parties absorbed all the really revolutionary elements in the old party. Not more than one-fourth remained in the Socialist Party, notably the large Finnish Federation. The Finnish Communists have not yet split off from the Finnish Socialist Federation. The betrayers of Socialism, "the cowardly compromisers," as you called them, remained in the Socialist Party, and even now lead and shape its policies and tactics. Fortunately, we do not have to go further back into the history of the Socialist Party in order to realize what that party now represents in the United States.

In the recent hearings on the outer of the five Socialist Assemblymen at Albany, we have the last word of the highest Socialist Party spokesmen on just what the party now stands for, and just how it intends to attain its aims. The entire defense of the Socialist Party at Albany was constitutional regularity as the limit of party purposes and actions. They accepted unreservedly the existing form of a capitalist government, based upon the Constitution of the United States, as the form upon which to build the future society. They insisted that the Socialist Party did and always would conform to the State and National Constitutions and laws. Not the least mention was made of the class struggle. Instead, patriotism and loyalty was painfully and somewhat ludicrously stressed. The class character of American Government could hardly be mentioned since the Socialist

Party boastfully proclaimed itself the arch-defender of "representative democracy" and of "constitutional integrity."

The St. Louis Platform, upon which you and others were convicted and sentenced to long prison terms, was brushed aside as "a scrap of paper" and as of no moment. Whatever was vital and revolutionary in it, even though moderately expressed, was twisted and distorted to rob it of its meaning and significance, and the witnesses all insisted upon their exemplary "loyalty" and "patriotism" during the war. In several other respects, in which the party declarations might seem to have offended bourgeois "respectability," the defense was that the party never did anything of the kind, no matter what it said. Control of legislative representatives by compulsory resignations, required by the party constitution, was declared a dead letter. The obligation not to vote for military appropriations was repudiated. Instead of insisting upon the propriety of alien membership in a working class political party, the Socialist Party introduced false figures to prove the "Americanism" of the party membership.

In spite of the achievements of the Russian Communists, in spite of the impending Communist revolutions in other European countries, the chief spokesman of the Socialist Party at Albany characterized the Communist International as "scarcely more than an idea or a name." There was much insistence upon sympathy for Soviet Russia, but that is quite different from adherence to the principles and tactics of International Socialism as expressed in the Manifesto of the Third International.

There was no one at the Albany "fiasco" who did not disavow Bolshevism. Nay, more, Morris Hiquet even went so far as to answer a hypothetical question to the effect that the Socialists would shoulder arms and defend America and American institutions from invasion by the Bolsheviks, should the latter declare war on this country. While another Socialist lawyer at Albany, Seymour Stedman, former member of the N. E. C. and next choice of the Socialist Party after yourself for the presidential nomination, branded the Communist Party as criminals in the capitalist courts in order to steal from them their meeting hall in Detroit.

Never before did the Socialist Party of America revel in such orgies of "respectability," "loyalty" and "patriotism." With such men as Judge Hughes and Attorney General Palmer to rally to their defense, surely the Socialist Party has purged itself on every taint and suspicion of revolutionary Socialism! We need only cite the comment of the man responsible for the thousands of deportations and nation-wide raids upon the Communist organizations, Attorney General Palmer: "The Socialist Party in America has cast out the radicals and forced them to organize the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party. The Socialists are loyal and patriotic men though radical. Their aim is to change the government by lawful means, while the 'Reds' would destroy lawful authority."

Never was there a more glaring climax of political irony than the publication, during the Albany affair, of the Socialist Party membership referendum vote in favor of allegiance to the Communist International—3,475 to 1,444 in favor of allegiance without acceptance of its program and tactics, while openly repudiating every principle of Socialism for the sake of retaining a few seats in a capitalist legislature!

In striking contrast with the corrupt Socialist Party, which deceives the workers with the hope of a "peaceful (!) social revolution" along the lines of parliamentary reforms, the Communist Party enters the parliamentary campaign for revolutionary propaganda and agitation only. Our slogan is "Down with the Parliament! Long live the Soviets!" The Communist Party

utilizes parliaments in the same manner as did the Bolsheviki in the Czarist Duma, as Karl Liebknecht did in the German Reichstag—to assist in destroying the bourgeois parliamentary system. Since our object is the destruction of capitalism, and not carrying out the will of the capitalist class, which is, in fact, the only function of executive officials, the Communist Party, in keeping with this general principle, has abolished all executive offices from its ticket. From President down to Governor, Mayor and Judges, the Communist Party places no candidates in the field. In other words, the Communist Party is for the full utilization of the bourgeois parliament for our Communist work—as long as we are not yet strong enough to overthrow the Parliament—and not for social reforms and other palliative measures.

The Communist Party is waging the class struggle mainly through extra-parliamentary channels—mass action of the working class through general political strikes, mass demonstrations, etc. And in order to carry on the struggle effectively we call upon the working class to conquer the power of the State, establish the dictatorship of the working class in the form of Soviets or Councils of Workers' Deputies and to break the resistance of the bourgeoisie.

* * *

In January the government staged a series of nation-wide raids upon the Communist Party with the express purpose of crushing it in its infancy. The very existence of a Communist movement is a serious menace to capitalism, and they know it. **BUT THEY DID NOT SUCCEED.** The Communist Party of America cannot be crushed, neither by the Iron Heel of Capitalist Democracy, nor by the cunning stealth of the servile capitalist tools, the Socialist Party of America. They did succeed, however, in driving the Communist Party underground, where, coming directly in contact with the workers in the shops, mills, factories and mines, it receives new reserves of energy with which to carry on the class struggle to its final and inevitable outcome, the Socialist revolution—the overthrow of the capitalist state—the establishment of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and through it the Communist Society.

* * *

Between the Communist Party and the Socialist Party there can be no compromise. The latter is the most dangerous enemy of the working class, and as such, we shall wage a bitter, merciless struggle against it. Their attempt to use your name in order to fool the masses will avail them nothing. Their betrayal of Socialism has been too complete and too cowardly. Not even your name can hide their counter-revolutionary tendency. The class-conscious workers of America are through with the stinking carcass that calls itself the Socialist Party of America.

As for their hypocritical act of seeking admission to membership in the Third International without first accepting its principles and tactics—that is too palpable a fraud to warrant any serious consideration. They cannot be admitted so long as they repudiate, by words or by deeds, mass action, proletarian dictatorship and Soviet Power.

Your alignment with the Socialist Party, whether you will it or not, is an alignment against the Communist Movement of America—against the Communist International—against the world-proletarian revolution toward which our heroic comrades in Russia are looking for their salvation. It is against your own inspiring efforts for the working class in the past.

Comrade Debs, we have placed the facts before you. It is yours to choose. The comrades and the class-conscious workers everywhere believe that the shameful record of the Socialist Party since your imprison-

(Continued from page 5)
to go to Europe, although no evidence was at hand that a Congress was to be held. Immediately after the November meeting he attempted to have himself placed on the party pay roll on the ground that he must go in hiding in order to be able to fulfill his mission. On three occasions through personal demands and through emissaries, he attempted to secure funds from the Executive Council, then located in Chicago. That in furtherance of these personal schemes Comrade Andrew came to Chicago twice and each time the money for these trips were voted out of the party treasury—the money for the last trip for two members of the majority group being voted out of the party treasury by the majority group of the Central Executive Committee after it had been refused by the Chicago Executive Council. These efforts of Andrew culminated in his plan to leave the country as International Delegate without any authority of any party committee, in which plan, according to statements made before the Central Executive Committee, certain members of the majority group abetted him.

To secure funds for this unauthorized trip the party organizations were resorted to and a member of the Central Executive Committee is charged with having gone to Boston and represented the District Organization that the Central Executive Committee had assessed the district \$100 for Comrade Andrew's trip. Later Andrew appeared and secured this money. Andrew himself confessed before the C. E. C. that he had secured money from party sources on the representation that a certain group considered the decision of the governing body of the party wrong and the before was raising funds for the trip as International Delegate contrary to the decisions of that body, which funds would be repaid by the party should this group be proven right by events.

In spite of the fact that Comrade Andrew's culpability was shown by his own statement, the majority group of which he has been a member has refused to even censure him, while on the other hand it has been quick to move against any member of the minority against whom the slightest ground for action existed, notably in the Wicks case and the removal of Langley from the Executive Council.

5. At the January meeting of the Central Executive Committee this majority group was prevented from securing control of the Executive Council through an ultimatum from certain Federation representatives, who supported the former Chicago majority of the Council. This control, was, however, established by the removal of Langley, which was part of the plan to further trench the majority group. The contrast between the prompt action against Langley because he had missed two meetings of the Executive Council and the action in the Andrew case, who succeeded him as a member of the Council, is in itself

ment is as yet unknown to you. But if, after you have read this statement, which goes not only to you, but in leaflet form by the millions to the workers of this country, you still adhere to the Socialist Party, we shall have to conclude that you have cast your lot with the 'cowardly compromisers,' as you once called them, with the betrayers of the working class, with the betrayers of the class struggle, with the betrayers of Socialism—and we shall announce that fact to the working class.

The eyes of the revolutionary class-conscious workers of America are focused upon you at this moment—can you remain a candidate on the Socialist Party ticket with these facts before you—realizing the significance of your candidacy in relation to your own life-work and the International Communist Movement?

the best kind of proof of the motives which govern the majority group.

6. That since it has been in office the majority of the C. E. C. has been completely taken up with forwarding personal schemes and maintaining its control and have not taken any constructive action in the interest of building a stronger organization. At no time has the committee considered questions of propaganda policy and the relation of the party to the working class movement in this country. What constructive propaganda and organization work has been done by the party has been done by initiative of the Executive Council while in Chicago and not dominated by the present majority group, and by the Executive Secretary.

7. That in dealing with the problems of reorganization after the January raids and the liquidation of the legal organization this majority group has decided all questions on the basis of its continued control rather than from the standpoint of the best interests of the party.

Personally I am to a large extent in agreement with this indictment of the majority of the committee, but on the other hand I believe that any movement of revolt against the majority group, shortly before a convention at which all elements within the party would have the opportunity to present their case and at which the party will be definitely reorganized, can not be justified and would only result in the disruption of the party at a time when all our energies should be devoted to rebuilding our organization.

I went to Chicago with the purpose of presenting this viewpoint and convinced the Committee that the only course to pursue, no matter how bitter its opposition to the majority group of the C. E. C.—and the opposition is bitter, was to go into the convention and fight for its viewpoint. I went to Chicago to use all my influence to prevent a break in the unity of the party and succeeded.

I reported this settlement to the Executive Council last Tuesday, but in place of accepting it and thus expressing its cooperation in endeavoring to prevent a split in our organization, four members of the Council representing the majority group of the Central Executive Committee took ac-

THE PARTY CRISIS

(Continued from page 2)

to the Socialist ideology of a "peaceful" revolution, will come into the Communist Party and by sheer weight of numbers compel it to change its Communist course of propaganda and agitation,—compel it to revise its whole position until it will meet with their politically immature ideals—compel it to recede until it will effect a juncture with the social-patriotic Socialist Party which is even now luring weak-minded Communists with the cry of "unity."

The Communist Party, if it is to learn anything from the bitter experiences of the past, cannot afford to attempt to get "contact with the masses" at the expense of sacrificing Communist principles and tactics. Essentially the Communist Party represents ideas and not numbers. We can afford to remain small in numbers for the present, if we shape our organization to hold Communist principles and policies unsullied and free from the base ingredients of compromise and opportunism and carry on our Communist propaganda to the workers with the full implication of all that it implies.

We must try to reach the workers with our propaganda—we don't expect to make much of an impression on them at present. Well and good. We shall continue our agitation, confident that the social forces, the economic disin-

tion to maintain their factional control of the party—action which is bound to bring about a split—by voting to send a representative of this majority group of four to Chicago with authority **TO REMOVE THE DISTRICT ORGANIZER.** This action was preceded by a proposal to remove the entire District Committee and to reorganize the district, which was only abandoned when it was shown by the minority that it would be impossible to carry out such a proposal because the membership of the Chicago District would not permit. The four members who comprise this majority (Andrew, Bernstein, Raphael and Sascha) also voted down my motion to refer the whole matter to the full C. E. C. (motion supported by Damon, Bunte and Braun).

The sending of a representative of the majority group to Chicago with authority to remove the District Organizer can have only one purpose and that is to use the temporary authority of the present majority group to perpetuate its control by arbitrarily ousting those who oppose it. The removal of the Chicago District Organizer on this issue would be resisted by the District Committee and the membership of the Chicago District and would bring about the break in the party which I succeeded in preventing.

There is no other ground than an effort to perpetuate factional control to warrant the removal of the Chicago District Organizer. He is the most capable man in such a position in the party at the present time. The Chicago District reorganization has progressed farther than any other district. The Chicago District has turned over to the National Organization for the party work more funds during the last three months than all the other districts combined. Yet this majority of four members of the Executive Council in its desperate attempt to maintain their control of the organization are ready to summarily dismiss this District Organizer because he represents a different party viewpoint than they do, at a time when the party has been unable to secure competent men to fill similar positions elsewhere.

Owing to lack of space we have to continue this report to our next issue.

tegration of world capitalism since the war—and which can no longer succeed in rehabilitating itself—will compel the masses to listen to our message. Capitalism is bankrupt and the rage of the workers is just emerging out of the travail of struggle and strife with the forces of reaction. Soviet Russia is leading the way—and the workers in this country as well as in all other countries, will soon feel the compelling urge of doing what their Russian comrades did. The masses will come to us in good time. What we will not do—what we cannot do if we are to function as an organic part of Third International, is to go to the masses now—seek "contact with them" and lead them into the Communist movement at the expense of sacrificing our principles, policies and aims.

If the "secessionists" do succeed in splitting the party—if they do succeed in winning most of the rank and file with them—why that will only mean that the majority of the rank and file were themselves not fully ready to accept *Communist theory and practice.* It will only mean that the real Communists remaining will close ranks and march unflinchingly onward to the goal. The Communist Party has no time to grieve over the loss of some of its numbers. There is work ahead—Communist work—and all those who can work must set themselves to the stern task ahead.